

# Leeds Studies in English

## Article:

E. A. Jones, 'A Chapter from Richard Rolle in Two Fifteenth-Century Compilations', *Leeds Studies in English*, n.s. 27 (1996), 139-62

## Permanent URL:

[https://ludos.leeds.ac.uk:443/R/-?func=dbin-jump-full&object\\_id=123740&silos\\_library=GEN01](https://ludos.leeds.ac.uk:443/R/-?func=dbin-jump-full&object_id=123740&silos_library=GEN01)



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

## A Chapter from Richard Rolle in Two Fifteenth-Century Compilations<sup>1</sup>

E. A. Jones

The works of 'the fourteenth-century English mystics' have too often been regarded as closed books. Despite the critical attention which they have attracted over the past few decades, very little work has yet been done on the reception, anthologisation and adaptation of these texts in the fifteenth and subsequent centuries, although the evidence available is plentiful. Even for the best known and most written about of the 'mystics', Hope Emily Allen's *Writings Ascribed to Richard Rolle* – in this as still in many other respects – remains to be superseded by a comprehensive modern study.<sup>2</sup>

\*In her chapter listing quotations from and references to Rolle in medieval treatises and compilations, Allen gives details of three 'compilations' and twenty-eight 'manuscripts', many of them including substantial excerpts from his works. It is a rather unproductive distinction, since many of her 'manuscripts' – a term suggesting unique and perhaps rather disparate miscellanies – are in fact different copies of the same work, and a number of these deserve to stand among the best examples of medieval compilation technique. Even if, as a consequence, the true number of distinct compilations incorporating Rolle material has been overestimated, it remains a matter for some surprise that only two of the three compilations, and barely half a dozen of the twenty-eight manuscripts, have received more than scanty further attention.<sup>3</sup>

The two compilations which form the subject of the present article were both listed by Allen. One is the Latin compilation (so designated), *Speculum Spiritualium*, the other the English compilation (the two extant copies of which appear together in Allen's 'manuscripts' section), *Disce Mori*.<sup>4</sup> Allen did not, however, notice that the two compilations are related. *Disce Mori* may in fact now be shown to be dependent on the Latin text for approximately one quarter of its content, including most of its frequently cited instruction in the contemplative life.<sup>5</sup> In particular, almost all of the English compilation's borrowings from the writings of Rolle have come by way of the

*Speculum*. Any investigation into the relationship of the two compilations must, however, be predicated on a sound knowledge of their respective texts – and this has hitherto been unavailable. This article takes as its focus a short chapter of excerpts from Rolle which the two compilations have in common, but seeks also to begin to remedy the scholarly neglect of two important witnesses to the fifteenth-century appeal of the fourteenth-century mystics.

*Speculum Spiritualium*, no doubt because it is a Latin compilation, has been the worse served by previous studies.<sup>6</sup> Yet it was evidently popular: written between 1400 and 1430, almost certainly by a Carthusian, it survives in twelve manuscripts containing substantial portions of the text; seven more contain short excerpts; four further manuscripts are listed in the Syon brothers' catalogue, and a quotation in the Syon *Myroure of oure Ladye* reinforces the impression of the work's popularity at the Bridgettine house.<sup>7</sup> The compilation's influence extends further to its use as a principal source for the Latin compilation *Donatus Deuocionis*, as well as to the borrowings in *Disce Mori* already mentioned.<sup>8</sup> The work was also printed at Paris by Wolfgang Hopyl in two impressions of 1510, for sale in London and Paris, at the expense of a London merchant, William Bretton. The seven other texts published by Bretton in the period 1505-10 confirm the popularity of the *Speculum*: it was evidently expected to sell alongside such commercial certainties as *Horae*, Lyndwood's *Provincial*, psalters, graduals and the *Pupilla Oculi*.<sup>9</sup>

Horstman described the *Speculum* as expounding a 'complete theory of contemplation';<sup>10</sup> in reality, it offers less a unified theory than a compendium of definitions and quotations drawn, 'with great labour and much study', from authorities both ancient and modern, on an exhaustive array of subjects, including not only the life of contemplation, but also the doctrinal knowledge and ascetic observance prerequisite for entry into that life. The compiler offers the work to those who, like himself, live an austere life, having time for contemplation – the religious – but also to those who, for lack of money, cannot have enough books: they will find in this one volume almost everything which might be necessary to them. This apparent concession to a less restricted readership is then made explicit: although the book is written principally for contemplatives, those dedicated to the active life will also find much that is of use to them.<sup>11</sup>

For the reader pursuing the active life, the compiler suggests the first three of the compilation's seven parts, and the seventh. Parts One to Three deal respectively with sins, principally the seven deadly sins, and the remedies against them; temptations and tribulations, in particular those attendant upon any attempt to achieve

perfection; and the sacrament of penance, and the virtues which follow from it. Part Four caters specifically for religious, with discussions of novitiate, monastic vows, and daily routine. In Part Five, the virtues of Part Three are supplemented by those *que obseruanda sint ad puritatem cordis obtinendam*, and which prepare the soul for contemplation. Contemplative experience itself is the subject of Part Six. Thus far, the compilation has followed the widely found pattern of an incremental progression from sin through purgation and ascesis to virtue and perfection manifested in contemplative experience.<sup>12</sup> Part Seven offers another model of medieval compilation technique in covering much of the same material as the first six parts, this time in the form of an encyclopedic collection of *exempla* and quotations from *auctores*, ranged alphabetically from *Abstinentia* to *De visitacione carnalium amicorum*, before the compilation concludes with a selection of *Suffragia*.

The *Speculum* is impressively wide-ranging and up to date in its selection of *auctores*, and varied in its treatment of them. The technique of some of its chapters is self-evident: thus one finds a barrage of quotations deploring each of the deadly sins under the heading *De Dictis sanctorum ad detestationem superbie* (and so on). Elsewhere, an extended argument from the same source is allowed to develop over several chapters. Most frequently, however, a brief, apparently original introduction prepares the ground for two or three substantial excerpts (in a modern analogy, of paragraph length) from *auctores*. Over fifty different writers are named, and quotations from others regularly go unacknowledged. Not surprisingly, the compiler is most indebted to the great doctors – Augustine, Gregory and Bernard; but also cited are the continental contemplatives – Bridget, Suso, Elizabeth of Schönau and Mechtild of Hackeborn – and the English contemplative authors Edmund of Abingdon, Walter Hilton and Richard Rolle. Edmund is represented by two extracts from the *Speculum Ecclesie*, concerning true poverty and the passion; Hilton by quotations from the Latin epistles *De Imagine Peccati* and the *Epistola de Utilitate et Prerogativis Religionis*, as well as numerous excerpts from Thomas Fishlake's translation of both books of the *Scale of Perfection*, including much of his most characteristic teaching on contemplation.<sup>13</sup>

The extracts from Rolle, too, have much that is characteristic of him. Excerpts from the popular *Emendatio Vitae* total roughly half of that work, and include descriptions of the 'three degrees of love' and of the heights of mystical experience; devotion to the Holy Name is represented by a long passage taken from the *Oleum Effusum* compilation.<sup>14</sup> One other quotation from Rolle is, however, exceptional, in being taken from an English work – the *Form of Living* – and, moreover, in being quoted (uniquely for the *Speculum*) in English.<sup>15</sup> The chapter, which concludes Part

Two of the *Speculum*, consists of three passages taken from the first, fifth and sixth chapters of the *Form*, following the sequence of the original closely, and with no intervening material added by the compiler. In introducing the chapter, the compiler declares that he has left it in English because Rolle's doctrine sounds better in his mother tongue, as he first propounded it, than if translated into the Latin language.<sup>16</sup> This might lead one to expect one of Rolle's extravagant rhetorical showpieces; the extracts selected, however, constitute an unexceptionable exhortation to discretion and moderation in ascetic practices, notably fasting and abstinence.

*Speculum Spiritualium* survives, as already mentioned, in a dozen manuscripts containing substantial portions of the text, and a number of others featuring extracts from the compilation. Since these have never been listed in full, and they vary considerably among themselves, it may be of use to provide a first list and classification of them here, together with some account of their relation to the printed edition by which the compilation has more usually been known.<sup>17</sup>

**S** Salisbury: Cathedral Library, MS 56, ff. 1<sup>r</sup>-220<sup>v</sup>. 15th c. Parts I-VII. Followed by the *Visio Tungdali*, excerpts from Suso's *Horologium Sapientie* and Rolle's *Emendatio Vitae*. This is the only extant manuscript which appears ever to have included all seven parts of the *Speculum*. As it survives, it is defective at the beginning, the first complete chapter being I.xxiii. It lacks II.xv, as do all manuscripts apart from **B** and **M**, and I.xlii, which only **B** and the printed edition preserve. The chief departure from the printed text is, however, the arrangement of V and VI, whose chapters are reorganised into one continuously numbered sequence of fifty-three chapters, as follows:

1-18	V.i-xviii
19-27	VI.i-ix
28-29	VI.xxi-xxii
30-32	V.xix-xxi
33-38	VI.x-xv
39-42	V.xxii-xxv
43-47	VI.xvi-xx
48-53	VI.xxiii-xxviii

It thus numbers only six parts, to the seven of the printed text.<sup>18</sup>

It appears that the *Speculum* was regularly divided between two, or even three, volumes. Among the copies owned by the brothers of Syon Abbey, M60 was *Primum volumen speculi spiritualium continens primas 4or partes*, while M61 was its companion, *continens 5am 6am & 7am partes*.<sup>19</sup> A number of extant manuscripts testify to a similar arrangement.

**Y** York: Minster Library, MS XVI.1.9, ff. 1<sup>r</sup>-227<sup>v</sup>. Earlier 15th c. Parts I-IV. Ex-Mount Grace priory (Carthusian). Explicitly the first of a two volume set, its donation notice records *Iste liber . . . vocatur Speculum spiritualium continens in se sex partes in toto. In isto vero volumine continentur quatuor partes de eodem libro* . . . *Et in altero volumine continentur due partes videlicet quinta & sexta* (f.<sup>v</sup> 8). The second volume may have included only V-VI, or, if its fifth part was the intercalated V/VI witnessed by **S**, it may have been a complete text.<sup>20</sup>

**B** Oxford: Bodleian Library, MS Bodley 450, ff. 17<sup>r</sup>-204<sup>v</sup> (*tabula*, ff. 1<sup>r</sup>-16<sup>v</sup>). 15th c. Parts I-IV. Most complete of extant manuscripts for those parts which it contains (including the rarely found I.xlii and II.xv). Closest to the printed edition. Prologue records *librum in vii partes is qui compilauit diuisit* (f. 17<sup>r</sup>a), indicating that the second volume followed (or was to follow) the arrangement of the printed text, rather than that of **S**. Prefaced by a *tabula*, referring only to I-IV.<sup>21</sup>

**R** London: British Library, MS Royal 7 B xiv, ff. 1<sup>r</sup>-195<sup>v</sup>. First half of 15th c. Parts I-IV. Less unequivocally than **B** one of a two volume set: prologue has *in vii partes*, but in referring the reader dedicated to the active life to appropriate parts of the work, mentions only I-III.<sup>22</sup>

**L** Oxford: Bodleian Library, MS Lat. Th. e. 8, ff. 1<sup>r</sup>-290<sup>v</sup>. 15th c. Parts V/VI. Ex-Priory of Saint Mary Overy, Southwark (Austin canons). The second of a three-volume set. The intercalated version of V/VI, preceded (nonsensically) by a list of chapters following the alternative arrangement found in the printed text. Followed by the first of the *narrationes* of VII (concerning abstinence, and including cross-references to I-III), before breaking off with: *queri residuum istarum narrationum in alio libro qui sic incipit Quia vero secundum beati Gregorium &c / liber videlicet narrationum predictus speculi spiritualium* (p. 266).<sup>23</sup>

Other manuscripts were never designed to have complete texts. In his prologue, the compiler explicitly sanctions such selective copying, suggesting that, if

a copyist – perhaps because of the prolixity of the work – does not wish to copy the whole of it, he might transcribe only those parts and chapters which seem appropriate to his (or his readers') circumstances.<sup>24</sup> Perhaps in response to this, volume M63 in the Syon catalogue contains, alongside other works of instruction, only *Due prime partes speculi spiritualium*.<sup>25</sup> Extant manuscripts containing abridged texts testify to a variety of intended audiences and uses.

**T** Dublin: Trinity College, MS 271, ff. 1<sup>r</sup>-232<sup>v</sup>. Mid-15th c. Parts I-IV, plus V/VI, incomplete. Ex-Chester Abbey (Benedictine). Prologue speaks of division into only *quinque partes* (f. 1<sup>r</sup>). The fifth part, listed as *de arte moriendi & interiori homine & de modo orandi & meditandi & aliis ad contemplacionem pertinentibus (ibid.)*, breaks off after the first twenty-eight chapters of the intercalated version of V/VI. All but *aliis ad contemplacionem pertinentibus* has been fulfilled by what survives; whether or not a full text of V/VI once followed is unclear. It is, however, evident that VII was not included.<sup>26</sup>

**M** Oxford: Merton College, MS 204, ff. 2<sup>r</sup>-181<sup>v</sup>. Written from 1446 to 1449 by John Gisburgh, Austin canon of Merton Priory. Parts II-VI, followed by a number of short devotional texts, some in English. Entitled *Speculum Humane Vite*, it was intended for the use of *incipiencium, proficiencium, et perfectorum* (f. 2<sup>ra</sup>). Contents as the printed text, except for the transposition of VI.xii and xiii, and the omission of II.xvi (the Rolle chapter), despite its listing – *in anglico extractum & scriptum de tractatu Ricardi hampoll* (f. 2<sup>rb</sup>) – in the table of chapters.<sup>27</sup>

**G** Cambridge: St. John's College, MS G.13, ff. 91<sup>v</sup>-221<sup>r</sup>. Early 15th c. Parts I-II. II.v and vi transposed; II.xv and xvi omitted. Follows a treatise on the Decalogue. Followed by an alphabetical *Kalender*. Some evidence of slavish copying: the prologue refers to material *in prima 2a 3a parte*, and declares the work to be divided into *vi partes* (f. 91<sup>r</sup>) – but there is no suggestion that more than I-II was ever intended. Further, the omission of II.xvi leaves the text with the following bizarre conclusion:

Dicto iam de [v]ariis temptacionibus & earum remediis ac de tribulacione & vtilitate ipsius: subiungam quedam in lingua materna de dictis Ricardi hampoll ad discrecionem pertinencia prout superius dixi me facturum Et hoc ideo quia melius sonat eius doctrina in lingua materna prout ipse eam primo protulit:

quam si eam in linguam latinam transferam. Amen (f. 221<sup>r</sup>b)<sup>28</sup>

**D** Cambridge: University Library, MS Dd.iv.54, ff. 64<sup>r</sup>-155<sup>r</sup>. 15th c. Part II, followed by a version of Part I. Also includes texts of Rolle's *Emendatio Vitae* and *Expositio Super Novem Lectiones Mortuorum*. II, entitled *quidam tractatus de variis temptacionibus*, features transposed v and vi (as **G**); omission of vii and xv (but not xvi), and a variant opening to xi. II.xvi is followed by *Et sic finit tractatus iste*, then *hic incipit tractatus de temptacionibus multimodis & variis necnon & remediis contra temptationes adhibendis* (f. 100<sup>v</sup>). This *tractatus* consists of eighteen chapters corresponding to the *Speculum's* treatment of the seven deadly sins, but with substantial alteration and omission.<sup>29</sup>

**Ma** Oxford: Magdalen College, MS 141, ff. 56<sup>r</sup>-66<sup>v</sup>. Part II, under the title *Breuis compilacio de diuersis temptacionibus & earum remediis*. Begun in 1433; owned, and the latter part (not including the *Speculum*) copied, by John Dygon, occupant of the Sheen reclusory from 1435. Other contents include Fishlake's translation of *Scale* I, and the first book of *Donatus Deuocionis* – itself largely derived from the *Speculum*. As in **G** and **D**, II.v and vi are transposed; **Ma** shares also with **D** the omission of vii and xv, and the variant opening to xi; xvi is, however, omitted. The copyist, noticing the omission of vii from his exemplar, has changed the number of his seventh chapter to eight, and noted in the margin *hic deficit capitulum . . . capitulum vii* (f. 60<sup>v</sup>).<sup>30</sup>

**H** London: British Library, MS Harley 237, ff. 151<sup>r</sup>-99<sup>v</sup>. 15th c. Ex-Mount Grace. Part II, supplementing a copy of the three-book version of the *Cibus Anime*, a compilation arguably lacking the comprehensive treatment of temptations and tribulations that II provides. Ascribed in the ownership inscription (presumably on the strength of the final chapter, with its concluding *hucusque Ric. hampol*) to Rolle. None of the features peculiar to **G** and/or **D****Ma**; xiii omitted. II.vii omitted from the preceding table of chapters, but the text of the chapter is in fact included, following on without chapter-division from vi. The table of chapters also indicates the omission of xv and the inclusion of xvi. This cannot, however, be verified since the text now ends imperfectly in xiiii.<sup>31</sup>

**B<sup>2</sup>** Oxford: Bodleian Library, MS Bodley 549, ff. 1<sup>r</sup>-23<sup>v</sup>. Earlier 15th c. Part V/VI, incomplete. A composite manuscript, bound together in the fifteenth century. The latter part, mostly material connected with the Carthusian order, is in the hand of

Stephen Dodesham, of Witham and later Sheen. It probably dates from his time at the latter house (after 1469); and, since the binding is contemporary, it seems reasonable to suppose that the earlier part of the manuscript, containing the *Speculum* extracts, also belonged to Sheen. Contains only V.i-xi plus xii (imperfect). A preceding table of chapters, however, lists thirty-two chapters, corresponding with the first thirty-two of the fifty-three chapters of the intercalated version of V/VI. This evidence for an abbreviated V/VI could be of relevance to the surviving text in **T**, whose twenty-eight chapters plus the heading for a twenty-ninth might thus represent, not barely half of the full V/VI, but a near-complete copy of the version of the text attested by **B**<sup>2</sup>.<sup>32</sup>

The Syon brothers possessed, in the first volume of a two-volume copy of the *Speculum*, a *Tabula vocalis super integrum opus*.<sup>33</sup> Other manuscripts – **B** and **G** – as well as the printed edition, contain *tabulae* or *kalenders*, in addition to the detailed lists of chapters found in nearly all manuscripts. In addition, Part VII of the compilation itself functions much like a *tabula*, in that its alphabetical collection of *narrationes* includes also cross-references to the rest of the work. *Speculum Spiritualium* was thus well equipped for use as a *florilegium*, both in the compilation of other treatises, such as *Disce Mori* and *Donatus Deuocionis*, and for briefer quotations in commonplace books and manuscript miscellanies. No doubt the instances recorded below represent only a small proportion of the extant (and a still smaller proportion of the one-time) total.

**T**<sup>2</sup> Dublin: Trinity College, MS 277, p. 549. Mid-15th c. Probably from York. Two *exempla* from VII. A note following the extracts acknowledges their source, and identifies it as a six-part text of the *Speculum*: *Iste due narrationes predictae habentur in libro uocato speculum spiritualium parte sexta titulo prelati in littera P*.<sup>34</sup>

**T**<sup>3</sup> Dublin: Trinity College, MS 432, section F of a composite manuscript, ff. 143<sup>v</sup>-144<sup>r</sup>. 15th c. A quotation ascribed to *Bonauentura . . . in sexta parte libri spiritualium* is part of VI.xxv (and is actually taken from chapter xii of Rolle's *Emendatio Vitae*).<sup>35</sup>

**Do** Bath: Downside Abbey, MS 26542, ff. 168<sup>v</sup>-72<sup>r</sup>. Later 15th c. Presented to Betyrce Chaumbre on the occasion of her reception into the Dominican priory of Dartford, and to be retained there in perpetuity for the use of the nuns. Includes V.xxi, a commendation of meditation on the passion drawing on Suso and Mechtild of Hackeborn.<sup>36</sup>

**F** Cambridge: University Library, MS Ff.vi.33, ff. 26<sup>V</sup>-31<sup>V</sup>. Written by William Darker of Sheen (fl. c. 1500) for the nuns of Syon. Features the sole surviving copy of the sisters' Additions to the Bridgettine Rule. Includes III.xxvii (commentary on the Pater Noster), in a unique translation into English.<sup>37</sup>

Three further manuscripts attest the separate circulation of II.xiii, an account of the temptations faced by the elect based on the third of Peter of Blois's twelve 'profits of tribulation'.<sup>38</sup> In this case, however, it is less clear whether the text is to be considered an excerpt from the *Speculum*, or one of its sources.

**Jo** Oxford: St. John's College, MS 77, ff. 13<sup>V</sup>-16<sup>V</sup>. 15th c. Given by John Dygon of the Sheen reclusory (owner also of **Ma**) to Exeter College, Oxford.<sup>39</sup>

**K** Cambridge: University Library, MS Kk.vi.41, ff. 113<sup>V</sup>-124<sup>V</sup>. 15th c. Text closely related to **Jo**, with which it regularly agrees against the printed edition.<sup>40</sup>

**E** Cambridge: St. John's College, MS E.22. Written at Hinton charterhouse by John Clerk (d. 1472). Chapter 13 of an 18-chapter compilation entitled *Veni mecum in adiutorium*. Its text omits the usual final sentence, and proceeds to a lengthy addition on the need to fear the occasion of sin, and its consequences. Regularly agrees with **Jo** and **K** against the printed edition, but not with the same degree of agreement as between **Jo** and **K**. Also includes, as chapter 16, a version of III.xxii (an extract from the *Stimulus Amoris*), here ascribed to *Bartholomeus in libro qui vocatur Florarium de vita perfecte*.<sup>41</sup>

Ten manuscripts thus contain Part Two of *Speculum Spiritualium* in substantially complete form, making it the most frequently attested part of the compilation. Of these ten manuscripts, six, **BDRSTY**, include II.xvi, the English chapter from Rolle's *Form of Living*; it has been lost from one, **H**, and omitted from three others, **GMMa**. An analysis of the variants for this chapter might be expected to provide further evidence for the grouping of the extant manuscripts of the compilation. In the event, the readings of most manuscripts emerge as idiosyncratic. Against this, two pairings stand out clearly. Twelve readings found in **R** and **S** are unique to these two manuscripts.<sup>42</sup> Independent readings in each, however, suggest neither is copied from the other; moreover, while **S** has a six-part text, featuring intercalated Parts V-VI, **R** seems to have followed the seven-part arrangement of the printed edition. More revealing are the four cases of agreement of **B** with the text of

the printed edition (hereafter, and in the transcription below,  $\pi$ ) against all other manuscripts, twice in clear error, and the two instances of alterations to **B** incorporated into  $\pi$ , but no other manuscript.<sup>43</sup> This would suggest that the printed text was set up from **B** or a manuscript of its type. That **B** itself was not the compositor's copy is suggested by the spelling *wip* or *wiy* for 'with' in  $\pi$  against the *whit* of **B**; although such variation would normally be explained by a compositor's (or a scribe's) alteration to his own idiolect, the fact that the compositor of  $\pi$  was so clearly unfamiliar with the English language in this instance makes his evidence all the more reliable.<sup>44</sup> The printed text was, then, set up from a manuscript related to **B**. That this manuscript was a descendent rather than an antecedent of **B** is suggested by the reading *Ther þe while* for *Therfor þe while*, which **B** shares with  $\pi$ , where the omission of *for* coincides with, and may reasonably be explained by, the break in **B** between one column of the page and the next.<sup>45</sup>

The relationship between **B** and the printed edition may be demonstrated from other evidence. Part Two is the most volatile part of the *Speculum* in terms of inclusion and omission of chapters: only **B** among the extant manuscripts has all the sixteen found in the printed text. (Similarly, only **B** and the printed text preserve I.xlii.) Moreover, while all manuscripts except **G** omit II.vii from their tables of chapters to Part Two, only **B** and the 1510 printing also fail to list II.xiii. Perhaps the most striking evidence for the dependence of the printed edition on a manuscript related to **B** is, however, afforded by a comparison of the *tabulae* which preface the text in each, and the apparatus which accompany them. In **B**, the *Tabula*, in a different hand from the main text had, has been added on two quires bound into the front of the manuscript.<sup>46</sup> It lists alphabetically a range of key topics which are treated in the compilation, from *Abusio* to *Zelator*, referring the reader to the appropriate part and chapter of the compilation. Subdivision of chapters is indicated in the *Tabula* by a letter of the alphabet, which corresponds with marginal letters located at convenient intervals throughout the text, and recommencing at 'A' with the start of each new chapter. Since references are to the first four parts of the compilation only, it may be inferred that this is not the *Tabula vocalis super integrum opus* mentioned in the Syon catalogue. Nevertheless, it is this *Tabula* which is adopted for the printed edition, in spite of the fact that the latter includes all seven parts of the compilation. The only difference between the printed *Tabula* and that in **B** is the omission from the former of the references to marginal letters. These are still in evidence in the text, at the same points in the argument, but their recommencement at 'A' with the first division of each recto, rather than of each chapter, has rendered them useless as a means of access to the text.<sup>47</sup>

A *Tabula* of this kind would, as noted above, have greatly facilitated the production of such derivatives of the *Speculum* as *Donatus Deuocionis* and *Disce Mori*. The latter is a lengthy English compilation, whose composition is to be dated between 1453 and 1464, extant in two manuscripts – Oxford: Jesus College, MS 39, and Bodleian Library, MS Laud misc. 99 – the first belonging to (but not necessarily originating from) Syon Abbey. Approximately the first four-fifths of the work follow the usual syllabus of catechetical instruction characteristic of the manual of religious instruction, and are derived in chief from the French *Miroir du monde*, with a section on temptations and tribulations taken from the English *Chastising of God's Children*. The text concludes with an 'Exhortacion' to the contemplative life, to which its female dedicatee has bound herself. This 'Exhortacion' is notable in particular for its regular use of the English contemplative authors, Rolle and Hilton (although both are found, albeit with less frequency, in the earlier parts of the compilation), and its assured handling of a wide-ranging discussion whose argument does not benefit from the extrinsic unity imparted by participation in the manual tradition.<sup>48</sup>

Many of the parts of the compilation for which a source had not hitherto been identified – the remedies against the seven deadly sins; sins of heart, mouth, deed, omission and against the Holy Spirit; blasphemy; penance, and much of the concluding 'Exhortacion' – are in fact derived from the *Speculum*. Almost all the work's borrowings from the 'English mystics' can be accounted for in this way.<sup>49</sup> The *Speculum's* chapter from Rolle is unique in that it is borrowed twice. Its first occurrence is as part of the discussion of fasting as an element of satisfaction for sin; it appears again in the 'litel fourme hou ye shal lyue' which opens the 'Exhortacion', in the context of other warnings against excessive asceticism.<sup>50</sup> The two versions of the chapter are strikingly different. The first is characterised by extensive paraphrase, while the second follows its original closely. Thus, corresponding to lines 32-34 in the transcription below, the second version of the chapter reads

... and holde hem fro moche spekyng of men, and take paciently  
what God sent for the tyme and place, and yeue hem hooly and  
parfitly to þe loue and þe worship of oure Lorde, Ihesu Crist

with 'place' for 'stede', and some freedom in the treatment of the definite article; while the earlier version expands to

... and eschewe þe vayne speche of men for þeire fastyng, and  
with þankyngges to God take such as God wol sende hem for þe

place & þe tyme, and entende rather to þe parfit desire and  
brennyng loue of oure Lorde.<sup>51</sup>

Similarly, where the later chapter follows the *Speculum* in 'I wolle þat þou be  
euermore clymbyng vpward to Ihesu', the same phrase in the first version becomes:

I wolle þerfore þat þou begynne faire and softe, and goo not  
bakward. For as þe gospel seith, 'He þat setteth his hande to þe  
plough and loketh bakward is not apt to þe kyngdome of God.'  
Take no suche perfeccion vpon þe as þi discrecion wol telle þee  
þat þou maist not parfourme. Be not singular, but euere desire to  
clymbe vpward in loue to Ihesu . . .<sup>52</sup>

Since the second of these two versions of the Rolle chapter remains so close to its  
source, it might be expected to yield some clues as to the textual affiliations of the  
manuscript of the *Speculum* used by the compiler of *Disce Mori*. In the event, all the  
evidence is negative: its text shares none of the errors of **Bπ**, nor the readings  
common to **R** and **S**. The text with which there is the least disagreement is **Y** – but a  
positive identification would be unwise, given the minor nature of most of the  
variants involved, and the fact that a number of manuscripts of the *Speculum* –  
including all those which were once at Syon – have been lost. What is apparent,  
however, is a markedly different approach to the source in the two versions of the  
chapter.<sup>53</sup>

Indeed, one is tempted on the strength of this contrast to speculate as to  
whether the 'Exhortacion' was a later addition to some pre-existing (and fairly  
conventional) manual of religious instruction, written for the specific purpose of  
converting it into a guide to the contemplative life. Its opening certainly has the air of  
a new departure, even separate composition –

Suster, now ye haue herde þe comendacion of þis vertu chastite,  
þe whiche ye haue chosen to cloþe you yn, and avowed it to  
youre spouse Ihesu Crist, I wil write you in þende of þis booke,  
whiche treteth of vices and vertues, as ye haue red afore, a litel  
fourme hou ye shal lyue to þe plesance of youre seid spouse and,  
with his grace and helpe, so ende your lyf in his seruice þat ye  
may come to his blisse þat he bought you to –

and such an act of appropriation and adaptation would not be without precedent in the field of late medieval devotional texts.<sup>54</sup>

It is a measure of the density of Hope Emily Allen's great compendium on Rolle that much of the information it contains is only now being assimilated and supplemented by modern research. Too often it has been forgotten that the works of the 'fourteenth-century English mystics' did not attain the status of literary and historical monuments with the turn of the fifteenth century, but were fair game for the compilers and anthologists who seem to have been that century's most active literary producers. The reception of these authors by their immediate literary descendants is not without significance. Certainly the chapter from Rolle discussed here impressed the compiler of *Disce Mori* enough for it to be included twice in his compilation; and it is instructive to see not only a doctrinal but also an aesthetic welcome being extended to the vernacular writers on contemplation in the *Speculum* compiler's decision to allow Rolle's work to stand *in lingua materna prout ipse eam primo protulit*.<sup>55</sup>

APPENDIX: *SPECULUM SPIRITUALIUM* II.xviTranscribed from MS Bodley 450, ff. 205<sup>rb</sup>-206<sup>rb</sup>

The decision of the *Speculum's* compiler not to translate the extracts from Rolle's *Form of Living* into Latin appears to have posed considerable difficulties for the compositor of the printed edition, working in Wolfgang Hopyl's Paris workshop. He seems to have been mystified by **p**, which appears most often as **y**, but as a variety of other letters also; **w**, similarly, is generally rendered **vv**, but sometimes completely misread, as when *how* becomes *hors*. Word-division is often indeterminate, on occasion plainly wrong – as *doine* for *do . I ne*. Lack of familiarity with English is further demonstrated by such errors as *wy ont* for *wip out*, *zeldevo* for *zelde vp* and *nouede yonf* for *no nede perof*.<sup>56</sup> The transcription of the chapter given below is, accordingly, taken not from the printed edition, but from the manuscript closest to it, Oxford: Bodleian Library, MS Bodley 450.

Comparison of the text of the chapter with the text and variants given in the edition of the *Form* by S. J. Ogilvie-Thomson reveals a considerable amount of minor variation, four omissions of whole lines, and a number of more significant variants. Two of the omissions are unique; the other two are, in combination, unrevealing, since one is supported by the manuscript grouping headed by Cambridge: University Library, MS Dd.v.64 (base text for Allen's edition), the other by the group closest to Longleat, MS 29 (chosen by Ogilvie-Thomson).<sup>57</sup> In general, however, the *Speculum* chapter agrees with the former (**Dd**) group against the latter. In particular, a high level of agreement is found with the **Dd** sub-group **PFLdHT<sup>2</sup>B<sup>2</sup>**: among seventeen variants for which there is corroboration from the **Dd** group, all but two are supported by at least one member of **PFLdHT<sup>2</sup>B<sup>2</sup>** – and these exceptions are different instances of the same easily made substitution, *falle* for *faillie*.<sup>58</sup> In fourteen of these fifteen cases, the corroborating manuscripts include **F**, the Foyle MS. In addition, four additions made in the *Speculum* are elsewhere found only in **F**.<sup>59</sup> If, however, as seems certain, **F** is not to be dated before 1465, it clearly cannot have been used by the compiler of the *Speculum*.<sup>60</sup> A further variant would appear to confirm this. The northern form *quathis* in *and oft shal pou be in quathis* appears to have caused problems for a number of copyists: several translate to *feyntnes* or *feyntise*; one omits it altogether. **F** has *pou3tis*, which cannot be derived from *quathis* by a simple scribal error, and, equally, does not seem likely to give rise to the *Speculum's* *and oft schalt pu be coghyng*. Probably both are derived from an intermediate reading along the lines of the *in cow3tis* found in two manuscripts.<sup>61</sup> The compiler of the *Speculum* thus

used a manuscript antecedent to **F**, but closer to it than to any of the other extant manuscripts.

The text which follows is transcribed from MS Bodley 450; variants from other manuscripts and the printed text are given following the text. Division into paragraphs is according to the extent of continuous borrowings from Rolle's text, and is for ease of reference; corresponding line numbers in Ogilvie-Thomson's edition of the *Form* are given preceding each paragraph. Abbreviations are expanded and underlined; insertions are indicated thus: ` . . . `; words cancelled but still legible in the manuscript are enclosed in angle brackets, words supplied from another manuscript in square brackets.

## TEXT

Sequitur hic vnum capitulum de discrecione habenda non solum in cibo & potu . sed  
 eciam in sompno & est extractum de tractatu quem transmisit cuidam recluse  
 <prefatus> Ricardi hampol

(48-88)

Svmmen <men> as Richarde hampol saiþ ben begylet whit ouermuche abstinence of  
 5 mete & drynke and of slepe . and þat is of temptacioun of þe deuel . for to make hem  
 falle at here myd werke . so þat þay (205<sup>va</sup>) brynge it to no goode ende as þay  
 schulde done ; 3if þay knewe resoun and helde discrecioun . And so þay lese here  
 merite for here frowardenes . þese greues leyth oure enmy ; to taken vs with when we  
 10 begynne to hate wikkednes and turne to god . þan many a man begynneth þat þynge  
 þat he may neuer brynge to good ende . þan þay weneþ þat þay may doo what so euer  
 here herte is sette on . but ofte þay fallen or þay comen to myd wey . and þat þynge  
 þat þay wene were for hem is lettyng to hem . for we haue a longe way to heuen .  
 and as mony good dedes as we done . as mony prayers as we make . and as mony  
 15 good þoughtes as we þenke in feyth hope and charite ; also mony passes goo we to  
 heuen warde . Then 3if we make vs so feble þat we may ne`i`per worche as we  
 schulden done ; ne pray as we schulden pray ; ne þenke as we schulden þenke . be we  
 not gretly to blame þat fallen when we hadde moste nede to be stalworth ? wel I wot  
 þat it is not goddes wille þat we do so . For þe prophete seyth . lorde I schal kepe my  
 strengþe to þe ; so þat I may susteyne goddes seruice to my dep̄ day . noght in a litel  
 20 ne in a schorte tyme waste my myght ; and afterwarde lyen weylunge and gronyng  
 by þe walle ; for it is muche more (205<sup>vb</sup>) perel þan men wene . For seint <seint>  
 Ierome seyþ þat he makeþ of raueyne offryng ; þat by outrage gouernyng turmentþ  
 his body in ouer litel mete or drynke or slepe . Also seint Bernarde seiþ fastyng and  
 wakyng letteþ not goostly goodes . but helpeþ . if it be done by discrecioun . and  
 25 whit oute discrecioun ; þay ben vices . þefore it is noght goode `to pyne´ vs so muche  
 . And afterwarde haue mawgre for oure dede . þer han be mony and beþ þat wenen þat  
 it is noght þat þay done ; but þay ben in so muche abstinence and fastyng ; þat þay  
 make alle men to speke of hem þat knowen hem . But of suche it falleth þat euer þe  
 30 more ioy and wondryng þat þay han whit out of þe worshipyng of men ; þe lasse ioy  
 þay haue whit inne of þe loue of god . To my dome þay schulde pay ihesu criste more  
 3if þay toke for his loue and in þat þankyng and worshipyng of hym suche as þay  
 myght susteyne here bodyes whit to his seruice and holde hem fro much spekyng of

35 men and [take] paciently what god sent . for þe tyme and þe stede . and zeue hem holich and perfitelich to þe loue and worshipe of oure lo<o>rde ihesu criste ; þat wole stalworthly and lastyngly be serued . so þat here holynes were more seyn in goddes eye ; þan in mannes eye . for euer þe better þat þu arte (206<sup>ra</sup>) and þe lasse speche hast of men ; þe more is þe ioy before god .

(310-21)

40 I wole þat þu be euermore clymbynge vpwarde to ihesu and echyngge þy loue and þy seruice in hym . and nocht as foles done ; for þay begynne in þe heyest degre ; and comen doun in to þe lowest . For mony þat were brennyngge at þe begynninge and able to þe loue of ihesu criste ; þurgh muche penaunce þay han letten hem selfe and made hem so feble ; þat þay mowe not loue god as þay schulde do . I ne halde þe neuer þe lasse of merite ; þey þu be not in so muche abstinence as þu hast ybe but þat þu sette alle þy þouztes how þu myghtest love þy spouse ihesu criste ; more þan þu haste done

(440-55)

50 I say forsoþe 3if þu take sustinaunce of suche godes as god sendeþ whit discrecioun and temperaunce þu doste wel . Neuerþeles 3if þu leue mony metes þat men vsen not dispisyng þat mete þat god haþ made to mannes helpe . but for þe þynkeþ þat þu <ne> haste `no´ nede þer of ; þu doste wel ; 3if þu see þat þu arte stalworþe ynow ; for to serue god and it brekiþ not þy stomake ; `For 3if þu haue broke þi stomake ;´ whit ouermuch abstinence ; þe is bereveth appetite of mete ; and ofte schalt þu be coghyngge as þu were redy to 3elde vp þe goste . and wete þu wel þu synneste in þat dede and þu maiste not sone wete ; weper þy abstinence be whit þe or azens þe . Ther(206<sup>rb</sup>)þe while þat þu arte 3onge ; I rede þat þu ete and drynke beter and wers as it comeþ ; þat þu be not begyled and afterwarde when þu haste proued mony þynges and ouercome mony temptaciouns ; and knoweste þy selfe and god better þan þu doste now ; þan 3if þu see þat it be to do ; þu may take to þe more abstinence . hucusque Ricardus hampol .

## VARIANTS

Sigla as above, recorded in the order **BDRSTY** $\pi$ .  $\pi$  denotes the printed edition of 1510. Due to the large number of spelling and word-division errors noted above, substantive variants only are recorded for  $\pi$ . Abbreviations: *om.* omitted; *ins.* inserted above the line; *trans.* transposed.

1 capitulum] quod xvi capitulum & vltimum istius partis *Added*  $\pi$ . 3 pefatus] **DRSTY**; *struck through* **B**; *Om.*  $\pi$ . 4 Svmmen men] men *struck through*, *mark of abbreviation added in later hand* **B**; *Sum men* **DRSTY**; *Svmmen*  $\pi$ . 4 ben] foule *Added* **S**. 6 falle] fayle **D**. 8 greues] grenes  $\pi$ . 9 turne] vs *Added* **DRSTY**. 10 neuer] not  $\pi$ . 10 brynge] *Om.* **RS**. 10 ende] endyng **D**. 10 brynge to good ende] to good ende brynge **T**. 10 may] *Om.* **Y**. 13 and<sup>2</sup>] *Om.* **Y**. 14 we<sup>1</sup>] *Om.* **R**. 15 neiþer] i *Ins.* **B**. 16-17 we not] *Trans.* **Y**. 18 þat<sup>1</sup>] *Om.*  $\pi$ . 18 not] *Om.* **D**. 18 we] ewe **S**. 18 prophete] dauit *Added* **RS**. 20 lyen] ly down **RS**. 21 for] *Om.* **D**. 21 seint<sup>2</sup>] *struck through* **B**. 22 þat he] *Trans.*  $\pi$ . 2 or<sup>1</sup>] *Om.* **DRSTY**. 23 or<sup>2</sup>] and **S**. 23 slepe] and *Added* **D**. 24 it] þei **T**. 24 by] wyth **RS**. 24-25 and whit oute discrecioun] *Om.*  $\pi$ . 25 to pyne] *Ins.* **B**. 26 be mony and beþ] ibe & 3ut both **RS**. 28 But] Bothe **S**. 28 of suche] oftesithis **D**. 28 it] þat **T**. 29 and] in **R**. 29 þe<sup>1</sup>] *Om.* **RS**. 30 þay<sup>2</sup>] þe **T**. 30 more] *Om.* **T**. 31 þat] hise **D**; *Om.* **RS**. 33 take] **DRSTY**; *Om.* **B** $\pi$ . 34 and<sup>2</sup>] þe *Added* **RSY**; to þe *Added* **T**. 34 loorde] *second o subpuncted and partly erased* **B**. 35 and lastyngly] *Om.* **R**. 36 eye<sup>2</sup>] *Om.* **Y**. 37 þe<sup>2</sup>] þi **DRT**. 38 ihesu] crist *Added* **D**. 38 loue] soule **RS**. 39 in] to *Added* **Y**. 39 þay begynne] þe biginnyng **R**. 40 at þe begynninge] *Om.* **T**. 40 able] al **D**. 41 þay] þe **R**. 43 sette] besette **Y**. 47 leue] loue **R**. 48 þat<sup>1</sup>] þe **RS**. 48 for] *Om.* **Y**. 48 ne] *struck through and subpuncted* **B**; *Om.* **RSY** $\pi$ ; *sic* **DT**. 49 no] *Ins.* **B**. 50 For 3if . . . stomake] *added foot of page, + mark in text* **B**. 51 abstinence] and *Added* **D**. 51 bereveth] byreued **T**. 51 schalt þu] *Trans.* **RS**. 52 þat] þe **RS**. 54 Therþe] Perfor þe **DRSTY**. 54 þat<sup>1</sup>] *Om.* **ST**. 56 þy] þe **RS**. 57 may] myght **DRST**.

NOTES TO THE TEXT

18 *lorde* . . . Ps. 58:10.

22-23 *he makeþ of raueyne* Cf. D.5 c.24 *de Con.*

23-25 *fastyng and wakyng* PL 184.328.

NOTES

<sup>1</sup> This article is based on material from the third chapter of my D. Phil. thesis, 'A Critical Edition of the Concluding Part of *Disce Mori*, a late medieval devotional compilation, with a study of some related texts' (2 vols., Oxford, 1994). It is no accident that its title is a form of *omaggio* to Professor Anne Hudson, whose 'A Chapter from Walter Hilton in Two Middle English Compilations', *Neophilologus* 52 (1968), 416-21, remains the most important article on *Disce Mori*, and who was the supervisor of my thesis. I am grateful also for her helpful comments on an earlier version of the present article. I have benefitted further from many productive suggestions from the *Leeds Studies in English* readers.

<sup>2</sup> H. E. Allen, *Writings Ascribed to Richard Rolle and materials for his Biography*, Modern Language Association Monographs III (New York, 1927). Nicholas Watson, despite a comprehensive revision of much of what Allen has to say about the chronology of Rolle's writings, and the qualities of his Latin works, does not introduce the subject of anthologisation and compilation before his 'Epilogue'. See *Richard Rolle and the Invention of Authority* (Cambridge, 1991), pp. 257-70.

<sup>3</sup> Allen, *Writings*, pp. 398-407. Four of the 'manuscripts' are copies of the *Cibus Anime* (on which, see V.A. Gillespie, 'The Literary Form of the Middle English Pastoral Manual with particular reference to the *Speculum Christiani* and some related texts', unpublished D. Phil. thesis, 2 vols. (Oxford, 1981)); two others (Thornton and Rawl. C. 285) were used by C. Horstman in his *Yorkshire Writers: Richard Rolle of Hampole and his followers*, 2 vols. (London, 1896). Of the compilations, for *Speculum Christiani*, see Gillespie, 'Literary Form'; for *Pore Caitif*, a series of articles by M. T. Brady, most recently 'Lollard Interpolations and Omissions in Manuscripts of *The Pore Caitif* in *De Cella in Saeculum*, ed. M. G. Sargent (Cambridge, 1989), pp. 183-203.

<sup>4</sup> For the *Speculum*, see Allen, *Writings*, pp. 405-06; for *Disce Mori*, Allen, *Writings*, p. 399 (Jesus Coll. 39 and Laud Misc. 99).

<sup>5</sup> Discussed below, and Jones, 'A Critical Edition', I.168-79.

<sup>6</sup> For the *Speculum*, see M. W. Bloomfield *et al.*, *Incipits of Latin Works on the Virtues and Vices, 1100-1500 A.D.* (Cambridge, Mass., 1979), no. 5934; M. R. Moyes, *Richard Rolle's*

*Expositio Super Novem Lectiones Mortuorum*, 2 vols. (Salzburg, 1988), I.22 and II.50-2; A. I. Doyle, 'The European Circulation of Three Latin Spiritual Texts' in *Latin and Vernacular*, ed. A. J. Minnis (Cambridge, 1989), pp. 129-41 (pp. 138-41), and 'Publication by Members of the Religious Orders' in *Book Production and Publishing in Britain 1375-1475*, ed. J. Griffiths and D. Pearsall (Cambridge, 1989), pp. 109-23 (p. 114).

<sup>7</sup> The *terminus a quo* for composition is given by the borrowings from Fishlake's translation of the *Scale of Perfection*, completed c. 1400; the *terminus ante quem* by the use of the *Speculum* in the compilation of *Donatus Deuocionis*, which (at least in two manuscripts) is dated 1430 [Doyle, 'European Circulation', p. 138]. The Syon catalogue, in its index, ascribes the *Speculum* to both *Adam monachus cartusiensis* and *Henricus cartusiensis* [M. Bateson, ed., *Catalogue of the Library of Syon Monastery* (Cambridge, 1898)]; the catalogue entry for M60 seems to indicate (although the syntax is not unambiguous) that the latter is in fact the compiler only of the rubrics to the text: *Primum volumen speculi spiritualium . . . cum suis Rubricis vnique parti premissis ex compilacione dompni henrici Domus Cartusiensis de Bethleem monachi* [Bateson, *Catalogue*, p. 107]. Nevertheless, manuscript **D** (below) includes a note to the effect that *hic est liber secundus speculi spiritualium henrici de balnea cartusiensis* [f. 64<sup>f</sup> and cf. 100<sup>v</sup>]. Syon manuscripts of the *Speculum* are M60-1 (a two-volume set), M62, M63, M108; in addition, M36 is a copy of the 1510 printed edition. For the reference in *The Myroure of Oure Ladye*, see the edition of J.ϠH. Blunt, EETS es 19 (London, 1873), pp. 28-29.

<sup>8</sup> See Doyle, 'European Circulation', pp. 138-41.

<sup>9</sup> E. G. Duff, *A Century of the English Book Trade* (London, 1905), p. 18. A. W. Pollard and G. R. Redgrave, *A Short-Title Catalogue of Books Printed in England, Scotland, and Ireland and of English Books Printed Abroad 1475-1640* (2nd ed., London, 1976-86), no. 23030.7. The two impressions differ only in the imprint on the title page: for London, *venale habet' Londonie ad signu' trinitatis*, and for Paris, *venale habetur in vico sancti Jacobi ad signum sancti Georgii*. For surviving copies of the printed edition, see further Moyes, *Expositio*, I.23 n. 122.

<sup>10</sup> *Yorkshire Writers*, I.vii n. 1.

<sup>11</sup> *Hunc librum sequentem . . . quem quidem librum ex multis voluminibus tractatibus & epistulis extractum atque in vnum volumen redactum grandi labore multoque studio conscripsit non solum pro sui ipsius vtilitate & solatio: sed & aliorum rudium et similium sibi simplicium vite videlicet contemplatiue vacantium quatenus hii qui propter penuriam non possunt sufficientiam habere librorum in hoc vno volumine pene omnia que sibi magis necessaria sunt: valeant reperire. Et licet pro contemplatiuis precipue conscriptus sit liber: tamen actiue vite deditus in eo multa sibi vtilia reperiet* [f. i<sup>ra</sup>]. Quotations from the *Speculum* are taken from Oxford: Bodleian Library, 4<sup>o</sup>. S. 8. Th. Seld., a copy of the text destined, on the evidence of its

title page, for sale in London.

<sup>12</sup> Cf. V. A. Gillespie, 'Vernacular Books of Religion' in Griffiths and Pearsall, *Book Production*, pp. 317-44 (p. 330).

<sup>13</sup> The excerpts from Edmund are found in IV.xiii and V.xix, corresponding with pp. 71.29-30; 71.34-73.19 and 91.8-25 respectively in H. P. Forshaw, *Edmund of Abingdon: Speculum religiosorum and Speculum ecclesie*, Auctores Britannici medii aevi, 3 (Oxford, 1973). For Hilton's letters, see J. P. H. Clark and C. Taylor, *Walter Hilton's Latin Writings*, 2 vols. (Salzburg, 1989), p. 68. The use of Fishlake is noted by Moyes, *Expositio*, I.22 n. 121. The compiler also includes unacknowledged a substantial extract from the 'Hiltonian' (interpolated) text of William Flete's *De Remediis Contra Temptaciones* [see B. Hackett, 'William Flete and the *De Remediis Contra Temptaciones*' in *Medieval Studies Presented to Aubrey Gwynn, S. J.*, ed. J. A. Watt, et al. (Dublin, 1961), pp. 330-48 (p. 333 n. 12)].

<sup>14</sup> Extracts from chapters iv, v, vii, viii, xi and xii of *Emendatio Vitae* are found in I.xli, II.iii, III.xvi, IV.xxxi, V.xvii, VI.iii, vi, xxi and xxii; the passage from *Oleum Effusum* is part of V.xviii.

<sup>15</sup> This chapter of the *Speculum* is noticed by Allen, *Writings*, pp. 263, 406.

<sup>16</sup> *Quia melius sonat eius doctrina in lingua materna prout ipse eam primo protulit quam si eam in linguam transferrem latinam* [f. xlix<sup>vb</sup>]. This is the concluding sentence of II.xv.

<sup>17</sup> Bloomfield, *Incipits*, no. 5934, lists only six manuscripts; a further four are mentioned in Moyes, *Expositio*, I.22 and II.50-52. I am grateful to Dr. A. I. Doyle for information concerning other manuscripts of the *Speculum*.

<sup>18</sup> For **S**, see S. M. Lakin, *A Catalogue of the Library of the Cathedral Church of Salisbury* (London, 1880), p. 13. Dates given for the manuscripts in the following list are generally those given in the catalogue of the relevant library. Doubtless further research will in many cases be able to fix these more precisely.

<sup>19</sup> Bateson, *Catalogue*, p. 107.

<sup>20</sup> For **Y**, see N. R. Ker, *Medieval Manuscripts in British Libraries*, 4 vols. (Oxford, 1969-92), IV (completed by A. J. Piper), pp. 717-18. While the donation notice includes specific accounts of the material covered in each of the first four parts, for the last two it contents itself frustratingly with *de quibus ille partes tractant manifeste declarantur* [f. 3<sup>v</sup>]. For provenance, see N. R. Ker, *Medieval Libraries of Great Britain: A List of Surviving Books* (2nd ed., London, 1964), p. 132.

<sup>21</sup> **B** is no. 2398 in the *Summary Catalogue of Western Manuscripts in the Bodleian Library at Oxford which have not hitherto been catalogued in the Quarto series*, ed. F. Madan, 7 vols. (Oxford, 1895-1937). For the relation to the printed text, see below. The *Summary Catalogue* assigns the book to Reading; it was however rejected by Ker (*Medieval Libraries*, p. 158). I am grateful to Dr. Alan Coates for confirming (and explaining the grounds for) this

rejection of a Reading connection to me.

<sup>22</sup> For **R**, see G. F. Warner and J. P. Gilson, *Catalogue of Western Manuscripts in the Old Royal and King's Collections*, 4 vols. (London, 1921), I.173-74. For the prologue, see f. i<sup>ra</sup>.

<sup>23</sup> *Summary Catalogue*, no. 32566. The variant version of V-VI is described in a note inserted into the Bodleian copy of the catalogue, facing p. 171. For provenance, see Ker, *Medieval Libraries*, p. 181.

<sup>24</sup> *Si cui autem non libet totum librum sibi conscribere quia fortassis nimis prolixus sibi videbitur transcribat saltem ea capitula vel partes que sibi & sui status personis viderit conuenire* [f. i<sup>ra</sup>].

<sup>25</sup> Bateson, *Catalogue*, p. 107.

<sup>26</sup> For **T**, see M. L. Colker, *A Descriptive Catalogue of the Medieval and Renaissance Latin Manuscripts in the Library of Trinity College Dublin* (Dublin, 1992), pp. 492-98; for provenance, Ker, *Medieval Libraries*, p. 49. On its version of V-VI, see further below, under **B**<sup>2</sup>.

<sup>27</sup> For **M**, see H. O. Coxe, *Catalogus Codicum MSS. Qui in Collegis Aulisque Oxoniensibus Hodie Adservantur*, 2 vols. (Oxford, 1852), I(3).79-80, and A. G. Watson, *Catalogue of Dated and Datable Manuscripts c. 435-1600 in Oxford Libraries*, 2 vols. (Oxford, 1984), no. 841 (I.140).

<sup>28</sup> For **G**, see M. R. James, *A Descriptive Catalogue of the Manuscripts in the Library of St. John's College, Cambridge* (Cambridge, 1913), no.181 (pp. 213-14). In the quotation, the *v* of *variis* is unclear and has been supplied from the printed edition. James's suggestion of a Bury provenance is rejected by Ker, *Medieval Libraries*, p. 22.

<sup>29</sup> For **D**, see *A Catalogue of the Manuscripts Preserved in the Library of the University of Cambridge*, 5 vols. (Cambridge, 1858-67), I. 246-49; Moyes, *Expositio*, II.50-53.

<sup>30</sup> For **Ma**, see Coxe, *Catalogus*, II.(2).67; Watson, *Dated and Datable Manuscripts*, no.830 (I.138). Moyes, *Expositio*, II.52 and n. 60 notes the correspondence with **D**; I can find no trace of **D**'s version of I which he also declares to be present.

<sup>31</sup> For **H**, see *A Catalogue of the Harleian Manuscripts in the British Museum*, 4 vols. (London, 1808), I.73-74. For provenance, Ker, *Medieval Libraries*, p. 132. The table of chapters is at f. 150<sup>r-v</sup>; II.vii begins at f. 172<sup>r</sup>.

<sup>32</sup> For **B**<sup>2</sup>, see *Summary Catalogue*, no. 2298. See further R. Lovatt, 'The Influence of the Religious Literature of Germany and the Low Countries on English Spirituality c.1350-1475', unpublished D. Phil. thesis (Oxford, 1965), pp. 146-47. For Dodesham, see J. Ayto and A. Barratt, ed., *Ailred of Rievaulx's De Institutione Inclusarum*, EETS os 287 (London, 1984), pp. xxix-xxxii, and for this manuscript, p. xxxi.

<sup>33</sup> Bateson, *Catalogue*, M60 (p. 107).

<sup>34</sup> For **T**<sup>2</sup>, see Colker, *Catalogue*, 509-32: this excerpt is at p. 530. Moyes (*Expositio*,

II.109-10) argues convincingly against Allen's characterisation of this as a Lollard manuscript.

<sup>35</sup> For **T<sup>3</sup>**, see Colker, *Catalogue*, p. 863.

<sup>36</sup> For **Do**, see Ker, *Medieval Manuscripts*, II.444-5; A. Watkin, 'Some Manuscripts in the Downside Abbey Library Continued', *Downside Review*, 59 (1941), 75-92; Ker, *Medieval Libraries*, p. 57. For the Mechtild extract, see T. A. Halligan, 'The Revelations of St. Matilda in English: The Booke of Gostlye Grace', *Notes and Queries*, n.s. 21 (1974), 443-46.

<sup>37</sup> For **F**, see J. Hogg, ed., *The Rewyll of Seynt Sauioure*, Salzburger Studien zur Anglistik und Amerikanistik, Bd.6 (Salzburg, 1978-80), II.iii-viii.

<sup>38</sup> For Peter's text, see J.-P. Migne, *Patrologiae cursus completus: series latina*, 221 vols. (Paris, 1841-64; hereafter, PL), 207.980-1006.

<sup>39</sup> For **Jo**, see Coxe, *Catalogus*, II.21-23. Dygon's gift (made jointly with Joan, anchoress of St. Botolph's without Bishopsgate) to Exeter College is noted by Ker, *Medieval Libraries*, pp. 146, 290.

<sup>40</sup> For **K**, see *University of Cambridge*, III.731-33.

<sup>41</sup> For **E**, see James, *St. John's*, no. 125 (pp. 157-58) and Ker, *Medieval Libraries*, p. 101. For John Clerk, see E. M. Thompson, *A History of the Somerset Carthusians* (London, 1895), p. 306 and A. I. Doyle, 'Book Production by the Monastic Orders' in *Medieval Book Production: Assessing the evidence*, ed. L. L. Brownrigg (Los Altos Hills, Ca., 1990), pp. 1-19 at p. 14 and n. 76. James mistakenly describes the compilation as having only 16 chapters. The *Florarium* of Bartholomeus, often called Florarius, is not extant. See J. Bale, *Index Britanniae Scriptorum*, ed. R. L. Poole and M. Bateson (Oxford, 1902), p. 38 for references, and Bloomfield, *Incipits*, nos. 0133, 2250, 3685 for other excerpts from the work.

<sup>42</sup> At II. 10, 18, 20, 24, 26, 29, 31, 38, 48, 51, 52, 56.

<sup>43</sup> At II. 9, 23, 33, 54; 3, 4.

<sup>44</sup> See the appendix, below. With the reliability of the foreign compositor's testimony, one is reminded of OED's non-English-speaking 'keyboarders' [cf. E. G. Stanley, 'The *Oxford English Dictionary and Supplement*: the integrated edition of 1989', *RES*, n.s. 41 (1990), 76-88 (p. 77)].

<sup>45</sup> Cf. l. 54.

<sup>46</sup> Ff. 1<sup>ra</sup>-16<sup>vb</sup>.

<sup>47</sup> Interestingly, the *Pupilla Oculi* produced by Hopyl at the instigation of Bretton in the same year as the *Speculum* (STC 4115) has had a *Tabula* added to it (cf. f. iv) employing the same system of marginal letters. Here, however, the letters in the text begin, correctly, with the first division of each chapter.

<sup>48</sup> *Disce Mori* is item A.6 in P. S. Jolliffe, *A Check-List of Middle English Prose Writings of Spiritual Guidance* (Toronto, 1974) and item 11 in R. R. Raymo, 'Works of Religious and Philosophical Instruction' in *A Manual of the Writings in Middle English*, gen. ed. A. E.

Hartung, vol. 7 (New Haven, Connecticut, 1986). The information given in each of the above requires some modification in the light of my researches on *Disce Mori*, summarised in Jones, 'A Critical Edition'. I am currently preparing my edition of the 'Exhortacion' from *Disce Mori* for publication in the series Middle English Texts.

<sup>49</sup> I hope to return to the question of the use of 'mystical' authors in *Disce Mori* at a later date.

<sup>50</sup> In Oxford: Jesus College, MS 39: pp. 350-53; 548-50.

<sup>51</sup> Jesus MS, pp. 549, 350.

<sup>52</sup> Below, l. 38; Jesus MS, pp. 549, 351.

<sup>53</sup> For the variants, see the appendix, below.

<sup>54</sup> A parallel would be the third book of *Cibus Anime* - for which, see V. A. Gillespie, 'Cibus Anime Book 3: A Guide for Contemplatives?' in *Spiritualität Heute und Gestern*, *Analecta Cartusiana* 35:3 (Salzburg, 1983), 90-119.

<sup>55</sup> *Speculum*, f. xlix<sup>vb</sup>. To say 'the compiler of *Disce Mori*' included the chapter twice is not necessarily a contradiction of the possibility raised above; the incongruity of the repetition would have been equally evident to a reviser/supplementer as to the original author (if, indeed, they were not the same person).

<sup>56</sup> Errors corresponding with ll. 44, 42, 29, 52, 49 in the transcription following.

<sup>57</sup> H.E. Allen, ed., *English Writings of Richard Rolle* (Oxford, 1931); S. J. Ogilvie-Thomson, ed., *Richard Rolle: Prose and Verse*, EETS os 293 (Oxford, 1988). For Ogilvie-Thomson's sigla, adopted here, see *Richard Rolle*, pp. xvi-xvii; for the relationship of manuscripts of the *Form*, see pp. lii-lxv.

<sup>58</sup> *Form*, ll. 50, 62; variants listed *Richard Rolle*, pp. 89, 90, respectively. Subsequent references to the *Form* will follow the format: line number/page number in Ogilvie-Thomson, *Richard Rolle*, for variants. Note that Ogilvie-Thomson's variants for the *Form* are selective only [*Richard Rolle*, pp. xcv-xcvi]. Within this sub-group, however, all material variants are recorded [p. xcvi].

<sup>59</sup> *suche as þay myght* [31-32]; *and take paciently* [33]; *vpward* [38]; *I say forsothe* [46]. *Form* l. 81 / variants p. 91; 82/91; 310/103; 440/110.

<sup>60</sup> **F** is manuscript MV3 in R. E. Lewis and A. McIntosh, *A descriptive guide to the manuscripts of the Prick of Conscience* (Oxford, 1982), pp. 35-6.

<sup>61</sup> *Form* 448/111.