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Ashmole 61 contains five popular romances: Sir Isumbras, The Earl of Tolouse, Libeus Disconeus, Sir Cleges, and Sir Orfeo. These are compiled with 38 preaching, teaching and entertaining verse texts. This thesis examines the practice, purpose and personality of Rate, a scribal editor working around 1480-1500. Chapter 1 provides a full palaeographical description of the manuscript, with discussion of the often perplexing features of its make-up. Chapter 2 examines the nature and purpose of Rate's scribal editing. Chapter 3 suggests the possible identity of the scribe and his social background. Chapter 4 provides information in tabular and note form on the manuscript context of each item. In volume two, all 43 texts are transcribed, with editorial notes and pertinent collations, ending with a critical survey and the bibliography. The study explores the creative-destructive function of a medieval scribe, demonstrating how a deliberate policy of adaptation in Ashmole 61 is at work, undermined by a lack of expertise in assimilating changes. Variants have been attributed to Rate only if consistent with modes of omission, addition and alteration that are well-attested throughout the manuscript as a whole. The texts themselves are re-shaped in order to express family unity and piety on the one hand, and on the other a strong anti-Semitic devotion to the Passion of Christ in the cult of the Five Wounds, which provides a significant interpretation of Rate's sketches of fish, roses, hexafoil and shield. Since the scribal dialect was localized in North-East Leicestershire, the combination of the scribal editing, the devotional bias and the curious sketches, suggests links with the Corpus Christi Guild of Leicester, and with medieval pilgrimage. Far from being a "minstrel's storybook", the manuscript was either the library of a devout, literate merchant, or, with slightly more evidence, the handbook of a family chaplain.
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INCIPIT: The Choice of Ashmole 61

There may always be another reality to make fiction of the truth we think we've arrived at. (Christopher Fry)

Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Ashmole 61 poses many problems for editors of its texts on account of the variants introduced by its scribe, Rate. Derek Pearsall notes that "manuscripts dismissed as worthless by editors of critical texts are often the very ones where scribal editors have participated most fully in the activity of a poem" (1984:128), and such is the case here. Rate was first characterised by Alan Bliss as "an idiosyncratic scribe freely adapting a sound copy" (1966:xvii). Seldom do we have such an opportunity for studying scribal personality, and for identifying the active re-shaping of late medieval verse. In his introduction to the Thornton Manuscript Facsimile, Derek Brewer expresses our gratitude to the compiler for producing manuscripts which "constitute in themselves a literary creation, beyond their direct usefulness, which speaks to us across five centuries" (1977:vii), and the same may be accorded to Rate. We owe to him the preservation of distinctive versions of five popular romances *1, five unique texts not preserved elsewhere *2; nine unique versions of texts *3; and within the texts themselves, unique variants and additional material which I believe largely to have been added by Rate himself, whether from lost versions to which he had access, or from his own local composition.

1 Sir Isumbras (5), The Earl of Tolouse (19), Libeus Disconeus (20), Sir Cleges (24), and Sir Orfeo (39).
2 Carpenter's Tools (16), Sir Corneus (21), Jealous Wife (22), Vanity (40), King Edward (41).
3 Good Wife (4), Commandments (6), Stans Puer (7), Dame Curtasy (8), Latin Proverbs (9, 11ab), All Saints (25), Four Daughters (26), Pilgrimage (34), Resurrection (36).
Where the texts in Ashmole 61 have been edited, it is often with little sympathy for the scribal editing that only becomes comprehensible when all the texts are studied together, rather than separately edited across a wide span of time and following different editorial policies. For this reason I believe that the complete transcription of the manuscript, providing all the texts in one place, suitably annotated to indicate the precise areas of Rate's probable influence, was not only essential for the material presented in chapters 2 and 4, but highly desirable now that the Ashmole texts have become attractive to modern editors.

Nineteenth-century editors such as Horstmann, Hazlitt, and others, have denounced the Ashmole texts as 'irredeemably corrupt', 'horribly mangled', 'quite altered', 'overworked', 'garbled', 'full of transpositions, extraneous material, and ludicrous blunders' *4, with the result that up until two decades ago the manuscript was unjustifiably neglected (Guddat-Figge, 1976:251). The increased popularity of Ashmole 61 has coincided with a shift in romance scholarship away from the uncertain business of recovering authorial text and towards the "richer harvest" of treating "every manuscript on its merits as a witness to a different state in the poem's existence" (Pearsall, 1984:122-7). This thesis is written in response to various calls to study a romance manuscript in its entirety, from which we may perceive "the process of copying, the intentions of the scribe, his personality, and his idiosyncracies" (Guddat-Figge, 1976:7), and to study the scribe of Ashmole 61 in particular, since an examination of "the nature and extent of this 'idiosyncracy', and the purpose behind ... this consistent policy of addition and adaptation ...  

*4 Paraphrased from headnotes to the texts, kindly translated from the German by Dr Elin Gerslund.
Throughout Ashmole 61 and its contents as a whole, should throw light upon the procedure adopted by the scribe Rate" (Ginn, 1967:74, 82). I am much indebted to the work of these editors and others for inspiration and guidelines on which to proceed with the investigations they suggest. Any deficiencies in methodology or results are entirely my own.

This thesis started out to examine the juxtaposition of romances with religious verse, which occurs in a large number of romance manuscripts. I was interested in the relationship between apparently secular narratives and popular devotional lyrics which gave important insights into the religious thought of the time. I began a process of elimination to find a single romance manuscript upon which to base my investigation. My intention was to produce a catalogue of all the manuscripts which contained the texts of my chosen base manuscript, and from this catalogue to draw conclusions as to the transmission and circulation of romances in units of religious verse.

From a list of 32 romance manuscripts, I applied certain criteria of content, size and scope and arrived at a short-list of six, including Ashmole 61. At this point I, in my turn, became intrigued by the character of the scribe Rate, and decided to study Ashmole 61 both as a romance manuscript and also as an example of a fifteenth-century scribal editor at work (Ginn, 1967:86). However, in the process of compiling the catalogue, and collating all the texts with Rate's versions, the focus of the thesis gradually but determinedly shifted from the wider context of romances and religious verse onto the very specific and compelling study of Rate's scribal habits; in short, his practice, purpose, and identity. By the time the first volume was written, and the texts transcribed and annotated in the second, it
became obvious that the catalogue which initiated the study had become redundant. To include it as a third volume would not only have been excessive in terms of size and material, but it would have undermined the integrity of the thesis as it now stands. It was with regret that I excluded it, and some of the material in chapters 2 and 4 has had to be modified accordingly.

But I believe that its loss is more than compensated by the fascinating material that came to light concerning Rate's editing of the texts, the meaning of his sketches, and his possible connection with the Corpus Christi Guild of Leicester, at the turn of the fifteenth century. It should be stated that I have not been able to prove conclusively anything about the scribe; there exists no indisputable documentary evidence to substantiate my conjectures. I can only offer personal interpretations based on long and careful study of the scribe, his manuscript, and his texts. But I have been able to advance the study of his practice and purpose, to provide accurate transcriptions to facilitate future editions of his texts, to give provocative discussion of the palaeographical and textual issues, and to interpret the sketches in a way which I believe is quite new and significant.

Summary of Presentation

Volume 1 contains the main body of the thesis. In the first chapter I present my own detailed description of the manuscript *5, together with discussion of its palaeographical features. At salient points I have noted the variety of interpretation offered in the existing descriptions, notably in those of Bliss, Ginn and Robinson's theses,

5 Based on the outline kindly provided by Dr Bruce Barker-Benfield; see further chapter 1 section 1.2.c, Key References.
and in Guddat-Figge's catalogue of romance manuscripts. The second chapter attempts to draw conclusions out of the wealth of material amassed in the process of collating the Ashmole texts with as many other copies as time and finance allowed me to obtain; the list is not exhaustive. I limited my search to those manuscripts (excluding early prints) held in mainland Britain, excluding certain collections (such as Longleat) which in the end time did not permit me to visit. These conclusions suggest firstly the main characteristics of Rate as scribe and editor, secondly the use of the manuscript and the audience for whom it was edited in particular ways. The third chapter presents the new material which has come to light following the localisation of the scribal dialect in Leicestershire, offering suggestions as to the identity of the scribe, an account of previous attempts to identify the scribe, the meaning of the sketches, and a description of the main religious guild in Leicester with which the scribe appears to have been connected. The fourth chapter is intended for use with the texts in the second volume, providing functional information about the manuscript context, editing and affiliation of each text. In this chapter the material is presented as briefly and systematically as possible, with the emphasis always on the distinction of the Ashmole texts within a given manuscript group. It is not intended to establish manuscript affiliations or textual transmission for each text as a whole or in detail.

Volume 2 contains a complete transcription of the entire manuscript. It is not intended to be an edition of the manuscript in the accepted sense, but rather to show Rate's scribal characteristics. His errors, transpositions and obscurities have therefore been allowed to stand as they appear in the manuscript, with explanatory notes for the reader's
guidance. Each text includes editorial suggestions, footnotes, and lists of the main variants in the other copies which show where the Ashmole text has unique wording; a full collation of all copies is not intended. I am at no time concerned with recovering authorial text, or with any linguistic analysis. Preceding the texts are six plates from the manuscript showing the most significant features. The item numbers visible on plates 3-6 are one number behind my item numbers, as the texts were numbered according to Black's catalogue which mistakes items 22 and 23 as one.

The Bibliography is provided at the end of this volume, so that the texts and references can be consulted in conjunction with the discursive chapters in the first volume. All the works listed are those cited in the discussion. References to the master Bibliography are given by the short "author (date:pages)" method, which is convenient, succinct, and reduces footnotes to the most significant. To facilitate this system of cross-reference I have placed the date of publication before the titles; other publishing details follow the titles, including the names of publishers (as Rice 1985). The Bibliography is preceded by a chronological survey of the critical history of Ashmole 61, and a short-list of text editions.
CHAPTER ONE

The Scribe's Book: An Annotated Description of Ashmole 61

This chapter contains a detailed description of the manuscript with discussion of the often perplexing features of its make-up. This is organised into sections as listed in the contents list (pages vi-vii) above. The list of manuscript contents following is designed as a quick-reference guide to the texts, listed in the manuscript order *1. The columns show the item number, with an asterisk if the item is signed with Rate's name; the number of copies in which the item appears, or whether the text is unique, or a unique version; the metrical form; the quire(s) in which the text appears; the folio numbers the text occupies, and the short title. The final columns give the page numbers of the notes to each text in chapter 4, and of the transcription of each text in volume 2.

1 The relevant item sections in chapter 4 give the full titles, lists of other manuscripts, and notes on the manuscript affiliation of each text.
### 1.1 Contents of Ashmole 61

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Quire</th>
<th>Folios</th>
<th>Short Title</th>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1r-5r</td>
<td>The Life of St Eustace</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5v-6r</td>
<td>Lydgate: Ram’s Horn</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3*</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6r</td>
<td>The Wise Man</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4*</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7r-8v</td>
<td>The Good Wife</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5*</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9r-16v</td>
<td>SIR ISUMBRAS</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6*</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>Q</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16v-17r</td>
<td>The Ten Commandments</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7*</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>Q</td>
<td>2/3</td>
<td>17v-19v</td>
<td>Stans Puer Ad Mensam</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8*</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20r-21v</td>
<td>Dame Curtasy</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21v</td>
<td>Latin Proverb</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21v</td>
<td>Rules for Land Purchase</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11a</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21v</td>
<td>Latin Proverb</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11b</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21v</td>
<td>Latin Proverb</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Q</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>22r</td>
<td>Prayer at Night</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13*</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Q</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>22rv</td>
<td>Prayer at Morning</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Q</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>22v</td>
<td>Commandments (re-copy)</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>22v-23r</td>
<td>Prayer to the Virgin Mary</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16*</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>23r-26r</td>
<td>The Carpenter’s Tools</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17*</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>26r</td>
<td>Prayer at the Levation</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18*</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>26v-27v</td>
<td>The Forgiving Knight</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19*</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>3/4</td>
<td>27v-38v</td>
<td>THE EARL OF TOLOUSE</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20*</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>4/6</td>
<td>38v-59v</td>
<td>LIBEUS DISCONEUS</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>59v-62r</td>
<td>Sir Corneus</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>421</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>6/7</td>
<td>62r-65v</td>
<td>The Jealous Wife</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>6/7</td>
<td>66r-67v</td>
<td>The Incestuous Daughter</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>67v-73r</td>
<td>SIR CLEGES</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>441</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>7/8</td>
<td>73r-78v</td>
<td>All Saints and All Souls</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>457</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>78v-83r</td>
<td>The King and Four Daughters</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>469</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>83r-87v</td>
<td>Ypotis, The Wise Child</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>478</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>8/10</td>
<td>87v-105v</td>
<td>The Northern Passion</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>106r</td>
<td>Short Charter of Christ</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30*</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>106r-107r</td>
<td>Lament of the Virgin Mary</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>536</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>107r-108r</td>
<td>Lydgate: Dietary</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32*</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>108r-119v</td>
<td>Maydestone: Psalms</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>543</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>10/11</td>
<td>120r-128r</td>
<td>Prick of Conscience Minor</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34*</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>128r-136r</td>
<td>A Pilgrimage to Jerusalem</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>601</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35a</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>136r</td>
<td>Lament of a Lost Soul</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>618</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35b*</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Q</td>
<td>11/12</td>
<td>136v-138v</td>
<td>The Adulterous Falmouth Squire</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>621</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36*</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>138v-144v</td>
<td>The Resurrection</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>627</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37*</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>145r-150v</td>
<td>The Life of St Margaret</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>646</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>12/13</td>
<td>150v-151r</td>
<td>The Wounds of Christ</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>151r-156r</td>
<td>SIR ORFEO</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>662</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40*</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>156v-157v</td>
<td>On the Vanity of the World</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>677</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>157v-161v</td>
<td>King Edward and the Hermit</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>680</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NB Status = Ashmole text one of specified number of copies. Notes = Page numbers of Notes in chapter 4 sections; Text = Page numbers of transcriptions of Texts.
1.2 Key Bibliography

1.2.a Catalogue entry: William Henry Black 1845.

A very tall and narrow folio volume, consisting of 161 leaves of paper of the largest size folded down the length of the sheet. On a fly leaf at the beginning is fixed a torn leaf containing a spoiled copy of 30 lines of the first article, and part of a list of the contents of the volume, which are... A collection of METRICAL ROMANCES, LAYS, and other POEMS in old English, made by one RATE, in or before the time of Henry VII. The volume is written in a coarse but legible hand; each page contains about 50 lines. Between most of the poems is drawn a fish with leaves and flowers, across the page, to distinguish the articles.

1.2.b Printed notices: A chronological survey of criticism and printed notices is to be found before the main Bibliography, together with a brief check-list of editions of the Ashmole 61 texts.

1.2.c Key references *2:

1. BLISS, Alan Thesis 1954:8-25
2. BLISS, Alan Sir Orfeo 1966:xi-xiii
3. GINN, Rosemary Thesis 1967:8-20
5. GUDDAT-FIGGE, Gisela Catalogue 1976:249-252

This description is based on the set of notes and collation-chart made by Dr Bruce Barker-Benfield of the Bodleian Library at the time of the manuscript's re-binding in 1986, a copy of which is kept in the Bodleian Library at REFS.LXXIV.27 *3. References to these unpublished notes will be indicated by the sigla "BB".

---

2 This is a list of the main references used throughout the main body of the thesis. The page numbers given here are to descriptions of Ashmole 61.

3 I am indebted to him for showing the manuscript to me while in its 'pulled' state, for discussion and correspondence on various aspects of the manuscript's make-up, and for permitting me to quote from his notes and collation.
1.3 Date: It is not possible to date Ashmole 61 more precisely than "c.1500". The dates assigned to the manuscript range from 1450, by Lucy Toulmin Smith in 1886, to the beginning of the 16th century, by Gustav Lüdtke in 1881. The following table shows the datings favoured by some critics from the earliest opinion in 1814 (Brydges, "1450") to the present study:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2nd half-end 15C</th>
<th>late 15-early 16C</th>
<th>c1500</th>
<th>Early 16C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black 1845</td>
<td>Girvan 1939</td>
<td>Furnivall 1868</td>
<td>Lüdtke 1881</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zielke 1880</td>
<td>Boyd 1964</td>
<td>Sajavaara 1967</td>
<td>De Wit 1977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mustanoja 1948</td>
<td>Robinson 1972</td>
<td>Ginn 1967</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hirsh 1977</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McFarlane 1981</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hülsmann 1985</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doyle 1987</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speed 1987</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c1450</td>
<td>c1470</td>
<td>c1490</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brydges 1814</td>
<td>Braswell 1965</td>
<td>Pearsall 1977a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L.T. Smith 1886</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Bliss suggests that the volume was compiled over a number of years and that "the scribe renewed his supplies of paper roughly every five years" (Thesis 1954:11); this appears to be corroborated by the watermark sequence *5, but the handwriting indicates a continuous flow of copying, as Ian Doyle has confirmed *6, and the paper may have been acquired in job lots and used up in sequence.

I cannot agree with Guddat-Figge’s statement that "On palaeographical grounds the later date seems more justified" (1976:252), since the

4 The list is representative rather than comprehensive.
5 See section 1.6.f, Watermarks.
6 "The writing and ink seemed to me very even and continuous for fairly long spells"; private communication 1987. Further comments by Doyle in this chapter are from this informal source, by kind permission of the writer.
watermark evidence together with the conservatism of Rate's script would seem to suggest a late fifteenth-century dating. From close comparison with plates of both types of hand from both centuries, Rate's script exhibits more fifteenth-century characteristics *7, and I would at least posit a starting date of "post-1479", based on the water-mark evidence alone (see section 1.6.f), upon which Bliss dates the end of the manuscript (Orfeo onwards) as "post-1488". I originally considered "c1490" as a likely dating (as Pearsall 1977a), but in the light of Wilson's comments on some of the elements of item 16 *8, which was written on paper with the Type A watermark (1479), I have decided on a more hospitable dating and have adopted Ginn's "c1500" as a safe compromise, although I suspect that Pearsall's guess is nearer the mark.

1.4 History

1.4.a Provenance: The scribal dialect of Ashmole 61 has been localized by Angus McIntosh in the Linguistic Atlas in the North-East Leicestershire area (1986:233, LP.71) *9. Prior to publication of the Atlas the problem of determining provenance for this manuscript was reflected in the variety of suggestions offered by previous critics, but the predominant opinion was for the North-East Midlands (Mustanoja

7 Out of the plates given in Parkes' thesis, Rate's hand compares most closely to those showing vernacular hands of the late fifteenth century; compare also examples of late fifteenth-century Anglicana and Secretary hands in plates 21.iii and 13.ii in ECBH (1969) and plate 17 in Petti (1977), an example of Early Tudor Secretary. The closest resemblance to Rate's hand yet found is that of Cotton Vespasian D.8, dated 15C iii, possibly 1468. See the plate facing page 1 in Block's edition of the manuscript (1922).

8 For instance, examples of costs of drink recorded from 1492 onwards (1987:464n); a Northern construction in line 94 recorded for Rutland "c.1500" (465n). Earliest recorded examples are not, of course, reliable guides for dating texts.

Bliss queries MacCracken's description of Rate as the "Scots scribe": "The extant MS of "Ratis Raving" was certainly copied by a Scottish scribe; the scribe of Ashmole 61 was not a Scotsman, but he may have had connections with Scotland, for it will be seen ... that his version of "Sir Orfeo" seems to have been copied from a Scottish text" (Thesis 1954:13) *10.

1.4.b Medieval history: Nothing is yet known, except that the manuscript evidently had at least one Elizabethan owner, and one possibly in the region of Hookenorth (?) - see section 1.10, Marginalia), which has so far proved untraceable.

1.4.c Post-medieval history: It is not known when Elias Ashmole acquired the manuscript *11. It is presumed to have been first bound by him. The Ashmole collection passed from the Ashmolean Museum to the Bodleian Library in 1860, and no records were kept of the

9 Other manuscripts localised in this county include CUL Ff.2.38 (see section 1.6.f, Watermarks). Localisation on linguistic grounds alone is limited, as the whole of the book's evidence needs to be assessed, and it does not take into account migratory scribes who come from one part of the country and write their manuscripts in another. However, it provides a useful starting point to search for external evidence, which in the case of Ashmole 61 appears to have produced corroborative material (see further chapter 3 section 3.1).

10 In the later edition he qualifies this somewhat: "Certain rhymes peculiar to this text suggest that it was copied from a very northerly or Scottish exemplar" (1966:xxv). See further chapter 3 section 3.4, and chapter 4 section 2.

11 It is known, however, that Ashmole was travelling through Leicestershire in 1657 (Nichols, 1795:I.i, cli).
1.5 Handwriting

1.5.a Scribe: Written throughout by Rate. Discussion of the possible identity of the scribe is given in chapter 3 section 3.3. In two instances the name has been mis-read as "Kate": Furnivall, EETS ES 8, after printing items 3, 4, and 7, while Idelle Sullens gives the scribe's name as "Rate or Kate" (1983:xxiii). Since Rate never uses a capital form of "k", the letter intended is definitely a capital "R", which cannot be confused with the lower case "k" *13. Thus any attempt to identify the scribe of Ashmole 61 as female is spurious.

1.5.b Script: Current Anglicana. At first glance it has the appearance of a mixed hand, because the degree of abbreviation, fluency, and speed would indicate a documentary hand. However, no other Secretary graphs appear other than the common single-lobed "a", while the cramped angularity which marks so many late Secretary hands is entirely lacking here. Doyle believes that the style of the hand is more characteristic of the middle of the fifteenth century than of the early sixteenth, "though the watermarks point to the late fifteenth". From this we may deduce that Rate uses a conservative hand, which cannot be relied upon for dating.

1.5.c Overall appearance: While Rate's script lacks a standard of professionalism evident from its careless sprawl, speed and open-handedness, it is nevertheless a stylish and distinctive hand not

---

*12 I am indebted to Timothy Rogers of the Bodleian Library, and David McGregor of the Ashmolean Museum, for their help.

*13 For example, see plate 6: "Rise" and "kepe" (f.151r, lines 1 and 6), and the following title "kyng orfew"; see further section 1.5.d, Letter-forms.
easily confused with, although comparable to, other vernacular book-hands of the late fifteenth century. Rate appears to have used a squared nib, held upright or at a slight forward angle, as the minims on "m" and "n" testify. The degree of vertical compression in the hand is quite marked, as is its rounded and looped appearance. It often exhibits a dashing and exaggerated character, giving rise to a number of quirky and unique letter-forms.

Ginn provides a concise characterization of Rate's hand:

The script is basically a simple current form of Anglicana but the scribe has a tendency to adopt the more easily controlled Secretary features such as rounded loops to the ascenders, irregularity in the height of the letter-forms and a simplified form of the two-compartment "a" based on capital forms (beside single-compartment "a"). The hand tends to 'open out' and to spread across the page, causing the minims to be reduced in height. The size and proportion of individual letters seems to vary even within a single word. The general compression of the hand, especially the minims, together with the forms "t" (with the ascending stroke coming far above the cross-bar) and "h", with a pronounced descender, in this variety of the script indicate that the manuscript was written c.1500.

1.5.d Letter-forms: Using the test key letters "a g r e w s d", the main letter forms include: double-lobed "a" used mostly for the indefinite article, at the beginnings of lines, initially, and in isolation - although it is sometimes used interchangeably with single-lobed "a", the main lower-case letter *15; double-lobed "g", often with an otiose flourish on the tail carried on over the head of the letter; long-"r", with a high shoulder, increasingly with a

---

14 See for example Cotton Vespasian D.8 (1468); Cotton Caligula A.2 and Advocates 19.3.1. (both of the late fifteenth century), and the Brome MS (1460-80).

15 Similarly in Douce MS 228, and commonly. It is often ambiguous when a capital is intended, and I have only used the upper-case form at the beginnings of lines in the transcriptions (see Principles of Transcription). For terminology and samples of Anglicana see Parkes 1969 and Petti 1977.
foreshortened descender, also the secondary 2-form, used occasionally after "y" and "e"; reversed-circular "e"; single-loop 3-form "w" (sometimes with a flying headstroke), with the capital virtually undistinguished in size and form; flat-topped long-"s", and sigma-"s" often with an extended head-stroke; looped "d", sometimes with an angular bowl or heavy downstroke. Of the other letters Rate uses the simple "h" and "b", both with the ascender looped onto the bowl; small, flat-topped "c"; small "i", often with a diacritic; "j" (i-longa) as a short single stroke curving below the line without diacritic; "o" often corrupted by haste into an alpha-type stroke (some textual ambiguity occurs *16); "k" as a double-barred looped ascender; "p" often with an open bowl; "q" as a con- abbreviation type of stroke; thorn and "y" undistinguished, both a two-stroke closed-bowl form, both can appear with a diacritic *17; yogh with the descender either straight or curved to the right *18.

1.5.e Style: His other lower-case letters are consistent with current Anglicana, with variations in the degree of angularity; slope, size, and speed, as Ginn notes. He has some distinctive idiosyncrasies of handwriting; for example, his practice of writing "rd" at the end of a word in a single flourish, the "d" almost superscripted from the shoulder of the "r", as in "wt word", line 22 of Commandments (plate 2, f.16v). These are developments of speed and should not be regarded as genuinely superscript letters.

The lombard capitals are boldly decorative *19. They are mostly

16 See plate 1, penultimate line: "Thou arte" appears at first sight to read "Than arte".

17 For example, see plate 1 line 5, "That mykyl had", and line 10, "wt pe pore".

18 See plate 3, f.106r (item 30), "sy3ht", "3ou" (lines 3 and 4).
blocked in, sometimes with a pen-line flourish around them, but they are often left as outlines with only crude strokes filling them, as if to save the tedium of blocking in the whole letter *20. These short filler lines are nearly always curled at the ends, like elongated tildas, as in the bars on the fish and the outer ring of the geometrical hexafoil on f.17r (see plate 2). Touches of humour are apparent in the occasional face drawn into the capitals, as in the "W" on f.21v, the "I" on f.38v, and the "O" on f.145r. The other capitals are generally varied and flourished, drawn with more panache than precision. Most decorative are his top-line flourishes, which produce some unique capital forms, and are evidently a result of creative exuberance rather than tutored skill. He achieves most variety with the flourished form of capital "A".

1.5. Punctuation and Correction: The only punctuation is Rate's use of scruffily-drawn braces to link the rhymes together, which he often does carelessly or erroneously *21. Pamela De Wit describes the braces as a "diagrammatic indication of the rhyme schemes" and interprets them as "a visual expression of one of the patterns in the text" (1977:plate 4). I think Rate's intention is less artistic than conventional; while he is aware of this versification practice, he does not fully appreciate its purpose, or else is not concerned with applying it accurately. If he intended the texts for reading aloud, the braces might possibly have been helpful in respect of the stanzaic works; elsewhere they probably exist as a standard feature rather than

19 The copying of Passion (28) is distinguished by the use of many large and bold lombard capitals. See also plate 2, f.16v, "Herkyns" opening the Commandments; the same lombard is also drawn in the re-copy of the first stanza on f.22v.

20 See plate 3, f.105v: "I" (line 11), "M" (line 29).

21 See ff.15v-16r, 22rv, and passim.
Abbreviations, flourishes and superscripts are dealt with under Principles of Transcription before the texts, but I note here his scant method of correction. He uses very few corrections, expunction *22 being his most common practice, as in the three lines expunged on f.66v, while "feyrest" on f.28r is both expunged and crossed out *23. For all that he constantly reverses letters, words, stanzas, lines and whole passages unremarked, I have found only two instances of the letters "b, a" used to indicate two lines reversed. Uncompleted words occur frequently, words are wrongly joined or divided, abbreviation marks are inconsistently used, all without correction. A few erasures occur, not always with the correction inserted, as on f.7r, "sch...", end of word erased but left unfinished. Lack of corrections creates the surface appearance that he makes few mistakes, an impression contradicted by close study of the cognate texts *24. Rather he prefers to assimilate errors by altering his text to suit - even to the extent of changing rhyme or word-order - or unconcernedly allowing them to stand, as the next chapter demonstrates. Letters omitted at the ends of words are sometimes squeezed into the space between words, and are often obscured. Final letters are often left off, especially "n" and "r", as if he is too impatient to finish words when he knows what he means.

22 The term indicates that the words have been marked for deletion by the practice of underdotting (see text of Eustace (1), note to line 126c).

23 See also plate 6, f.150v, second copy of "A3ens enuy" in Wounds (38).

24 The term "cognate" is used of manuscripts to indicate those containing the same texts as Ashmole 61, and of texts to indicate those which are collated with the Ashmole versions.
His system of abbreviation has often been difficult to interpret, particularly his tailed-a suspension mark which does duty for omitted "u, ur, r, re, er, or, our(e)" *25, and the reflex curve for "e, r, er, re" and so forth. This suggests that Rate was not properly concerned with the faithful transmission of texts, as befits a professional scribe. Rather he was producing the volume for his own use, modified and adapted according to personal preference and purpose.

1.6 Physical Make-up

1.6.a Binding: Since rebinding in 1986, Ashmole 61 has a white board binding with a white imitation leather spine, unmarked. It is housed in a brown board case, with a top tray containing the original Ashmolean binding. The contents leaf is now repasted to the flyleaf and attached in its proper position at the top of the leaf, thus aligning the horizontal fold with that of the subsequent leaves. The original binding is described as follows (BB):

The binding is of dark brown calf, with a double fillet line in gilt around the edge of each board and a simple blind-roll pattern on the outside edges themselves; two original metal clasps with the arms of Ashmole were originally mounted on calf thongs. This is a late 17th-century binding of the style standard to the Ashmole collection. The original spine is lost. The manuscript was repaired and rebacked in the 19th and/or 20th centuries (not necessarily all at the same time), when the spine was replaced, the clasps perhaps now remounted on thick vellum, the insides of the boards relined, and fols. 150-155 sidestitched together. No clear deduction about the pre-17th-cent. sewing (if any) seems possible on the confused evidence of the existing sewing-holes.

25 See plate 4, f.107r, "seke or ded" (line 22), "no more" (line 29), "3our godnys" (line 30).
Before replacement the binding was in fairly good condition with some wear and tear. The two brass clasps were well preserved and still fastened, despite the increased bulkiness of the manuscript owing to frequent use, which also caused the binding to loosen in the ten years since Guddat-Figge noted "Binding so tight that collation impossible to ascertain" (1976:249).

1.6.b **Size:** c.417-18x138-41mm (BB). Robinson cites "420x135mm" (1972:192), whereas Ginn quotes 405x140mm and 417x140mm (1967:9); Guddat-Figge gives "415x137mm" (1976:249). This disparity reflects the unevenness of the pages owing to deterioration and the trimming of damaged areas at various stages. My original measurement accorded with Robinson.

1.6.c **Material and condition:** Paper; horizontal chain-lines. Before rebinding the paper was beginning to tear down the vertical folds at the top of the manuscript, and some of the quires were detaching towards the end (this has now been mended). The paper is at present comparatively strong and in good condition, but it is in danger of deteriorating badly, having been "permanently softened and weakened" through "past over-use", as a note on the carrying box states. It has evidently already deteriorated since Guddat-Figge noted, only a short time before, that the paper was "in very good condition, very few stains, little worn" (1976:251) *26. The edges are stained (professionally?) in red. It is damp-stained top and bottom. The top of f.30 seems to have been burnt (carelessness with a candle?) as the browned edges suggested, before the recent patching

---

26 However, I believe this to have been an over-optimistic assessment on her part, since not all the current tears, stains and soiling can be modern. Probably the greatest modern damage has been fading of the ink due to exposure to light.
largely hid the damage. The earlier folio number is written at the side instead of in its usual central position, indicating that the damage occurred early in the manuscript's history, before it was first foliated.

The paper is folded into the tall, narrow format. The presence of horizontal folds indicates that this shape was deliberately chosen (BB):

As frequently remarked, a horizontal crease occurs on every leaf. The direction of the folds, and the occasional spurt of ink where the scribe's pen has hiccupped over the crease (e.g. fol. 34), suggest that these folds were present before writing; a decision must have been taken to change the format of the blank paper from a modest-sized quarto to a 'holster' book. This seems more likely than the alternative theory, which posits an unorthodox and awkward mode of carrying the manuscript in individual quires after writing.

Bliss and Robinson note without comment that a horizontal fold is present in the manuscript. Ginn states "Lengthwise fold, original fold visible" (1967:9). But the horizontal folds are not uniform; some are sharper than others, as if only a few sheets were folded together. Some folds have severe lateral creasing on either side, which must have been formed through folding and re-folding, which Pamela De Wit suggests occurred during storage: "The sheets seem to have been kept folded again the other way at some time before being bound" (1977:50).

While disbound, Dr Barker-Benfield experimentally refolded some bifolia along the horizontal crease, and we found that the edges did not all meet properly; some top edges fell short of the bottom by about an inch. It would appear that the scribe, having purchased the sheets in the folio format, then folded the bifolia horizontally into the squarer quarto in order to store them, for instance in a box or
pouch. A scale mock-up of the quires revealed the following strange process of folding *27:

Quire 1: Folded in closed sheets (vertically); bottom turned upwards (ridge crease); quire then folded and refolded horizontally (double middle crease).

Quire 2: First bifolium (ff. 9 and 18) folded closed (ridge crease); rest of quire folded in open sheets (ridge crease).

Quire 3: Folded open (ridge crease).

Quire 4: First three bifolia (ff. 30b-32 and 43-45) folded open (valley crease); next three bifolia (ff. 33-35 and 40-42) folded open (ridge crease); middle two bifolia (ff. 36-37 and 38-39) folded closed (valley crease).

Quire 5: First two bifolia (ff. 46-47 and 56-57) folded open (ridge crease); next bifolium (ff. 48 and 55) folded open (valley crease); rest of quire (ff. 49-54) folded open (ridge crease).

Quire 6: f. 58, single leaf (valley crease); f. 59, single leaf (ridge crease); next bifolium (ff. 60 and 65) folded open (ridge crease); next bifolium (ff. 61 and 64) folded closed (ridge crease); middle bifolium (ff. 62 and 63) folded open (ridge crease).

Quire 7: First five bifolia (ff. 66-70 and 73-77) folded open (ridge crease); middle bifolium (ff. 71-72) folded closed (ridge crease).

Quire 8: First four bifolia (ff. 78-81 and 88-91) folded open (valley crease); next two bifolia (ff. 82-83 and 86-87) folded closed (valley crease); middle bifolium (ff. 84-85) folded open (valley crease).

Quire 9: (ff. 92-104) folded open (ridge crease).

Quire 10: First five bifolia (ff. 105-109 and 116-120) folded open (valley crease); rest of quire (ff. 110-115) folded closed (ridge crease).

Quire 11: (ff. 121-136) folded closed (ridge crease).

Quire 12: First six bifolia (ff. 137-142 and 145-150) folded open (ridge crease); middle bifolium (ff. 143-144) folded closed (ridge crease).

Quire 13: First seven bifolia (ff. 151-157 and 160-1, 162-166 lost) folded open (ridge crease); middle bifolium (ff. 158-159) folded closed (ridge crease).

27 I use the terminology ‘ridge’ and ‘valley’ folds, to indicate a raised or sunk fold on the recto of the leaf.
Ian Doyle notes that "it is likely that the paper was bought in normal folio folds, not open sheets". But there is no certainty that the quarto format was intended from the outset, as Guddat-Figge suggests: "the folios would seem to have been intended for a manuscript in the ordinary format and folded into the oblong holster book size only later" (1976:251). Hiccups in the ink attest that the folds were present before the sheets were written. Doyle remarks that "the horizontal folds across the paper are not all in the same direction": their unevenness, as noted above *28, and the amount of subsidiary creasing (including diagonal creases at the corners of certain leaves) indicates that these folds were carelessly formed during the storage process. As it is probable that the sheets would have been folded in the vertical format prior to being written, my explanation is that the paper was first folded horizontally simply to store more conveniently; subsequently the leaves were placed together first one way and then the other as the gatherings were made up for writing, being simultaneously refolded along the longest axis "to accommodate the 'holster' shape" as Doyle notes.

The effect of the folds upon the handwriting can be seen through careful scrutiny. The middle fold does not seem to have been consciously avoided, as the position of the writing occurs in accordance with the natural progression of the lines on the page (which do not tend to conform with the scoring, where that exists). Darker points of ink occur where the pen writes over the sharper folds. For example, in the words "At pis nexte howse" (f.4v), the crossbar on the "t" is heavy, the "n" of "nexte" is foreshortened, although in the previous line the "m" in "men" has short minims and is

*28 Although although the amount of trimming means that we cannot tell how even were the vertical folds originally.
not on a crease. Rate's downstrokes are naturally heavy. The crease at the bottom of f.8r (first quire) was made after the writing, as there are no jumps in the ink. A thin white line appears through "dette" on the crease, showing that the ink has worn off; this is present in a number of words written over valley folds. Little spurts of ink also occur on words not written on creases, such as on f.8r and 10r, especially in letters where the body joins the descender. The paper surface is rough enough to cause a certain amount of interference with the ink flow, but the evidence of the greater disruption over the creases is conclusive that the paper was folded horizontally before writing *29.

The lateral creases above and below the middle fold occurred after the writing, as otherwise much pressure would have been needed to keep the downstrokes clean and to flatten the paper as it was written. But the writing is consistent: the descenders on long-"s" are heavy, as is Rate's practice, while those on "f", "y" and "h" are light, and quite badly distorted by the subsequent creasing. Also, one would expect curved strokes to be flattened and to run into the creases, but this is not evident *30.

The holster-book format was originally thought to indicate that the manuscript must have formed part of a minstrel's collection *31 However, Guddat-Figge believes that the minstrel theory is inappropriate to Ashmole 61 (1976:251):

29 See f.20v, "of thy frendys" on the crease in pale grey ink, darker points like small bars in the downstrokes of "f, h, f, r" where they cross the crease; also ff.32v, 33r, 34r, 42v, 47r, 90r, 121r, 150v, 151r.

30 The flattened top of the long-"s" is indigenous to the script.

Holster Book. Clearly and well written; paper and writing in very good condition, very few stains, little worn. All this scarcely in accordance with the idea of a travelling minstrel carrying the book in his holster.

A photograph of the Pre-Reformation Churchwardens’ Accounts for 1490-91 of St Mary de Castro at Leicester shows a long and narrow book written in a current Anglicana comparable to that in Ashmole 61, and an early Register for 1600-1738 shows the same format (J. Collins, 1935:27-9). The account-book or ‘agenda’ format (Robinson, 1972:194) is thus a more appropriate description of Ashmole 61 (as of Cambridge, Trinity 1450) than ‘holster-book’, since the bulk and weight of the volume would have made it cumbersome to carry about unless in individual quires, in which case more wear and tear would surely be present; only the first quire is likely to have been so used. Other collections that have been designated holster books - Lincoln’s Inn 150 and Douce 228 - are much smaller, homogeneous collections.

The account book format best suits Rate’s purpose. If the paper was folded horizontally it would measure approximately 280x210mm (trimmed). He could then have written a single column with wide spacing either side, which is wasteful, or double columns which would have been very cramp. Rate’s writing often stretches to 100-110mm across the page; its size, sprawl, speed and crudely-drawn braces indicate that to cramp his texts in double columns would not have suited his style. The vertical format provides enough space to write across the page without wastage. The margins are scored to 360x105mm.

As noted by Taylor (1991:58): "no sensible traveller would burden his poor horse with a volume that can only be lifted by both hands". He also suggests that the term "holster" might be a complete fiction, especially since nobody has ever produced an actual holster in which such books might have been carried. In his opinion the so-called holster books were more likely to have been account books without ever actually travelling at all.
where scoring occurs, but he often ignores them.

As well as being ideal for Rate's writing, the format also facilitates his use of the volume. Ian Doyle notes that the so-called holster format "was not only more portable in something like a saddle bag, but more easily held open with one hand in circumstances such as a pulpit or reading desk, where it was useful to have the other hand free, or perhaps more precisely to keep one's place marked with one hand while one read aloud". Guddat-Figge also notes that the same format is "well-suited to oral recitation" (1976:31). The oral context of the manuscript is reflected in the choice of texts and their adaptation, which will be discussed in the succeeding chapters.

1.6.d Lost leaves: Two leaves are lost between ff.65 and 66, containing the end of item 22 and the beginning of item 23, which misled Black into counting the two items as one. The leaves were lost before the manuscript was first foliated, as the contemporary numbering is continuous (58, 59). Neither Ginn nor Bliss consider that Rate may have been the early foliator. Both assume that the foliator was ignorant of the proper order, and that the overlooking of two lost leaves after f.65 suggests that it was not the scribe, since "it does not seem likely that the scribe would have failed to notice the loss of two folios" (Bliss, 1954:11). However, since Rate "fails to notice" so many omissions and discrepancies in his texts, I think that even had he noticed he would not have bothered to mark the loss. It is typical of Rate's practice that a) the first quire was so carelessly stored; b) that having discovered the misplacement he then allowed the numbering to stand uncorrected; and c) that the first quire remained unfoliated. It is reasonable to expect that a later foliator would have corrected the errors, as indeed a Bodleian
librarian did ultimately. Ignorance of the manuscript's compilation
does not rule out the scribe as foliator, since from absent-mindedness
(a quality he frequently exhibits in his copying techniques), he may
have thought the first quire lost, or lent out, only to discover it
carelessly inserted among the later quires. Bliss makes no mention of
the skip in foliation from 150-160. One leaf has been cancelled after
f.98, the eighth leaf of quire 9.

1.6.e Foliation: ii + 162 + i. There are 162 written leaves, the
last leaf and the endleaf being incorrectly foliated 161 and 162. A
leaf between ff.30 and 31 was omitted in the nineteenth-century
foliation (hence Black records only 161 leaves), and the sequence is
now re-numbered 29, 30a, 30b; 31 (corrected from an earlier correction
29, 30, 30+, 31). Guddat-Figge asserts that the foliation "should
actually be ff.ii+163, since one leaf after f.30 is not included in
the foliation" (1976:252); she counts the flyleaf as f.163, but it
does not belong with the main volume, being a blank leaf of 17th
century laid paper, bearing the same watermark as the blank frontleaf
iia (BB).

There are two systems of foliation (BB):

(a) Top right-hand corner. 19th-cent., still in use
today; since this foliation is used by W.H.Black in his
catalogue of the Ashmole manuscripts, it was perhaps
added by or for him in 1831-3, when he did the initial
work.

(b) Top centre. Grey ink, sprawling numerals
incorporating a sideways '8' and an occasional 'i'. Not
later than the early 17th cent., more likely 16th-cent.
or possibly even by the scribe himself. An interesting
feature of this foliation is that it ignores fols. iib
and 1-8, but reaches more or less the right total by
leaping from fol. 150 to 160 at fols. 158/159; it is
unclear whether these two errors are connected.
The older foliation starts from f.9, from the beginning of Isu'mbras. The leaf not foliated in the later system is here numbered f.23 *33 (following the burned leaf). The early foliator repeats 91 (91=98, 91=99), and jumps from 150-160 (150=158, 160=159). Ginn offers the following explanation for this nine-leaf discrepancy, although her theory relies on the assumption that the foliator was counting first in tens (1967:13):

Whilst the manuscript was kept in loose sheets, the first quire, and the table of contents, became misplaced in the sequence and were inserted between fos.158 and 159. The change in order would not be apparent to anyone who had no list of contents to consult, since "Sir Isu'mbras" begins at the top of fo.9r, the first folio of the second gathering. The foliator would then have begun numbering from this leaf, numbering the complete manuscript first in tens (hence 150-160). Only when the intermediate numbers were being filled in would the foliator have come upon the stray quire and restored it to its original position, as indicated by the table of contents. Fo.9r is considerably more rubbed than fo.1r, which supports the theory that fo.9r had been an endleaf for some time.

Alternatively, the foliator could have been numbering sequentially, and coming upon the misplaced quire, removed it to the beginning. In numbering the next leaf '160', he could either have been counting in the nine leaves "silently", in order to achieve the correct total, as Maldwyn Mills suggests (1969:5), or it could be a simple mistake. It may be significant that a leaf is cancelled after f.98, for the foliator counts 98 = 91, and also the next leaf = 91. Was there a hiatus at that point, while he cut out the cancelled leaf? As it was part of the middle bifolium of the quire it could easily have been removed. Since there is no text lost between the two leaves, we can only assume that the leaf was spoiled.

*33 Ginn incorrectly states that the leaf omitted in the later foliation was numbered '30' by the early foliator, instead of '23'.
Did the volume originally open with *Eustace* or with the first romance *Isumbras*? *Eustace* proper begins the first quire of eight leaves, and *Isumbras* the second quire of ten; no other texts in the manuscript begin new quires, being written continuously one after the other and overlapping the quire divisions. Thus the first quire is the only one which qualifies as Robinson's "booklet", and its use as such is borne out by several factors. Firstly, the reduction of items 3 and 4 in order to fit within the three leaves left after *Ram's Horn*. Secondly, by the greater degree of soiling and rubbing on the first page of *Isumbras*, f. 9r, indicating that it was for some time the outer leaf. Thirdly, by the contemporary foliation beginning from *Isumbras* and not from *Eustace*.

The manuscript is prefaced by a contents leaf, written below a spoiled copy of the first 31 lines of *Eustace* (see plate 1). This leaf is unfortunately torn across at the bottom, so we cannot know how big the volume was originally, as the last five leaves of quire 13 - originally of 16 leaves - are lost, and with them the end of *Edward* (41). Bliss offers three theories to account for the presence of the contents leaf (Thesis 1954:11): the spoilt leaf was written...

---

**34** See the discussion in chapter 2, section 1, *The Scribe as Compiler.*

**35** There would have been just enough room on the contents leaf to list all of the present volume; with an average of 54 lines per page, 31 lines were written from *Eustace*, followed by 9 lines in column 1 listing items 1-12 (with an extra inserted title for *Wise Man* between lines 3 and 4, and items 9-11 omitted), and 9 lines in column 2 listing items 27-35a. This leaves about 14 lines for the rest of the index; this would be enough room for a separate line for each of items 13-26 in column 1, although items 12-13 may have been entered as one, items 14-15 almost certainly would have been treated as one, and if necessary items 22-23 also, while only items 35b-41 need to be added to column 2 (7 lines), leaving a possible 7 lines for any other items. However, I am assuming that *Edward* was the final text, as to posit the presence of further lost items presents an unnecessary complication and contributes nothing helpful to the discussion.
before any other text and preserved until the volume was complete; the scribe wrote on the leaf the contents he was intending to copy; the first quire was written last. I agree with Bliss that it is unlikely that the scribe would know in advance which exemplars he would be able to obtain, and even if the texts were listed as they were written up, it is unlikely that a spoiled half-leaf would have been preserved so carefully with the manuscript for all that time, especially considering the known carelessness of the scribe. If the first quire was written last, and then put to the front of the volume, Bliss suggests (1954:11) that Rate must have deliberately chosen to bring Eustace and Isumbras closer together and that the quire was resited at the beginning to give "pride of place" to Eustace *36. But the theory that the first quire was written last arose because at the time of the first foliation, the first quire was evidently not sited at the beginning of the volume. If Ginn is correct in assuming that the skip in foliation was caused by the insertion of the first quire and the contents leaf, it suggests that having been loaned out or used by Rate as a separate booklet, upon return it was carelessly inserted within the last three pages of the extant volume, whether or not the final five leaves were lost at that time. When the foliator discovered its insertion, why then did he not simply put the quire to the end of the volume and continue foliating in sequence, since he only needed to alter one number, from 160 to 151? One explanation is Bliss's "pride of place" theory. But to cause such a dislocation in the foliation sequence for that reason is an unsatisfactory explanation, as it relies upon scribal intention which cannot be proved. It can only be properly accounted if the contents leaf had already been written, and if Eustace had been copied first and was thus replaced in its proper

*36 See chapter 3 section 3.1.
order 37.

In that case, I believe that the correct explanation is that after copying Edward (41) Rate began to re-copy Eustace, realized half-way down that he already had this text 38, cut the bifolium in half, wrote out the contents of the finished volume on the bottom of the spoiled copy, and placed it at the beginning with the first quire. Subsequently this leaf and the first quire became displaced, and were only discovered when the manuscript was eventually foliated. They were then returned to the beginning of the manuscript, their proper place as indicated by the contents list and by the catchword which was added before the foliation. This explanation is borne out by the state of the handwriting: the writing of the last item is very similar to that of the spoiled copy of Eustace, while Eustace proper begins in a stylish hand quite unlike Isumbras and most of the rest of the volume 39. This suggests that the scribe began his volume attempting a 'book hand', but being unable to sustain it for very long he 'relaxes' into his usual current hand. Also, the handwriting of the contents list is uniform and suggests that the entries were not

37 There is also the fact that the first two quires are both unmarked, although this alone does not prove that they are from the same batches of paper, or that if the first quire was written last it would necessarily had to have been watermarked.

38 This is Robinson's explanation for the second copy of item 6, first two verses of the Commandments at item 14 (1972:38). Similarly, he re-copies whole passages without noticing (see chapter 2 section 2.3.c, Narrative Sequence). Maldwyn Mills notes that the main copy of Eustace "seems to be rather more thoroughly 'translated' into the scribe's own language than is the fragment on the Index leaf" (private communication 1990), which is consistent with my view that the main copy is the planned and re-worked one (see chapter 2), the one on the contents leaf being a later, accidental and spoiled copy. See also Guddat-Figge's notes concerning scribal inconsistencies in the re-copy of the Alexander romance (1976:280).

39 See chapter 2 section 2.2.a, Script.
added as each text was copied (after long gaps in time), but in one session after the volume was completed.

Thus the spoiled leaf was used as a record of what had already been compiled. Some of the titles appear above the items *40, perhaps taken from the contents list which he may have written before adding the titles. The contents are entered in two columns, with a crude line drawn between the two sets of titles. In the first column the last full entry is the first line of item 8. Of the line below only a fragment of a word remains, which might be "Ihesu" from item 12, a night prayer to Christ. Thus Rate added the commonplace items 9-11 after writing the contents leaf, filling up the half-blank page after item 8.

1.6.f Watermarks: A full description of the watermarks is kept with the collation-chart (BB). The paper has been dated as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Folio</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Watermark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>iib-18</td>
<td>(unmarked)</td>
<td>Type D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-57</td>
<td>(1479)</td>
<td>Type A (Briquet no. 694)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58-91</td>
<td>(1483)</td>
<td>Type B (Briquet no. 11159)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92-104</td>
<td>(unmarked)</td>
<td>Type D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105-161</td>
<td>(1488)</td>
<td>Type C (Briquet no. 10116)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

BB's identification is based on that of Bliss (1966:xi-xiii); he corrects Bliss's translation of Génes as "Geneva" to "Genoa" for Type B. BB also cites a similar watermark to Briquet no. 11159 at no. 11165, dated Perpignan 1505, which contains an element lacking in 11159 but present in the Ashmole watermark *41. However, Friedrich Hülsmann

40 English headings are provided for items 1, 5, 20, 31, 34, 37, 39, 40; Latin headings for items 25, 28, 30, 32.

41 But it is not reliable corroboration of the later dating suggested by Lüdtke and De Wit (see section 1.3) as it is not identical, and applies only to the middle portion of the manuscript which was evidently written in sequence (ie. before 1488).
identifies the second watermark with Briquet no. 11194 (1480-90), which is also present in CUL Ff.2.38: "Both scribes used similar sorts of paper" (1985:12). He notes the "nearly simultaneous origin of Ff.2.38 and Ashmole 61", which has interesting implications since the two manuscripts have been localised in Leicestershire *42. Robinson apparently ignores Bliss and Ginn's identification of the three types, and asserts that "the watermark is the same throughout the volume" (1972:194), upon which mistaken reasoning she concludes that the volume was already bound at the time of purchase *43. This 'dubious hypothesis' (Doyle) is infeasible practically, since the writing would show some distortion towards the inner margins, but this does not occur; neither is there evidence of binding prior to that of Ashmole *44.

1.7 Collation: The collation is now recorded as follows:

ii + 1/8 2/10 3/12 4/16 5/12 6/10 (9,10 gone) 7/12 8/14 9/14 (8 canc.)
10/16 11/16 12/14 13/16 (12-16 gone) (BB).

Before rebinding, the collation caused some difficulty. Bliss gives none, while Ginn counted quire 9 as "12 + 1" (1967:10); she erroneously refers to this quire as the eleventh, but it is in fact the ninth, her quire 'i' *45. She further states that f.98 is an

*42 See section 1.4.a, Provenance. Ff.2.38 is localised in the South West, Ashmole 61 in the North East, of the county.

*43 Among other examples showing that the volume was not written as a bound book see Tolouse (19), where line 507 is inserted at the end of 506 and is partly hidden in the binding.

*44 "No clear deduction about the pre-17th-cent. sewing (if any) seems possible on the confused evidence of the existing sewing-holes" (BB).

*45 Ginn appears to have muddled her quire count, for while she states that there are "fourteen gatherings" (actually thirteen), she refers to the eleventh and fifteenth gatherings instead of the ninth and thirteenth.
insertion, when in fact it is leaf 7 of quire 9, leaf 8 being "an original cancel" (BB); Robinson notes that this leaf is wanting (1972:193). Similarly, the last quire proved problematic before 'pulling' revealed that the first five leaves were "stab-stitched together, 19th or 20th cent." (BB), being single halves of five bifolia, of which the final leaves are now lost. Ginn ends her collation: "m (fos.151-155) 5 singletons, n (fos.156-161) 6, i(endleaf)" (1967:10). In fact quire 13 is the final gathering of 16 leaves (11 remain; 151-161). Robinson correctly ends her collation "xiii 16 wants 12-16 (after fol.161)" (1972:193); Guddat-Figge had been unable to ascertain the collation *46.

1.7.a Catchwords: Catchwords occur after every quire except 6, and 12-14. They are "contemporary, most if not all perhaps by the scribe himself" (BB). The catchwords are all in Rate's hand, including the first one linking the misplaced quire to the beginning of the manuscript.

1.7.b Quire signatures: None. The leaves make up the quires as follows:

1=1-8, 2=9-18, 3=19-30a, 4=30b-45, 5=46-57, 6=58-65, 7=66-77, 8=78-91, 9=92-104, 10=105-120, 11=121-136, 12=137-150, 13=151-161.

1.8 Lay-out

1.8.a Written space: The written space is an average of 330-350x70-100mm; both length and width vary according to the layout of the verse. All the texts are written straight down the page, in single columns. No gaps are left between the texts, except a quarter-page after items 1 and 6. Visual breaks are provided by the

*46 See section 1.6.a, Binding.
fish and flower drawings (see section 1.9, Decoration) and the explicits.

1.8.b **Lines per page:** The number varies, approximately 50-60; this often depends on whether or not fish and flowers are present.

1.8.c **Ruling:** There is no ruling in ink, but scoring appears quite heavily on some folios, as if Rate attempted to score whole quires at a time. Robinson notes "Frame ruling in hard point" (1972:193), and Guddat-Figge states "Ruled with stylus ... marginal lines also drawn with stylus" (1976:249) *47, but this all suggests a greater degree of professional lay-out and consistency than exists in the manuscript. The scoring is irregular: heavy scoring appears on frontleaf ii (the contents leaf and spoiled copy of Eustace). The following folios are also heavily scored (on the rectos unless otherwise stated): 20, 22, 23, 25, 28 (at an angle), 110, 113v, 114, 115, 123 (bottom line slipped), 128 (begins from new text, quarter page down), 141 (scoring in 4-line sections, bottom line cuts through paper), 150v, and all through quire 13 from the verso (there are ridge lines on the rectos instead of the usual valley lines); the inner margin cuts through the paper.

There is no pricking *48, but there is a single four-pointed hole right through the entire volume at the bottom, made from the back. It appears to have been made after the first quire was replaced in its frontal position, as a very faint prick appears in the correct position on the backs of the opening leaves *49. It may have been a very crude way of keeping the volume together until it was bound,

---


*48 I have not found any, despite Guddat-Figge's assertion to the contrary (1976:249).
although it seems a dubious method. I have seen two other examples of this four-pointed hole: in a Stow MS, BM Add. 34360, where it pierces the bottom margin of the first three quires as far as f.57, which constitute the first part of the manuscript; and in the Bibliotheca Marciana, Venice, MS 1472, where it pierces the quires of a late sixteenth-century play *50.

1.9 Decoration

1.9.a Sketches: The manuscript is a plain and unilluminated volume, containing elements of decoration which show more character than skill. Fish and flowers are drawn throughout, and three other features occur. On f.17r, below the text of the Commandments (6), a geometrical device is drawn in the form of a hexafoil within a double circle (see plate 2). On f.106r, below the text of the Charter (29), is drawn a heraldic-type shield bearing a cross and five rayed suns, with a heart added around the middle sun (see plate 3) *51. On f.128r a framework of small flowers surrounds the scribal tag (see plate 5).

If the fish and flowers stand as a kind of visual signature, then only items 15 and 38 remain completely unsigned. Items 1, 2, 31, and 39 have an Explicit or Amen only; items 9-11 (fish and rose after item

49 See the plate of an iron ship’s nail in Wilson 1987: long, tapering, and square-cut. In a private communication (1988) he notes “If it is a nail-hole [through Ashmole 61], clearly any connexion with the nail of the poem [Carpenter’s Tools (16)] is fortuitous”.

50 Pistikos Voskos: the Cretan translation of Guarini’s Il Pastor Fido. I am indebted to Dr Rosemary Bancroft-Marcus, who arranged access to the manuscript for me. It is her belief that the author was Georgios Chortatsis, a Cretan playwright, and that the date of composition was 1600-1610. No explanation is given for the hole in the quires, and there is no other connection between the manuscripts.

51 See the interpretation of the decorative features given in chapter 3 section 3.2.
(signed after item 13), 14-15, and 35a-b (signed after item 35b) are copied together. The ends of items 22 and 41 are lost. Black suggests that the sketches are used to "distinguish the articles", which would be true if they only occurred at the ends of the items, but they are also drawn mid-text. For instance, during Tolouse, a fish occurs on the bottom of f.31r, two roses on 32v, one on 33v; two fish together on 36v, one on 37r, and the text is signed "Amen quod Rate" and accompanied by a rose. Libeus has two fish drawn mid-text, and is also signed "Amen quod Rate". All the mid-text fish and flowers are drawn at the bottom of the pages and may represent a particular break in copying.

So far no detailed study of the sketches has been thought necessary, but by carefully copying each drawing I have been able to ascertain that it is always the same type of fish with minor variations in the number of teeth or scales. While there is some variety in the rose, the fish is drawn in the same way, with a childish ineptness which never really improves despite drawing it 33 times. He starts the head along the top of the nose, draws the mouth, under-jaw, and gill first, then sketches the outline of the body, leaving the tail open-ended; he then decorates it with scales, eye, teeth and bars before going back and "correcting" the outline, which results in a messy and crude illustration (see plates 2-5). He often omits one of the bars on the gill or tail, sometimes rectifying this by drawing over the scales, as on f.21v. His lines are shaky and uncertain, and towards the end of the manuscript he never quite draws a perfect fish although there is some improvement. But he does not change his

52 The Winchester Anthology is likewise decorated with crude drawings all of the same bird: see the note on f.110, "this is a fesant" (Wilson, 1981:17).
practice of 'correcting' the outline, apparently unable to find a
different way of drawing the fish rather than continue with his clumsy
methods. On ff.18v, 67v, 106v and 135v, he corrects the outline
before adding the fins (see plate 4), showing that he did not go back
and correct all the outlines together after drawing all the fish.
This suggests that he draws the fish in situ, at whim, without benefit
of practice or tutoring.

Nevertheless, there is a distinct likeness of these fish to the
heraldic salmon. All the fish have a show of teeth, which are
represented by three or four vertical lines in the mouth, consistent
with Rate's tendency to simplify and adapt. Towards the end of the
manuscript he draws the fish, inanely grinning, holding the flowers in
their teeth (see plate 4). With the exception of individual
variations on ff.8v and 119r, all the flowers that Rate draws are
identifiable with the Tudor rose, in its single form (not the combined
red and white rose that Henry VIII initiated) and in its typical
heraldic form, drawn as in nature with stem, leaves and buds. Only in
two flowers on f.62r and f.116v does he draw the suggestion of double
petals in the middle. He draws the flowers consistently,
beginning with the checkered central circle for the stamens, the
divisions of the petals as five radiating lines, the curled edges of
the petals, the five points of the calyx between each petal, and the
stem and its attachments which are varied at will. Occasionally there
are several small, simpler flowers and buds on a wavy horizontal line,
but the single large flower on a stem is the main type. A variation

53 The inner ring is drawn in a lighter ink. If this is an attempt
to turn them into double roses after Henry VIII's accession, it
still would not help with the dating of the manuscript, but would
give some indication of the scribe's life-span. However, it would
be more conclusive if all the roses had been altered in this way.
occurs on f.119r, a type of 'stellate' flower, which so far I have been unable to identify.

The hexafoil on f.17r was first scored with a stylus *54, and only inked over after the the fish was drawn, as there is no ink through the fin of the fish which intrudes into the lower edge of the hexafoil, but the scoring is clear. It is possible that the fish was drawn first, too low down on the page, and so Rate filled up the space with the hexafoil, having to squeeze it in on top of the fish (the last two lines of the text were also added later by Rate, squeezed in before the explicit), so that when the hexafoil was inked over it appears to be balancing on the back of the fish (see plate 2). That he should choose to draw a hexafoil and not more fish or roses (less space-taking) must be significant (see chapter 3 section 3.2).

A type of coat-of-arms occurs on f.106r (see plate 3), at the end of the Short Charter (29). Its position is not, I believe, coincidental. In three manuscripts of the Charter *55 the legal warrant device used as the framework of the poem is faithfully observed even to the appended seal. In Ashmole 61 Rate draws the shield after the line "Myn awne sele per to I hyng", intending it to stand as a form of seal.

1.9.b Use of colour: The ink has evidently faded since Pamela De Wit observed that "the manuscript is written and decorated entirely in black ink" (1977:plate 4). Some of the fading is very marked, as on

*54 Conlee notes that "medieval carpenters used small iron compasses to make circles in a process known as 'scribing'" (1991:line 23n). Is this, together with the presence of the Carpenter's Tools, an indication of the scribe's 'day-time job'?*55 LBM MSS Sloane 3292, Stowe 620, Add. 37049 (Spalding, 1914:xix-xxix).
ff.19v-39r, where it appears faint and grey, changing to a stronger sepia tone on ff.39sq. Like Guddat-Figge, De Wit may have been over-optimistic in her description, and there are in fact different qualities of ink which have given rise to the assumption that the manuscript took at least ten years to compile. Bliss states that the contents leaf was written "in red ink which has faded so badly that the writing is only with difficulty legible" (Thesis 1954:10); it has now turned sepia.

The only colour that relieves the now generally brown ink of the writing and decoration is a very crude and faint staining of yellow, with which Rate daubs some lombard initials and other capitals. The yellow is dirty, often faded, often little more than a stain. It is not at all suited to the paper, being too easily absorbed and spread out by it. The suns in the shield, and nearly all the fish and flowers are 'coloured' with this yellow, and it appears to have been mostly patted on or washed over them. Although he is careless in following the line, the general shape is adhered to well enough to show that it is a deliberate scribal practice, and not an accidental occurrence from natural causes such as smudging of the ink through damp, as this would produce an overall 'ghosting' of the text such as occurs on ff.160v-161r.

The first occurrence of the yellow stain is on f.21v, marking the commonplace items 9, 10, and 11. This shows that the wash was added after these items, the lombard initials, and the contents leaf were written, as the list jumps from item 8 to item 12. Perhaps the commonplace items were added to fill a space which Rate discovered in the process of decoration, although the quarter-page spaces after items 1 and 6 remain unfilled *56. On ff.30b (rv) and 31r, he pats
the yellow onto every initial down the length of the page, not in a single stroke, but onto each letter individually, though hastily and inexpertly. After f.31r he abandons this attempt, thereafter applying the wash only to the main lombards and the sketches.

Clement Gunn is the first to note that one of the flowers is "painted yellow" (1918:66); but generally this yellow stain is ignored in printed notices; Pamela De Wit states "there is no colour at all in the book" (1977:50), while Idelle Sullens mentions only a "pale coloration" on some of the fish (1983:xxiii). The similarity of the faded yellow to the lighter sepia ink of some of the middle texts suggests that Rate may simply have used a watered-down version of his main ink. It seems curious that he would choose the lesser-used yellow instead of the usual red for his colour, particularly such a bad one. If, however, he is making do with materials at hand, it follows that either a home-produced dye or watered ink, which produces a slight variation in colour, would suit his purpose if he were not over-concerned to produce a work of art.

1.9.c Decorated initials: There is no illumination of initial capitals. Close study of every opening initial reveals that spaces were left before items 1, 5, 6, 14, 15, 24, 28, 34, and 37. The manuscript was not sent for illumination, since only those spaces before items 1, 5, and 24 remain blank; all the other initials have been blocked in by Rate himself, as indicated by the style of the hand and position of the initial in relation to the indented first two lines *57. Similarly, the long lombard initial "I" opening items 7,

56 A half-page space was originally left after item 6, and is now partly filled with the fish and hexafoil.

57 See items 6 (plate 2), 14, 15, 28, and 37.
12, 13, 19, 20, 25, 26, and 41, forming a side border to the first six or seven lines, must have been added after the writing of the texts, at the same time as the other initials were blocked in. The flourishes with which Rate decorates the other capitals, particularly the larger initials and those on the top-line, are a distinctive and enlivening feature of this otherwise plain volume. Whether or not Rate intended to send his manuscript for illumination, or to finish it himself (as the lack of guide letters in the spaces may suggest), his final blocking-in of the capitals in the ink of text was an inexpensive method of production *58.

1.10 Marginalia: Most of the marginalia are scribbles like those of a child (see plates 3 and 6), or undecipherable scrawls, especially on folios 104v, 105r-106r, 112v, 143r, 147v, 150v-151r, and 152v *59.

f.8v t.m. Scribbles, possibly the figure 8.

f.23r. Small black section or Nota mark, not unlike the astrological sign for Taurus *60, standing next to item 16 (Carpenter’s Tools).

f.63r. "Sign of the Cross" Nota-mark in brown, in the form of a quartered square with triangles marking the tops of the intersections. Also on folios 65r, 79r, 124v, and 125r *61.

f.65v t.m. Copy in a later hand of the first line.

f.98v t.m. Copy in a fully developed Secretary hand of the first line: "I Reade that wee late off thy goe(?) father" - the last four words differ from the text: is this a miscopy or a private memorandum?

f.104v l.m. "Mar" - for Mary? Also "Robert".


59 The abbreviations for marginal positions are as follows: "t.m., b.m., l.m., r.m." = top, bottom, left and right margins. "hz" = horizontal position (written parallel to the length of the page).

60 Possibly a seventeenth-century printed stamp (BB, in a private communication). It is not unlike a merchant mark given in Bateson 1901:II, lxxx, plate 2.

61 See chapter 2 section 2.4.a, The Passion.
f.105v l.m./b.m.  Pen trials and single letter-forms.

f.106r r.m.  "And ---", repeated.  r.m.hz.  "ho the he" (?).

f.106v t.m.  In same hand as 98v, "Delivered d dame Elizabeth" *62.

f.121r r.m.hz.  "Genera" in later hand but similar ink.

f.126v b.m.  "the" "he" "ye", trials in sixteenth-century hand.

f.143r b.r.m.  "she" (?) and "he" in sixteenth-century hand.

f.150v-151r Scribbles and pen trials.

f.161v t.m.  "Item to me from M. Austin of Hoop[k?]enorth on thursday 2 couple of Rabbitts ye thursday followinge 2 couple more thursday the 15 of August 2 [sic=1] couple more".  Ginn designates the hand "late seventeenth century" (1967:10).

There is some marginal annotation by Rate of the later texts, giving the Latin headings and Nota marks (see Conscience, item 33).

There is very little that can be deduced from this list of marginalia. The manuscript had an Elizabethan owner who made some practice pen-trials by copying lines of text. Either during this or Rate's ownership the manuscript suffered damage from scribbling such as that of a child. This is not unlikely considering how badly the manuscript appears to have been treated in its early history, from the evidence of damp-damage, folding and creasing, soiling and burning, which resulted from careless storage and handling.

Two factors have clearly emerged from the study in this chapter of the physical production of Ashmole 61: the combination of carelessness and deliberate policy in its make-up and use, and the personal nature of the compilation. These characteristics are reflected in his production of the texts, as examined in the following chapter.

*62 See plate 4, top of f.106v.
CHAPTER TWO
The Scribe and his Texts

Chapters 2 and 3 *1 attempt to answer three questions about the scribe:

a) What does his practice as a scribe, and as an editor, tell us about his professional status?

b) What does his practice tell us about his purpose in compiling the manuscript?

c) What steps have been taken to identify the scribe?

Many of the variants found in Rate’s texts will bear more than one interpretation: they may derive from lost versions or from contamination, no less than from his own invention. But for all those listed below, the last of these explanations seems to me the most likely, although the others may be silently understood. In order to avoid constant equivocation *2, I have attributed alterations in the texts to Rate *3 after a long process of comparing each item with cognate copies and adducing characteristic patterns of change in all the texts, in accordance with the following statement by Pamela Robinson (1972:60):

---

1 See the prefacing Declarations on the use of material in these chapters for publication.

2 Such as "Rate changed this line of the text for this reason, or else it had already happened in his exemplar, or else the text had been contaminated by another version, now lost, or else he (or an antecedent) corrupted the reading".

3 A number of editors and scholars have attributed alterations in their texts to Rate, including Hargreaves 1976:257 and MacCracken 1934:461 for Ram’s Horn (2); Mustanoja 1948:122 for Good Wife (4); Girvan 1939:xxxiv for Commandments (6); Sullens 1983:xxiv for Forgiving Knight (18); Boyd 1964:137 for Jealous Wife (22); Ginn 1967:73 for Cleges (24); Bliss 1966:xvii for Orfeo (39).
When a compiler's selection of material is governed by a particular interest or criterion and when the nature of the variants found in each of the texts within his compilation illustrates the same criterion one may argue that he is the copyist responsible for introducing the variants.

There is in any case such a wealth of variants in the Ashmole texts that to attribute all of them to preceding versions presupposes an inordinate degree of lost material, whereas the hypothesis that Rate plays an active part in the re-shaping of his texts leads to a better understanding of his purpose in producing Ashmole 61.

The commentary in this chapter makes close reference to the texts and collations in volume 2, but for the convenience of the reader, quotations and cognate readings are given where appropriate, as for example when comparing lines across a number of texts.

Section 1: The Scribe as Compiler

It is unfortunate that owing to an oversight in cataloguing, the great collectors of romances such as Thomas Percy, Joseph Ritson, Thomas Warton, Walter Scott, and George Ellis *4, did not know of Ashmole 61. According to Leah Dennis, Thomas Percy saw only one romance at Oxford, the "Ashmolean" Erle of Tholouse, which will undoubtedly have been that of Ashmole 45. If it had been Ashmole 61, Percy would have also found the other four romances to add to his plan of collecting romances (Johnston, 1964:75-99). Dennis adds (1934:90):

On July 11, 1761, Warton wrote Percy (for the second time) that the libraries at Oxford contained no such treasures as he was seeking.

4 See Johnston 1964, chapters on individual antiquarians, appendix of manuscripts consulted by them pp.223-33. Ritson (1802:III, 333-6) discusses only the Auchenleck and Harley copies of Orfeo (39); similarly Weber (1810:I, xli) knew only the Edinburgh copy of Cleges (24).
Since no records were kept by Ashmole himself or by the authorities at the Ashmolean Museum, where the manuscripts were housed until 1860, it appears that Ashmole 61 did not come to light until Brydges discovered it in the first decade of the nineteenth century: "Accident, however, having thrown in my way a manuscript containing a perfect copy of this romance [Sir Cleges] ...", he decided to publish the Ashmole instead of the Edinburgh copy. His account of that discovery explains the probable reason for the manuscript's neglect in the early part of its critical history (1814:17-19):

The manuscript from which I have extracted it is contained in the Ashmolean Collection at Oxford - By some singular oversight it has not been mentioned as a separate article in the Oxford Catalogue, the only notice of it being the following, "No.6922, Another poem by the same author (Ric. Rolle) 60. Vide etiam num.61". The No.61 thus cursorily noticed has apparently no connection with the works of R.Rolle, (the writer of the Stimulus Consciencie *5) but is in fact a miscellaneous collection of early English poetry, chiefly of a religious or moral nature; in addition to which it contains the romances of "The Erle of Tolous", "Lybeus Dysconius", "Ysumbras", "King Orfeas" [sic], and "Syr Clegys" ... The MS. is a long narrow folio on paper, written apparently about the year 1450.

The mistake was rectified in the 1830's when William Black began work on the Ashmolean catalogue for the Bodleian Library, published in 1845; yet even now this error is still confusing to some modern editors *6.

In Guddat-Figge's Catalogue (1976) Ashmole 61 is classified as a devotional miscellany containing romances. In about 32 manuscripts romances are juxtaposed with mainly religious items. This reflects both the lack of our modern demarcation between secular and religious

---

5 He is either not attributing the Stimulus Consciencie Minor in Ashmole 61 (item 33) to Rolle, or is not aware of its presence.

6 Ogilvie-Thomson refers to the manuscript still as Ashmole 60 (1981:633).
poetry, and also the diversity of purpose which the texts served: literary, entertaining and instructive. Ashmole 61 contains five romances: Sir Isumbras, The Earl of Tolouse, Libeus Disconeus, Sir Cleges, and Sir Orfeo. They are not copied in a single group, like the romances in CUL Ff.2.38, nor are they grouped in different sections as in the Auchinleck MS, and only Tolouse and Libeus are copied next to each other (items 19 and 20). Isumbras appears near the beginning of the volume (item 5), and Orfeo towards the end (item 39), with Cleges (item 24) in the middle. In between is a range of narrative, instructive or meditational verse, and short lyrics, comprising a fair-sized anthology of 43 texts. There are few secular texts (items 10, 16, 21 and 41), and no prose, commonplace items, or later additions except three Latin proverbs (items 9, 11a, 11b), and Land Purchase (item 10), which were added by Rate himself.

It is this "stretched" order of romances and diverse texts that has led previous scholars to suggest that there is no pre-planned order in the manuscript or coherence of items beyond two or three together, and that selection of items was mainly governed by the availability of exemplars, which is certainly a limiting factor. However, there is more agreement in theme and content than appears at first sight, for Rate was compiling not a romance manuscript which he filled in with religious and didactic verse, but a devotional miscellany containing romances. The distinction is important as it shows that the scribe’s

7 For critical works and editions of these romances, see Rice 1985.

8 Although the items are numbered 1-41, 11a and 11b are separate Latin proverbs, and although 35a is copied as a preface to 35b, Rate is the first to ally the otherwise separate poems. However, as the poems are copied as one item in the manuscript, I have followed Guddat-Figge’s numbering to avoid confusion.

primary intention was to instruct in the devotional life using any popular means available.

As part of the original intention of this thesis to examine the circulation of romances in units of religious verse, I collated all the IMEV numbers of the verse texts in the manuscripts containing other copies of the Ashmole 61 texts. As Doyle suggests (1974:328), the IMEV and SUPP are:

indispensable tools for tracing other copies and editions of particular items, and thereby the means of ascertaining not only the affiliations of those copies but also the recurrence together in the same manuscript of groups of pieces, from which some notion may be had of the way an anthology was created and from what kinds of source.

I had hoped to produce information concerning which other items were compiled with other copies of the Ashmole 61 texts in all the cognate manuscripts, and thereby suggest what kind of exemplars Rate may have used in compiling his own collection. However, in order to establish the precise relationships between the texts, the collation of the IMEV numbers is only a first step. It cannot be relied upon because different versions of a text are sometimes listed under the same number if their opening line is common (as in Ram’s Horn, apparently the same text but Ashmole 61 has three unique stanzas in place of other common stanzas), while the same version of a text can be listed under different numbers if their opening lines differ (for example, substantially the same text but with additional opening and closing stanzas (Commandments); with re-shaping of opening and closing text for extracting the poem from a larger work (Forgiving Knight); or, as in Wounds, with disarranged stanzas in some manuscripts. In order to be certain that an apparently common item is the same version, the same process of cross-collation and examining scribal editing would
have to be done for each manuscript concerned as has been done for Ashmole 61. As this was too great a task to undertake in this study, that work has been deferred; the following notes describe only the compilation of Rate's texts in relationship to each other.

Rate included some suitable romances among his instructional works as entertainment; but they are not privileged by lay-out, writing, decoration, or position. This thesis is not concerned with reviewing the 'Definition of Romance' debate *10, which would involve an analysis of the structure of all the texts compiled. However, it is interesting to note how our application of the term "romance" has certainly changed between Black's Catalogue of Ashmolean MSS in 1845, and Guddat-Figge's Catalogue of romance manuscripts in 1976. Black also describes the saints' lives, items 1 and 37, the three Debate tales 16, 26, and 27, and the Passion texts 28, 34, and 36, as "romances". The overlap between different types of narrative has often been remarked *11; this is due to the fact that similar techniques are employed in writing religious and romance narratives. Religious narratives often borrow the trappings of romance to make them more palatable. Miracle stories such as saints' legends are to biography as historical romances are to chronicle: both are imaginative expansions of factual account. Boitani points out that while the romances were written "purely to please the public", part of the function of 'romanticised' religious stories was that of "entertaining a public that would not have taken to indoctrination

*10 See the bibliography given in Reiss 1985, list of principal writers on romance p.126 n.4; and Joanne Rice 1985, background pp.3-37, nos. 1-111, genre pp.39-63, nos. 112-192. For bibliography on various aspects of medieval literature, see Crosby, Bishko and Kellog 1983.

pure and simple" (1982:1). Thus the narrator in the prologue to the South English Legendary (lines 64-5) earnestly assures his audience that saints are just as exciting as romance heroes, and that apostles and martyrs are just as "hardy kni3tes ... / pat studeuast were in bataille and ne fleide no3t for fere", and who suffered "al quik hare lymes totere" (d'Evelyn and Mill, 1956:3). Brewer remarks that in religious stories "the extravagance and variety of incident can, as with the romances, in the hands of a good writer, create an imaginative world of legitimate excitement" (1983:258-9); on the other hand, Douglas Kelly observes that the excitement of romance is "founded on emotional but inarticulate religious experience" (1985:74), while Reiss notes that "the didactic and the religious are the warp and woof of romance" (1985:115). Barron suggests that religious stories share a fundamental attribute with romances: "they represent life as it is and as it might be, as imperfect reality and imagined ideal in one" (1987:6) *12.

It is sufficient to note here that in Ashmole 61 the five narratives we classify as romances are "stories in verse which deal with the adventures of noble men and women and which end happily" (Schmidt and Jacobs, 1980:1), without major problems of a generic nature. They share a structure centred (in differing permutations) on two family relationships, the marital and the parental; Isumbras and Cleges combine each. The marital relationship is based on fidelity and mutual support (Isumbras, Tolouse, Cleges, Orfeo). Plots exploring the parental relationship involve the disruption of the family unit, and the impediments, reversals of fortune, and adventures which parents and children undergo before being reunited with each other

12 On the interaction between religion and romance see further pp.203-5; also Mehl 1968:17-19.
(Isumbras, Libeus, Cleges). None of the other narratives in Ashmole 61, which are mainly religious, preserve this separation and reunion cycle of family events *13.

There is little doubt that the manuscript was compiled sequentially, rather than as a series of main texts interspersed with filler items within single gatherings or booklets *14. The manuscript falls roughly into four parts, but there is no rigid demarcation; rather a gradual move upwards from the low-level and relatively unsophisticated 'teaching' verses to the meatier exegetical texts. Reference to the four 'parts' of the manuscript is simply for critical convenience and is not a codological description. The lack of clearly defined sections in Rate's anthology means that there are many different ways of grouping together the texts for the purposes of discussion, as for example by the different types of verse in the manuscript, which fall into four broad categories: narratives, instructional verse, lyrics, and preaching texts. The different types of narratives comprise the romances (items 5, 19, 20, 24, 39), the saints' lives (items 1, 37), the exempla stories (items 18, 22, 23, 35a, 35b), the Passion

13 Braswell (1965:128-51) outlines the plots of other 'family' romances such as Triamour, Eglamour, Torrent of Portyngale, Octavian, Emaré, Gowther, King of Tars, Le Bone Florence.

narratives (items 28, 34, 36), and the secular tales (items 16, 21, 41). The first part of the manuscript is mainly made up of pragmatic instructional verse: the courtesy books (items 3, 4, 7, 8) and the Latin proverbs and rules for land purchase (items 9, 10, 11ab) added later. There are few poetic verses in the manuscript which may be described as lyrics, that is, verses which capture a mood or an emotion, rather than telling a story or giving instruction: the three poems on the Passion (items 29, 30, 38), and the two satirical poems (items 2, 40) fall into this category. The remaining texts are what might be termed "preaching" verses, that is, meditational texts possibly used in daily worship (items 25, 26, 27, 32, 33), and functional texts possibly taught to children for learning by heart (items 6, 12, 13, 15, 17). However, I have found it more appropriate to move sequentially through the manuscript as it was compiled; by doing this it is possible to perceive thematic groupings of texts, even though these sequences are usually 'interrupted' by a text of contrasting character, as if Rate tried to vary the tone even while acting under particular interests at different stages in the compilation.

It is interesting that the first text and the first romance in the manuscript are both redactions of the same Latin legend, saint’s life and pious romance respectively *15, concerning the knight Placidas who became the martyr St Eustace. The two redactions were probably compiled together as a mark of devotion to the saint, and apart from

*15 Although the text of Eustace in Cotton Caligula A.2 is from the South English Legendary, one may speculate that Eustace was selected for both the Cotton and Ashmole manuscripts owing to the presence of Isumbras in both. On the matter of which text originally opened Ashmole 61, see chapter 1 section 1.6.e, Foliation; for general discussions of Eustace and Isumbras see Childress 1978:311-22, Braswell 1965:128-51 and Gerould 1904:335-448.
their common use as pious entertainment **Eustace** may also have been recited as a commemorative text on the saint's day *16*. When compared with the Digby version — which was not done by Laurel Braswell in her study of **Eustace** *17*, Rate's version of **Eustace** exhibits intensified pietistic elements, coupled with a greater concentration on family relationships, a trend that is sustained throughout the manuscript.

The early part of the manuscript consists of a "children's corner" of texts, with a run of courtesy books (items 3, 4, 7, 8) flanking the two **Eustace** tales (items 1, 5). Interrupting this sequence is a more sophisticated lyric, **Ram's Horn** (2), which satirises fifteenth-century society, including its religious integrity, and the corruptness of human nature (Hargreaves 1976:255-9). It was originally addressed to the merchant class and nobility; the changes which Rate introduces indicate a broader social spread, encompassing religious and legal authorities, and the popular entertainer. Thus the beginning mirrors the ending of the volume (as we have it), opening and closing with an entertaining tale: one sacred, **Eustace**, the other profane, **King Edward** (41), while the second and penultimate texts (**Vanity**, item 40) are both satires on the vanity of gaining worldly status.

Courtesy books are generally monologues of instruction by parents to children on appropriate behaviour and household management, used as part of meal-time parental teaching (McSparran and Robinson, 1979:xvii). **Wise Man** (3) and **Good Wife** (4) are addressed to the

16 November 2nd according to Cheney 1978:50, September 21st according to Thurston and Attwater 1981:III.

17 Braswell (1965) has compared in detail the structure and motifs of other versions of **Eustace** and **Isumbras**, and concludes that the romance disseminates Christian teaching more successfully than the religious narrative, by reason of its greater accessibility to the people. See also my MA thesis (Bancroft, 1984), and Childress 1978.
different sexes, but contain much the same advice on etiquette and household management, and rendered mnemonically easier by Rate's re-shaping of the versification. Stans Puer (7) and Dame Curtasy (8) are substantially altered treatises on table manners, with an increased emphasis on moral conduct introduced by the scribe; contamination between the two suggests his own re-working. Vernacular translations of Latin books of parental instruction were not used in the schoolroom but in the home, mainly for children not expected to receive a full grammar-school education, as John Nicholls points out *18, citing the unique lines 147-52 in Dame Curtasy (8) as evidence: "This boke is made for chylder 3ong / At the scowle that byde not long / Sone it may be conyed & had / And make them gode iff thei be bad". These lines are indicative of the generally low level of the language in the Ashmole texts; they are "memorable" only in the mnemonic sense and in their accessibility to an unsophisticated audience. Similarly, Edward Wilson (1987:447-8) cites certain lines from Stans Puer (7) and Dame Curtasy (8) which demonstrate what he terms the "otherworldly stand" of the manuscript, but both he and Nicholls were unaware at the time that their selected examples are all unique interpolations in the Ashmole courtesy texts *19.

The courtesy books are interrupted by the romance Isumbras (5) and the versified Commandments (6). Sir Isumbras loses everything through the sin of pride (like Cleges), and is separated from his family (like Eustace). Much of the hagiographical source is retained in Isumbras, as the hero triumphs after trials of penitential wandering, Christian

18 Nicholls lists the versions in Ashmole 61 without comment, and notes that Latin texts such as the Disticha Catonis were used in school (1985:69). See his general discussion of courtesy books.

19 For the attribution of these redactions to the scribe, see chapter 4 sections 7 and 8.
crusades and miraculous appearances. Unlike Eustace, who suffers Christian martyrdom, the romance hero regains his former status and happiness.

The Commandments (6), and the sequence of prayers following the courtesy books (items 12-13, 15, 17) are short texts probably intended to be learnt by heart. The commonplace items 9-11 were added as page fillers after the manuscript was completed and the contents leaf written. The Latin proverbs (9, 11ab) were perhaps favourite sententious sayings of Rate's, taught to the children as simple Latin to learn. The other added text, Land purchase (10), is a common late fifteenth-century filler item, and was probably taught to the son of the house.

The Commandments appears in many different versions, being a very popular versification of one of the texts recommended by Grosseteste for preaching friars (Jeffrey, 1975:188). This version is extracted from the preaching manual Speculum Christiani, together with the Prayer to Mary (15) *20. Rate's text of Commandments has extra stanzas giving the scriptural context, which probably served a catechistic function, while his version of Prayer to Mary is a conflation of two types of the Prayer, suggesting that he had access to the manual itself, as well as to separately-occurring texts. The two simple prayers for night and morning (12, 13) were obviously for home use, and evidently compiled together: in Ashmole 61 the trend of the script and Rate's signature at the foot of the second poem suggests that they were copied as a unit, and were probably by the same author (MacCracken 1913:286). The Levation Prayer (17) was

20 For discussion of the Speculum Christiani see Gillespie, Thesis 1981.
learnt for reciting during Mass while the priests were preparing the Eucharist. Levation prayers were a means for the congregation to participate when the use of Liturgical Latin would otherwise have been too alienating (Robbins 1942-3:131-46).

This sequence is interrupted by another satirical text, Carpenter's Tools (16), which is one of only three secular tales in the manuscript together with Corneus (21), and Edward (41), and all of them are drinking tales unique to Ashmole 61. Carpenter's Tools (16) was probably recited at a Carpenter's Guild feast, where the satirical lampooning of drunkeness, shrewish wives, and profligate masters would be fully appreciated. The tools personify the men who use them, disparaging the worth of working for a man who drinks the profits. The satirical twist at the end shows how the wife is in a worse plight than they are, for they can seek other positions while she is 'apprenticed' to him for life. The passages cited by Wilson from the instructive items 3, 4, 7 and 8 emphasise the necessity of good living above material gain. He remarks that "As a comic analogue to such virtuous thriving the Debate must have gained from its manuscript context" (1987:448).

The second part of the manuscript is a run of narratives, with exemplary stories (items 18, 22, 23) interspersing romances (items 19, 20, 24). Items 18, 22, 23 all exemplify the ill-consequences of wrath and the reward of fidelity. Particularly striking is the next item, Forging Knight (18), in which blood-vengeance for the slain father is undertaken by the faithful son. But the son's fidelity to God proves the greater, and forgiveness wins over wrath. His virtue is rewarded with a miracle, as the animated crucifix embraces the good son.
While the romances have an obvious entertainment value, their moral and domestic relevance justifies their place in Rate's devotional miscellany. Three of the romances (Isumbras, Cleges, and Orfeo) are clearly moral family tales, extolling the virtue of the family unit and the marital relationship, through the vicissitudes of penitential suffering, separation, danger, and trial, inflicted by external forces (God, Saracen pirates, tyrannical porters, fairy king). The two chivalric romances which follow Forgiving Knight, Tolouse and Libeus, have only loose connections with this framework, although Tolouse shares their theme of fidelity: to marriage vows, sworn word, to God, friends and to duty. Tolouse is loosely based on a historical incident *21, while Libeus and the following secular tale Corneus have Arthurian settings. Tolouse exemplifies the virtue of sexual continence, in that the hero and his lady avoid the sin of adultery by waiting for her husband to die— a natural death, moreover— before marrying. As such it provides a complementary tale to the subsequent two exempla stories (items 22 and 23), which deal with the evil consequences of sexual jealousy. Dieter Mehl (1968:86-93) writes warmly of its "tact and reticence" and its "exemplary character", deploring its neglect in favour of more 'tediously sensational' romances such as the much-abused Libeus which follows *22. But it is just this "effective combination of love-interest and moral didacticism" that recommends it as a suitable tale for Rate's family.

---


22 Carol Meale describes Libeus as a "crudely executed and rumbustious work ... altogether lacking in subtlety" (1984:388), while to Thomas Percy it was full of "barbarous unpolished language" (Johnston, 1964:92). Barron does not share this critical view of its failings, remarking only that the tale provides "a chivalric gloss on the characteristic career of a folk-hero" and notes that it was "highly popular with English audiences" (1987:166).
audience.

It is therefore all the more inexplicable why Rate should have included *Libeus*, as out of all the romances it is the most ill-fitting. It is the longest text in the volume (2251 lines), yet it lacks the family focus shared by the others, as both the marital and the parental relationship are nominal. It is the only one of the five romances in which the child is the protagonist and the story centres on his adventures alone. The parental relationship scarcely figures; it is non-marital, and it is the child's pride itself which impels his actions, rather than any divine response to it as in the adventures of Isumbras and Cleges, and their families. His only goal is to redress the slur of his illegitimacy and to win for himself renown and the status of knight; he has no intention of reuniting his parents or of discovering the identity of his father, like Sir Degarré. The achievement of his goal is by an "inconsequential series of adventures ... with a plain if not very strong connecting thread" (Trounce 1932:90-1). The gaining of his knighthood does eventually reunite his parents with each other and with their child, but only coincidentally, and only in the revised copy which produced the second group of texts in MSS Hale, Ashmole 61, Naples Royal 13.B.29, and the Percy Folio. Maldwyn Mills (1963:23) quotes lines A 1243-8 *23 to illustrate how the text passed through the hands of a disour who wrote down the story from the memory of a written text. The reviser introduced the reunion of the hero's parents with each other and their son by the unexplained appearance of the mother at Libeus' wedding,

---

23 In this chapter Rate's version of any text is given the siglum A, except where otherwise stated (as for *Ypotis* and *Orfeo*, where B is used by the editors). References to other copies are given by their short manuscript titles and/or sigla. The full titles can be ascertained by consulting the appropriate section in chapter 4, and the abbreviations list where necessary.
who identifies his father as the renowned Gawain. But even this reconciliation is simply added by way of assuring the Lady of Sinadoun that Libeus has a respectable lineage; it occurs right at the end, and has no connection with his foregoing adventures. It is hardly even a token gesture towards the theme of family unity that the other romances explore. The imitatio purpose of both hagiography and some romance heroes, as discussed by Diana Childress (1978:312), is fundamental to the selection of most of the Ashmole romances except Libeus. All exemplify some trait of family responsibility, or admonish against some personal failing which threatens the stability of the family unit, except Libeus.

One explanation for the inclusion of Libeus is that Rate copied it from an exemplar also containing both Tolouse and Corneus, treating them all as "romances". However, although both Tolouse and Libeus occur in the third group of linked romances identified by Pamela Robinson (1972:42), only in Ashmole 61 do they appear together and in juxtaposition to one another. The handwriting shows that in the copying process at least they are not significantly associated. If Rate was indeed working to a patron's orders, as a household chaplain for instance, he may simply have been ordered to copy Libeus by a man whose taste in entertaining literature was less than refined. All the other entertaining stories have some obvious moral point: Isumbras: penance redeems pride; Carpenter's Tools: drink ruins industry; Corneus: cuckoldry levels rank; Tolouse: fidelity rewarded; Cleges: justice served; Orfeo: power of love triumphs; Edward (the extant text): the treachery of drink. Even by the most generous interpretive licence it would be hard to see Libeus as the story of, for example, a disadvantaged child made good, and perhaps Barron's
explanation that it is simply a popular folk-tale is better than trying to see any deeper meaning in it.

The short narrative following, Corneus (21), is a quasi-Arthurian tale falling between romance and exemplum. It is told in romance style, but with an exemplary character by illustrating how cuckoldry, like death, is a great leveller of rank, for when King Arthur is proved to have been deceived by Guinevere, he joins his 'brothers' in the cuckold's dance as a forfeit. The text provides a comic analogue to the more serious cautionary tales of the Lost Soul (35a) and the Adulterous Falmouth Squire (35b), where the forfeit is the everlasting torments of hell.

Both Jealous Wife (22) and Incestuous Daughter (23) serve as cautionary tales of women fallen from grace, warning of the perils of sexual wrong-doing: jealousy and incest respectively. In both it is the women's adverse reaction to the good actions of the men which provide their downfall, for the Jealous Wife fears that her husband's nightly absence to keep vigil for the Virgin is due to trysts of a more worldly nature, while the Incestuous Daughter is incensed by her father's repentance of his sin. In Jealous Wife (22), the wife's wrath and jealousy is incited by the Devil, who is annoyed by her husband's devotion to Mary. The wife is driven to infanticide and suicide, but the husband's fidelity, both to his wife and to Mary, wins the favour of the Virgin who reclaims the souls from hell. In Incestuous Daughter (23) the sinful daughter's wrath at her father's repentance of their act drives her into patricide, infanticide, and prostitution. Through the eloquence of a preacher, she is eventually brought to such an extreme state of remorse that she dies before the priest can absolve her. The stories also offer hope of redemption,
since both women are rescued from damnation.

By contrast with the long-winded and shallow Libeus, the shortest romance in the volume, Cleges, successfully combines the three elements of entertainment, religious morality, and family unity, which run through most of the texts compiled in the first half of Ashmole 61. In a similar way to Isumbras, the generous knight commits the sin of pride in placing too much value on worldly wealth. While it is the folk-tale element of Cleges, incorporating motifs of the miraculous cherries and the shared blows that is generally held to be its primary source of interest (Ginn 1967), Barron notes that "pious legend comes even closer to a secular saint's legend in Sir Cleges" (1987:200). Severs describes it as a "pleasant combination of romance, piety and humour" (1967:171), while George McKnight notes that it is a minstrel's Christmas story "told merely to excite a laugh, or to point a moral" (1913:lxii, lxxii). As he observes, "this moral element made the story a useful one to the medieval preacher, and it appears in books of exempla" (1913:lxv). It therefore serves as an appropriate link between the narrative section of exempla stories and romances and the third part of the manuscript where the texts become more discursive on religious concerns.

Items 25-27 might be termed "Court of Heaven" texts, as each provides a vision of life after death by means of mixing imaginative and intellectual conceptions of the hierarchy of heaven. In form they are a mixture of visionary, miraculous and allegorical elements. In Saints the spirit of a good monk is given a guided tour of Hell, Purgatory and Paradise by an angel while his body appears lifeless to his brothers *24. The beggars whom he sees at the Feast of Paradise represent all those souls who have nobody to pray for them to be
released from Purgatory, and this is the reason for establishing the Feast of All Souls after the Feast of All Saints. The easy narrative style and miraculous vision framework indicate that the text served an entertaining as well as an exegetic function.

Four Daughters (26) is a unique translation of part of Grosseteste's Chasteau d'Amour (Sajavaara 1967:268-78; Traver 1907), a moral debate loosely housed in the framework of personified virtues arguing the sentence of a misbehaving servant before the Judge (God). It was evidently popular and used in many contexts: in the Gesta Romanorum (Heritage 1879:132-5) anthology of moral tales, in the dramatic pageant of the the N-Town Parliament of Heaven (Block 1922:97-103), in different forms in the Castle of Perseverance (Pollard and Furnivall 1904:170-86) and in the recitation anthology of the Cursor Mundi (Morris 1875:II, 549-64), a vast collection of religious and moral stories written as an antidote to bad romances. It thus had several outlets and audiences for its recitation. It is described in Black's catalogue as a "Romance of the Creation of the World and Fall of Man with an allegory of the King and his Four Daughters". The text begins with a commentary on the Creation and Fall, continuing with an allegorical story about the Court of Heaven, illustrating the operations of mercy, peace, truth and righteousness on judgement and wisdom.

Ypotis (27) is a more technical description of the physical make-up of the Heavens, Creation, Man, ending with the 13 Reasons for Fasting on Friday. Chaucer included it in his list of "romances of Price" simply

24 I cannot find if this is a redaction of a common legend to account for the feast, or simply a story written for a specific purpose, to be recited on All Saints day. The text is described in MED: Bib as a "Sermon on the Founding of the Feasts of All Saints and All Souls" (Kurath and Kuhn, 1954:72).
as a rhyme-filler, and so misled Percy in 1765 into mistaking it for a romance when he found the version in Cotton Caligula A.2 *25. This misconception persisted as late as 1939, when Ritchie Girvan attested to the "six romances" of Ashmole 61, the sixth being Ypotis (1939:xxxiv). Yet Ypotis is nothing more than a vehicle for scriptural dissertation, clothed in the attractive but very tenuous framework of a miracle story, in which the disguised Christ child debates with the Roman Emperor Hadrian, for the purpose of converting him to Christianity. In this way theological perception of the origin of the world and man's place within it, the different types of sin, and precepts of religious custom can easily be taught. The version in Ashmole 61 is condensed so that bare facts and premises can be more easily learned without all the intervening exposition. Thus it was probably recited to the household on Sundays, or used as a form of catechism, a means of teaching and learning religious and philosophical tenets by a series of questions and answers *26. Dorothy Everett (1930:448) notes that there was probably an exemplar circulating in Chaucer's time, containing the texts of Ypotis, Libeus, and Isumbras, as these texts appear together in Cotton Caligula A.2 and Ashmole 61 *27. Since Libeus may also have appeared with Tolouse

25 See Johnston 1964:91, and Everett 1930:446-8. Reiss (1985:111-12) suggests that the names of Ypotis and Pleyndamour were recognised by Chaucer's audiences as romance heroes, and that Ypotis may have derived from "Hippotes", meaning a knight. Trounce, on the other hand, suggests that these names were mere jokes, and that Ypotis is associated with "unwarlike piety" (1932:93n). For Ypotis as a version of Epictetus see Lucy T. Smith 1886:21-3, and Shackford 1913:425.

26 This educational method is discussed by Lucy T. Smith, in her introduction to the Brome version (1886:20-4).

27 Loomis (1941:488-9) goes even further in suggesting that the prototype of Cotton Caligula A.2 contained texts of the Trentals of St Gregory, a Life of St Jerome, and the romances Launfal, Eglamour and Octavian besides those mentioned above.
and *Corneus* *28*, we may also include these in that exemplar, and since Sajavaara suggests that *Ypotis* appeared in an exemplar with *Four Daughters* *29* which seems likely to have been compiled with *All Saints*, we may posit an exemplar containing at least items 5, 19-21, and 25-7. Although such a conjecture cannot be proved, the close copying of the second and third groups in this manuscript suggests its probability; it may have contained a different version of *Isumbras* from the one Rate copied earlier.

Items 28-30 interpret the events of the Passion in three different ways, by narrative, allegory and lyric. Black describes the narratives at items 28, 34 and 36 respectively as "the Romance of the Passion", a "religious romance", and the "Romance of the Resurrection"; whereas the last romance-type tale or burlesque romance of *Edward* is merely called a "gest". This attests to the narrative success of the Passion accounts despite their non-adventurous form. Dramatisation of Christ's Life and the Biblical stories was a means of instructing the people through accessibly entertaining interpretations of the Gospels and Old Testament (Coulton 1918:402-3; Pantin 1955:243).

The *Northern Passion* (28) is a straight-forward Gospel account from Palm Sunday to the Resurrection; parts of Rate's version are omitted in favour of a unique text of the *Resurrection* (36), suggesting that some pre-planning may have been involved. In spite of these reductions, it is the second longest text in the volume *30*, and was recited in stages over Holy Week before Easter (Barratt, 1975:265).

---

28 See section 1, *Scribe as Compiler.*

29 Texts of the *Castle of Love* precede *Ypotis* also in the Vernon and Simeon manuscripts.
Rate's version is particularly interesting for the addition of anti-Semitic variants, and other anomalies.

The Passion is followed by two Passion lyrics of contrasting mood. The Short Charter of Christ (29) is an ingenious representation of the crucifixion in legal terms, and in several manuscripts is actually depicted in charter form *31. The Virgin's Lament (30) relies on emotional rather than intellectual appeal. The device of contrasting the dead body of her son with the living children of her audience is a typical technique for evoking pathos. The intensity of visualisation in this poem, particularly in lines such as 45-7, is characteristic of much Franciscan literature (Jeffrey, 1975:186-7 and passim).

This sequence of Court of Heaven texts, Passion texts and the Meditational texts following is interrupted by Lydgate's Dietary (31), which gives detailed advice on health and good living. It is compiled with Ram's Horn (2) and Stans Puer (7) in a number of Lydgateian collections, generally copied closely together. In Ashmole 61 Rate appears to have used three separate exemplars, since Ram's Horn contains unique stanzas, Stans Puer is substantially changed, and Dietary is copied after a great gap in space and time from the other two. Robbins notes (1955:251) that Dietary was probably a mnemonic poem used by school-children, as it is found in other courtesy books together with Stans Puer. I suspect that its position in A, separated from the other courtesy texts to form a small 'bridge' section (with Charter and Lament) between the long texts of Passion (28) and Psalms

30 1913 lines; Libeus (20) is the longest with 2251 lines; Tolouse (19) has 1218. For the relationship between the Northern Passion the Corpus Christi plays see Foster EETS 147, 1916:81-101.

(32), suggests that in Rate's manuscript it was intended more for adults, or the family in general.

The third part of the manuscript ends with two meditative texts, the Psalms (32) and the Prick of Conscience Minor (33). They were probably used serially in the context of worship; the Psalms as part of the Liturgy, Conscience perhaps as a peroration on the after-life. The Psalms (32) may have been extracted from a Primer. This is the only text with any form of regular Latin, albeit badly copied, with each line of the penitential psalms prefacing an exegetic eight-line stanza in English. Conscience (33) gives a straightforward account of Hell, Purgatory and Heaven, giving the most detailed descriptions of all the Court of Heaven texts. Typically the descriptions of Hell and Purgatory are the most graphic and vivid accounts, whereas the vision of Heaven is conveyed through hyperbole, limited to eulogising the intensification of pleasure to be found there. The emphasis is on the abundance of everything good, but the poet's imagination fails him in specifying the details of such goodness, whereas he has no trouble in imagining the precise pains and torments of hell.

The manuscript appears to have originally ended here; it then continues with Pilgrimage (34), an account of the journey to the Holy Land that Rate apparently undertook at this point, leaving behind his anthology. Pilgrimages were considered efficacious in earning indulgences (lines 35-8), and Rate's account (if he wrote or adapted it himself) is finely observed and detailed *32.

32 See further sections 2.2.a, Script, and 2.3.b, Addition. For discussion of William Wey's itinerary see Meech and Allen, EETS 212, 1940. No mention is made of the Ashmole text. Other pilgrimages to the Holy Land in French and Italian are listed, and a description of the journey is given on p.288. Of the many general works on medieval pilgrimage the best are Howard 1980, Sumption 1975, Hall 1965 and Heath 1911.
As in the second part of the manuscript, the final part is a mixture of narrative types: passion narratives (items 34, 36), exempla stories (items 35a, 35b), a saint's life (37), a romance (39), and a secular tale (41). The texts of Lost Soul (35a) and Squire (35b) interrupt what would otherwise be a congruous placing of Pilgrimage (34) followed by Resurrection (36). These exempla stories are grim reminders of hell won and heaven lost through lechery. The Lost Soul (identified by Rate as William Basterdfeld) speaks directly to the audience, lamenting his fate; while the Adulterous Falmouth Squire, languishing in hell, cautions his son in a dream vision to follow the better example of the Squire's brother, happy in paradise above. Thus the two brothers, parted from the living child by death, are parted from each other by the unbridgeable distance between heaven and hell. The Resurrection (36) is an account of the knights guarding the tomb of Christ, their boasts and discomfiture, which is omitted from Rate's text of Passion (28). There appears to be some connection with the Resurrection play, and the relationship between these three texts is discussed in section 2.2.e, Textual Correlations.

The Life of St Margaret (37) is a romance-type saint's life like Eustace (1), but in contrast with the opening text, which is a pious family tale of corporate martyrdom, Margaret exemplifies the virtues of holy virginity and fidelity to the Christian faith through a series of quite fantastic miracles designed for the conversion of her pagan tormentors. These include being swallowed by a dragon and killing it

33 Thus are the long exegetic texts alternated with shorter, pithier poems which appeal to the imagination and conscience rather than to the intellect and conscience. Similarly, the light-hearted pious romance Cleges (24) is followed by the long instructive items 25-28, relieved by the shorter lyrics and verse items 29-31 before the long meditational items 32-34. This pattern probably reflects Rate's own need of relief both in copying and reading his collection.
by bursting from it, and surviving subsequent deaths by boiling oil, molten lead, drowning and burning; to die finally at her own request by beheading. Brewer comments that "Saints' legends eventually earned themselves a bad name for improbability even among the devout" (1983:258), but he also notes their long-lasting popularity and their influence on secular romance (as illustrated by the relationship between Eustace and Isumbras in this manuscript).

Orfeo (39) appears at the end of a long, weighty religious section. It counterbalances two types of narrative; one of excessive religious absurdity in Margaret (37), the other of excessive secular absurdity in Edward (41). The Classical source of Orfeo is well-established as the tale of Orpheus and Eurydice, the pre-Virgilian version in which the hero successfully rescues his dead wife from the Underworld by playing his harp so well that Pluto grants his request and restores Eurydice to life. Virgil and later Latin versions saw the myth's potential as a tragedy, and introduced the looking taboo, which the hero inevitably breaks and loses his wife for the second time. In the Middle English redaction the Underworld is transposed to fairyland, the dead to the 'taken' (Allen 1964), and the rescue of the wife is only half of the plot, being counterpointed by the hero's recovery of his kingdom. Sir Orfeo is, in my opinion and others, the most successful of all the romances. Its remarkable focus of marital love and fidelity is entirely in keeping with the general trend of Ashmole 61, as are its entertaining elements of the supernatural, which light-heartedly complement the miraculous motifs of the more overtly Christian tales. Much has been written on the romance; its much-noted combination of minstrelsy, marital harmony, fantasy, and Christian ethos evidently attracted our scribe, which Barron adroitly describes
as the "enormous complexity in Sir Orfeo, which harmonizes at mythic, courtly, and moral levels a dual idealism of love and loyalty as fundamental human values rather than as the courtly codes of an aristocratic society" (1987:218).

The sequence is interrupted by two lyrics: one Passion verse (item 38) and one satire (40). Item 38 is another text on the Wounds of Christ; it is a popular version of the Seven Sins, housed in the framework of the Passion as Christ's Wounds as Remedies for the Sins, and thus adds to the unifying motif of the Wounds and the Passion which occurs in so many of the texts. Vanity (40) admonishes the nobility that all their endeavour to gain wealth and high estate is in vain, since rich and poor end equally in death. The inclusion of satirical verse in a devotional miscellany such as Ashmole 61 demonstrates the compiler's realistic awareness of human nature and of the audience for whom it was intended. As such it provides a balance with the idealistic didacticism of most of the other texts. The end of the volume is incomplete. The extant manuscript concludes with half of a romance-type tale, the burlesque of King Edward and the Hermit. Edward was evidently recited at rowdy feasts, from the frequent requests for the audience to be quiet. As the last text in the volume it is the most debased, a crude tale of how King Edward, incognito, indulged in a drinking competition with a lowly hermit, the substance of which revolves around their ability to shout "fusty bandias" and "strike panter" as they grow increasingly drunk and debauched *34. One speculates whether the end of the manuscript is indeed lost, or deliberately cancelled by Rate, drawing the line at this particular "comic analogue" on drunkenness, or whether it had

34 On these terms see chapter 4 section 41.
been included specifically to point up the absurdity and treachery of drink.

We cannot know whether Rate himself was aware of any generic difference between, for example, Eustace and Isumbras, or Corneus and Cleges, or Libeus and Edward. What is strongly suggested by the nature of the compilation is that he chose texts according to their content in order that they might serve specific purposes. Thus the compilation provides a comprehensive policy of pastoral care for both the spiritual and temporal needs of its readers. The romances would probably not have assumed the importance for Rate that they bear for today's scholars; in Ashmole 61 the didactic texts appear to have had more value for the scribe, since these are the most altered. Apart from careless errors, which abound, his active shaping of the texts is more to be seen in those he uses for teaching, as in the first part of the volume, and for preaching, as in the later and longer texts. The romances, and the humorous romance-type tales such as Carpenter's Tools (16), Corneus (21) and Edward (41), provide light relief from both.

Section 2: The Scribe as Copyist

The status of a scribe can be ascertained by analysing the professionalism of the production, the standard of the copying, and the extent of the editing. The term professional can be used both in a technical and in a qualitative sense: it applies to making a living as a scribe, and to the degree of expertise in the quality of the production. Rate fails in both senses. If his texts are spurned by modern editors because his interaction with them has destroyed the purity of their transmission, it is scarcely likely that they would
have found favour with contemporary employers.

2.1 Standard of Production

In Ashmole 61 there is a contradiction between the presence of professional-type features in the volume and its unprofessional standard of production. Points in favour of professionalism include Rate’s evident access to a variety of exemplars, with preservation of some oddities like Carpenter’s Tools (16); the fluency of the hand; the sustained and sequential writing of the texts across several quires; limited use of correction such as expunction; spaces left for capitals; some titles and explicits; use of catchwords.

This surface organisation of the manuscript invited this conclusion from John Hirsh (1977:348):

MS Ashmole 61 is not the work of an amateur scribe. It is written in a good secretary hand, and the presence of catchwords ... gives every indication that it is a planned professional production, in no sense a private commonplace book.

However, Rate’s hand is not a "good secretary" but a very fluent Anglicana *35, while professional features may be readily simulated by a competent amateur scribe, in order to lend his manuscript a pleasing air of authenticity. Catchwords are a simple device for the arrangement of quires with a practical value for the amateur as well as the professional scribe, and in isolation are no proof of professionalism.

The evidence for lack of professionalism is greater. While Ashmole 61 is not a commonplace book like the manuscripts of John Colyns or

35 Ian Doyle notes that Guddat-Figge also "wrongly styles the hand secretary whereas it is rather a current Anglicana only with the common simple secretary a" (private communication, 1987).
Richard Hill, as meticulously defined by Carol Meale (1984: chapter 2) *36, it lacks the marks of the professional production as she and Guddat-Figge identify them: careful ruling, framing and pricking prior to writing; colour, ornament, and above all consistency. In comparison with two other 'home-made' anthologies, the Findern and Lincoln Thornton manuscripts, Ashmole 61 is even less formally produced than they are, lacking the degree of elaborate top-line flourishes in the Findern manuscript, and the formality of script, lay-out and decoration of the Thornton manuscript *37. There are no running titles or rubrication, and the 'workaday' script is largely uncorrected. There is no ruling, but scoring appears quite heavily on some folios and very faintly on others, as if the scribe had attempted to score whole quires rather than trouble with individual sheets. On some folios the lines are scored sloping upwards or downwards, and are often overwritten. The only colour in the manuscript is the pale dirty wash of yellow or watered sepia, which is applied inexpertly and messily. The ink of the text is extremely patchy in places, as if watered down too much, particularly in items 12-19. The spaces left for capitals were later filled in by the scribe himself in ordinary ink. The only ornament is the crude sketching of fish, flowers, shield and hexafoil, which together with his frequent signatures appear to have a personal significance for the scribe, and suggest that it was not a commissioned work *38. The manuscript shows signs

36 See also the descriptions in Guddat-Figge 1976: 18-19, and Boffey and Thompson 1989: 292.

37 Robert Thornton's hand is described as "not that of a professional scribe, and, though the writer knew Latin, there are many mistakes. All points to an educated man of literary tastes" (Brewer and Owen, 1977: vii), a description which applies also to Rate. For the Findern manuscript see Beadle and Owen 1977. See also the descriptions of other amateur productions lacking sophisticated ornamentation in Boffey and Thompson 1989: 282.
of careless storage and handling, as in the clumsy refolding of the paper, and the displacement of the first quire causing problems in the foliation sequence *39.

2.2 Standard of Copying

The carelessness with which Rate produces his compilation is reflected in his copying of its texts. Some errors are purely mechanical, while others are the result of not paying attention to the exemplar, and of introducing alterations without due consideration of their effect on the text. The deceptive fluency of the handwriting tends to mask the ineptitude of the copying, until comparison of the texts with the cognate copies reveals the scribe's flawed policy of adaptation.

2.2.a Script

The script does not help us to date the manuscript more precisely than "c1500", since Rate uses the conservative business hand characteristic of Guddat-Figge's set of "enthusiastic amateurs ... well-versed in the use of the pen and proud of it" (1976:21) *40. Guddat-Figge observes an anomaly between the "quite professional, steady script and the childish and primitive drawings" (1976:22) in the manuscript. But his script is not always that steady; it shows a marked tendency to deteriorate from the recto to the verso, becoming faster, more sloping...

38 For discussion of the points summarised here see chapter 1.

39 See chapter 1 section 1.6.e.

40 Similarly M.B.Parkes: "The majority of [amateur] scribes seem to have received little or no such training, and consequently used for their books the hand which they were accustomed to use for everyday business purposes" (Thesis, 1958:12). His plate 6, from Digby 11, shows an attempted display script not unlike the type Rate uses for his explicits. See also Bühler 1960:20-2 for "occasional" scribes whose names are associated with only one manuscript, as in this case.
and with more careless errors due to a characteristic hastiness as the page progresses.

Some of the items are more carefully copied than others; *Wounds* (38) is the most scruffily-written text in the manuscript, unusually blotted and smudged (see plate 6). The title has been written as an afterthought below the first heading; in the second line Rate wrote "dede" for "hede"; then the second heading was prematurely copied after the first couplet and expunged. When he copied the second heading in its correct place, he wrote so hastily that the headstroke of the final "s" joined with the abbreviation bar over the "e" of the next word for the suspended "n", a practice exhibited frequently elsewhere. It is difficult to determine whether the imperfections are due to a corrupt exemplar, bad copying, or imperfect memory. The stanzas are also disordered, but since their order is also mostly shared by the version in LBM Add.37049, it is likely that a written exemplar was used and then badly copied by Rate. If the text had been written on a single folio, its bad production might have been attributed to its being a filler item, jotted down on a blank portion of paper. But the final stanzas are written on a new recto (erroneously as a single eight-line stanza), in an improved hand, and *Orfeo* was started below apparently soon afterwards.

By contrast, for the texts of *Eustace* (1) which opens the manuscript, and (to a lesser extent) *Pilgrimage* (34), Rate uses a 'pretty' hand which is much more carefully formed and decorative, although after a short time it 'settles down' into his more usual working script. It appears from the changes in hand and the method of scoring that the manuscript originally finished before the pilgrimage account *41*. But the break before *Pilgrimage* is the most definite evidence of such an
intention. The end of Conscience occupies the top quarter of the page, and scoring only starts with the beginning of Pilgrimage (rather heavily and not straight), which all indicates a fresh start. It is likely that Rate, and perhaps his family (lines 808-9), actually underwent a lengthy visit to the Holy Land at this point, and that Rate wrote up the account on their return. On the same folio is a pseudo-professional scribal tag, added after Conscience (33), surrounded by a rough framework of small flowers: "Explicit stimulus conciencie minoris / Nunc finem feci da mchi [sic] quod merui (Here ends the prick of conscience minor / Now I have finished give me what I have earned" (see plate 5). In view of Rate's poor showing as a copyist - he even manages to miscopy 'michi' in the tag - this should not be taken as evidence of his status as a professional, as he could simply have copied it from his exemplar *42.

The uniformity of the hand, together with its noticeable improvement on the rectos throughout a text makes it difficult to determine exact copying stints, as such 'evidence' can be misleading. Although the state of the ink in Tolouse (19) is very poor, it shows breaks in copying more clearly, as at line 481: stronger ink, large lombard initials; then fainter again after 678. But in the rest of the manuscript it is not so visible; in any case, such apparent 'breaks' only show where the pen was refilled, not how many texts (or what proportion of the long texts) were copied at a time.

41 There were possibly two other abortive attempts to finish his manuscript earlier; one is the use of "Amen" before Psalm 142, the other is the scribal tag at the end of the Psalms (see section 2.3.a, Omission, and section 2.8, Rate's Audience).

42 If he learned most of his decorative skills by observing, copying, and adapting salient features of his exemplars into his own work, however crude, clumsy and home-made they appear, it does at least suggest that his sources were well-produced.
2.2. b Copying Errors

While the fluency of Rate's script suggests a certain formal training, it is not matched by expertise in copying. He constantly reverses words, lines and whole passages unmarked (see chapter 1). There are numerous uncompleted words, while omitted letters, words, lines or stanzas are for the most part ignored, sometimes inserted above the line with or without a caret, and sometimes corrected through expunction or deletion, but not consistently. Many errors are the result of carelessness and haste. His bracing of the lines is erratic and often wrong *43, while his system of abbreviation, which has always been the bane of transcribers, is equally careless and imperfect *44. Such slap-dash methods resulting in, for example, the two endings of Pilgrimage (34) and the disordered passages in Resurrection (36) would cause great difficulty to a patron wanting to use the manuscript.

2.2. c Copying of Exemplars

Some of the errors and variants indicate the lay-out of the exemplar he was using, showing that at least some of his sources were written copies. For example, in Levation Prayer (17) tail-line 33 is omitted, which suggests that the exemplar was set out in couplets with the tail-lines braced at the side, a frequent method of laying out tail-rhyme stanzas, especially short verses inserted in

---

43 Out of many examples, in Passion (28) Rate's use of braces goes astray at lines 1022-1030, where 1023-6 and 1030 have the same rhyme: he ignores 1023 and pairs 1024 and 1025; lines 1027-9 are omitted, probably carelessly, so that 1026 is paired with 1030. If he had not overlooked 1023, he may have realized that there was an omission before 1030.

44 This is a summary of the type of errors, and the resulting difficulties in interpretation, which are variously detailed in the footnotes and emendations to the transcriptions.
closely-written prose tracts. In Resurrection (36), the misplacement of stanzas 60-78 appear to be due to copying the wrong column in his exemplar. After line 364 Rate skips 50 lines, for no obvious reason such as eye-skip, from Mary Magdalen telling the disciples about seeing the risen Christ in the garden (stanza 59) to the middle of the account of the Road to Emmaus (stanza 70). The displaced passage (lines 428-81, stanzas 70-78) continues to the beginning of the Doubting Thomas scene, after which Rate copies the beginning of the Emmaus episode (lines 377-427, stanzas 62-69), and then jumps back to the reactions of the disciples to Mary’s news which should precede the Emmaus story and the introduction to Thomas (lines 365-76, stanzas 60-61) *45. The text then continues in its proper sequence with the disciples rebuking Thomas for continuing to doubt after the Resurrection appearances (stanza 79 to the end).

How Rate came to make such a muddle of the sequence can be explained if we assume that his exemplar was in double columns, and that after a break he began copying the wrong column without checking his place, skipping from stanza 59 to 70 (the length of the displaced Emmaus passage is 54 lines long; Rate’s columns contain a similar number of lines). When he realized his mistake he added the beginning of the Emmaus passage after the end of it, then the rest of the earlier Disciples passage, attempting to smooth the break by linking the two Thomas passages. This adds to the confusion as one should precede the Resurrection (stanza 61) and the other should follow it (stanza 79), and both are similarly worded. This cannot have facilitated recitation, and only familiarity and personal use of the text can

*45 This is my own re-alignment of the stanzas; Horstmann merely joins the two halves of the Emmaus story without noticing the further displacement of the disciples’ reaction.
justify his failure to mark the displaced passages.

2.2.d Memorial Transmission

Some of the carelessness and unreliability of the texts may be due to reliance on memory rather than on written text, for instance where the middle of a line is altered to give the sense but not the letter of the copy-text, as in Psalms (32) line 405 *46. There are several minor repetitions, some through attraction from previous readings, as in Conscience (33) 213-17, where the 'familiarity trap' causes the repetition of the noun "sykernes", when the sequence should read "sykernes" (213; noun), "syker" (214; adj.), "sylence" (216; noun), "sely" (217; adj.) *47. Other variants appear to be the result of local re-writing by the scribe, as in Saints (25) lines 495-6, where the goodness of the monk is described in almost the same words used for the Pope's exhortation to repent in lines 105-6 *48. Many repetitions are the result of simple error, as in Margaret (37), line 297 repeated as added line 304a, perhaps a memorial/aural error from the rhyme.

Some errors indicate his own method of copying in half-line units, such as a line being split into two, as in Tolouse (19), where line 24 is written on two lines, thus impairing the tail-rhyme structure, or where the second halves of certain couplets are reversed, perhaps due to copying aloud, as in Ypotis (27) where the rhymes in line 153,

46 See Knight 1969:164; for evidence of Shirley working from memory see Boffey and Thompson 1989:285.

47 Similarly in line 628, where "stablys" is repeated from 627, instead of "gladdes"; also in Tolouse (19) line 1177 echoing 1170; Passion (28) line 1322 echoing 1320, and elsewhere.

48 See also lines 345-50, 364-5, and Resurrection (36) 8 and 26; 145 and 157; 153, 160 and 166; 371-2 and 471-2 (see section 2.2.c, Copying of Exemplars).
"loud & styll", are reversed with line 154, "wyth gode wyll"; similarly in lines 205-6, "an ebe & flod" and "pe werldys gode"; also 237-8, "I be pray" and "wyth outen deley" *49. Some reversed lines are simply re-written in this new order and are not true errors, as in lines 287-8. That he copied aloud is indicated by some minor errors in which he appears to have misheard his own voice *50, as in line 189, where he appears to have misheard "wyttus beth" as "wytte is beste", and adjusts the rhyme in line 190 accordingly, from "made hys breth" to "breth of breste". Similarly in line 331: he corrupts or perhaps mishears "tydes seuene" in the common exemplar of Ashmole 61 (B) and Titus A.26 (T): B reads "ij deys euyn", while T makes sense of or simplifies the reading as "dayse sewyn".

2.2. e Textual Correlations

Rate shows an apparent familiarity with more than one text in the course of copying, which reveals itself in certain echoes between texts, as in the correlations between Stans Puer (7), Dame Curtasy (8), and their cognates *51. Rate's version of Stans Puer should really be re-named, as it shares only lines 49-67 with its cognates (MacCracken, lines 1-17). Indeed the poem bears more resemblance to

49 See Mc Gillivray (thesis 1987) for evidence that such factors indicate memorial transmission in the romances.
50 Bliss, Thesis, 1954:22. See Conscience (33) line 482, which reads "heuen" for "hepen".
51 There are also minor similarities between the other courtesy texts, such as Good Wife (4) line 161 and Wise Man (3) line 69 (Ff.2.38); Good Wife lines 159-60 and Dame Curtasy (8) lines 79-82; Good Wife lines 204a-d and Wise Man line 187 in Harley 5396 (Hb). Many of the themes in Good Wife (4): avoiding common women, paying debts, the proverb "fayre wordes brake neuer bone", are also contained in Wise Man, text Hb lines 62-64, 70, 142, and 153. This would suggest a familiarity with his texts indicating memorisation, and a purposefulness by which he re-writes as he writes down.
the following text, Dame Curtasy, which has only lines 5-10 in common with its cognates. The two courtesy poems share a number of ideas which are not contained in their cognates, although differently worded from each other, as the following examples show *52. Among the rules for table etiquette is a prohibition against playing with animals at meals:

Stans Puer (145-6)  
Pley þu not wyth a dogge ne 3it wyth a cate  
Be for þi better at þe tabull ne be syde

Dame Curtasy (143-4)  
Make þu noþer cate ne hound  
Thi felow at þi tabull round

Saying grace before meals:

Stans Puer (79-80)  
Take þu no mete be well wer off itte  
vnto grace be seyd & þer to veyll þi hode

Dame Curtasy (25-6)  
Be for þi mete sey þu þi grace  
It ocupys bot lytell space

And not speaking until spoken to:

Stans Puer (169-70)  
Com not to counsell bot if þu be callyd

Dame Curtasy (55-6)  
vn callyd go þu to no counsell

In my opinion these affiliations suggest that Stans Puer and Dame Curtasy are Rate’s own redactions of courtesy texts known to him. A table of correlations between these texts and their cognates is given in chapter 4 section 7, Affiliation.

It is evident that Rate regarded certain texts as being related; the

---

52 The ideas which they share might, of course, have originated in other courtesy books, perhaps translated from Latin; for example, lines 145-6 of item 7 are also quoted in R.W. Chambers, EETS 148 (1914:4) as resembling the courtesy book of Father Riva, while lines similar to 237-40 are also found in the Cotton Caligula A.2 courtesy text, Urbanitatis. However, it is outside the scope of this study to trace the exact sources of Rate’s texts.
main example being items 35a and 35b. The similarity in theme and phraseology between Jealous Wife (22) lines 157, 260, and Incestuous Daughter (23) line 139, suggests that these two exempla stories are by the same author and were compiled together in the source copy. Both are concerned with the salvation of a sinful woman, who commits acts of murder through the instigation of the devil.

The Lament of the Lost Soul is treated in the IMEV as the prologue to the following story of the Adulterous Falmouth Squire. But since Ashmole 61 is the only manuscript which contains both texts it was evidently Rate who copied the two otherwise separate texts as a pair. The title Adulterous Falmouth Squire properly belongs to the 'story', in which Falmouth is cited in line 55. Lines 1-56 of the 'story' constitute a moralistic prologue in their own right, so that Lost Soul as a 'prologue' would be superfluous. Only in Ashmole 61 is Lost Soul localised in "Ingland" and attributed to the soul of "syr wylliam basterdfeld kny3t" (lines 4a-c). The list of contents on f.ii.a is unfortunately torn away just at the mention of this item, but it is possible to deduce that the remaining letters "Ser W [illiam Basterdfeld's Lament/Complaint ?]" apply to Lost Soul; but whether as a separate item or to both texts as a prologue and story unit can only be conjectured. Rate's version is the only one in which the last line is modified: the other texts echo the opening line with an admonitory

53 For other minor correlations see the opening lines of Saints (25) and Four Daughters (26) which are similarly worded; a variant reading in line xix of Lament (30) recalls line 1 of Wounds (38); and three unique lines (173-5) inserted in Rate's version of Good Wife (4) are similar to lines x-xiii of stanza B in Lament (30), which vary slightly from the Rawlinson version. For the similarities in theme and content between Eustace and Isumbras see the commentary in section 1 above, The Scribe as Compiler, and section 2.5, Family Bias.

54 See section 2.6, Other Substantive Variants.
variation ("All christen men bewarre by me"), whereas the line in A implies that the "horne" of line 95 is calling the soul to his place of punishment. This venue is graphically described in the following story; thus Rate effectively links the two texts.

There are some striking similarities in wording between the texts, especially between Orfeo (39) and other poems in the manuscript. To begin with, his own copy of Orfeo appears to be influenced by a memorized source copy, as suggested by the similarity in wording between the added lines 273-4 and lines 435-7 of the Auchinleck text, in which the hero "tempers" his harp. Rate's version appears to anticipate the later harping scene in the palace while in the process of describing the harping in the wilderness scene. A more notable example is in the similarity between Orfeo and Pilgrimage (34) (see also Vanity (40) lines 8-10):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pilgrimage (Ashmole 791-2)</th>
<th>Orfeo (Ashmole 158-60)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>And schewyd hym ther haulys &amp; bourys</td>
<td>He schewyd me hys castellus &amp; tourys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riche castellus &amp; many toures</td>
<td>And hys hey haules &amp; boures fforestys ruyers frutys &amp; floures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Orfeo</strong> (Auchinleck 159-60)</td>
<td><strong>Orfeo</strong> (Harley 157-8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&amp; schewed me castels &amp; tours Riuers forestes frip wip flours</td>
<td>He schewed me castels &amp; tours Medewys ruyeres feldys &amp; floures</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Pilgrimage the devil shows Christ the world in order to tempt him away from his mission, while in Orfeo the Fairy King shows Herodys his kingdom in order to tempt her away from her husband. Since line 159 in Rate's text of Orfeo is extra, forces a triple rhyme instead of the usual couplet, and is the only version in both Pilgrimage and Orfeo to mention "boures", I think contamination between the two poems is certain. It indicates the familiarity of the scribe with his texts, and that in his mind he related the domestic temptation to the
religious analogy.

In lines 125-6 of Edward (41), the hardships of the Hermit in the wilderness are described in such similar terms to the hero’s experiences in Orfeo (lines 240-62) that Rate must have been thinking of that passage as he copied this text. This is shown again in Cleges (24) lines 329-30, where Rate substitutes a reading which suggests that he had in mind lines 408-15 of Orfeo:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cleges (A)</th>
<th>Cleges (E)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>And seyd who made þe so herdy</td>
<td>And seyd ho made the soo hardi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To come heþer or þu were bede</td>
<td>To com in to thys stede</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Orfeo (Ashmole lines 408-15)

- Than seyd þe kyng what arte þu
- That heþer arte þe come now
- I nore non þat is wyth me
- Neuer Þit sent after the
- Neuer seth þat my Reyn be gan
- ffond I neuer non so herdy man
- That hyder durst to vs wend
- Bot iff I wold after hym send

Such textual ‘echoes’ between widely separated texts suggest that he was familiar with a large repertoire at least in part by memory; many errors may thus have resulted from the scribe’s copying of his written exemplars being then contaminated or influenced by partly-remembered versions.

A similar process may have produced the somewhat complex relationship between Passion (28) and Resurrection (36). There are a large number of omitted lines in Passion, whereby superfluous narrative links are excised, and repetitive or discursive passages dropped, in order to achieve a tight narrative flow. The most significant omissions occur where large passages are dropped towards the end of the text, the substance of which is covered in the text of Resurrection. The
passage omitted at lines 1955-68 relates the conversation of the knights on the positions they will take up around Christ's body, and their menaces to intruders during their vigil; this is covered by lines 69-116 in Resurrection with much greater detail and extended speeches. The ink at line 1954 of Passion is darker and thicker, as if Rate had paused beforehand to decide on the omission; the wording of the line is repeated at line 1969 after the gap. The scribe is confused by this interruption to the narrative; in line 1971 he puts "nyght" instead of "day", forgetting that the knights have watched all night but could not keep awake when day came and Jesus rose.

Similarly, the passage of the knights awakening to the empty tomb (lines 2001-78) is omitted in Passion, but present in Resurrection in lines 530 to the end. In the Passion cognates only one shining angel descends to tell the frightened knights of the Resurrection (line 2013); in Resurrection lines 560-5 Arfax reports seeing the marvel of 60,000 angels escorting the risen Christ, while one remains to tell the three Maries; it has been conveniently ignored that he should have been in an enchanted sleep. There are many parallels between the usual text of the Passion and Rate's Resurrection poem, as Foster has listed (1913:96), while the names of the knights, given in Resurrection but not in Passion also occur (in different forms) in the N-Town play of the "Guarding of the Sepulchre" in Passion Play 2 (Block 1922:313-14), and in Robert Reynes's manuscript (Louis, 1980:257) *55. It is possible, therefore, that the separate poem of the Resurrection was derived from a combination of the Passion and the play, perhaps by using a written exemplar of the Passion while being influenced by memorial familiarity with the play; this combination may

55 See further chapter 4 section 36.
account for other variants in the texts.

There are also correlations between the Ashmole texts and other texts, as in Jealous Wife (22) and the Desputisoun betwen be Bodi and be Soule, noted by Hans Sauer (1985:449-50). He compares the description of the devils in Jealous Wife lines 289-300 (ragged, long-tailed, sharp claws and long nails) with that of Bodi and Soule (lines 473-84) and concludes that the close similarity of wording indicates deliberate conflation *56. We cannot know, of course, whether it is the author of the poem or Rate who was responsible for the plagiarism, but other instances of such borrowing occur in Ashmole 61, as in Orfeo (39). The prologue which appears in full in the Harley MS (and is the same as the prologue to Lay Le Freine) is missing from the Auchinleck MS because a leaf is lost at that point. In MS Ashmole 61 the first six lines of that same prologue are altered, and have been identified by Bliss (1966:56) as the opening lines from Arthour and Merlin, which are then 'fitted' onto the usual form of the prologue by a link passage probably added by Rate himself: Bliss notes that "their confused and commonplace style is ... much in keeping with other additions in the manuscript" (Thesis 1954:40) *57. The lines were apparently interpolated by Rate because the reference to "man & wyffe" in line 6 highlights the domestic relevance of the romance. It also shows off Rate's knowledge of Arthuriana (Ginn 1967:88), as evidenced by the close copying of three romances (if, for the sake of argument,

*56 Other correlations include conflations of Four Daughters (26) with Rex et Famulus, and Passion (28) with the Legend of Longinus, as noted respectively by Sajavaara 1967:224 and Foster 1916:96, although these conflations are not unique to Ashmole 61.

*57 Although at the time Bliss was commenting on the entire passage of ten lines before he had identified the source of the first six, his remarks still apply to the 'link' lines and other variants which can be attributed to Rate.
one includes Corneus with Libeus and Cleges *58) which have Arthurian connections. Ginn describes the 'mechanical' references to Uther and Arthur in Cleges as just "a piece of name-dropping, designed to arouse the curiosity about the subject" (1967:138).

Another indication of Rate's wider knowledge is suggested by the insertion of a unique couplet into the wilderness harping passage in Orfeo. Lines 279-80 describe the taming of the wild beasts by the power of Orfeo's music. This is the principal motif of the Orpheus myth, the Classical source of the romance. Since the taming motif foreshadows the conquering by music of the Otherworld powers in both myth and romance, but is only present in Rate's version of Orfeo, the variant was probably added by Rate:

Auchinleck (273-80)

\[
\text{at alle Pe wilde bestes} \\
\text{for ioie abouten him pai tep}
\]

\[
\text{& alle Pe foules pat per were} \\
\text{To here his harping a fine} \\
\text{No best bi him abide nold}
\]

Ashmole (277-86)

\[
\text{The wild bestys pat per were} \\
\text{They com aboute hys herpe to here} \\
\text{To here hys harpyng so fyne} \\
\text{when he hys harpyng stynct wylle} \\
\text{And all pe foulys pat per were} \\
\text{They com aboute hym by busch & brere}
\]

\[
\text{pat per bep} \\
\text{pat per bep} \\
\text{pat per bep} \\
\text{pat per bep} \\
\text{pat per bep} \\
\text{pat per bep}
\]

\[
\text{pat per bep} \\
\text{pat per bep} \\
\text{pat per bep} \\
\text{pat per bep} \\
\text{pat per bep} \\
\text{pat per bep}
\]

The insertion displaces the couplet on the flocking of birds which Rate copied after the logical end to the passage; furthermore he repeats "com aboute" three times and rhymes "wylle : wylle" for "wold : nold".

---

58 See Girvan 1939:xxxiv. He lists six romances in Ashmole 61 by mistakenly including Ypotis (27), but makes a point of excluding Corneus (21), which is more of a romance-type tale than is the theological exegesis of Ypotis.
In many texts Rate's version appears to agree with more than one manuscript or group, as in Prayer to Mary (15), where his version seems to conflate the Lambeth and Speculum texts *59. This makes it very difficult to place the Ashmole texts correctly within manuscript groupings; indeed, in published editions they are often to be found out on a limb in stemmata of affiliations *60.

This disruption to the copying process, together with the extensive scribal editing, suggests that beyond doubt the manuscript was intended for the scribe's own use, whether in a private or public context; in that sense it is an amateur production, and doubtless some anomalies were corrected verbally at the time of recitation. Malcolm Parkes suggests that Rate was a scribe by profession, but that Ashmole 61 is a recreational compilation produced by him for his own family reading (1973:569):

Some of the compilers brought to the texts that they collected for recreation the same tendency to excerpt, adapt, and enlarge the material as is found in the texts that they compiled for reference purposes in the course of their professional activities. One such compiler was a man called Rate...

This might account for some relaxation of professional standards in a recreational compilation, as this would not hinder performance because of the obvious familiarity of the scribe/reciter with its contents. But it does not, I think, explain Rate's combination of extreme carelessness and deliberate re-working of the texts, or their marked

59 See chapter 4 section 15, Affiliation, and similarly sections 10 (Land Purchase), 18 (Forgiving Knight), 29 (Charter), and 31 (Dietary). For the possibility that Rate used two exemplars for Passion (28), see Downing 1969:xxxvi.

60 See Mustanoja 1948:117 for Good Wife (4); Schleich 1901:87 for Isumbras (5); Sullens 1983:xxii-iii for Forgiving Knight (18); Sutton 1916:154 for Ypotis (27); and Spalding 1914:lxv for Charter (29). Other editors ignore the text completely, as MacCracken 1934:461 for Ram's Horn (2), and Breul 1885 for Dame Curtasy (8).
devotional bias; these features can be accounted for only in terms of his idiosyncratic scribal personality.

2.3 **Versification** *61*

Rosemary Ginn summarises the two main features of Rate's practice as a copyist (1967:80):

first, adaptation (including addition, paraphrasing and re-arrangement) of the text in order to place stronger emphasis on the domestic aspect of any given sequence; secondly, failure to maintain a coherent progression of events at certain crucial stages in the narrative, either because the scribe was not aware of (or concerned with) the techniques of narrative development, or because of his failure to integrate his own interpolations with the original text.

The following notes illustrate Rate's patterns of omission, addition and alteration to the versification of his texts. I cannot, of course, be certain that all the listed changes were made by Rate, but until the contrary can be proved I have acted on prevailing patterns throughout the manuscript, which have been ascertained by computer search. As it is not practical to list every instance of a particular practice in the manuscript, these examples should be taken as representative.

The textual discrepancies provide illuminating insights into Rate's mental processes: a bewildering mixture of muddle-headedness and conscious intent *62*. There are prolific examples of his attempts to substitute, modernise, simplify and clarify, but at the expense of metre, rhyme or narrative sequence *63*. In some texts the form of the

---

61 I use the term "versification" to include semantic issues such as stanza order, rearrangement of passages, and local composition, as well as verse form, rhyme sequence and diction.

62 See Rosamund Allen's analysis of the same combination of deliberate and mechanical error shown by the scribes of *King Horn* (1984:55-60ff).
verse itself is inconsistent, as if re-writing or using a mixture of exemplars, as in *Stans Puer* (7), which is mostly written in quatrains except where it agrees with the other versions and slips back into rhyme royal stanzas, while in *Pilgrimage* (34) lines 1-32 are written in cross-rimed quatrains; 33-4 couplets; 35-8 1 quatrain; 39-840 couplets; 841-8 2 quatrains. This may be a sign that Rate abandoned his source text just as he did with the courtesy books, but since its nearest cognate is also in couplets with three quatrains among them, the confused versification of this text may be due to contamination rather than to Rate's re-working. However, throughout his texts the rhyme-schemes are often sacrificed to re-writing, showing that content and context are more important to the scribe than form and style, and that he is more concerned with the adaptability of the texts than with their preservation *64*.

2.3.a Omission

Rate’s active re-shaping of the versification suggests that he adapted material to make certain didactic poems more accessible to his audience, and to simplify the more rhetorical pieces, as well as saving himself a certain amount of labour. This practice manifests itself by a tendency both to reduce, and to elaborate. For example, Rate’s versions of the courtesy books *Wise Man* (3) and *Good Wife* (4) are reduced in length; *Wise Man* contains 13 stanzas against 24 in the

63 Among many examples see *Eustace* (1) 333-6; *Wise Man* (3) 34; *Tolouse* (19) 1086, 1092; *Dietary* (31), 53-4. See further section 2.3.e, Diction.

64 Nevertheless we can be grateful to Rate for the preservation of certain unique texts, as noted in the Incipit, and for fuller versions of some texts, such as *Cleges* (24) and *Margaret* (37) which have endings lacking in the cognates, and *Wise Man* (3), in which lines 181-4 are omitted in all other manuscripts (see chapter 4 section 3, Affiliation).
base text CUL Ff.2.38 *65, while the text of Good Wife is re-worked from the seven-line stanzas in the cognate copies into a unique couplet form, but the insertion of extra couplets to explain or amplify certain points results in a reduced-then-expanded form of 208 lines against the standard length of 215 lines *66. The omission of material in Wise Man, and the simplification of the stanza form in Good Wife apparently arose from Rate's desire to fit items 1-4 within the first eight-leaf quire, but this intention was nearly undermined by his ad hoc expansion of item 4.

It is not easy to discern the motives for the addition and omission of material within a single poem, and a modern critic must always guard against over-reading. For instance, stanzas 4 and 5 in Ram's Horn are omitted. These deal with charity of word and deed (4), truth and falsehood (5). The stanzas thus juxtaposed (3 and 6) are designated "anti-feminist" by Hargreaves (1976:255-6), denouncing fashionable and prideful women. The term, however, is too limiting, as the two stanzas also denigrate merchants, usurers, servants, and simoners; thus too much importance should not be attached to these lines (A 3:19-20, 6:45-7), as they are only part of the general denunciation of the times. Elsewhere, Rate does not exhibit marked anti-feminist tendencies either by his selection or adaptation of texts; rather he

---

65 The term "base text" designates the version with which the Ashmole text is directly collated. This is selected on a purely editorial basis with no imputation of textual authority.

66 As for example the weak and repetitious addition in lines 41-4, expanding line 30 in Hunt.HM.128 (H). Mustanoja believes that the variants in A are attributable to Rate. The results of his linguistic survey "seem to corroborate the impression that the alterations in versification etc. are due to the scribe of the Ashmole MS (Rate)" (1948:117). This suggests that Rate is responsible for re-working the form into couplets, as well as for introducing the extra text. See further chapter 4 section 4, Affiliation.
points up human fallibility in any form or gender *67, as in the satire *Vanity* (40).

There are many minor omissions in the texts for reasons which are ambiguous or inconsistent. For example, in *Orfeo* the passage on the Fairy Host's "al maner menstraci" (Auchinleck (A) lines 299-302) is omitted, as if to abbreviate the description, yet throughout the manuscript there are many references to minstrelsy *68, including *Orfeo* line 377, a unique variant which emphasises that "as a mynstrell" Orfeo was allowed into the palace, and line 585 in which the hero and his queen are welcomed back with "yche maner mynstralsy" (as in A). Also in *Orfeo* there are ambiguous omissions and additions to the list of entranced captives in the courtyard passage (A lines 391-404; omitted in (H) Harley 3810). A lines 394, 397-404 are dropped in Ashmole 61 (B), describing those taken in death by drowning, fire, or childbirth, and the mad. This might be thought to reduce the level of horror in the passage, except that there is then an insertion of three lines (387-9) adding that those eating with the men who choked at mealtimes (396) were also taken, as were men and women found "in fere" at noonday (390). This may refer to unlawful sexual liaisons of which Rate disapproves *69; but as 390 replaces lines 401-4, which Orton identifies as describing the second group of taken who were unwisely sleeping under trees at noonday (1980:197), it

67 In this he resembles Little’s description of the itinerant preachers who "knew the difficulties and sorrows and temptations of the people they addressed; they were not afraid to castigate vices of all classes, and to insist on the performance of duties" (1917:156-7). But the similarity tells us more about his character than his identity.

68 See *Ram’s Horn* (2) lines 48q-x, *Isumbras* (5) lines 785-8, and *Cleges* (24) lines 97-105.

69 See the comments on lechery in section 2.4, Religious Bias.
may simply be a clumsy way of stressing that both men and women were
victims. That it is Rate’s interpolation is indicated by the
disruption to the versification: after line 384 the rhyming line is
omitted, and 387 inserted forcing a triple rhyme with 385–6 “sette :
mete : etc”. But the reason for expanding the list to include
‘innocent’ dinner guests remains obscure 70.

The reductive trend is especially noticeable in the longer religious
narratives 71, and shows a certain impatience with their discursive
material, as in Ypotis (27) lines 557–647, where the list of reasons
for fasting on Friday beginning at line 557 is abbreviated in several
of the manuscripts, but most severely in Ashmole 61, which in addition
to the shared cuts also drops lines 559–60, 563–4, 593–4 (eighth
reason dropped altogether), 603–4, 611–14, 617–18. Some of the cuts
have resulted in careless or awkward re-writing of the remaining text,
as in lines 609–10:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{C 609–14} & \\
\text{The XI reson ys full trewe} & \text{The xi off seynt Andrew pat holy man} \\
\text{That þe apostell saynt Andrewe} & \text{how he sufferd hys mertyrdom} \\
\text{upon a fryday was don on crosse} & \text{To god he called wyth meke voys} \\
\text{To god he called wyth meke voys} & \text{And sayde fadur yn trynyte} \\
\text{Thys suffre y for þe loue of þe} & \text{Thys suffre y for þe loue of þe} \\
\text{The xii reson ...} & \text{The xij reson ...}
\end{align*}
\]

Rate’s list is reduced by about 110 lines in comparison with the base
text Cotton Caligula A.2.

In Psalms (32), when Rate reaches Psalm 129, he evidently starts
tiring of his labour and omits the exegetical half of the stanzas,
leaving the first parts which more directly translate the Latin. The

70 Unless it was a sly joke at the expense of his audience, perhaps
his own dinner guests.

71 For the omissions in Passion (28) see section 2.2.e, Textual
Correlations.
truncated stanzas are mainly left to stand as they are; only stanzas 101 and 105 are altered to make a more definite finish; the fourth line of stanza 101 reads "Ther for lord to pi loue me draw" for "was neuer said no soper sawe", a more devout variant focusing on the love of God; while the last stanza (105) is re-written to finish with a concluding prayer, although the rhyme sequence is again disrupted. This re-working is more sophisticated than usual, perhaps indicating that Rate worked it out beforehand rather than on-the-spot fabrications. It is interesting that he writes "Amen" after this reduced and re-written psalm. He probably intended to finish here, and added Psalm 142 later *72.

That Rate may have decided some of the textual changes in situ is suggested by the fact that some omissions coincide with changes in ink continuity of script and *73, and interrupt the narrative, as in Eustace (1) where the tail-line 174 is omitted before changing lines 175-6 to substitute a different prayer for the one in Digby 86; Rate's version has the more direct appeal, with its correlation between the lamenting sufferer and Christ the Comforter. In Incestuous Daughter (23) one stanza (lines 277-82) is omitted before the addition of three preaching stanzas (lines 285-301) *74. The omitted lines describe the heavenly voice directing the priest to grant the repentant sinner Christian burial. Lines 1710-12 in Libeus (20) are omitted before an addition of 15 lines, the first 12 of which also occur in the Naples version (N). Lines 1713-21 are omitted in A N, which in A precedes a unique

*72 However, Edden notes that "Amen" is also present in the Huntington MS (private communication, 1988). See further chapter 4 section 32, Affiliation.

*73 See the comment on Passion (28) line 1954 in section 2.2.e, Textual Correlations.

*74 See section 2.4.b, Preaching.
addition (1722-4) *75; but as these omissions occur in another version they must represent a re-working of the text prior to Rate's copy.

Some careless omissions occur through simple errors such as eye-skip, as in Ypotis (27) lines 48-58 where the narrative jumps from line 48 "And pe holy gost to gedur" to the same words in line 58, thus combining the beginning of one line with the ending of the other and skipping nine lines in between *76. The reasons for dropping lines 509-18 are rather more ambiguous; the narrative jumps from "Thynke" in 508 to the same word in 519, thereby dropping the passage about the Wounds of Christ. This was probably an error, since the events of the Passion are described in detail in other texts (items 28, 34, 36); but elsewhere they are toned down, as when the graphic description in line 626, "wyth feet & hondes & sydes all blode", is commuted to the unique reading "Oure lord bou3t vs wyth hys blode" in Rate's version, thus emphasising in typical fashion the redemptive sacrifice of the crucifixion rather than its horror *77. However, the fact that some of these omissions also occur in other versions suggests that Rate may not have been responsible; but these examples are typical of the kind of eye-skip error that occurs frequently in the manuscript *78. Other omissions occur through no clear reason, as in omitting lines 27-38 of Prayer to Mary (15) *79, an apparently unnecessary omission as regards

75 See section 2.3.c, Narrative Sequence.

76 Similarly 144-7; 280-3; 295-300; 452-5; 464-79; although not all of these eye-skip errors are unique to Ashmole 61.

77 Among many examples of this phrase see Forgiving Knight (18) 58; Tolouse (19) 864, 1035; Libeus (20) 219, 552, 705; Jealous Wife (22) 353; Cleges (24) 283, 335, 345, etc.

78 As in Forgiving Knight (18), where lines 5-6 are omitted apparently through eye-skip on the word "slow", but since the omission tightens the narrative it may have been deliberate.

79 See chapter 4 section 15, Affiliation.
space on the page or subject-matter. Some of the omissions are due to bowdlerisation on moral or religious grounds, and these are dealt with in section 2.4.c, Moral Concern.

2.3.b Addition

Much of the additional material in Rate's texts probably originated from source texts; the examples listed throughout the following sections appear to be attributable to him, but whether as insertions from other texts (written or memorized) or his own invention cannot be proved here. Most of the additions illustrate the scribe's bias towards a devotional and family context, and these are dealt with in the appropriate sub-sections below.

The addition of large amounts of text *80, the presence of unique texts or unique versions (see Incipit), and the prolific minor additions and alterations throughout most of the manuscript, raises the further question of the scribe as composer. I have not devoted an extra section to this, as to do so would involve linguistic analysis with which I am not concerned.

Where there exist different versions of Rate's apparently unique texts, such as Saints (25), Four Daughters (26), Pilgrimage (34), Resurrection (36) (based mainly on the Passion narratives), which do not correlate closely with his renditions, it is tempting to suggest that he is responsible for re-writing a known text and producing his own versions. In the case of Stans Puer (7), Rate upsets the Lydgatian versification by inserting an extra b-rhyme line between the

---

80 As in the extra stanzas in Eustace (1), Ram's Horn (2), Isumbras (5), Commandments (6), Libeus (20), Incestuous Daughter (23), Cleges (24); in Lament (30) there are three prefixed stanzas which may have originated with Rate and been transmitted by a later manuscript; see section 2.4.a, The Passion.
two cc-rhymes in order to preserve the quatrain format, even though the fourth and first lines of adjoining stanzas 13-16 rhyme (elsewhere the rhyme-schemes are imperfect, as in stanzas 27, 30, 33, 46). The inserted line 55 is a mixture of lines 14 and 17 in the base text (Laud 683), while line 63 is a re-writing of line 14; the next four lines diverge greatly from the base text, after which Rate abandons his source text, and continues to write in quatrains.

For the rest of the text Rate was apparently either composing pen-in-hand, or remembering imperfectly; but if the latter, greater similarity of wording would be expected, whereas Rate’s text contains similar ideas but differently expressed and elaborated, and in a simpler form, which rather indicates re-writing. The text is written on the batch of paper dated 1479; since Furnivall dates the poem 1461-83 (1868:62n), date alone does not necessarily rule out Rate as composer. However, until possible sources for his unique version have been investigated, it is more likely that he was copying rather than composing, perhaps making minor alterations in the process. The text ends abruptly without any of the usual concluding addresses, as if tiring of the ever-lasting diatribe on table-manners.

The local alterations alone suggest that Rate is certainly capable of simple composition at a fairly inferior level *81, while simple narrative, particularly for devotional subjects such as the Pilgrimage account, would perhaps not be beyond his capacity to produce *82. The

---

81 See also the comments on lines 495-6 of Saints (25) in section 2.2.d, Memorial Transmission. Such local composition is ascribed by Ralph Cohen to natural linguistic transformational processes: "any attempt to narrate another's discourse by retelling, revising, or reconstructing it necessarily involves a process of construction" (1985:269).

82 I make this suggestion with caution; see the comments on the prologue to Orfeo (39) in section 2.2.e, Textual Correlations.
Pilgrimage account could have been based on an actual trip by the scribe, or it could have been invented, as a means of re-telling the Gospel stories. I am inclined to take the Pilgrimage at face value, since some of the narrative appears to arise from first-hand experience. Even if he based his own account on existing versions, he added material of his own. His account is more interesting than that in Bodley 565 which is simply an itinerary. Rate includes commentary on the devotional life of the pilgrims and the differences he found in Eastern Orthodox traditions, which met with a mostly favourable response: "off oure maner is þer songe / Saue þer berdes are wele longe" (lines 231-2) *83.

But it is less easy to decide the origin of new material in the more sophisticated items. Like MacCracken but in greater detail, Hargreaves does not hesitate to attribute the extra stanzas in Ram's Horn to Rate, as the commonplace quality is at variance with the style of the rest of the text *84. They do not consider conflation with another version, nor contamination; Hargreaves merely notes their similarity to Ellesmere, "though with rather more minor verbal divergences than are recorded for other manuscripts" (1976:256). That a second tradition exists would appear likely in view of the unique stanza in Lansdowne 409 and the divergent text of LBM Add.12195, and yet extraneous material or large-scale alterations to a given text should not automatically mean that it represents the longer or original version *85. Hargreaves perceives an undoubted scribal

83 See also lines 109-18, 185-242, 383-410.

84 The simplified style of stanza 11 in Vanity (40) might also be attributable to the scribe, since it changes its address from "þu" to "we", and replaces the satirical rhetoric of the preacher to his wayward congregation with a straightforward complaint of the poor man'.
presence in the inferiority of the extra stanzas to those in common with the cognates (1976:257):

The quality of these new stanzas is in several respects inferior to that of their Ellesmere counterparts. Their metre is even less reducible to system; they depend on rhyming tags such as "as I gesse", "to more & lesse". Alliteration is increased well beyond that elsewhere in the poem, but the vocabulary lacks the solid Latinate foundation characteristic of Lydgate.

Perhaps somewhat incautiously he assumes that because the added stanzas deal with the integrity of the clergy, jurors and minstrels, Rate must have been a minstrel who, from his unique position of traversing cultural barriers was able to point up the flaws in any level of society, including the Church and the Law (1976:257):

All in all, these stanzas have the air of being more popular in construction, and following as they do four stanzas marked by their inferior readings, they suggest that Lydgate's poem has proved attractive to the sort of popular entertainer who, it was surmised above, compiled the collection in Ashmole; he has reproduced the first part imperfectly and added work of his own, with some shrewdness turning the laugh in his last extra lines against his own class.

But if the background of the scribe is deduced from the material alone, Rate could equally well have been a cleric or a burgess, as both professions are denounced in the unique lines and we cannot argue that either were incapable of seeing society as a whole.

There are a number of additions which may be attributable to Rate on the grounds of inferior literary quality, especially when this is combined with a domestic bias, as in Eustace (1). Lines 259-60 are changed apparently to accommodate an insertion of seven lines; "nedes" is thereby forced to rhyme with the unstressed syllable of "knyghtes", an acceptable but clumsy practice. The added lines 260b-c show Eustace taking leave "At man & wyfe & gentylles alle" *86, while line

85 See section 2.7, Orality, and chapter 4 sections 6 and 15.
260d suggests that "bei wer loth to departe", which conflicts somewhat with the anxiety of the knights to restore Eustace to the Emperor and discharge their task. Lines 260e-g form the first half of a new stanza, but line 260g is in fact a repetition of 260a and has no place as a separate line. The next lines 261-4 converge once more with Digby 26(f). The extra lines soften the abrupt transition from the cornfields to the Emperor's court, as it appears in D, though they actually add little to the plot. The clumsy handling of fitting in the extra text suggests that Rate was adding lines of his own to give a greater human interest to the story. However, the fact that a number of apparent additions to the Ashmole texts have been identified as conflations from other texts *87 demonstrates that it is wise to be cautious in attributing any great degree of composition to the scribe, but right to be bold in highlighting his practice as an editor.

Where certain additions directly contradict lines from the copy-text which he also includes, then the addition may be cited as another example of his practice of re-working in situ, or for assimilating changes thoughtlessly. For example, in Passion, the added lines 1978a-d uniquely state that Christ's first appearance was to Joseph of Arimathia in prison (1978a), his second was to his mother (1978c), and the third to Mary Magdalene (1980), whereas in Resurrection (36) he shows himself first to Mary Magdalene (335) and asks her to tell his mother for him that he is risen (344). Then in lines 1982 and 1985 of Passion, he asks Mary Magdalene to tell his mother of his Resurrection, which shows that Rate was following his exemplar again, thus contradicting the fact that in the added line 1978c he had 86 Compare the alteration in Orfeo (39) line 492.

87 See section 2.2.e, Textual Correlations, and the discussion of item 14 in chapter 4 section 6.
already visited her.

Kari Sajavaara identifies certain interpolations in the text of *Four Daughters* (26), which he attributes to "the translator" who is not regarded as very proficient (1967:406). Lines 90-8 were inserted into the Genesis passage, in order to "draw a moral out of the creation episode", as Sajavaara remarks. The translator argues that marriage was literally made in heaven:

```
In paradys in that stounde
Ther was wedloke fy rst j fonde
ffor pat skyll every man of lyfe
Is holden to loue hys wyfe
After pat sche is worthey
That wyll god all my3hty
```

Other interpolations include lines 141-6, the translator's "personal comment on the Fall"; while in lines 175-82 the translator "has either not quite grasped the meaning of [the French text] or has not been able to render it in English". The ability to translate from both French and Latin is congruent with a clerical profession, yet we do not know whether Rate is the translator in question, or interpolating material of his own into the translation as he copies *88*. Certainly the concern with the sanctity of marriage and the worthiness of deserving wives is reflected elsewhere in Ashmole 61, and it is not impossible to perceive the hand of Rate at work, at least in re-shaping his copy-text. But caution is advisable, and where there are many witnesses to a text it is fairly evident that Rate is essentially a copyist and not a composer. The extent of the editing, however, shows that whether a professional or amateur scribe he adopts

---

88 Rate miscopies Latin as easily as he does English (see the transcription of *Psalms*), which does not help us to determine his familiarity with the language. It might be thought that if he was uncertain of the language he would copy it more slavishly, but with such a careless copyist this logic need not apply.
a flexible approach to his copy-text, to the extent that not even the proper narrative sequence is respected.

2.3.c Narrative Sequence

The versification is most badly disrupted when the narrative sequence is disturbed by the assimilation of unmarked errors, such as the displacement of passages, as in Pilgrimage (34) and Resurrection (36). After line 735 in Pilgrimage Rate skipped the next 72 lines and copied the end passage (lines 808-27), and the concluding prayer (828-39). Realizing his omission, he copied the missing portion (736-807) after the end of the poem, unmarked, adding his own stanza of closing prayer (840-9). Eye-skip is responsible for a serious dislocation in the Resurrection story, where a break in copying is indicated by the change in ink. When Rate re-started he eye-skipped from 'raphaelle' in line 214 back to 'raphaelle' in line 184, and re-copied the whole passage apparently without noticing. This error is useful, as it shows that in this text at least he was using a written source, from which he varies orthographically while retaining the substance.

Another serious confusion occurs when Rate attempts to heighten the drama and suspense in a tale, but in doing so disrupts the narrative sequence and muddles the climaxes. This happens particularly when he anticipates the outcome of an event and brings it forward, to the detriment of both narrative and versification, as in Libeus (20) lines 1722-4, in which the identity of the criminals holding the Lady of Sinadoun is revealed 30 lines earlier than in the Lambeth text. This feature was first highlighted by Rosemary Ginn, who cites three passages of muddled climaxes in Eustace (1), Cleges (24) and Orfeo (39) (1967:72, 77-9). In line 161 in the Ashmole text of Eustace, the
narrator states that both children have been stolen, even though in the preceding lines (154-9) only one child is snatched away by the lion. The following stanza in Digby 86 (D) (163-8), which recounts the abduction of the second child by the wolf, is omitted in A. This is possibly the result of eye-skip, since the first line of both the missing stanza and the one following is the same in D:

163 po he hof swoning aros
169 po he of swoning aros

but the fact that Rate appears to anticipate his error, and changes lines 160-2 to give the vital information that both children had gone, shows that he has rather anticipated the climax of the narrative and spoiled it. This suggests that Rate is impatient with the repetition-with-variation style of narrative and in attempting to abbreviate fails to make sense of the narrative sequence. In the recognition scenes both in Cleges (lines 484-500) and in Orfeo (Ashmole lines 550-65) the hero’s identity is revealed too soon *89.

In the Auchinleck copy of Orfeo the king reveals his identity to the Steward through a series of hypothetical statements, during which it gradually dawns on the Steward and the court that they are a factual account of Orfeo’s adventures. In the Harley version this hypothetical passage is completely dropped: "To hym he seyde wyth out lesyng / Syr he seyde Y am Orpheo pe kyng" (lines 494-5). Ginn does not take the Ashmole passage quite far enough, quoting only lines 550-3 (1967:79), which gives the misleading impression that the passage was also cut by Rate. But the passage has simply been turned into a series of facts by expediently changing the subjunctive mood to the indicative:

89 The passage in Cleges is discussed in detail by Ginn 1971:72-3. Similarly Trounce, describing Ashmole as "a minstrel copy", notes how Rate’s version "improvises and bungles" the scene (1933:189-98).
It appears that as Rate began copying the rhetorical list, he decided to make the change of mood and started again, reiterating line 550 at 552 and adding line 553 which openly reveals Orfeo’s identity. The Auchinleck text never actually states that the ‘minstrel’ is in fact Orfeo, but Rate avoids such rhetorical subtlety and adopts a no-nonsense approach, just as he does in the recognition scene in Cleges.

Lines 233-42 of Saints (25) show Rate about to anticipate the end of the story, in a passage where the monk’s soul is shown a vision of the Court of Heaven. His guiding Angel interprets the allegory which explains the reasons for instituting All Saints’ Day. At lines 233-8 Rate begins to write that the Angel instructs the soul to report the vision to the people, thereby almost omitting the whole of the passage on hell, heaven and purgatory, the allegory of the Beggars at the Feast and the explanation for founding the feast of All Souls’ Day. He catches himself in time, and clumsily makes good the error (lines 239-242):
And tell pe pepull to & fro
what þu hast herd & sen also
Bot 3it or þu deperte fro me
Mo[re] meruellus þu schall se
To a place of merellyng
The angell dyde þe soule bryng

The passage that was almost brought forward is re-worked in its proper place at lines 403-420, with the Monk's soul charged to tell his vision to the Pope himself. Similarly in Ypotis (27) a couplet commenting on the lecher's foolish enjoyment of his wicked life (423-4) is misplaced after 380, anticipated from 42 lines further on, as if Rate was anxious to make the moral point of the passage as soon as possible. There are other examples of anticipation that do not disrupt the narrative flow but suggest a certain reversal of priorities, in which underlining the spiritual significance of the scene is more important than preserving the narrative sequence, as in Passion (28) lines 329-50, where the feet-washing scene is brought forward to emphasise Christ's humility, and is more detailed in Rate's version with additional lines.

Another form of anticipation occurs when Rate appears to read ahead in his exemplar probably quite quickly, and picks up readings from subsequent lines, as in Wise Man (3) line 28, where "send" is picked up from the next line. Similarly in line 121, the rhyme should read "I the pray", as in Ff.2.38, but Ashmole repeats "be no weye" which appears in line 123. In Passion (28), line 1232 reads "do þe to deth" for "saue þi lyf": an eye-skip error from 1233, "Or I may do þe to þe dede", which makes nonsense out of the line *90. A slower and more careful copyist is more likely to repeat from preceding lines.

90 See also the transcription of Carpenter's Tools (16), notes to line 4, and to line 1495 in Passion (28).
Displacement of lines frequently occurs *91, as in Wise Man (3): the last line is misplaced and should occur after line 12, which ought to read "ffayre of body and of vysage". Rate evidently believed he was copying the fifth line of the stanza ("Gentyll of kynde and of corage"), and only discovered his mistake at the end of the stanza. He then simply added the missing line there with no indicating mark.

When Rate omitted line 21 in Lost Soul (35a), he was then forced to insert a repetition of line 14 after line 24 to make up the deficiency, although the rhyme-sequence is then impure *92.

A number of contractions occur, as in Ypotis (27) where the repetitious lines 645-7 are contracted into one line to tighten the narrative. In Orfeo (39) the passage on Orfeo’s lineage is treated differently in each version, according to the importance each scribe places on it: the Harley scribe valued it more and brings it forward before the lines on his harping skill; in Auchinleck it occurs after them, while in Ashmole it is contracted to the single line: "he was for soth a nobull kyng" (27), followed by the unexpurgated lines on harping. Some words are also contracted through haste, as in Tolouse (19) line 748, "Thild" = Th[e ch]ild, and Margaret (37) line 41, "sche hyr" contracted to "scher".

---

*91 Out of many examples see Conscience (33), lines 229-30 displaced after 231-2, 257-60 after 264, 669-70 after 672; in Squire (35b) line 60 is misplaced after line 57.

*92 For displacement of short units of text by reversal of phrases see section 2.2.d, Memorial Transmission.
2.3.d  Rhyme Sequence

Some contractions disturb the rhyme sequence, as in *Libeus* (20) where Rate contracts lines 1101-2 and has to fashion a rhyming line, which he does by first repeating the rhyme and then expunging and correcting it to "lyste" (:beste); similarly lines 1300-1 are contracted to one, unremarked, and without supplying a new line. In *Margaret* (37) lines 107-8 are contracted by eyeskip or memorial error. The beginning of 108 was copied as the end of 107; thus causing the line to rhyme with the previous couplet. Line 108 was then fabricated out of line 107 in the exemplar, forcing a bad rhyme in line 109 by word reversal, and dropping line 109a of the Brome text.

Rate shows some reluctance to preserve the stanza forms in his copy-texts. He appears to have had some dislike for long stanzas, as when he changes the seven-line stanzas of *Good Wife* (4) to couplets and of *Stans Puer* to quatrains, while in *Isumbras* (5) and *Tolouse* (19), the tail-rhymes in the first part of the texts are adjusted to make six-line stanzas instead of the usual twelve-line. He does not keep up this practice through the whole text, just as some changes to the rhymes are not carried through the whole stanza, as in *Psalms* (32), stanzas 53 (lines 417-24), 56 (441-8), 61 (481-8), and elsewhere; stanza 65 is disrupted by putting "sacrifyce" as the rhyme, perhaps by eye-skipping forward to line 521. By repeating the rhyme "sacrifyse-seruyce" three times (513/15, 521/525, 537/539), the adapted lines are weakened *93.

---

93 Valerie Edden takes the opposite view that "Add and Ash (which have alpha here) emend to improve the rhyme-scheme" (1990:114).
Similarly in *Eustace* (1) line 309, which reads "And ruddy of all hew" for Digby "And hadden riche I won", despite the tail-rhyme at 312, "In halle & boure of stone". He may have initiated a change to alter the tail-line, picking up the theme of fidelity mentioned in line 178, with the same rhymes "hew : trew", and then simply forgot his intention and copied the exemplar, as he did in *Tolouse* (19): the rhyme in line 9 is changed from "led" to "lond", and line 12 adjusted to read "I pray 3ow vnderstond". However, "vnderstond" is then followed by "take gode he[de]" expunged, which suggests that Rate himself had adjusted the rhyme to fit his previous re-writing of line 9, but then absent-mindedly wrote the line from his exemplar as well, which he then marked for deletion. Rhymes are also frequently changed to accommodate the simplifying of hard readings, as the next section discusses.

2.3. e **Diction**

As might be expected in a late fifteenth-century manuscript, the most common alteration to the actual wording of the texts arises from Rate's practice of substituting a simpler or more familiar word for certain readings in the exemplar; among many examples are several in *Forgiving Knight* (18), such as "veraly" for "no ferly" in line 67 (which has an added gloss "wndur" written above in the Bodley and Harley versions); line 98 reads "sprong wele wyde" for "sone oueral was kyd"; while the last word in line 105 is simplified from "dygne" to "ry3ht wele", and consequently the rhyme in line 106 is altered from "sygne" to "merakell". In *Conscience* (33) line 28 reads "is redy" for "ese ay slye"; 93 "quenchyd" for "slekyd"; 352 "foule lothsom" for "caytif wlatsom"; and 373 "donge hyll of pi body" for "myddyng of vylany". Hargreaves notes that in line 47 of *Ram's Horn*
Lydgate’s favourite word, "tarage (of sharpenes)", is replaced by "talent (to schrewdnes)" (1976:258). In Dietary (31) line 54 the hard reading "dronkelew" has been dropped, and in line 53 "portresse" has been replaced by the conventional phrase "as I gesse", which is also used as a variant in Ram’s Horn (2) lines 48b and 55.

Sometimes it is possible to follow Rate’s thought processes, as in Psalms: he copies the beginning of line 154, balks at "enuyrownde", which he omits, substituting "myn enmys", and then to fit the sense he alters "hath" to "hatyth" by superscripting "-ty". At other times his mentality is quite obscure; there is no obvious reason for altering line 437 which reads "Thrall is fre as þu knawyst it" for "Thral ys free & knaue is kny3t"; in doing so he has ruined the paradoxical metaphor of the presumed original. It is hard to tell whether he is making sense of a corruption in his own copy, or corrupting by simplifying, or perhaps mis-reading "knawe" for "knaue".

Some words are consistently replaced, as in Tolouse (19) where "trowyd" is substituted for "hopyd" and "comandment" for "couenaunt" throughout the text; similarly "loos" (=fame) replaced in lines 792 and 796 by "name" and "worschipe" respectively, and also in Libeus (20) line 716; "awede" (to go mad), Libeus lines 415, 648 and 986; throughout Passion (28) the word "conteke" is replaced with "counsell", and with "cotell" in lines 870 and 1512, but as the word is allowed to stand in Forgiving Knight (18) line 2, and Four Daughters (26) lines 429 and 439, the substitutions in Passion probably occurred in the exemplar. Certain substitutions alter the exact meaning of the original, as in Tolouse line 820, where he was apparently unfamiliar with "somers" (=packhorses) and puts "cartes" instead; in Orfeo (39) line 230 he puts "staff" for "sclauin" (a
pilgrim's mantle), but both are symbols of pilgrimage.

With only two witnesses to a text, as in Cleges (24), some of the variants can be interpreted either as substitutions of more distinctive vocabulary for commonplace readings in one manuscript, or as simplifications of hard readings in the other. For example, line 19 in the Ashmole text reads "tenantes" for "pore pepull" in the Edinburgh version (E): either the substitution was made by Rate, presenting himself as a conscientious landholder, or it was a simplification in E to avoid the hard rhyme "rehete". One interpretation relies on changes in the text bearing personal significance, the other (as Ginn notes) relies on the common practice of replacing a hard reading with a simpler. Ginn identifies one change which might be regarded as a personal variant: line 32 reads "to pore man and to frere" for "pore pepull": the alteration shows how both husband and wife performed acts of charity. Either "frere" is a simple rhyme-forced addition, or it indicates the generosity perhaps of Rate and his wife in granting hospitality to travellers and friars, from whom he may have acquired some of his material; or even that he was a dependent mendicant himself, and that this is a subtle hint to his benefactors *94.

Generally the reason for the substitutions is clear *95, for example to avoid technical terms such as "crowthe", "arsoun" and "styropis", as in Libeus (20) in lines 147, 341-4 (at the expense of the rhyme), and 495, where they are replaced by commonplace readings *96; or where

94 While it is always a safer course to opt for the most obvious interpretation (the exigencies of versification), in Rate's case it is beneficial to keep a mind open to the personal interpretation of his variants, as for example, the substitution of "thre loxus of gold" for "thre lys of gold" in Libeus (20) line 1601; see the detailed comment on this change in section 2.6, Other Substantive Variants.
specific topographical details are deliberately edited out, as in Libeus (20) line 1040 ("be vayle" for "Wyralle"), and Isumbras (5) 200 ("grete" sea for "greckes" sea), while the reading "In Acris gun pay lende" (516) is replaced with "As godys wyll it was"; similarly in 517 "Acris" is changed to "hethynes". In Eustace (1) lines 109-14 are omitted for reasons that are not altogether clear; it is apparently again to avoid specifying location, as the stanza in Digby begins "Toward Egipte hy gunnen fare", but as the rest of the stanza is one of the most pietistic, showing the hero lamenting the Wounds of Christ, one would have expected Rate to substitute a general reading rather than omitting the entire stanza.

Pronouns cause him much confusion throughout the texts. He puts the wrong gender, or the plural for singular and vice-versa, and there is widespread omission of pronouns altogether *97. A number of disruptions to the narrative arise from this confusion, especially in Forgiving Knight (18): lines 27-8 read "Barefote to pe chyrch he 3ede / To aske mercy fore his mysdede", mistaking "he" and "his" for "they" and "their" *98; the knight is watching people entering church on Good Friday, from his besieged position inside the castle. This error

95 However, Rate's choice of wording is sometimes unusual, although it may have been taken over from the exemplar; as in Libeus, lines 1057 ("kempys" = champions, for "knyghtis") and 1357 ("Rode in peir curryculys" for "Laynen in her toures"). In lines 192 and 218 in Margaret (37) "sergeantes" is substituted for "servanttys". On the phrases "fusty bandias" and "stryke pantner" in Edward (41), see chapter 4 section 41.

96 Or by more familiar readings, for example using "swerd" or "swerd broune" for "fawchon"; as in Libeus line 2005 which reads "hys scheld wyth hys swerd browne" for "Hys shilde with his fawchon", echoing Tolouse line 69, "wyth sperys & swerdys browne"; "swerd" replaces "fawchon" also in lines 361, 431, and "suerd broun" is given in lines 394 and 656.

97 The scribe of St John's College Camb.MS B.6 displays the same type of confusion (Pickering, 1984:55).
leads to another in line 33; under the impression that the knight is already barefoot Rate writes "He drew on his hose & schone" instead of "drew off", as in the narrative the knight is preparing to go barefoot out of the castle and risk being killed by his enemy.

In other cases pronouns are frequently replaced with proper nouns, as in Passion (28) lines 742 ("Ihesu" and "Peter" for "he"), 1041 ("Ihesu & pylate" for "pey two"), 1048 ("Pylate" for "pat man"); or with more specific vocabulary, as in Squire (35b) line-192 ("hell" for "pat place"), probably as much for Rate’s own benefit as that of his audience. Yet sometimes the proper nouns themselves are confused, as in Isumbras lines 430, 451 and 726, where "knyght" and "kyng" are interchanged; while Tolouse line 1129 reads "erle" for "emperour". In view of this, several agreements in Libeus between the Percy and Ashmole texts against the rest may be said to have originated with Rate, as in line 785 in which A P read "kyng arthours" armour for "Erl Antores" armour (C 768).

The examples of disruption to the versification given above illustrate the kind of inexpert adaptation by which Rate earned for himself the reputation of a bad scribe among the early editors (see Incipit). But more recent scholars have noticed that many of the errors and variants arise from an active desire to re-shape his texts for some specific purpose, which the third part of this chapter now discusses.

98 The same confusion occurs in lines 111-13, and in reverse in lines 46-9 and 68-9. See also Libeus (20) 281, 1073; Ypotis (27) 415-17, and Passion (28) 725, 936.
Section 3: The Scribe as Editor

The purpose of the scribe in compiling the manuscript can be determined by examining the editing of the texts. The presence of romances in this 'holster-book', together with their free-handed copying, and the oral content of many of the poems, led to the assumption that the volume was a minstrel manuscript, as Hargreaves suggests (1976:256). Hargreaves does not discuss all the items in the manuscript, merely quoting Isumbras (5) and Libeus (20) as examples of the romances included, Eustace (1) and Jealous Wife (22) as verse legends, the courtesy book Wise Man (3) and the satire Carpenter's Tools (16) as "other poems", and designates the whole collection as "very probably the repertoire of a professional entertainer". He evidently includes Ram's Horn in such a repertoire, but sheds no light on the long religious narratives in the later part of the manuscript. The alterations throughout the texts indicate that Rate was no passive collector and transmitter of recital texts; the religious pointing and moral didacticism with which the scribe re-shapes them indicates a more personal involvement which would not seem to be in keeping with the aims of a disour (professional verse-reciter). John Hirsh examines three manuscripts, Ashmole 61, Douce 228 and Lincoln's Inn 150 which "are often cited as having belonged to minstrels" (1977:347). While this may be true of the latter two manuscripts, which contain only romances *99, in Ashmole 61 the romances are juxtaposed with a greater proportion of religious and instructive verse, from a variety of sources, while most of the references to minstrels in the texts appear to be indigenous to the material and bear no significance for the scribe.

*99 Except that Lincoln's Inn 150 also contains a copy of Piers Plowman.
To date the most valid assessment of the nature and purpose of the manuscript has been offered by Rosemary Ginn in her as yet unpublished edition of Cleges; the present study is much indebted to her work. She argues convincingly (1967:82-5):

The manuscript is not simply a commonplace book full of random jottings and chance entries, the choice of a capricious taste. It is an anthology of domestitia, texts dealing with family life and family relationships ... with all aspects, normal and abnormal, pleasant and unpleasant, of relationships within the family ... the emphasis is on middle-class domesticity, manners and morals, on the joys and perils of marriage and ownership of property, on the instruction and education of children, and, above all, on the godly life, with a warning against [worldly] 'vanyte', and with a leavening of Romance, slanted also to the domestic bias.

The textual analysis in the previous section shows that from the patterns of addition, omission and alteration Rate was no slave to his copy-text, but undertook purposeful adaptation of his material. The nature of his variants suggests that the devotional content of the manuscript was of greater importance to him than its entertainment value. The patterns of adaptation show the scribal editing to be slanted towards a family preaching context.

2.4 Religious bias

Rosemary Ginn demonstrates the family bias of some of Rate's texts and variants (1967:69-78) *100, and I need not belabour the point. But many of her cited passages also bear a devotional interpretation, which she notes but is not concerned to explore in detail. As this religious bias of Ashmole 61 has largely been overlooked, I would like to extend the family readership theory *101 to a consideration of the

*100 See section 2.5, Family Bias.

texts used in family "preaching", not in the professional sense of having been licensed to preach, as for instance the texts in John of Grimestone's *Preaching Book* were used (Wilson, 1973); neither do they form the professional library of an ecclesiastic, such as CUL Ff.5.48 but in the amateur context of family worship and the instruction of children.

Ginn notes a significant variant in Rate's text of *Cleges* (24) lines 166-8, whereby the entire family goes to church, retiring to bed after "euensong" (line 161) rather than after "soper" (1967:70-1). Family piety and unity are in the forefront of Rate's work, as in the family reunions which occur at the end of *Cleges* and *Eustace*. In *Cleges* the penultimate stanza unique to A (lines 557-9) shows the "pride of place" accorded to God within the family, since Clarys's immediate reaction to Cleges's safe return (and that of their good fortune) is: "She thankyd god verament / Sche thankyd god of all maner". Since "maner" is a repetition of a previous rhyme, the repetition with variation pattern of the lines (possibly due to eye-skip made good), together with the commonplace nature of the variant and the religious emphasis, suggest that at least this stanza out of the three concluding stanzas lost from the Edinburgh manuscript might be attributable to Rate.

102 Edited by Downing, who observes that "In general, Pilkington's MS suggests that he was a cleric and that Ff.5.48 was his commonplace book, one used for both professional needs and personal likes" (1969:xxxi). Ashmole 61 shares six texts with CUL Ff.5.48 (items 15, 23, 28, 30, 35, 38), and six with CUL Ff.2.38 (items 3, 19, 30, 33, 35, 38); according to Downing none of the manuscripts appears to have been copied from each other, but there is evidence for a common exemplar (1969:xxxi-ii, xxxv-vii). Considering that Ashmole and Ff.2.38 are both localized in Leicestershire, we may posit the existence of a book-shop or loan copies circulating in the East Midlands region. According to Downing, CUL Ff.5.48 is located in the West Midlands, possibly Lancashire (1969:xxxi).
The reunion of the family in *Eustace* is the most dramatic point of the story, and is not fully explored by the weaker rendition in D. The changed text in A exploits both the emotional and the religious potential of this meeting:

A

And when pat þei ther sones 395 þei thankyd god in trinitye 396 And also suet seynt palle
se

D

Men beden hem sitten and drinken 395 Wip coupe and eke wip maselin 396 And maden hem chere fayre

396a The two kny3tes per fader knew b And some one kneys sone þei flewe c And thankyd god all myght d ffor joye þat they to geder were mette e All fowre full faste þei dyd wepe f And so dyde many a wyght

Line 393 in D ("Welcomed by weren fayre") is changed in A to rhyme with the new line 396 ("And come into þe halle"), while lines 394-6 directly recount the reunion of parents with sons, and their immediate thanksgiving to the Trinity and St Paul; D merely describes the alcoholic celebration. The extra stanza (lines 396a-f) evokes the intense emotions of the reunion, just as in the extra stanzas at lines 126a-1, recounting their separation (also missing from D; in this respect A is the more balanced version of the tale). The vivid use of "flewe" at line 396b shows again the immediacy of their response to God, although the repetition of "sone" is clumsy. The added lines 402a-c show the emotional reversal from thankful tears to joyous celebration, picking up the wine scene from D.

Many of the alterations serve to intensify the religious experience of the scene #103, as in *Eustace* (1). Following line 60 A has two extra

103 The minor religious variants are too numerous to list, and only the most interesting are selected here. Very rarely a secular for a pietistic reading is given, as in *Squire* (35b) line 122, and *Margaret* (37) line 16, and these may have occurred in previous redactions.
stanzas, lines 60a-1. The four stanzas thus juxtaposed (encompassing lines 60a-1, 61-72) give a more dramatic and effective account of the Saint's conversion. The use of direct speech involves the audience more effectively with the characters. This structural alteration combined with the marital emphasis (the wife's instant support of her husband) and the intense religious experience is typical of Rate's practice throughout the manuscript, and suggests that these stanzas may be attributed to him.

The unique alteration in 409-14 shows their obedience to God's will even to death. The text in D explains how the Emperor attempts to kill them with wild beasts, but the animals were "glade and milde" with them, recalling the Androcles legend. The stanza in A simply states that Eustace's family piously submits to any death that the Emperor - or God - might have in mind for them; the ambiguity in this last line is interesting. The added lines 402d-f reiterate the conversion of the family to Christianity, which provides the narrative fulcrum for the martyrdom which follows. Without these lines, the account of their christening in line 405 loses its impact, for in D the effect upon the Emperor of the news of their conversion has to be understood, whereas it is much clearer in A. These extra lines reflect the alteration of lines 88-90, whereby their conversion is described as a challenge to the devil, just as it here challenges the omnipotence of the Emperor.

There are several variants emphasising God's will as the moving force behind the action, as in Orfeo (39) added lines 464-5, which state that the hero and his wife were released from the Fairy King's palace by God's grace, rather than by any leniency of the King or cunning of Orfeo *104. In Isumbras (5) lines 116-20 are altered to show the
hero's resolve to undergo 'irksome' penitential begging, commending them into God's hands to put them to good use; this contrasts with the cognate reading which shows Isumbras simply lamenting his lack of largesse. Other variants intensify the penitential element of the stories, as in Ypotis (27) line 228 which reads "And sofer penans and penans wyrch" for "And opur penaunce for to wyrche"; similarly he changes the rhymes in lines 289-90 to intensify the emotional force of Adam's repentance, putting "ansuerd wyth wo anon" for "ansuerd a3eyn with mouth", and in line 295 Adam answers "wyth wykyd wyll", showing by a heightened sense of sin how he had fallen into temptation. In line 494 the sinner who refuses to believe in the Incarnation will go to hell "Body and saule" rather than just "wyth oute ende", a more complete punishment.

The foulness of sin is stressed prolifically in the Ashmole texts, especially lechery *105, as in the rewording of lines 617-22 in Conscience (33), and the bowdlerisation of a stanza after line 162 in Incestuous Daughter (23), in which the fallen woman gave her life to lechery, hoping to win hell rather than heaven. The alteration in Squire (35b) line 8 emphasises that adultery is a greater sin even than lechery because in breaking the marriage vow it trangresses the law of God *106.

104 See also Isumbras (5) 360a-c and 552a-c, additions which show the hero submitting to divine guidance; Cleges (24) 418-20 (omitted in E); and Conscience (33) 400, 472.

105 See Commandments (6), Corneus (21), Ypotis (27), Psalms (32), Lost Soul (35a), and Wounds (38).

106 See Four Daughters (26) 93-8 noted above, and section 2.5, Family Bias.
2.4. a The Passion

The nature of the religious awareness throughout Rate's manuscript is the typical late fifteenth-century pattern of "affective piety" *107, with its special focus on the Passion of Christ. For instance, out of the many versions of the Seven Deadly Sins, Rate chooses the type Wounds of Christ as Remedies, and out of the many Planctus Mariae, Rate chooses the emotive version "For now lies dead my der son dere", which begins with three additional stanzas present only in Ashmole and the later Rawlinson MS *108. The stanzas evoke an image of the Pietà in a church, which could have been inspired by an actual statue, wall-painting, stained glass, or the illustration in a primer *109. Pamela De Wit notes that "there are textual inconsistencies in these extra stanzas, which suggest that they were not a part of the poem as it was originally composed" (1977:128-31). It is not inconceivable that Rate composed or inserted these prefacing stanzas. It is known that a movingly realistic crucifix, "petowsly poyntyd & lamentabyl to be-heldyn" (Meech and Allen, 1940:111), was present in one of the Leicester churches at the time of Margery Kempe's visit there, for she caused a disturbance by her excessive reaction to its emotional appeal *110.


108 See chapter 4 section 30, Affiliation. Of course, "choose" is an equivocal term, since any choice is necessarily governed by the availability of exemplars. On the Pietà as literary inspiration, see Brewer 1983:46.


110 Margery visited Leicester in 1421, the same year as James I of Scotland (Kelly 1884:208-9), but six years before David Rate became his Confessor (see chapter 3 section 3.4).
The focus on Christ's Passion in Ashmole 61 is further discussed in chapter 3 sections 3.1 and 3.2 below. Allusions to the Passion and Wounds of Christ in varying degrees of importance are found in these texts: Eustace (1), Isumbras (5), Stans Puer (7), Dame Curtasy (8), Forgiving Knight (18), Tolouse (19), Libeus (20), Ypotis (27), Passion (28), Charter (29), Lament (30), Psalms (32), Conscience (33), Pilgrimage (34), Resurrection (36), Margaret (37); Wounds (38), and in some unique variants *111. Occasionally passages connected with the Wounds are marked by Rate's special Nota-mark, as in Conscience (33) line 449 (f.124v), where it appears beside the number of Christ's Wounds (not marked in any other version). This mark first appears beside line 109 (f.63r) of Jealous Wife (22) (reference to the devil *112); it takes the form of a quartered square with triangles marking the tops of the intersections. From examples on seals and religious tokens I interpret this as a cue for the reader (and audience) to make the sign of the cross *113. It also occurs on f.65r of Jealous Wife beside line 289 (reference to the fiends of hell); on f.79r of Four Daughters (26) line 43 (marking the sun and moon passage of the Creation), and on f.125r of Conscience line 505 (disobedience to God) *114.

*111 Such as in Passion (28) 174; Psalms (32) 405, 503-4, 511. There are substitutions of phrases invoking the Passion for less pietistic readings, as in Tolouse (19), lines 1152, 1188 (and elsewhere), which read "By hym pat dyed on tre" for "Be god that owyth this day".

*112 Elsewhere lines containing oaths invoking the devil are omitted altogether, as in Libeus 209-10, 212-13, or replaced with a different line as in Cleges 528.

*113 See the usual form of the mark on religious seals in Donald Hall 1965:viii, 106.

*114 Obedience appears to be a favourite theme of Rate's; compare the commentary throughout section 2.4, Religious Bias, on obedience to God's will; and the comments throughout section 2.5, Family Bias on the obedience of husband and wife, to each other and to God.
After the text of *Lament* (30), Rate draws a fish holding a rose in its mouth at the bottom of f.106v, following the lines on the scourge-marks on Christ's body. The position of the fish and flowers when drawn mid-text sometimes, but not always, coincides with references to the Passion (which, on the other hand, are not always marked pictorially). This lack of consistent correlation makes the interpretation of the sketches all the more challenging \(^{115}\). These examples, together with the textual evidence, seem to confirm that Rate accords a special reverence to the Wounds of Christ, which he promulgated in the texts he used both for entertaining and preaching.

2.4.b Preaching

The preaching function of the manuscript is strongly indicated by some of the variants, even if the texts themselves are not obviously preaching items; there are no sermons, psalters, primers, mass-books, or copies of liturgical prayers. There are unique references to the Pater Noster, Ave Maria and Creed, in *Prayer to Mary* (15) lines 53-5; Stans Puer (7) 212; *Dame Curtasy* (8) 29; *Libeus* (20) 2204d-e; and *Pilgrimage* (34) 193-4, 498-503, but in this manuscript it is taken for granted that they were already known by heart and such references serve as reminders to say the prayers: in a preaching hand-book, rather than a literary collection, the prayers are normally written in full \(^{116}\). Ogilvie-Thomson notes that the Pater Noster lines in the Prayer being unique to Ashmole 61 were probably not part of the original poem, and that the addition was a "recognized poetic formula" (1974:394). However, when comparing the contents of Pilkington's

\(^{115}\) See chapter 3 section 3.2.

\(^{116}\) See Peacock 1868, Littlehales 1895, Simmons 1889, Simmons and Nolloth 1901. As Barratt notes, they were "the three prayers most familiar to the medieval laity" (1975:271).
preaching handbook, CUL Ff.5.48 *117, the two compilations contain
similar literary texts, so that lack of items such as Mirk's
Instructions to Parish Priests (as in the Cambridge manuscript) need
not rule out the use of Ashmole 61 in a preaching context.

J.B. Allen points out that exempla stories were the preacher's mainstay
in moral education (1971:45) *118:

In this focus on morality, the preaching of the friars was
of central importance, and the use of exempla in preaching
was one of the chief ways of gaining vividness and power for
moral teaching.

This is almost certainly the use for the Ashmole texts such as
Forgiving Knight (18), Jealous Wife (22), Incestuous Daughter (23),
Lost Soul (35a) and Squire (35b); Downing suggests that these tales
and verses such as Prayer to Mary (15) and Wounds (38) would have
functioned as exempla "in a medieval sermon, just as modern preachers
occasionally quote appropriate poems from the pulpit" (1969:xxxii).

The most interesting example of a preaching variant is the addition of
lines 227-30 in Passion (28), grimly warning an unworthy person that
if he eats the Eucharist bread he is eating his own damnation. This
insertion seems more appropriate to a cleric with authority to
administer the sacrament than merely the opinion of a devout business
man.

Other minor variants include Ram's Horn (2) line 21, which reads

117 As noted above, section 2.4, Religious Bias.

118 See also Minnis 1984:264 n.82, and Owst 1966:chapter 4. Pfander
uses the rose as a metaphor for exempla stories used in preaching:
"Be the discourse short or long, the wide appeal was made by song,
poem, and story. Couched in such roses, the thorns of warning
against the World, the Flesh, and the Devil, against Doomsday and
Hellfire, did not prick so deeply" (1937:66). However, this is a
modern metaphor; to medieval preachers roses symbolised primarily
the Virgin Mary and the Wounds of Christ (see chapter 3).
"servantes" for "laborers", a substitution better suited to household preaching; the re-writing of Cleges (24) 136-8 preaches contentment with one's lot. Sometimes the lines are altered so that the narrator/reciter more directly addresses the audience who love the fickle world, as in Conscience (33) line 379, and Four Daughters (26) line 440: "My wyll it is I schall saue pe" for "And druyuen out werre nup and onde / And sauen al pe folk in londe" *119. Similarly the alteration in Squire (35b) line 6 reads "And fro hell I wyll 3ou teche" for a much vaguer expression, while stanza 6 in Vanity (40) cynically denounces the happiness of the family unit, so energetically upheld throughout the other poems. In the light of the additional material on preaching throughout the manuscript, Vanity is an interesting inclusion. It is based on the Biblical text spoken by "the Preacher" in Ecclesiastes 1:2, but is a re-working of the scriptural message rather than a direct paraphrase of the Vulgate.

There is a marked emphasis on the importance of shrift in the texts, as in Isumbras (5), lines 133-4, where Isumbras cuts a penitential cross on his breast and takes both himself and his wife to confession. This may allude to the old practice whereby pilgrims used to carve crosses into the flesh of their chests before departing for the Holy Land, until the practice was stopped; thereafter cloth or metal crosses were sewn onto their clothes instead (Hulme 1976:200; Rock 1903:II, 376). In Incestuous Daughter (23) two unique stanzas are added, stressing the importance of confession (lines 285-301) *120. Lines 283-5 are shared with Ff.5.48, but thereafter Rate adds a further fifteen lines reiterating his message that repentance, shrift and penance are available to every person committing even the greatest

119 Lines 553-4, Castle of Love, Vernon MS (Sajavaara 1967:278).
sins, even if he only repents on his last day - divine forgiveness and entry to heaven is assured him. Another unique stanza inserted after line 228 tells how "the holy man prechyd of godys lore", driving away the fiends as the prostitute is inspired by him to repent. In the unique text *Jealous Wife* (22), the importance of confession is indicated by showing how the fallen woman is claimed by the devils because her acts of murder were committed "wyth out schryft & repentans" (lines 361-6). The simple prayers, such as those at items 12 and 13 (or single verses from them), were probably taught to parishioners by the priest for reciting when they came to confession (Robbins 1942:142), while Mustanoja notes that even instructional verses such as *Good Wife* (4) were indebted to the pulpit (1948:88) *121.

Many of the endings of the Ashmole texts are effectively concluding prayers directing the audience's imagination towards heaven *122, as in the slightly altered ending of *Orfeo* (39). Auchinleck has a straight-forward romance ending, that the audience should fare as happily as the hero. Harley has a rather more pious wish that the audience will have a place in heaven. Ashmole (B) extends this idea:

---

120 See Peter Whiteford (1984:456-7) for commentary on some English verses in Latin exempla, the third story of which resembles *Incestuous Daughter* in theme; the correlation between roses and salvation inherent to these verses adds another dimension to the symbolism of Rate's flower drawings in the manuscript. See also Herrtage, EETS ES 33, 1879:390-2, for an Early English analogue of the text printed from the *Gesta Romanorum*, no.LXXII, "Of a Repentant Harlot".

121 According to Owst many types of texts, from Piers Plowman to the *Prick of Conscience*, passed from the pulpit "into the religious handbook of the home" (1926:279).

& all pat have herde his talkynge
In heuen blys be his wonyng
Amen Amen for charyte
Lord vs graunt pat it so be

And all pat bys wyll here or rede
God forgyff þem þer mysdede
To þe blysse of heuyn þat þei
may com
And euer more þer in to wone
And þat it may so be
Prey we all for charyte

The extra material in B suggests that both those reading aloud, or those hearing the romance read aloud, will have God's forgiveness, and may be attributed to Rate since the endings of other texts are similarly re-worked *123.

Certain texts and variants point up the pain of hell, as in Conscience (33), passim, especially lines 93-104, where the stanza on the intense heat of hell fire is marked by the word "Nota" written in the margin beside line 100. Line 92 reads "And þat peyn schall neuer abate" for "And defaute of alle gode als clerkes wate": a more dramatic reading stressing the pain of hell rather than merely the lack of pleasure. Many preaching texts are intended to frighten the listeners away from hell and towards heaven *124; in line 138 of Conscience it is specifically "Clerkes" in Rate’s version, rather than "men", who say that the pain of hell is a hundred times worse than on earth. In Squire (35b) the son, who is a good priest, visits his father suffering in hell, and is charged to preach his story to everyone as a warning against wedlock-breaking and the torments of hell (lines 137-40).


124 See the descriptions of grisly fiends in items 22, 27, and 35a-b; lines 155-6 are altered in Wise Man with a much stronger exhortation to resist the devil's wiles and avoid the pain of hell.
The Latin proverbs (9, 11ab) added later are also altered to fit in with the devotional bias of the manuscript. Although the seven lines of the Latin tags are too brief to be of much value, there is an interesting change in the last line of item 11b: "Infelix qui sancta docet si viuat inique (Unfortunate is he who teaches sacred things if he lives unjustly)"; the original line, according to Walther 31559, reads "recta (good things)" for "sancta" *125. Even in an amateur capacity Rate certainly qualifies as someone who 'teaches sacred things', while it is Dr Pritchard's opinion that the inclusion of the lines is more indicative of a cleric than a merchant, which would certainly fit the preaching motifs described above. Yet a well-to-do merchant or merchant's son would probably be educated well enough to cope with the low-level Latin in Ashmole 61, mainly headings (in items 26, 29, 33), Psalm verses (32) and these proverbial sayings. On the other hand, the presence of two heavily abbreviated theological references and comment in Latin written mid-text in Conscience (33) below lines 736, 744 and 760 in the course of copying *126, would appear to be more in keeping with the idea of the scribe as a household chaplain. Yet it is clear that the manuscript is primarily a literary collection, used also in devotional contexts, as indicated by the presence of literary versions of such liturgical texts as the Commandments (6), Levation Prayer (17), Penitential Psalms (32), Wounds (38), and the two "childlike prayers" at items 12 and 13; and by the absence of such preaching-manual items as the Pater Noster, Creed, Ave, and Mass Book. The fact that it is possible to argue first for one case and then the other shows that the problem cannot

125 See Telfryn Pritchard's commentary on these Latin lines in chapter 4 section 9.

126 See plate 5 and chapter 4 section 33, Affiliation.
easily be solved by the internal evidence alone; even the level of moral pointing in the texts might equally have been made by an ascetic head of the household.

2.4.c Moral Concern

Providing a moral framework for the texts is mainly achieved by minor local re-working, for instance by expedient omission: in Tolouse lines 34-6 are omitted, which show the Earl in an evil mood, similarly 1174-6, in which the Emperor extravagantly declares that he will befriend the Earl even if he had slain all his family; such omissions suggest that Rate clearly disapproves of murder, as does his inclusion of the exemplar stories *127. In Orfeo lines 367-78 are omitted from the Ashmole version alone. This passage describes the shining light of the palace in terms similar to the scriptural account of the New Jerusalem in Revelation 21; perhaps Rate thought it inappropriate to compare a pagan King's palace with the Court of Heaven *128.

Some of the more 'sensational' passages are bowdlerised, such as Tolouse lines 706-8. In the other versions (represented by CUL Ff.2.38) the wicked knights threaten to rape the Empress, whereas in Rate's version they simply threaten to kill her, thus avoiding the sexual element of the scene:

*127 See section 2.4.b, Preaching. Other minor substitutions which highlight the moral stance of the scribe include Tolouse lines 1108, 1112, and 1139.

They daunsed and revelyd os pey no3t dredded
To brynge the lady to hur bedde
There foule muste them falle

The tail-line 708 is altered so that the scribe (as narrator) curses the evil-doers. A similar principle is at work in Libeus, in the omission of lines 1776-8 (the evil knights’ torment of the Lady of Sinadoun), similarly 1788-90 (sexual threat) and 1794-6 (violence). Violence in the texts is somewhat mitigated, as in Libeus where lines 1683-8 may have been consciously dropped in order to condemn by omission the public enjoyment of blood sports. Yet since most of the gorier details in the story are faithfully reproduced this toning down can hardly be deliberate bowdlerisation, although Rate’s lack of any consistent policy makes all such assumptions difficult.129

Many specific examples of moral pointing overlap to a large extent with the religious variants; for instance, in Eustace (1) lines 322-4 are re-written to stress the immorality of the captain’s action:

This is reinforced by the alteration of line 384 to introduce an added stanza giving the story of the wife’s rescue from the ship’s captain by a gallant knight. Line 384c, "he was not of my laye", suggests that forced adultery is an even grimmer fate when the perpetrator is a heathen.130; thus the wife has been rescued from moral disgrace on three counts: the violation of her virtue, of her marriage vows and

129 See also the comments on lines dropped from the courtyard passage in Orfeo (39), section 2.3.a, Omission.

130 Compare Margaret (37) line 113, where the Saint prays to Christ "That no sary3en schuld hyr schend".
of her Faith. This combination of domestic with religious and moral concerns is typical of Rate's editing.

Even the more pragmatic items contain a mixture of purely practical advice and moral or spiritual exhortation, as in Good Wife (4), where there is a unique couplet (127-8) inserted into a section of six lines, otherwise corresponding to stanza 20 in the base text. It intrudes into the lines exhorting the woman to be a good housewife, warning her against consorting with other women of "yuell name". Lines 171-8 form an important, unique section containing two powerful ideas: one, warning against blaming God for the deprivation of friends or the loss of a child; the other, explaining that such human vengefulness is "unthrifty" folly which leads to one's own undoing. This is sentiment on an elevated plane, exhortation to spiritual fortitude quite out of place with the pedantic advice in which it is set. The omitted stanzas in Wise Man (3) offer the most practical and detailed advice on character (stanzas 6-11), and on choosing and treating a wife (stanzas 12-15, 17). The remaining stanzas concentrate on moral conduct, and the spiritual prizes to be sought above the deceptive and treacherous gains of worldly commerce, which may indicate that the stanzas to be omitted were chosen beforehand with this emphasis in mind.

Although the variants and omissions discussed in this section show that some of the sensational elements in the poems have been toned down, religious sensationalism in the form of marvels and miracles seems rather to have been pointed up.
2.4.d Mystical elements

Several texts illustrate Rate's evident predilection for the mystical or supernatural, as suggested by his inclusion of items 1, 5, 18, 20-30, 34-39, which all contain fantastical elements; and by certain unique variants pointing up the miraculous content of a scene. In Eustace (1) the lines Rate changes at 37-9, the three he inserts after 39, and the next three after 42, greatly enhance the dramatic moment of the miraculous speech of the stag and the apparition of the Cross. In particular, there is a greater emphasis on the visual impact of the apparition:

\[\begin{align*}
37 & \quad \text{Bituene min horns } \text{pou mi3t} \quad \text{loke} \\
38 & \quad \text{pe feirest ping } \text{pat stont in} \\
39 & \quad \text{Wel sone } \text{pou salt ise} \\
39a & \quad \\
39b & \quad \\
39c & \quad \\
40 & \quad \text{Jhesu Cristes creis I wis} \\
41 & \quad \text{pat sal } \text{pe bringen alle blis} \\
42 & \quad \text{And hountep after } \text{pe} \\
42a & \quad \\
42b & \quad \\
42c & \quad \\
43 & \quad \text{pe li3t of heuene } \text{& pe glem} \\
\end{align*}\]

The extra lines are repetitious and couched in traditional hyperbole; line 40 is altered to bring in reference to the Cross, and the constant exhortations to "look" may suggest additions by Rate perhaps with reference to an actual depiction of the scene *131. Line 1150 in Passion (28) in other versions is a simple reference to heaven where

*131 For example, there is a fifteenth-century fresco of the life of St Eustace in Canterbury Cathedral, although I am not suggesting any connection. Nevertheless, the pilgrimage motifs in Ashmole 61 (see chapter 3) do not rule it out.
Christ's power resides; it is re-written in Ashmole to introduce a mystical note, by suggesting that Christ's presence was simultaneously in heaven and in his earthly prison during his trial. Similarly, two lines (1774a-b) are added after his death on the cross to intensify the mystical experience of the event: "The elementes pei roffe pat dey / That was grete meruell forto sey" *132. Rate was apparently reluctant to explain Heurodis's visitation by the Fairy King in Orfeo (39) as a dream, as in the other versions. Her vision in lines 59-66 is recapitulated in the added lines 125-33: as Longsworth points out (1982:3-4), Rate's version is the only one in which her vision occurs after she awakes rather than during her sleep, thus emphasising the marvellous nature of the event *133.

Another personal characteristic of our scribe is an anti-Semitic prejudice, whereby Rate appears to have re-written several lines in order to show his own contempt for the Jews.

*132 Other elements are inherent to the texts and cannot for certain be attributed to Rate, but the mystical atmosphere they create is undoubtedly attractive; out of many examples see Pilgrimage (34) lines 245-6, which describe an oratory where priests converse with the souls in purgatory; also Resurrection (36) lines 560-5 (noted above, section 2.2.e, Textual Correlations).

*133 Bliss was puzzled by the addition which weakens rather than strengthens the dramatic effect; he attributes it to a minstrel who falls into the 'familiarity trap', "like an actor who answers a wrong cue" (Thesis 1954:24-25). I think Longsworth's interpretation is more in keeping with Rate's practice of deliberate but clumsy interpolation. Where he does repeat whole passages inadvertently, he does not usually make significant changes as in this case: in the recapitulation of the passage the narrator is changed from third to first person. Rate may have been influenced by familiarity with the Breton Lay de Tydorel, which as Kittredge points out contains a similar passage, in which the queen falls asleep exactly as Heurodis, and then "on waking" is visited by a "knightly stranger" (1886:190).
2.4.e Anti-Semitism

The longer religious poems between items 25 and 33, and the Passion texts 28, 34 and 36, are all as Ginn notes, "concerned chiefly with private devotions and with the cultivation of the individual conscience" (1967:83). This spiritual instruction is not without bias. There are no Lollard influences, but the anti-Semitism of the times is well-reflected in Rate's texts, particularly in the Passion (28). Rate appears to denounce the Jews at any opportunity by substituting maledictory language, as in lines 1124, 1222, and 1692, "vylonye" for "gret folye" and other readings *134.

Most of the anti-Semitic passages take the form of outbursts against the Jews' treatment of Christ; for example, in Pilgrimage (34) the account of the scourging at the Pillar in lines 149-68, described on four separate occasions in this text alone in varying degrees of detail, is interrupted in this its second telling by a passage exhorting all Christian kings to hang any Jew entering their lands (lines 161-6). In lines 614-21, the Jews are accused of attempting to defile the deceased body of the Virgin Mary, and even, by way of adapting one of the parables, for causing the stony ground around Bethlehem (lines 640-5) *135.

In a number of Rate's variants he appears to speak through the characters to pass judgement on the wicked, even if this contradicts

*134 See lines 499, 881-2, 906, 1102, 1109-12, 1441, 1597-8, 1686.
Line 1838 is altered to put the shame on the Jews and not on the good Centurion who recognises that Jesus was truly the son of God. In lines 1285-6 "hangyd" is substituted for "dampned"; see the variant in Pilgrimage (34) lines 161-6, which advocates hanging Jews, and compare a unique variant in Orfeo (39) line 569, which reads "hangyd" for "voided" as Orfeo's punishment to the Steward if he had proved unfaithful.

*135 See also lines 461, 695.
the Christian nature of the characters themselves. For example, much of the invective against the Jews takes the form of curses, as in Passion (28) line 777, which reads "euyll mote þu the" for "what eylyth the": Rate puts a curse in Christ's mouth, as if on his own behalf against the Jew who had struck him, in blatant disregard of the fact that Christ did not resist their cruelty and freely forgave them on the cross. In the following lines also (787-8) Rate puts God's words into Christ's mouth, warning the Jews of their downfall: "Ihesu seyd bote is þer non / fforto plete a geyn my sone" for "Ihesu seyde it is no bote / Ageyns 3owe to holde no mote"; in lines 1500a-1502 both Jews and the wicked wife are cursed by the smith *136 and line 1701 reads "wrench" for "I wene": thus the good thief castigates the bad for taunting Christ *137.

Hargreaves notes that the substitution of "scrybes & fareseys" for "Eretikes" in Ram's Horn (2) line 53, "tells us something about his [Rate's] sympathies" (1976:257), which evidently do not lie with the Jews *138. In Ypotis (27) lines 581-8, the word "cyrcumcise" has been altered to "conseyued" and the rhyme before it adapted, in order to avoid mention of the Jewish practice *139, and the following four

136 See section 2.5, Family Bias.

137 See also Jealous Wife (22) line 184, where the narrator curses the witch that plotted against the wife; the unique text Carpenter's Tools (16) lines 269-72, where the wife curses the priest for binding her to such a feckless man; Tolouse (19) line 708, noted above, and Psalms (32) line 544 where "all cursyd fere" is substituted for "pe fendys fere".

138 The guilt of the Jews is stressed many times, as in Pilgrimage (34) 103; Resurrection (36) 252-60, Mary Magdalene's denouncing of the Jews for killing an innocent and sinless man; and Margaret (37) 148-53, lines altered to make Olybrius accept the guilt of the Crucifixion on behalf of the Jews. See also Passion (28) lines 1196, 1597-8.

139 However, the word is used unaltered in Pilgrimage (34) line 657.
lines on circumcision are dropped (also in other texts). The alteration makes nonsense out of the narrative sequence; in this arrangement Jesus was conceived (581-2) after he was born (577-8).

There is also a curious prejudice against nuns; in Rate's version of Isumbras (5), lines 490, 493, and 508-510 have been altered to avoid all mention of nunneries; 509 repeats the rhyme in 508 to avoid "pryores":

Schleich                     Rate
At a nunrye þe knyght was leuede he was leuyd in þat stede
þe nonnes of hym were full fayne The crysten men wer full feyn
his leue he tuke withowttyn lesse his leue he toke wythouten lesse
And thankede faire þe pryores And thankyd them both mor & lesse
And alle hir nunnes hende That helpyd to hele hys wounde

Anti-Semitic feeling was rife in the Middle Ages and may have been inherent to the Passion texts before Rate acquired them, but it is my belief that the variants highlighted here were introduced by him, and reflect a particular aspect of his devotion to the Passion of Christ. These notes have shown the strong religious bias of Rate's variants in their different forms. The family bias is closely allied to this, emphasising moral rectitude within family relationships.

2.5 Family bias

The opposites of fallen and virtuous women are finely counterpointed in the texts, from the adultery of Guinevere in Corneus and the exploits of the Jealous Wife and Incestuous Daughter (who between them commit infanticide, matricide, patricide, prostitution and suicide), to the good wives of Eustace, Isumbras, Bernard, Cleges, and Orfeo, and the holy virgins Margaret and Mary, who between them exemplify
obedience, chastity and loyalty. Among the family variants which have not already been dealt with under Religious bias are those which stress the togetherness of husband and wife *140, as in Orfeo (39) lines 466-9, in which together they escape from fairyland through the forest straight back to Winchester; this contrasts with lines 239-42 in which Orfeo alone enters the wilderness, not knowing where he is or where to go:

B (239-42)

He went thorow wode & heth
And into wyldernes he geth
So fer he went I sey j wys
That he wyst not wher he was

B (466-9)

To wyldernes both forth þei geth
And passyth over holtys & heth
So lo[n]g he hys wey þer nom
To trasyens þei were j com

Similarly in Ypotis (27) some pronouns are changed to include Eve where only Adam is mentioned in the cognate versions; line 318 reads "them" for "man" (: sathan), and line 329 reads "Ther soulys" for "Hys sowle". In so doing Rate stresses that together husband and wife succumbed to temptation and together they went to hell after they died.

Some of Rate's alterations accord a greater share of the narrative and moral impetus to the good wives of the stories; as Ginn notes, "Although Cleges is the hero, it is Dame Clarys who holds the home together and on whom the family unity is centred" (1967:102). When Eustace runs home to tell his wife of the miraculous stag, it is she who takes the verbal initiative to get the whole family christened that night "in þe name of god all myght" (lines 60g-1).

Other minor variants include simple alterations referring to both husband and wife, or including the children, as in Isumbras (5) 258; Tolouse (19) 154; Cleges (24) lines 31-3, 55, 82-7; Dietary (31) 40a (noted below, chapter 3 section 3.1); Margaret (37) 12; or stressing the love between husband and wife, as in Orfeo (39) 6, 88, 109-12, 179-80, 191-2. See also the general discussion of the 'family' romances in section 1, The Scribe as Compiler.
The husband and wife also support each other in Cleges (24), where certain variants show Clarys encouraging her husband to take a less depressed view of their situation: in lines 142-4 she prepares the food herself for her family, the change forcing a repetition of the rhyme, while in lines 223-5 (not in E) she counteracts Cleges’ pessimistic interpretation of the miraculous cherries ("more greuans is ny") with a cheerful optimism ("it is tokenyng / off more godness pat is comyng").

In these examples the goodness of the wife is stressed, while others show extreme disapproval towards foolish or bad wives, as in the text of Jealous Wife (22), and in Passion (28) a unique couplet is added (1500a-b), in which the treachery of the wife in making the nails for the cross (which the good smith had refused to do) is equated with the wickedness of the Jews in killing Christ. Lines 1501-2 are re-written to make the smith curse both the Jews and his wife "in hys thou3t" *141. In Pilgrimage (34) lines 750-75, the story of the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah, and the salination of Lot’s wife, serves to warn wives of the consequences of disobedience. With the typical medieval fondness for linking ideas, her pillar of salt is said to have become the Dead Sea, and because nothing could live in its salinity it was thought to be "be pytte of helle" (775).

Fallen men do not escape censure either; line 66 in Squire reads "So lytell he set by hys wyffe", for "by hys spouse hede": the altered emphasis shows that the crime is specifically against the wife rather than the general concept of marriage. The change is deliberate, since the word order of line 68 is reversed to accommodate the new rhyme

*141 See also the comments on Tolouse (19) 850-2 in section 2.6, Other Substantive Variants.
"wyffe : myscheffe" for "mede : hede". In *Four Daughters* (26) lines 150-3, the wife is not blamed for tempting Adam to eat the apple, but Adam for being more obedient to his wife than to God. Rate appears to mitigate this indictment by a unique variant stating that he did it "for lufe of hys wyfe", which suggests that obedience to God must come first, even before the love of husband and wife which is so greatly extolled in the texts and variants of Ashmole 61.

Separation of the wife from her family is given greater emphasis in both *Eustace* and *Isumbras* than in any of their cognates. Several unique additions and variants highlight the emotional stress of the loving couple when they are forcibly parted, as in *Eustace* (1) 126a-1, and *Isumbras* (5) 151-3, 294a-c (cruelty of the Sultan to abduct the wife), 300a-c, 311a-c (distress of the parted couple); while others intensify the joy of the family's reunion, as in the *Eustace* lines 396a-f, and 402a-c, highlighting also the gratitude of the whole family to the mercy of God *142*. Similarly the end of the Ashmole version of *Isumbras* emphasises the joy of the reunited family and their thanksgiving to God, as in lines 769-70, 773-4 (thanking God); 776 (children blessed, rather than kissed); 778-83 (whole family together again, wife and sons mentioned instead of just sons); 784-789a-c (unique account of the triumphant return of family).

Children are not prominently considered in the manuscript except in respect of their upbringing and management. Some elements of bowdlerisation may have been for their benefit, but the variants are not slanted in their direction to any noticeable degree. This is not surprising, as in the fifteenth-century parents were more concerned with the discipline of their children than with their individual

*142* See section 2.4, Religious Bias.
rights *143. However, it seems to have been at least part of Rate's function to cater for the devotional instruction of children, as suggested by the close proximity of the versified doctrinal items 6, 12, 13, 14-15, and 17, as well as for their practical upbringing as taught by the courtesy books, items 3, 4, 7 and 8 *144. Further encouragement towards learning is found in variants such as lines 429-30 in the Pilgrimage (34) account, using the Virgin Mary as a model of virtue *145:

(Ashmole 429-30)  
Be 3ond pat sche was sette to scolc  
That euer was wyse & neuer no fole

(Bodley 565 112-3)  
By yonde that yn a stret  
Ys the scolc of owre lady swete

There are several teaching motifs; one is given as the purpose for writing or reciting the Pilgrimage (34) account (lines 828-33):

Now we have told all pat we haue sene  
So god me saue fro sorow & tene  
And all be cause pat I can seye  
Is to teche a man be weye  
What pylgrym pat theper wylle go  
I praye god saue hym to & fro

Another introduces Stans Puer (7) (lines 5-12):

143 For discussions on the position of children see Owst 1966:chapter 7; see also Bennett 1922:81 and chapter 6, and Furnivall 1868:vii and introduction, especially for the poignant account of Lady Jane Grey's treatment by her parents. The most comprehensive study of the attitudes to and the treatment of children in medieval society is given by Shahar 1990.

144 These texts were probably transmitted orally and were intended to be learnt by heart; see line 151 of Dame Curtasy, "Sone it may be conyd & had". See further section 1, The Scribe as Compiler.

145 See also the unique material in Commandments (6), "To teche man kynd pis werld to wyne" (line 48); Dame Curtasy, "lerne of hym pat the tech cane" (line 58); while in Passion Christ's role as teacher is highlighted where line 1143 reads "teches new lawys" for "takes new lawes": Pilate rationalises the Jews' hatred of Christ because he teaches new laws instead of the old traditions.
And gyffe me grace þat I may so teche
That som man þer for þe better maye be
And to be to chylder a bodely leche
And euer more all vyces þei may fere & ffle
To tech chylder curtasy is myn entent
And þus forth my proces I purpos to be gyne
The trinity me sped & gode seynt clement
In what contrey þat euer y be jyne

Since Clement is the patron saint of mariners, we may interpret 'contrey' as abroad; but we cannot know from these lines alone whether Rate himself was a peripatetic teacher, or copying an altered version of Lydgate's poem from such a source *146. Rate's text of Stans Puer seems also intended for children other than those of the parent reciting the poem, as lines 181-4 imply:

If þu haue a fader þat be of lyfe here
honour hym wyth wyrschype my counsell I þe gyffe
And also þi modor þat is thi faderes fere
And euer more after þe better þu schall fare

The text could be delivered by a teacher to his pupils on behalf of their parents, or by the head of a household not only to his own children but to those whom he has taken in for service, as was the custom (Bennett, 1922:82-6).

2.6 Other Substantive Variants

The most interesting verbal substitution in the manuscript occurs in line 1601 of Libeus (20). In the other versions the decoration on the armour of one of the Arthurian knights is described as "thre lyons of gold", for which Rate substitutes "thre loxus of gold". The MED glosses "lax" as salmon *147. There are three factors which rule out this change as a mere coincidence: Rate's propensity to interchange

*146 The reference is also used by Gunn (1918:xii) in an unconvincing attempt to link this version of Stans Puer with David Rate; see further chapter 3 section 3.4. Line 12 resembles Carpenter's Tools line 272 "In what contre þat euer he be", and may therefore be another result of memorial correlation.
"o" and "a" *148; the specific decoration of his manuscript with yellow-coloured salmon-type fish *149; and the presence of the shield on f.107r which replaces the "seal" of the Charter text with a personal pictographic emblem *150. This semantic by-play with word and image is another of the scribe’s idiosyncratic, humorous touches, not without its devotional context: the fish has more Christian connotations than a lion. Thus Rate combines pseudo-heraldry with religious symbolism to form another embedded signature.

In Passion (28) lines 1446 and 1458a-b unique readings are given stating that four rather than three nails are wanted for the crucifixion, thus contradicting the first mention of the nails in line 1440, which is given as "thre" to fit in with the rhyme *151. Thereafter the number is deliberately changed to four, as in lines

147 Also in the OED, which gives the form "lox, loxes"; in the Dictionary of the Older Scottish Tongue, and the Dialect Dictionary, the word is given as a Scottish form. Rate frequently uses "-us" for the plural, as in lines 915-16 ("colorus: floures"), 981-2 ("mynstrellus", "trumperus", "herperus", "gestorus"), and throughout; see also Dame Curtasy (8) lines 2 and 9 "vertus"; Clees (24) 31 "almus"; Pilgrimage (34) 6 "falous"; while the "-us" abbreviation mark is used throughout the texts, especially in "almus", "mynstrellus", "angellus", and "castellus".

148 Among many examples see Libeus (20) "Aper" and "Other" at the beginnings of lines 1951-2, and the rhyme-words in Passion (28) 1021-2 "lond : hand", and 1615-16 "hondes : bandes"; in Resurrection (36) 204 the spelling of "saule", and in the re-copy of the passage, "soule" is interchanged (and passim); in Jealous Wife (22) 303 "raw" is given for "row" etc.

149 Compare also the variant in A N P line 1159, "As pe fysche in pe nette".

150 Compare also in Northern Passion (28) line 1946, where only in A is a shield made the object of the Jews' oath to defend the body of Christ against theft by his disciples. The significance of the shield drawing substituted for the last lines of Charter (29) in the light of the Corpus Christi Guild badge is discussed in chapter 3 section 3.2.

151 Compare Libeus (20) line 1337, which reads "ffowre mawmentes per in were" (A N) for the "Thre" of the Lambeth version.
1497-8 where the smith's wife breaks four pieces of iron, and makes four nails. In line 1633 Rate's version alone explicitly states that two nails were used for the feet. This may be an allusion to iconographic art, in which the Byzantine school in particular represents the feet of Christ nailed separately *152. Rate may have had in mind a particular work of art in his home or church, whether fresco, canvas, artefact, or manuscript painting.

One of the most specific variants occurs as an insertion into Rate's version of the *Lost Soul (35a). Three lines are inserted after line 4, attempting to identify the damned sinner as one "Sir William Basterdfeld". The lines form a couplet and a single line of which the rhyme word is identical with that of the next line, thus disturbing the ababbcbc rhyme-scheme. I have been unable to trace (in printed county records or biographical dictionaries) whether the name of the knight is an authentic or spurious identification, but it would seem a pointless addition if the scribe did not have a particular purpose for inserting the lines, for example directing them at a person incurring his displeasure.

Many of Rate's substitutions are obscure, and may indeed have been taken over from corrupt copies, or have borne a significance which is now lost; for example in *Wise Man* (3) the last line (192) reads "The chyld pat was in bedlem borne" for "That for vs weryd the crowne of thorne"; the reference to Christmas instead of the scribe's usual concern with Easter may bear some temporal significance either for the copying of the poem, or for its recitation. Similarly, only in Rate's

152 See many of the plates in volume 2 of Gertrud Schiller's *Iconography of Christian Art* (1968), especially plates 327-395 and others. For the possible artistic inspiration for the "Pietà" verses in *Lament*, see section 2.4.a, *The Passion* above.
version of *Ypotis* (27) is Easter day specifically mentioned as the Friday (rather than Sunday) on which Judgement day will fall (line 624) *153.

In Tolouse (19) lines 850-2, the Emperor's wife is unjustly accused of adultery; in Ashmole 45 the knights simply state that while the Emperor was away they surprised his wife with her lover, while the Lincoln Thornton reading is just a vague reiteration that their accusation against his wife is true; the lines are omitted in CUL Ff.2.38. Ashmole 61 contains the most intriguing variant: the traitorous knights reassure the supposedly cuckolded Emperor that "Sche schall neuer were of 3our cloth" (851); I have not been able to trace the origin of this phrase.

2.7 Orality

Most of the beginnings and endings of Rate's texts show some re-working towards both a moral and an oral framework, and may indicate that the scribe extracted certain pieces from longer works and re-shaped them to stand as self-contained poems *154. For example, the four unique stanzas in Rate's text of the Commandments have caused much speculation. The main body of the text differs little from its 60 or so cognates in the Speculum. Rate's version is distinguished by an introductory stanza forming a call to attention, and three concluding stanzas on the giving of the Commandments to

153 See further chapter 3 section 3.2.

154 This may be one explanation for re-working the courtesy texts, especially *Stans Puer* (7), in which the common lines are prefaced by a unique prologue of 12 quatrains (not "six eight-line stanzas" as given in IMEV) of homiletic content, designed to introduce the Lydgate text which is written in ababbcc stanzas, and distinguished from the usual text only by a lombard capital. It is not certain whether this prologue is Rate's own composition, or the result of conflating two (or more) different courtesy texts.
Moses *155, which give the Speculum Christiani text an oral and preaching value outside the manual. Ritchie Girvan believes that the extra lines "may have been added by him [Rate] when extracting the poem" (1939:xxxiv), an explanation preferable to that of Vincent Gillespie, who ignores scribal activity and attributes to Rate only the preservation of a longer text which pre-existed the Speculum *156. He comments (1981:256):

Given the commonplace nature of the material and the many similar treatments of it, it seems unlikely that a writer would take the trouble of patching together a poem on such a subject and more particularly would bother to match the formal structure in his additions.

There are at least two classes of writer who would take this trouble: a preacher tailoring his material to a sermon context, or a scribe giving a devotional bias to his material, rendering it suitable for recitation outside the Speculum. The language of the four stanzas is simple, popular and conventional. Their composition would not be beyond the powers of either preacher or disour, both professionally used to adapting material to suit local circumstances. Since both the Commandments (6) and the Prayer to Mary (15) are from the Speculum they are obviously suitable as preaching texts, and may have been used, as Gillespie suggests, "in oral instruction". The first two verses of the Commandments are re-copied, either by mistake or as a deliberate oral preface *157, before Prayer to Mary (15). David Jeffrey mistakenly regards the Commandments stanzas as an integral part of the Prayer, a call to attention suggesting that "the long Mary

*155 Compare the N-Town Proclamation, verse on the sixth pageant of Moses (Block, 1922:3).

*156 This is also Holmstedt's explanation for Rate's longer version of Prayer to Mary; see chapter 4 section 15.

*157 See chapter 4 section 6.
poem was delivered out-of-doors, perhaps at a market place, and that it formed the basis of the friar’s sermon to the people who were standing ‘aboute’ (1975:200). The final lines of the Prayer can also be attributed to Rate, as they do not appear in any other version, are conventional in nature and wording, disrupt the couplet rhyme-scheme, and are preceded by a unique addition of lines concerning the Pater Noster.

Boitani points out that religious stories enjoyed a wide listening audience (1982:1):

A large number of these narratives were therefore composed to be heard, especially in sermons, and what has come down to us in manuscripts is a formalisation (due to the writing-down of what was spoken) of a kind of narrative that was originally different.

Some of the exempla tales in Ashmole 61 may have been extracted from sermon text-books, such as Forgiving Knight (18) from Handlyng Synne, in which the last four lines are altered to round off the story, substituting for the link passage which introduces the next Deadly Sin in the Handlyng Synne manuscripts; similarly Four Daughters (26) is a unique translation of the Court of Heaven story originally part of Grosseteste’s Chateau d’Amour. Exempla stories which are based on Marian miracle stories were certainly used in oral contexts, as Carol Meale suggests (1990:115-16):

Accounts of the Virgin’s miracles were recited in church and monastery in celebration of her feasts; translated into dramatic form they entertained and instructed crowds of spectators; and they formed a staple part of the reading-matter of members of the urban and rural middle classes, such as Robert Thornton, Robert Reynes and the compiler of Ashmole 61.

158 See section 2.4.b, Preaching.
Even an apparently secular satirical verse such as Ram's Horn may have been used as a humorous exemplum or peroration: the unique substitution of the adverb "Thus" in the opening line may indicate a reference to a preceding homily; similarly, line 55 reads "Thus be we gouerned for soth as I gesse" for "eche astate": this personalisation suggests that the poem was recited, perhaps in a sermon denouncing the corruption of the times.

Most of the oral content within the texts is probably taken over from the source-copies, but the format of the manuscript and the style of some of the variants suggest that Rate did use his volume in a performance context *159. For example, lines 4-6 in Isumbras (5) vary slightly from the other versions: "I schall 3ow tell a wonder case / ffrendys herkyns how it was / 3e schall haue heuen to mede". This may be just another narrative convention, but it is also a moral expedient to ensure attention. Several texts end in a similar fashion, as at the end of the unique Resurrection poem (36): "They that this talkyng herd sey / God send hem grace to take the wey / To the blysse with out endyng"; and at the end of Libeus (20): "And 3e that haue herd thys talkyng / 3e schall haue the blyssing / Of Jhesu Cryst all so"; while Tolouse (19): "Ithesus þat is heuen kyng / Grante vs all þi blyssing / Amen for charyte", is very similar to Ypotis (27) "Amen Amen for charyte / God grante vs þat it so be / her endys þis talkyng / God grante vs all hys blyssyng"; similarly the end of Orfeo (39): "And all þat þys wyll here or rede [= hear or read aloud] / God forgýff þem þer mysdede" resembles Guy of Warwick, "God graunt hem heuen blis to mede / þat herken to mi romaunce rede" (Zupitza, 1833:384). These 159 On the holster format of the manuscript, see the discussion in chapter 1 section 1.6.c, Material and Condition; especially the comments by Guddat-Figge and Ian Doyle on the suitability of the volume for oral recitation.
addresses suggest to the audience that by listening to the recitation they will enjoy God's grace and favour, whether the poems are for entertainment or for edification; thus Rate's role as reciter-entertainer, as well as reciter-preacher, is justified.

Were the Ashmole texts sung or spoken in performance? The predominance of verbs of speaking indicates recitation of the poems rather than any musical context, although vocabulary alone is no reliable guide. The following variants are rather more significant: line 484 in Cleges has been changed in Ashmole 61 from "An harpor sange a gest be mowth" to "An harper had a geyst j-seyd"; similarly in Orfeo (39) the lines describing Breton lays (23-5) are altered, changing the idea of tale with a harp accompaniment to one written down: "They let them wryte" (line 25 B) for "pai token an harp". The fifth line of Wise Man (3) states that "pys songe for Jounge men was be gon", but at the end the narrator exhorts the child to "thinke one ... all pat I haue seyd be forne" (189-90).

References to singing usually apply to divine services and angels in heaven, as in lines 112, 187, 193, 206-8, 228-31, and so on throughout Pilgrimage (34). Corneus (21) is likeliest to have been performed musically; Hazlitt makes the interesting connection between the poem and the later dance tune "Cuckolds all a-row", which would suggest that this poem was originally performed to music at feasts (1864:38), also the most likely venue for Edward (41), another drinking tale. A craft guild feast was certainly the context of Carpenter's Tools (16). Edward Wilson notes that "the use of romances, carols, and songs at feasts and convivial gatherings is, of course, fully established, and the Debate is evidence that a comic debate was another genre to be heard on such occasions" (1987:451-2) *160. The narrator at the end
of Carpenter's Tools, addressing his audience of "wry3tys" tells them not to be grieved at his "song" (278). The attention to detail concerning the tools of the profession is very marked. We cannot infer from the mere inclusion of such a poem that Rate was connected with the Guild, or whether he simply collected such items of curiosity for amusement. Yet it would be unusual to find such a technical piece, specifically addressed to wry3tys, in a general household library with no professional connections, although there is an obvious need for caution in trying to deduce the background of the scribe from the textual material alone.

I will not stress here the constant use of oral vocabulary *161, nor the many references to minstrelsy *162 throughout the texts. Several references display a certain knowledge of musical instruments, as in Cleges (24), lines 97-105, and in the unique variant in Rate's version of Isumbras (5), expanding the celebration of the family's home-coming (lines 785-8):

160 On entertainment at guild feasts see also pp.448 and 454. Similarly Conlee (1991:223) depicts the text "receiving a vigorous public performance before an audience including artisans and tradespeople".

161 Out of many examples, Saints (25) lines 1-8, 115-27, and 219, contain many calls to attention and other oral references, while in Edward (41) the frequent exhortations to listen in the opening verses of this text indicate the kind of noisy gathering at which it would have been performed (see lines 5, 6, 8, 9, 12, 14, 15). See also the similar addresses in the opening lines of Wise Man (3), Good Wife (4), and Commandments (6).

162 For example, in Ram's Horn (2) stanza C (lines 48q-x); Orfeo (39), B lines 9, 27-40, 271-84, 373-7, 406-7, 416-37, 475, 502, 507, 512-25, 584-5. "Minstrelsy" is used in its strict sense of entertaining with musical instruments, as laid down in the statutes of the Minstrel's Guild at Beverly, BM MS Lansdowne 896, ff.153r-155r.
Ther wer bei rychely welcom
wyth myrthe gle & game
wyth gret honour bei dyd pem welcom
wyth trumpys pype & wyth schalmewon

The repetitive nature of the alteration is typical of Rate's variants. The minstrel's desire for reward is referred to on several occasions, in the form of subtle hints, as in Isumbras lines 19-24, Cleges lines 49-54, and Orfeo lines 27-30. These are largely inherent to the material, and should not be taken as proof that Rate was a minstrel, just as the scribal tag originally closing the manuscript before Pilgrimage cannot in isolation be proof of Rate's scribal profession; it may refer to payment for reciting the text as well as writing it, or it is just a common scribal feature copied into his own volume in order to end with a flourish.

Reference to payment of a different kind is found in Carpenter's Tools (16), lines 282-3, in which the narrator/reciter makes a veiled allegation of inadequate financial rewards for past services to the Carpenter's Guild:

ffor why pe craft hath do hym schame
By mo weys than two or thre
Thus seys pe boke sertielynle

Wilson interprets the "boke" as the Guild account book, and believes that the writer must have been a member of the Carpenter's Guild or closely involved with them (1987:448) *163. He suggests that the Carpenter's Tools was probably recited by a disour, or teller of tales, and not an instrumentalist (1987:451). The presence of this text in a devotional miscellany contributes to the problem of the

*163 Conlee (1991:line 284n) interprets the 'boke' simply as a conventional reference to the poet's imaginary source, but he does not consider the context of the preceding lines as Wilson has done.
scribe's identity, as to whether he was the actual disour who recited it at the Guild feast, or a member of the Guild itself who acquired the text by memorization, dictation, or by borrowing the disour's copy, or a collector of curiosities who acquired the text as it circulated in written form. There are very few obvious errors, and none that convincingly indicates either eye-skip or memorial error.


An address to wry3tys, though not to one individual, is much more specific; it intends the exclusion of all other trades, roles, and social estates, and this exclusion could not be guaranteed if the poet had envisaged his poem from the start as having a general circulation in written mode. Further, such a particular craft, as carpenter, is not one with which a wide audience could readily identify; the life of carpenters, unlike that of lovers and warriors, is unlikely to be the subject of widely shared experience or the object of widely shared dreams.

If the scribe's audience was his own family, assuming that they had some connection with the Guild for whom it was written, the laugh may have been against either the shrewish wife or the profligate husband themselves; as Wilson points out, the tale portrays a humorous marital setting, in which the wife berates the mercenary tools for failing to recognise that all their striving for wealth is in vain, since the husband drinks all the profits; while if he were the household chaplain it might hold a sharper hint about the diversion of profits away from his own remuneration *164.

Maldwyn Mills notes that the Ashmole Libeus is the result of "mixed transmission ... one in which both scribes and professional reciters

164 Certain texts such as Good Wife (4), Carpenter's Tools (16), Corneus (21), and Edward (41), all illustrate the treachery of drink, and may reflect another (perhaps personal) dimension of the scribe's moral stance. They may have been aimed at the father of the household (William Basterdfield, for instance?) who was depriving not only his family but his chaplain of their livelihood, hence the references to material reward noted above.
have taken a hand" (1963:21), which complicates the attempt to identify Rate's interaction with his material. We are too prone to modern demarcation to be comfortable with, for instance, the idea of a disour performing the exegetic Penitential Psalms (32), or the meditative Prick of Conscience Minor (33); still less with the picture of a household chaplain being invited to recite the Carpenter's Tools (16) at a Guild feast, or the "drasty" Libeus Disconeus (20), bawdy Corneus (21), or vulgar King Edward (41) at Christmas banquets. Nevertheless, we must beware of assuming that a particular profession would necessarily preclude the enjoyment of certain types of literary texts, especially in a fifteenth-century volume in which, as Malcolm Parkes remarks, "the scribes and readers seem to have made very little distinction between the different kinds of narrative" (1973:566), while the rise of an educated merchant class makes such distinctions even less tenable *165.

Thus to speak of the minstrel origins of a devotional miscellany such as Ashmole 61 is a non-sequitur, as Guddat-Figge points out: "If anything it might have been copied from a minstrel's manuscript (which might then account for the corruptness of its texts) and might have preserved the original format - if talking about 'minstrel manuscripts' is justified at all" (1976:251) *166. The friars were also disseminators of saints' lives and other religious poems; they "adapted minstrel practices" and were known as the "Ioculatores Domini" (Pfander, 1937:23, Jeffrey 1975:chapter 5). They drew material for their verse sermons from such compilations as Speculum Christiani and Handlyng Synne (items 6, 15, 18), and they

165 See Thrupp 1948, especially pp.158-9, 247, and chapter 4.
166 Taylor notes (1991:59) that the "puzzlingly eclectic" range of material in Ashmole 61 does not suggest minstrel ownership.
preached to a wide variety of audiences, employing a number of attention-gaining tricks, not unlike those used by secular reciters. Conversely, professional verse-reciters performed miracle stories, saints' lives and didactic tales for the edification through entertainment of the audience *167. An educated and eclectic layman could draw on the materials and techniques of both, just as romance writers used the medium of entertainment to inculcate moral and religious behaviour, and the writers of devotional texts drew on the styles and forms of romance to lighten the didactic load of their treatises.

2.8 Rate's Audience

By examining Rate's influence on the make-up of the manuscript, and on the transmission of the texts in respect of his effect on the copying and versification, and of his alterations to the texts towards a religious and family bias, we may deduce that Ashmole 61 is a non-commissioned personal compilation aimed at a non-aristocratic audience *168, to whom it was probably recited aloud by the scribe, or by others who made use of his manuscript, as indicated by the scribal tag at the end of Psalms (32): "Nomen scribentis benedicat lingua legentis (May the tongue of the reader bless the name of the scribe)" *169. This scribal tag does not prove that Rate is a professional, since "scribens" can refer to any person writing down a text.


*168 As suggested by the absence of 'aureate poetry', and such alterations as in Orfeo (39), line 492, in which "men & wyues & maydinse bold" welcomed back Orfeo and Herodys in Rate's version, rather than the "Eris & barouns bold / Buriays & leuedis" (lines 503-4) of the Auchinleck text; and in Cleges (24) line 65 which reads "gentyll men and comenere" for "kny3t and squire".
That the audience was mainly a listening audience is suggested by the lack of prose and commonplace items such as recipes, notes of account and memoranda which usually indicate a compilation intended for silent reading *170, and by the fact that the texts are consistently simplified and clarified. Narrative technique is reduced to the most dramatic and sensational, meditational texts rely on the immediacy of the imagination to grasp the concepts involved, rather than purely intellectual processes, while the slight amount of Latin in the manuscript is at a very simple level. The short texts are rendered even more easily mnemonic, since the more elaborate verse forms are in at least two cases deliberately re-worked as couplets and quatrains (items 4 and 7).

The family circle undoubtedly constituted part of this audience, as the sanctity of the family unit, marital fidelity, and filial duty are constant themes of the texts and variants. The audience was also treated as a congregation, whether at an actual church service or in the context of daily family devotions, as implied by the pervasive ethos of moral and theological teaching, the specific preaching variants, the distinctive religious bias, and the constant devotion to the Passion of Christ. All these elements may also suggest that the family members of a religious guild were one type of audience for which Ashmole 61 was so creatively compiled.

169 It would, however, be difficult for other readers to use some of the more corrupted texts due to Rate's failure to mark errors, such as Pilgrimage (34) and Resurrection (36) noted above, and the scribal tag may have been a wry joke on himself. The same tag appears in CUL Gg.5.31 (containing different versions of Forgiving Knight and Passion), following a text explaining the service used at Mass, with an additional line: "Nomen scriptoris benedic Deus omnibus horis" (God bless the name of the scribe every hour).

Although the conclusions reached in this chapter may not be new or startling, they nevertheless amplify the suggestions made by previous commentators such as Rosemary Ginn, Pamela Robinson and Malcom Parkes: that although the texts are badly copied they are at the same time purposefully adapted towards a family preaching context. No definite clue to the scribe’s identity is to be found in the texts. There are certain indications of his personality and hints about his background, such as familiarity with particular types of popular texts, both entertaining and devotional, plus a certain knowledge of Latin; the idiosyncratic treatment of those texts plus the presence of teaching and preaching variants; as well as specific elements such as a particular item on carpentry; devotion to certain saints; unique mention of the Basterdfeld family; and the sketches of fish, flowers, hexafoil, and especially the shield. Without documentary evidence none of these elements is sufficient to determine whether Rate was the pious father of a household, compiling the book in his spare time, or the chaplain of a fairly well-to-do but not aristocratic family, who took his pastoral duties so seriously that he carefully but inexpertly edited the family’s reading material. It is the devotional aspect of the compilation, largely ignored by previous commentators, that is the overriding characteristic of Ashmole 61, and this is the most promising field in which to search for the scribe’s identity.
CHAPTER THREE

The Identity of the Scribe

The search for the scribe's identity is not helped by the finely-balanced triple aspect of preaching, teaching and entertaining in the manuscript, which the preceding commentary has illustrated. Different texts suggest different professions, while ambiguities arise from the destructive-creative function of the scribe. The religious bias and the personal nature of the compilation are the most significant features; yet it is not easy to find a single explanation to fit all cases, nor is the attempt to do so necessarily productive. I hesitate to assign labels to the scribe, such as household chaplain, disour, or merchant, without the concrete evidence to support such hypotheses. On the internal evidence alone, 'household chaplain' seems the most hospitable at present, as it would encompass the functions of scribe, teacher, reciter, and preacher suggested by the texts *1. Despite extensive checking I have found no convincing association of the name Rate with any recorded profession, while documentary evidence for the performance of literary texts is notoriously scant. Angus McIntosh has localised the scribal dialect of Ashmole 61 in North-East Leicestershire (1986:233, LP.71). Investigation into materials held in the Leicestershire Record Office has produced some interesting findings, which are offered here in a spirit of enquiry rather than of solution.

*1 The Paston chaplains are noted for their involvement with the family's secular business as well as for conducting their religious affairs (Bennett, 1922:225-7). If Rate did have a trade, carpentry would seem the most logical profession.
3.1 The Corpus Christi Guild of Leicester

The corporate social life of Leicestershire revolved around the Church, the guilds, and the drama *2. Most of the extant records relate to the largest and wealthiest religious fraternity of Leicester, the Corpus Christi Guild *3; which was centred in St Martin's Church, now Leicester Cathedral, and whose purpose-built Guildhall, also surviving, became the corporation Town Hall. The common aims of such guilds were to provide mutual support, both temporal and spiritual, for both the living and the dead members (by the provision of masses, burials, prayers), for both men and women *4. They were bound by devotion to patron saints, by guild ordinances.

2 Some of the subjects of the Ashmole texts have been re-worked dramatically, such as Eustace (1), "Placy Dacy als St Ewy Stacy" performed in Braintree, Essex, dated post 1534. The Speculum Christiani text of the Ten Commandments (6) recurs in the Towneley Doctor's Play. The form of debate present in item 26 (Rate's unique Four Daughters) occurs in the N-Town Parliament of Heaven Pageant (also in the Castle of Perseverance and the Cursor Mundi in different forms). There is the Dux Moraud play of the Incestuous Daughter story (item 23), and in 1456 the Coventry Pageant of St Margaret slaying the dragon (item 37), written by John Wedurby of Leicester (possibly an interesting local connection). For further references on drama, see Lancashire 1984.

3 I have seen all the relevant original records listed in the Borough handlist (The Records of the Corporation of Leicester, 1956), BR V/2/1-11 (1458-1542); The First Hall Book (1467-1553); The Town Book of Acts (1467-1581); The Register of Freemen (1474-1600); and a roll of sixteenth-century notes on the guilds. There do not appear to be any extant records relating to the religious and social life of the guilds, nor to their members, beyond disparate commercial entries in the printed corporation records. If there is unindexed material deposited in the LRO, it has not yet come into public view. Most of the records are printed by Mary Bateson (1901); description of the guild p.lxiv. For the most detailed history of Leicestershire, see John Nichols (1795-1811). On p.510 of volume 1, part ii, is a footnote to one Richard Weston of Leicester (1732-1806), horticultural bibliographer and amateur local historian, who in 1802 prepared two literary anthologies entitled 'Leicestriana' and 'The Literary History of Leicestershire ... from the Year 1500 to 1801', which were never published. If these manuscripts could be discovered they may shed light on Leicestershire manuscripts such as Ashmole 61 (Atlas LP.71) and CUL Ff.2.38 (Atlas LP.531).
enforced by serving members, and by communal activity which was enjoined to be conducted in a spirit of peace and goodwill *5.

According to Fosbrooke and Skillington (1925:18), the guild was:

a body in which they [the members] were all united in the bonds of peace and of brotherly love, and this conception was symbolised by the periodical meetings of the brethren and sisteren, to eat and drink together in a spirit of mutual goodwill. Every guild had its great annual festival, celebrated with church services and special banquets, and at these assemblies all quarrels and misunderstandings between members were supposed to be reconciled ...

and they further note that the merchant and craft guilds also had "their religious, mutual-benefit and convivial sides" (1925:19).

Members of one guild were not precluded from joining others; thus Robert Reynes of Acle was alderman for St Edmund's Guild, while several of his texts were written for the Guild of St Anne *6.

4 Wilshire notes that many married couples belonged to the Leicester guilds (1979:6).

5 In Ashmole 61 there are many motifs on peace: in Four Daughters (26) the passage on peace (lines 383-90) is marked with a "cc" nota-mark; compare also Dietary (31): "wyth thy ney3bors lyue' in rest & pes" (line 32) and the unique added line 40a "And pus to lyue worschypfully wyth man & wyue"; and Forgiving Knight (18): "Ther fore prinsypally I hold it beste / fforto loue pec & lyue in reste / And þat it myght so be / Prey we all for charite" (unique variant, lines 115-18). The "for charite" tag occurs as a unique reading also in Prayer to Mary (15), Saints (25), Ypotis (27), Margaret (37), and Orfeo (39), but it is a common conventional phrase. The fact that William Charite was the contemporary Abbot of Leicester Abbey may add an ironic twist to the phrase, but is probably coincidental. However, Florence Skillington notes that in William Charite's time the Abbey "became a real centre of learning" (1950:40); while Nichols (1795:1.i, 591) records that William Charite was the patron of St Martin's church.

6 See Louis 1980:32, and Joshua Toulmin Smith 1870:1xxxvi; see also Westlake's standard study of guilds (1919), especially p.154, certificate 71. Skillington notes that "serio-comic dramas based upon Scriptural stories and popular legends of the saints" (1927:20) probably formed part of the guild entertainment at feasts. A text such as Resurrection (36) would be a suitable choice, concerned as it is with the buffoonery of the four knights guarding the tomb and their subsequent discomfiture.
S. H. Skillington states that "the gild in St Martin's was founded [in 1343] in honour of the Precious Body of our Lord Jesus Christ, St Mary and All Saints, and was known as the Corpus Christi Gild" (1927:11). Mary and the Saints are well represented in the manuscript, in such items as 15 (Prayer to Mary), 22 (Miracle of Mary), 25 (Mary the Queen of the Court of Heaven), 30 (Lament of Mary), and in the Passion narratives (28, 34, 36), as well as numerous one-line references. The unique account of the feasts of All Saints and All Souls (25) covers those saints without special feast days, with many individual saints named within the texts, although some of these are convenient rhyme-fillers.

There is particular mention of St Eustace and St Margaret. In line 206 of Carpenter's Tools, the Carpenter's wife swears by St Eustace, which as Wilson notes "was not particularly appropriate in the context of carpentry" (1987:468), since St Joseph is the traditional patron saint. That this alteration appears in a manuscript containing two derivatives of the Eustace legend (items 1 and 5) suggests, as Bliss remarks, "that the scribe may have had some special veneration for him" (1954:11) *7. Lines 561-4 in Margaret (37) allude to written copies of the saint's life carried around by members of the family as a protection against the devil:

And pat pe fend do þem no skathe
Neber late neber rathe
That beryth on þem my lyffe
Neþer man chyld ne wyffe

We cannot know if this idea was in the exemplar, as the end of the Brome text is lost, but it is not present in the different version of her legend in Bodley 779, and the reference to the whole family in 564

7 See also Braswell 1965:128-51. Conlee attributes no significance to the alteration as in his opinion the name was "used only to supply the rhyme" (1991:line 206n).
is typical of Rate's variants. Jonathan Wilshire notes (1979:17) that Margaret is usually artistically represented carrying a book (as in stained glass of Leicestershire, c1500), for she was the patron saint of religious learning; for this reason she may have been revered by Rate and his family.

But the main focus is on Christ: the Man, the Saviour, and God. The single references to Christ, the Cross and the Wounds are too prolific to list, and there are constant exhortations to 'have Christ's Passion in mind', as in Ypotis (27): "Thynke on crystys passyon ... Man thynke one hys wondes smerte / And haue his passyon in thyn herte" (lines 508, 519-20). This material reflects a particular concern of Rate's religious practice, and the decorative features can be re-interpreted in the light of this devotion.

3.2 Rate's Sketches

Only superficial mention has been made of the crude sketches of fish and flowers which occur throughout the volume *8, and hardly any at all of the geometrical device drawn as a hexafoil within a double circle, filling space below the Commandments (6), or of the heraldic-type shield below the Charter (29) which, as Black describes it, is "charged with a cross between four suns and in the centre a heart with a sun in it". Actually the five suns were drawn into the interstices of the cross, and the heart added later crudely drawn round the middle sun. Pamela De Wit has photographed and studied the sketches, but she concludes only that they "suggest a desire to fill space decoratively" and that these "flamboyant features ... are personal, even idiosyncratic" (1977:plate 4), which cannot be doubted.

---

8 Compare Taylor's dismissal of the illustrations as "little better than doodles" (1991:58).
She interprets the fish separating the items as a kind of visual signature; according to this view, hardly any text in Ashmole 61 is unsigned either orthographically or pictorially. The fish and roses are not a rebus in the strict sense, as Melissa Furrow notes (1985:238), and according to the College of Arms they are not true heraldic devices, despite the similarity of the fish to heraldic salmon, and the flowers to heraldic or Tudor roses, and the presence of the shield on f.106r *9. The river Soar at Leicester is described by Nichols (1795:I.i, clix) as being well-stocked with salmon in medieval times, but the representation of salmon is too widespread an image to be reliable *10. Although there is a main type of rose, several other forms appear including sprays and buds. The fish, on

*Sustained searching through manuals of heraldry, Papworth's Armorial, genealogical manuscripts relating to Leicestershire families (such as BM Add. MSS 10126: Burton's original History of Leicestershire, and Add.17462: topographical notes on Leicestershire), has revealed no armorial significance to the juxtaposition of fish with rose. Heraldic fish generally indicate connections with the dwelling place of the bearer. The Common Seal of the Burgh of Peebles (Birch, 1887:IV, 232), where David Rate held office, is three salmon, which do resemble those in Ashmole 61; but the seal is dated 1682. Gunn prints what appears to be his own copy of the hexafoil and fish on f.17r, and the large rose on f.38v with this comment: "The flower is painted yellow. The Salmo ferox is very suggestive of the Heraldic Bearings of the Royal Burgh of Peebles" (1918:66 facing), but he does not take into account the late dating.

*I am indebted to Hubert Chesshyre (Chester Herald) for his kind advice. In St John's College Camb. MS B.6 (Pickering 1984:66-8) the scribe "Rose" flourishes his name with small fish (ff.79r, 83v etc), but this may not be a deliberate association of fish with roses as in Ashmole 61. Although there is no other connection with Ashmole 61 (neither the hand nor the fish drawings are the same), the scribe shares Rate's careless and non-professional characteristics: "his doodle-like drawings; his fondness for naming himself; the fact that he appears to have worked single-handed; the frequent carelessness of his transcription; and his orthographic inconsistency", all of which led Doyle to suggest that the scribe Rose might have been a priest or other secular ecclesiastic (Pickering, 1984:68); the deduction might equally apply to Rate. The rose is also used both as a symbol of Mary the mother of Christ (Woolf, 1968:287-9), and of the five wounds of her son (Gray, 1963:165); see especially Schiller (1972:135, 194-6, and plates 668, 673, 758).
the other hand, is consistently, but clumsily drawn, mainly by
spoiling the clean line of the body. The placing of the roses in the
fish's mouth in the latter part of the manuscript may admit a
religious visual pun, such as 'the fish stemmed from the rose'; though
it is more likely to be a humorous touch.\textsuperscript{11}

Ian Doyle notes that he is "not inclined to think that Rate's fish and
flowers are of more than decorative intention, jeux d'esprit" \textsuperscript{12}, but
the devotional symbolism of the features that Rate chooses to draw has
so far been overlooked. The Catholic Encyclopaedia states that the
fish was used as a symbol of Christ's Passion long before the
pictographic device was adopted. Mary Anderson explains that bread
and fish symbolised the Eucharist because of their association with
the miracles and the Post-Resurrection appearances (1955:115). The
fish is to be found in miniatures and pictures of the Last Supper,
prominently displayed on the table beside the bread and wine, as a
symbol of Christ's sacrifice.\textsuperscript{13} In the account of the Last Supper
in \textit{Passion} (28) lines 213-14, Judas steals the best morsel from Jesus'
fish, a symbol of his impending betrayal. Pollard and Furnivall's
introduction to the \textit{Castle of Perseverance} describes roses as "emblems
of Christ's Passion", with which the Virtues fight off the Vices
(1904:xxv). Northrop Frye shows how the red and white rose of
religious communion manifests itself in the flag of St George in the
iconography of the Risen Christ, and in the Tudor Rose used for the
Head of the Church as "a secular Eucharist symbol" (1957:144).

\textsuperscript{11} The sketches are described in more detail in chapter 1 section
1.9.a. Gunn more kindly describes the sketches as "vigorously
drawn" (1918:66, facing plate).

\textsuperscript{12} Doyle, private communication, 1987.

\textsuperscript{13} See for example the illustration in St Alban's Psalter, f.41,
printed by Patrick Collins 1979:no.12.
Clement Gunn notes specifically that the recurrent emblem of the fish in Ashmole 61 "unquestionably is a clerical symbol, and may denote clerical authorship" (1918: xiv), but his statements should be treated with caution (see section 3.4).

The hexafoil drawn on the back of a fish after the Commandments (f.17r) resembles the "six-petalled rose in a circle" etched into ampullae sold at pilgrimage shrines, identified as a 'Rose of Mary' design by Michael Mitchiner (1986: 77-8, 124 fig.315, 145 fig.410, esp. 152 fig.424a) *14. In view of the unique text Pilgrimage (34) in Ashmole 61, and the likelihood of the scribe having made such a pilgrimage himself, Rate's sketch may have been a record of an actual artefact in his possession. The wavy lines filling the double circle may represent the corded edge of the etching (Mitchiner 1986:124 fig.315). An even closer resemblance is to be found in an article illustrating early Tudor (1490-1545) English tokens: Mitchiner and Skinner, 1984:105, 148 plate 7 fig.27 reverse. On this token the points of the hexafoil are joined by looped lines ("geometric ornament") exactly as in Rate's sketch; another version is given in an earlier article on geometric tokens: Mitchiner and Skinner, 1983:60, 75 plate 8 fig.12 obverse, while plates 9 and 10 (1983:76-7) figure many hexafoil designs, some with ray borders. According to Mitchiner and Skinner such tokens were given as 'chits-for-service', for example to chaplains for attending church services (1983:30), which were then saved up and redeemed for money at a later date. They were also used by the trade guilds (1983:33), and many were manufactured by the Church (sometimes illegally) as pilgrimage tokens (1983:37-8).

*14 Rock notes (1903:II, 360) that at the end of the fourteenth century a wreath of white roses was worn by pilgrims in Leicester.
As to the shield, Doyle notes that the suns are the "five wounds of Christ armorially expressed", and this is undoubtedly the correct explanation. The narrator at the end of the Passion (28) exhorts his audience to have Christ's Passion in mind as a "warant" or shield against the Devil. The Northern Passion in Ashmole 61 is followed by the Short Charter of Christ, the Passion of Christ represented as a legal document. The only major change in Rate's version is arguably the most significant in the entire manuscript, and is attributed to Rate by Spalding (1914:lxiv); he drops the last four lines, stopping at line 30 "Myn awne sele ther to I hynge", and draws the shield below the 'seal' line, undoubtedly as a personal signature. Spalding interprets the sketch as representing the Five Wounds (1914:xxvi):

The four suns and the sun within the heart seem to be intended to represent the five wounds of Christ, that in the heart being the one made by the spear. What appears in the drawing to be rays may be blood marks.

The drawing of rayed suns instead of the usual dripping lenticular wounds probably has added symbolic meaning: in the N-Town Doctors' Play, Jesus uses the sun as a metaphor for the Trinity: splendour heat and light in one body; and as a symbol for his virgin conception: the sun does not damage the glass through which it shines *15. In the unique concluding stanza to the Commandments, Rate append two more unique lines, in which the sun becomes a metaphor for the virtuous soul.

Therefore the shield is another visual signature, of the type that Douglas Gray calls a 'Blazon of the Five Wounds' *16. It also resembles certain shield designs on tokens illustrated in Mitchiner and Skinner (1984:142), described as crosses "with annulets in a

15 See also George Ferguson 1966:45, Christ is the "sun of righteousness" (Malachi 4:2).
double circle"; the 'rays' which Rate draws around his circles may possibly represent anti-clockwise ray borders on "cross and pellets" tokens (nos. 1-69) *17. In view of the devotional context in which it is drawn, it is possibly also a type of Pilgrim Badge, described by Charles Carter as Arma Christi, having "five circles, with or without a cross ... as on examples in the London Museum" (1956:116n.2) *18.

However, I believe that Rate has made a record of the badge of the religious guild to which he belonged. In the Leicestershire Record Office, the Corpus Christi Guild roll for 1542 is headed by a drawing of the Guild's Badge of Cognizance *19: a chalice bearing a six-petalled badge on its stem, the bowl decorated with the date set inside a heart bearing a lenticular wound dripping blood, the Eucharist plate with "IHC" inscribed, and in the four corners of the shield, severed hands and feet bearing nail-holes. Below the Badge, the flourish on the capital "I" of the first word "Imprimis" is lengthened out into a simple, but unmistakeable fish, with the double-barred gill and eye *20. Rate's shield can be seen as a crude

16 In describing the lenticular wound ("mensura vulneris") Gray notes that "a more usual type is that in which the wounded heart and limbs themselves are placed on a shield or in which the limbs are arranged around the Heart in an heraldic or semi-heraldic pattern. The idea is rather a grotesque one, and artistically most of the the examples are rough or dull" (1963:88).

17 It is possible that the 'suns' represent actual sewing holes (symbolising the Wounds) in a metallic badge, which would explain why the 'wounds' are round rather than lenticular (Mitchiner and Skinner, 1984:124, fig.315).

18 Although it contains these basic elements Rate's drawing is different from Carter's example: see the Medieval Catalogue (Perkins, 1940:262-3), especially Plate LXX, figures 29-30. I am indebted to John Clark (Museum of London) and Brian Spencer for their kind advice.

19 Rock (1903:II, 334) notes that these badges were either embroidered upon the hood or gown, or if made of silver, pinned in place, while the deed of admission to the guild was stamped with the guild seal (1903:II, 324-5).
reduction of the basic elements on the Badge. The five wounds are represented by easily-drawn suns instead of the dismembered hands and feet which are well beyond the skill of someone who cannot get a simple fish right. The six-petalled design embossed on the stem of the chalice is probably a Rose of Mary hexafoil like Rate’s design, noted above. The heart drawn around the middle sun of Rate’s shield supports the Wound symbolism, while the elaborately drawn chalice and paten are replaced by a cross, equally symbolic of Christ’s sacrifice. Thomas North records that the church was previously known, and often still referred to, as St Cross (1866:8). He describes the livery badge of the Guild as displaying the five wounds and a cross for St Martin’s, which fairly describes Rate’s shield, but I have been unable to discover if the livery badge was a simpler form of the Cognizance Badge, or one and the same *21. On the 1535 Guild rental roll (BR V/2/10) is a Badge drawn as a shield with "IHC" inscribed, and a banner with "INRI" piercing the ascender of the "H" (as described by North, 1866:216). This suggests that the complex and artistic style of the Badge as shown in 1542 may indeed have evolved from earlier and simpler forms.

It is possible that Rate’s decoration is simply taken from the illumination of his exemplars which he decided to copy into his own work. But his consistent use of a single type of fish and flower, rather than copying different elements which would lend his work the

20 Because of the late dating it is obviously coincidental, yet it may suggest that fish had some emblematic connection with the Corpus Christi Guild, and if this could be established, it would be a further link with Rate’s manuscript.

21 The Badge is printed opposite p.216, but the fish is not mentioned. Compare this Badge and Rate’s shield with the Passion Emblems on plates 239 and 240 in Cave 1948. A cross ‘engrailed’ is also the heraldic sign of the Rait family in Scotland (Birch, 1887-1900:IV, 532-3).
variety and ornament of his exemplars, together with the curious hexafoil and shield, suggests a more deliberate selection of these particular devices. I have not been able to discover any conclusive links with Leicester, but the following coincidences should be noted:

a) The Corporation Arms of Leicester is a stabbed cinquefoil; William Kelly cites the belief that the cinquefoil developed from the five-calyx rose (1884:221-1) *22. Both roses and cinquefoils adorn the stained glass of the Mayor’s Parlour in the Guildhall, dated c.1500 (McDonald, 1925:69-70), but no fish are present.

b) On the back porch of the Cathedral (formerly the medieval St Martin’s Church) Tudor roses in their natural form, with stems, leaves and buds, are etched into the inter-beam panels. Terence Cocks, Lay Canon and honorary Archivist of the Cathedral notes that the "doorway and the vaulted roof of the porch are thought to be of 15th century date, but the rest, including the plaster panels with their decoration, date only from 1862. There is no reason to suppose they were copied from older work; in fact I think there may be a deliberate similarity between the five-petalled roses in the design and Leicester’s heraldic cinquefoil, bearing in mind that St Martin’s was regarded as the civic church, and the cinquefoil was appearing on various public buildings at that time" *23. This suggests that the roses decorating Rate’s manuscript may be regarded in the same light.

c) The concurrence of the Guild Badge with Rate’s shield as noted above.

Although these are but tenuous links with the manuscript, it is important to record all findings in the hope that future research will prove or disprove the connections suggested here.

The three great festivals of the Guild were held on All Saints Day, Christmas, and Easter. Were these feasts the outlets for Rate’s recitation of his unique Legend of the Founding of the Feast of All

22 Kelly quotes from a letter by the Somerset Herald: "I have for some time had a suspicion that the well-known badge of Leicester, the cinquefoil, is identical with the rose in ancient heraldry, and your communication only strengthens my impression. The rose is always represented as five-leaved, and I find families bearing cinquefoils and roses indiscriminately."

Saints and All Souls, the Resurrection poem *24, or the Northern Passion, which was recited in instalments during Holy Week? Or the performance of Cleges and the other romances and romance-type texts at Christmas, and the Carpenter’s Tools at a craft guild feast? Was the Legend of St Margaret recited by him to her Guild in St Margaret’s Church? Did he recite the exempla stories and lyrics in St Martin’s Church, and entertain the Corpus Christi Guild members in their guildhall *25, where there was a stage erected at one end for the players? Cameron Louis (writing of OBL Tanner MS 407) sounds a cautionary note (1980:114):

> Of course, one has to beware of assuming that all aspects of the scribe’s personality are revealed, even in a MS of this type. Moreover, there is a danger of generalizing too much from the MS of one individual. On the other hand, so little is known about the group that Reynes was part of, that the MS has to be considered of great value for research.

The caveat applies equally well to Rate. Nevertheless, the unifying force of the personality behind the manuscript has so shaped not only the texts but our approach to them, that despite the lack of concrete evidence I claim the same research value for Ashmole 61. The concurrence of date, location, themes, aims, religious motif, decorative emblems and devotional focus between manuscript and guild can, of course, all be attributed to sheer coincidence, but I believe that the balance of internal evidence is weighted in favour of some relationship between Ashmole 61 and the Corpus Christi Guild at

24 Rock (1903:II, 349) notes that the play of the Resurrection was often written and performed on Easter Day by the priests of large households.

25 Florence Skillington notes that "Plays were acted in St Mary’s and St Martin’s churches at Christmas time, and these churches had equipment of their own. Items in the church accounts indicate that St Martin’s provided for the Stella or Nativity story, and St Mary’s for the Quem Quaeritis or Resurrection play" (1950:53). See the note to line 192 in Wise Man, chapter 2 section 2.6, Other Substantive Variants.
Moreover, there is a coincidence of names in the Leicestershire records which further tips the balance, even though no definite identification is possible.

3.3 William Rate of Leicester

In Hartopp's Wills, an entry is given for one "William Ratt of Leicester". The Register Book of Wills for 1495-1515 has not survived, but the volume for 1515-1526 is kept in the Record Office. It contains a copy of the will of "William Rate of Leicester", dated 1522, which reads (ff.152v, 157v):

Testamentum Willm' Ratt de parochia sti martini Leicester probatum coram [...] Comissario vjto die mensis Junij Anno Millesimo quingentesimo xxiiido [In margin, with pointing hand:] hic nihil quia postea.  
Testamentum Willm' Ratte de Ratte [crossed out] Leicester In dei nomine Amen the yer off our lord god, M iiiii and xxij and the xv day off may I willm' Rate seke in body with hole and parfytt mynd make here my last wyll and testament after this maner ffolowynge ffurst I bequeyth my soule to allmyghty god to our lady seynt mary and to all the holy company off heven and my body to be beried in the church yerd off seynt martyns item I bequeyth to the mother church off Lincoln iiiijd pless to the hye alter iiijd item I wyll pat Roger my eldyst son shall haue my house at lyeth in Wedd[e?]bury when he comyth to lawfull age and so yt muste remayn ffrome on eyr to anoder of the same stoke by trewe Ineritance The Residewe of my landes and godees [sic] both mevable and vnmoveable not bequeyth I gyff them to Jone my wyff whom I make sole executrix to pay my dettes & to beyr the costes & charges off my beriall Item to be good mother to my chylder and when pei be off lawfull age she to gyff theme parte off such gooddes as almyghty god hath lent hyr this performyd I wyll she shall do with the landdes pat I haue gyffyn her what she wyll owder to gyff or to sell and yff pat she be nott able to pay my dettes I wyll that she seell my houses to pay them wytteneis her off Ric' br ysbon thomas hale Robert tymson cum alijs

Couched as it is in conventional terms, there is nothing here to link this Rate with the scribe of Ashmole 61. His concern for his family (absent from the surrounding wills) does wave a flag in our minds, but it is the red flag of caution, and reluctantly, the connection must
remain unproved - for the present.

The name does not appear in any of the witness lists in this Register, and is not indexed after this date. In Hartopp’s *Freemen*, William Ratt is entered as the ‘first son of William, 1509-10 [1-2 Hen. VIII]; Richard Eyre, Mayor’. This entry can be seen in the original First Hall Book [of the Merchant Gild] 1477-1553, which adds nothing except the note of subscription payment (f.101):

\[
\text{Willms' Ratte primus filius Willi' Rat ii l [cancelled, repeated below:] Willms' Ratt primus filius Willi Ratt ii li.}
\]

Also in the First Hall Book (p.13), an entry lists a William Rot as "irenmonger" for 1480 [20-21 Edw.IV] *26. According to the fluidity of spelling in these documents (and the frequent confusion between "o" and "a" in Rate’s hand), this may be the father of William Rate, but no further information is given. Bateson also notes an entry for William Rotte in a Rental of the Corpus Christi Gild dated 1494-5 (1901:349).

Only two other references to William Rate are found; one is in the First Hall Book p.248, a notice of an arbitration agreement between William Rat and a John Whitwell, who appears frequently in guild records *27. The second is in Hamilton-Thompson’s *Calendar*, a record of a deed of Knyghton land granted among others to ‘William Ratte of Leycester’ (1933:384).

I have not found any further records of the name Rate (however spelt) in the Lincolnshire Archives Office, or in the Registers for Lincolnshire or Rutland, or in the Victoria Histories for the surrounding counties, or


*27* This entry is abstracted in Bateson 1901:441.
in other Leicestershire documents of the same period *28. The attempt to trace names and places associated with William Rate as noted above has proved fruitless; most of the names listed in his will and other deeds do appear in the merchant records, but nothing connects him with our scribe. The place-name Weddebury given in his will has proved untraceable to date *29. St Martin's Church is now Leicester Cathedral, and no record of his burial there survives. The record of his name (or one possible form of it) in the Corpus Christi Rental may suggest that he was a member of the Corpus Christi Guild, but the stone inscribed with the members' names has not survived, nor do they appear to have been written in a book, nor are there any specific mentions of religious guilds in the manuscript. We may reflect that William Rate would undoubtedly have used the Guildhall either in his mercantile capacity, or as a member of the Corpus Christi Guild. At the very least we know that in the place where the scribal dialect of a romance manuscript has been localised lived one family bearing the scribe's name, which would appear to support McIntosh's proposition that Rate came from Leicestershire. The next section examines previous attempts to identify the scribe.

28 There are some later entries: in the Leicestershire Record Office the index of persons reveals a single entry to a Thomas Rott of Cotesbach, dated 1554. In all the indexes to the manuscript collections in London, Oxford, and Cambridge, only one reference to the name is to be found, an arraignment of Andrew Ratt in 1485. In the Leicestershire Civil Parish Index a family Ratt is listed among the settlement certificates for 1757-1762. According to Venn (1924:III) an Abraham Rate or Ratt entered Emmanuel College Cambridge in 1602 (1924:422). The Leicestershire Marriage Licences for 1713 (no. 91) and 1727 (no. 112) list Mary and Sarah Ratt.

29 The nearest to it is an entry for "Wedyrley" in the Court Book of 1516, Town Book of Acts (LRO, microfilm).
3.4 David Rate of Scotland

It is certain from the scribal tag to item 32 that the person indicated by 'Rate' is the scribe of Ashmole 61: "Nomen scribentis benedicat lingua legentis. Amen quod Rate". The name RATE appears in the explicit (usually in the 'Amen quod' form) after items 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 13, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 30 ('Rathe'), 32, 34, 35b, 36, 37, and 40 *30. CUL MS KK.1.5 contains the text Ratis Raving, which is a different version of Wise Man (3). The title arises from the colophon to Book 1, line 1801: "The quhilk is ratis raving cald" (Girvan, 1939:51). In three articles (1897, volumes 11 and 12, and 1900) John T.T. Brown attempts to identify the 'Rate' of each manuscript as David Rate, the Vicar of the [Dominican] Order of Preaching Friars of Scotland, who was made Confessor to James I of Scotland in 1427, and is listed in Paul's Register of the Great Seal of Scotland vol.2 as 'David Rat' [sic]. Brown asserts that this David Rate, as he adjusts the spelling, is the author both of all the signed poems in Ashmole 61, and of Ratis Raving in KK.1.5 (1897a) *31. This has been convincingly disproved by Ritchie Girvan (1939:xxxiii-vii), who argues

30 See chapter 1, section 1.5.a, on the misreading of the name as "Kate". See plates 2 and 4 for the signatures.

31 Brown goes even further when he also tries, equally unconvincingly, to suggest that David Rate is to be identified with Ralph Strode, a fourteenth-century philosopher (1897b). His identification of David Rate as the author of Ratis Raving is perpetuated both by Gunn (1918, and 1908:xiii), and by Conlee (1991:line 289n), who mistakenly ascribes not only the authorship but the copying of the poems in MS KK.1.5 to our Rate simply on the coincidence of the names (thereby ignoring the dialectal differences). The frontispiece in Gunn's modern Scots translation, Rait's Raving, shows David Rait's seal, which has no significance for the scribe of Ashmole 61. He further suggests that the 'Falamounte' mentioned in Lost Soul (35a) is identifiable with a place of that name in Midlothian, rather than with Falmouth in Cornwall as generally understood, but I cannot find any record of such a place, and his attempt to link this text with David Rate and our scribe is distinctly strained.
that so many differing texts cannot have been written by the same man; that the oldest manuscript of *Isumbras* (c.1350) pre-dates James I and David Rate; that three of the five romances have different colophons which suggest the names of scribes, not the author, and indeed the three romances which bear Rate's name "are not in the same dialect and are widely separated in date" (1939:xxxv); lastly that the texts in Ashmole 61 show virtually no Scottish dialect *32. On David Rate himself he comments: "The coincidence of names is at any rate striking, for the name, though not rare, is not exactly common" (1939:xxxiii). In Paul's Register at least fourteen other references to the family of Rate or Rait can be found, mainly from the Kincardin region *33. Bliss suggests two possibilities, that the scribe of Ashmole 61 may have been either the author of *Ratis Raving*, or David Rate, but not both. He contends that David Rate himself could not have been the author of *Ratis Raving* since line 728 of that poem states "Fore I am nopir monk nore frere", while it does not seem likely that he was the scribe of Ashmole 61 since the scribal dialect is not Scottish, and there is nothing to suggest that David Rate might have been English. If the unknown author of *Ratis Raving* was the scribe of Ashmole 61, it implies that the extant copy of *Ratis Raving* is a Scottish copy of an English original. Although Girvan suggests that the original might have been written in an English dialect south of the border (1939:xxii), there is no way of proving any connection. In any case, if the late dating of the Ashmole manuscript proves reliable, the time factor alone would seem to preclude even this

*32* See chapter 1 section 1.4.a, Provenance.

*33* See also entries in Hall 1966, Black 1946, Anderson 1926, McFarlane 1900. In Paul's Register (1490) there are further references to a William Rate, the son and heir of David Rate of Drumnager, but there would appear to be no connection with our scribe.
possibility, despite the fact that Bliss suggests: "a writer who in his youth wrote a moral poem might well have spent his old age copying out other poems of moral value, and appending to them a note of his approval" (Thesis 1954:12-13). I think it would "strain chronology" more than a little to identify author with scribe in this way, unless new evidence for re-dating Ashmole 61 appears. As these hypotheses are based on such uncertain variables, it has not been possible to test any of them in the present study.

As to signing the poems being a mark of Rate's "approval", in the context of the whole manuscript I cannot think that the ill-fitting Libeus would have been more favoured by Rate than Orfeo with its special emphasis on marital love and fidelity, nor that Isumbras should be signed when Eustace, closer to the saint's legend, is not; nor why a long run of substantially popular texts in the middle of the manuscript (items 21-28) should not be signed. One obvious explanation is that he signs at whim, maybe that he intended to sign all of them but became forgetful as the manuscript wore on, and then took up the habit again. It is unlikely that the signatures represent stages in copying, since items 21-28 could not have been copied in one stage, while the short opening texts (items 3-8) are individually signed. Items 12-13 were evidently treated as a pair, as were 35a-b. It is probable that 22-23 would also have been copied as a pair, similarly 25-26 (both Court of Heaven texts), yet no signature appears until item 30. After such a labour as copying out the Northern Passion (28), one might expect at least a scribal tag such as appears after item 33, or some other expression of relieved self-congratulation, even a signature. Yet the next article he signs is the short Lament (30) which he appears to 'dash off' with ease.
Other possibilities are unlikely: that 'Rate' is not the name of the scribe of Ashmole 61, but an attribution to the scribe of a source collection from which the signed poems were copied, in the sense that BM MS Add. 29729 was "writen out of mstr. philyppes boke [Harley 172]". But as that would suggest that another scribe called Rate existed whose collection is lost, while the scribe of Ashmole 61 remains anonymous, this theory is, one hopes, unnecessarily complicated. Another suggestion is that 'Rate' is a pen-name, perhaps from 'rathe' (as signed after item 30), earned from his ability to write at speed. The coincidence of the Roman name for Leicester, Ratae, appears to have no bearing, as in the fifteenth century the town was known as Leyr-cestre *34. I agree with Girvan, who reasonably concludes that the 'Rate' of the signed romances refers to "the scribe who wrote, perhaps with modifications introduced by himself, the poems collected in MS Ashmole 61" (1939:xxxv-vi).

3.5 Explicit: "AMEN QUOD RATE"

We have then a picture of the scribe of Ashmole 61 as a devout, sincere, educated man of purpose on the one hand, while on the other he is impatient, careless, whimsical, and idiosyncratic in practice. His manuscript is thus unified by a distinctive personality which sets it apart from other amateur collections of a general 'household library' nature. Notwithstanding Louis's caveat, a strong impression

---

*34 See Burton 1777:146; Throsby 1777:8; Leicestershire and Rutland Notes and Queries 1889-91:I, 13. The Roman evidence is documented by Skillington, who prints the transcription and translation of a Roman milestone discovered in 1771: "ii a Ratis", 'from Ratae 2 miles', and notes that in 50 AD the Romans named the town Ratae Coritanorum, translating from the Celtic word "rath", meaning fortress, hence Ratby and Ratcliffe in the county (1923:9-10, 22).
of the scribe’s personality is communicated through his practice and purpose, which it would be remiss to withhold. The following remarks are general conclusions resulting from the detailed study in chapters 2 and 3.

In his choice of texts and their editing there is a balance between the spiritual and the temporal, between pragmatism and philosophy, between laughter and stern warning. This points up the undoubted fact that he was a man involved with people and concerned about human interests; not maintaining an aloof, superior distance, but mediating for them between this world and the next. An eclectic by nature, he borrowed techniques from preachers, teachers and entertainers in order to make his modified texts suitable for family audiences of mixed age and gender, as Ginn concludes (1967:85):

His general purpose in compiling the book now appears to have been to instruct in the virtuous life, not as it is led in some hermit’s cell withdrawn from the world, but in the midst of the family circle, set against the background of an emergent middle-class society; to remind the members of the family of the delights, responsibilities, perils and penalties attached to such a life and to give them exempla by which to instruct their children. This explains why, in adapting certain passages, the scribe was not generally concerned with maintaining narrative continuity or improving the style of the work. His interest was fixed on human relationships and the morals to be drawn from them, rather than on the intricacies of the plot.

The fact that he simplifies, clarifies and re-writes his copy-texts for his audience shows that he was sensitive to their capacity to understand and took their needs into consideration. He was probably a good communicator, not setting out to dazzle them with theology and high concepts, but trying to reach them on their own level. He tried to stimulate their conscience by visual and imaginative means; he played on their emotions and was himself an emotional and feeling man. In these respects it is plain that he knew his audience and how to
move them, more than a minstrel or a merchant working only to entertain or inform.

The sense of pastoral care in the manuscript goes beyond the personal tastes of a compilation such as Richard Hill’s; Rate’s volume looks outwards and forwards, to other people and to the life to come. His most impressive characteristic is a sense of mission, almost Dominican in nature, as described by Pfander (1937:10-11):

The Dominicans strove to show the people Truth, and to guard them against heresy. To distinguish good from evil, to reprove vice and commend virtue, and to emphasize the rewards of right conduct and the punishment for evil were their constant purposes.

Rate was a passionate Defender of the Faith, fervently devout and dedicated to the Five Wounds of Christ, to the extent of showing an unmistakeable stringency towards wrong-doers, wilful sinners, Jews, and disobedience to God. But this was not intransigency: faithful to Christ’s commandments he was a sincere advocate of repentance, forgiveness and mercy, reformation and salvation (except, it would seem, where Jews were concerned). Nor was he an ascetic; there is a great deal about feasting, drinking and entertaining in the texts, and he appears to have been a very colourful and sensual person; his texts appeal simultaneously to the senses, the imagination and the conscience. He evidently set store by external symbols, since he adopted as his visual signature the fish and the rose, and made sketches of particular tokens and guild or pilgrim badges, the importance of which can only be guessed at. Both the visual and the oral quality of his book has an immediacy still fresh after five hundred years. He undoubtedly had a sense of humour and fun, as J.T.T.Brown equally imaginatively suggests: "His poems evidence his urbanity, his nimble and merry wit, his worldly wisdom heightened
throughout by sly humour" (1897b:11) *35. All this was accompanied, however, by stringent opposition to sin and the wrongful use of drink, sex and authority. He was very keen on lawful marriage and attention to duty, very reproving of unlawful alliances and acts of negligence. If he was married and a father he was probably strict but fair, perhaps not particularly affectionate. He was in favour of disciplining wives and children, and would have been quite severe with wrong-doers, but for their own good rather than his gratification, and this would have been balanced with praise for good and right behaviour.

He was not so much a perfectionist as a zealot, someone who knows what he wants to do, but does not always do it well, especially if he is composing pen-in-hand, thinking on his feet as it were. Many errors are clearly the result of impatience, born of a desire to interpret the spirit rather than the letter of the law, or the text. The fact that he proudly signed his name after nineteen of the texts suggests that he was not particularly self-effacing or modest, rather he was probably quite forthright and outspoken, yet capable of compassion and leniency. The meditative side of the compilation shows that his inner life would have been as intense as his outer life was extrovert: prayer, and the contemplation of death and the after-life figure as prominently as social intercourse.

The evidence for memorial transmission and textual correlations examined in chapter 2 suggests that his many errors and his general carelessness are the products neither of youth nor inexperience. We

35 Although Brown is describing the poems in Ashmole 61, he is under the mistaken belief that he is describing David Rate / Ralph Strode as the single author of all the signed poems, instead of the scribe who copied and altered them. See above, section 3.4.
can imagine him perhaps as a rather worldly but conscientious family chaplain, getting on in years and not as clear-thinking as he used to be, but experienced both in the management of the family's moral well-being, and with a wide range of verse texts from which he drew the present compilation. He found inspiration for the selection and adaptation of his texts from those heard at feasts, religious drama, church sermons and readings, and social gatherings, not forgetting the all-important family circle. Where he obtained his copies from has yet to be ascertained, but that they were written sources is deduced from the nature of his errors, mostly eye-skip and misreadings, with an occasional mishearing of his own voice. He collected them for the purpose of evangelising the importance of family unity and piety, speaking through the beguiling mask of the entertainer. Thus he was both amateur scribe and amateur disour, and also amateur preacher. At this stage a more positive identification has yet to be made.
CHAPTER FOUR

Affiliation of the Scribe's Texts

Guide to Presentation

The purpose of this chapter is to provide quick-reference sections of functional information about each of Rate's texts in item order, to be used conjointly with the transcriptions in the second volume *1. To this end, I have produced a table of manuscripts containing the same version as, or the nearest version to, each Ashmole text, providing a line of relevant information for each manuscript; to this is appended a brief list of editions of individual texts, followed by a more discursive section of notes on the affiliation of the Ashmole text with its cognate copies (see below). The information is organised as follows:

(Item number) Item title

The titles assigned to the items are my own and given in modern English, except where the Latin title is commonly used, as in Stans Puer ad Mensam. The manuscript title, if any, is given in the transcription *2.

---

*1 In the manner of the headnotes provided by other editors of entire manuscripts, notably Rigg, Thesis, 1966. Items 6 and 14 are treated together, as are 9 and 11, and 12-13. Page numbers of the texts are listed in the manuscript contents list in chapter 1.

*2 The title for Libeus Disconeus (20) is taken from Rate's own spelling of the hero's name in lines 294, 318, 357, 387, 400, 423, 766, 793 and 2204c; similarly I have preserved Rate's spelling of Dame Curtasy (8).
### Manuscripts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IMEV (number)</th>
<th>sigla</th>
<th>folio</th>
<th>lines (30)</th>
<th>date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 OBL Ashmole 61</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>122r</td>
<td>28 (-5+3)</td>
<td>c1500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 LBM Harley 1234</td>
<td>Ha</td>
<td>23v</td>
<td>32 (+2)</td>
<td>16C in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 LBM Harley 5678</td>
<td>Hb</td>
<td>4r</td>
<td>32 (-6+8)</td>
<td>pre-1487</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 LIN Thornton</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>p50</td>
<td>18 (only)</td>
<td>c1440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 *ROM Eng.Coll.1306</td>
<td></td>
<td>87v</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As it has not been possible to see every cognate version, the manuscripts that I have not seen personally are marked by an asterisk before the manuscript title, and information for those manuscripts is usually restricted to the folio number, except where supplied from the printed editions. I have excluded early prints. The manuscripts are listed by the source-library, designated by three capital letters (abbreviations below); this is followed by the short title or name where the manuscript is known as such (eg. Vernon, Simeon, Wheatley, and the Lincoln and London Thornton manuscripts) *4. The manuscript containing the version of a text used as a basis for the collations with Ashmole 61 is designated the "base manuscript" and highlighted in the table, except where A is compared with only one other manuscript.

The **sigla** column shows the sigla which I have used in collating the manuscripts. Where they have been taken from printed editions this is stated in the notes.

The **folio** column gives the folio number of the beginning of the text; where page numbers are used, the number is prefixed by "p"; "fly" indicates that the text is written on an unnumbered flyleaf. Any text which is preserved as a single fragment, or a single leaf, is given as "frag".

---

4 The abbreviations list includes explanations of abbreviated names of locations and manuscripts.
The _lines_ column shows the disposition of omitted and added lines in each text used in collation, with the base number given in brackets in the heading. The number of total lines in each text is given, followed by the number of omitted and added lines according to the base number above. Thus in the given example, "28 (-5+3)" indicates that out of the base number of 30, A has a total of 28 because 5 were omitted and 3 added (the base numbers are calculated according to the base text). Where the text is simply a fragment of a certain number of lines, this is indicated by the total number followed by "(only)". In the case of the unique texts in Ashmole 61, or those with only one other extant version, a base number is not usually given. I have not calculated the disposition of lines for those texts in which I have relied on printed editions, such as items 5, 20, 28, and 32, where only one or two texts are printed in full, with the rest collated. The total number of lines in Ashmole 61 is 16,400.

The _date_ column lists the date of each manuscript as far as it is known. Specific cases are infrequent, and mostly approximations are used (abbreviations below). NB: I have not attempted to standardise the form of date cited in the different catalogues and editions consulted for each manuscript and text, and for the sake of space I have not specified the sources used *5.

**Editions**

**CE** Critical edition (if any).

Ritson 1802:II, 104.

---

5 I have not listed manuscript catalogues in the bibliography, with the exception of the Lansdowne Catalogue (Ellis, 1812) which prints one of the texts (item 10).
The editions list cites any critical edition used for each item as a whole, and a list of editions of individual texts showing where the text has been "printed from" which manuscript (listed in sigla order), and "by whom", listed (in recent-early date order) by the short "author date:pages" reference to the main bibliography. It has been found helpful to include short titles of widely used references, such as EETS, and Brown's Religious Lyrics series (RL14, RL15). Facsimiles of manuscripts are also included. This list is not intended to be comprehensive, and the IMEV and SUPP should be consulted for further references.

**Affiliation**

This section is exclusively concerned with the relationship of the Ashmole copy to those found in other manuscripts, as established by detailed work on collating and cross-comparing the Ashmole text with its cognate versions, establishing the patterns of line agreement, addition and omission. The amount of information selected for each section varies according to the material. Insignificant variation of vocabulary and word-order has generally been attributed to scribal preference and ignored; the reader may consult the collations to the texts in volume 2, or the printed editions for more information.

The stanza or line tables appended to certain sections show the correspondence of the stanzas in each version to the base text given in the first column. The figures refer to the position of the base stanza number in each manuscript, reading downwards. Omitted stanzas

---

* Since this thesis was eventually restricted to commentary directly relevant to the Ashmole version, much of the collation work originally intended for these sections has had to be excluded. However, I have retained the sigla for the reader’s convenience in using the texts in volume 2 and the collations given there.
are indicated by a dash, additional stanzas are lettered, and appear after the relevant stanza in each manuscript on separate lines. Square brackets indicate that the text within that stanza corresponds to but differs substantially from the same stanza in the base text, and is not considered additional material. Figures in round brackets after a stanza number refer to the extant lines in a fragmented stanza, thus "5 (1-4)" shows that in stanza 5 only lines 1-4 remain (omissions of less than half a stanza are not shown). Figures in round brackets after an added stanza show the number of additional lines if these exceed the usual number, thus "A (+4)" indicates that where the main stanza length is, for example, 8 lines, the unique added stanza in this text contains 4 extra lines to give a total of 12. Line tables are generally given for the short texts, and in these added lines are given on a separate line in the usual way with lower-case letters.
Abbreviations

Libraries

OBL Oxford, Bodleian Library
OXF Other Oxford-held manuscripts
CUL Cambridge, University Library
CAM Other Cambridge-held manuscripts
LBM London, British Museum (British Library)
LON Other London-held manuscripts
BRU Brussels
BTH Bath
DUB Dublin, Trinity College
DUR Durham Cathedral Library
GLA Glasgow University Library
JRL John Ryland’s Library, Manchester
LEY Leyden University, Netherlands
LIN Lincoln
LST Lost manuscript
MAN Manchester
NLM National Library of Medicine, Washington
NLI National Library of Naples
NLS National Library of Scotland, Edinburgh
NLW National Library of Wales, Aberystwyth
NOT Nottingham University Library
PRI Privately owned manuscript
USA American-held manuscripts; texts from printed editions only
USH Ushaw, Durham
YRK York

Locations

Bibl. Bibliotek
Chetham Chetham’s Music School Library, Manchester
Fitz. Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge
Folger Folger Library, Washington DC
Harv. Harvard University Library
Helm. olim Helmingham Hall, Pierpont Morgan Library, New York
Hunt. Huntington Library, San Marino, California
Lambeth Lambeth Palace Library
Linc.Inn Lincoln’s Inn Library, London
Morgan Pierpont Morgan Library, New York
Pepys Pepys Library, Magdalene College, Cambridge
Soc.Antiq Society of Antiquaries, Burlington House, London
Wellcome Wellcome Institute of Historical Medicine, London
Windsor St George’s Chapel Library, London

Manuscripts

Add. Additional manuscript
Adv. NLS Advocates manuscripts
Brome Yale University MS 365
Capesthorne Latin Misc.c.66
Cooke Davies Cooke, Owston, Yorks.
Delamere Boiles Penrose III, Yorks.
Glazier  olim Berkeley, art. 3, New York, Horae
Greg  olim Huth MS 153
Hale MS  Lincoln’s Inn 150
Ireland–Blackburne  University of Pennsylvania, MS Eng. 1
Misc.  Miscellany
Osborn  Yale University Library
Percy  Percy folio, LBM Add. 27879
Rawl.  OBL Rawlinson poetry manuscripts
Richardson  Harvard University Deposit
Simeon  LBM Add. 22283
Thornton  LBM Add. 31042
Vernon  OBL English poetry A. 1 (s. c. 3938)
Wheatley  LBM Add. 39574
Worcs.  Worcestershire Misc., LBM Add. 37787

LBM Cotton MSS: Caligula, Tiberius, Titus, Vespasian

Dates

15C  Fifteenth century
15C  1  First half of fifteenth century
15C  2  Second half of fifteenth century
15C in  Early fifteenth century (First third)
15C  med  Mid fifteenth century (Middle third)
15C  ex  Late fifteenth century (Last third)
15C  i  First quarter of fifteenth century
15C  ii  Second quarter of fifteenth century
15C  iii  Third quarter of fifteenth century
15C  iv  Fourth quarter of fifteenth century
pre-1450  Before 1450
post-1450  After 1450
c1450  About 1450
1480–90  Between these dates
Item 1: The Life of St Eustace

**Manuscripts**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manuscript</th>
<th>Sigla</th>
<th>Folio</th>
<th>Lines (426)</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IMEV 211</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>122v</td>
<td>464 (-17+55)</td>
<td>c1500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>1r</td>
<td>426</td>
<td>c1290</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Editions**

D Horstmann, Aeleg 1881:211-19, A collated *1
Stengel 1871:57-9, beginning and end only

**Affiliation**

This version of Eustace is extant in only one other manuscript from the thirteenth century. While we cannot know the importance to Rate of beginning his anthology with this particular text, Eustace exemplifies the type of scribal alteration that occurs in many of the subsequent texts. It is thus valuable to us for the opportunity to examine the changes that occur to a tale as it passes through two centuries of transmission. The unknown intervening steps can be inferred from the trends that are exhibited in the fifteenth-century redaction, such as simplification, clarification, altered emphasis and scribal intervention. These changes show that Ashmole is not a copy of Digby, and that the extra text in A is due to later additions, rather than that A represents a longer original version, parts of which have been omitted from D.

---

1 See the unpublished edition of the manuscript by Joanna Watson, Thesis 1970.
Item 2: Lydgate: Ram's Horn

**Manuscripts**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Sigla</th>
<th>Folio</th>
<th>Lines (56)</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>OBL Ashmole 61</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>5v</td>
<td>63 (-17+24)</td>
<td>c1500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>OBL Bodley 686</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>190v</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>1430-40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>CAM Trinity Coll.1450</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>27r</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>c1450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>LBM Harley 4011</td>
<td>Ha</td>
<td>1r</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>16in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>LBM Harley 172</td>
<td>Hb</td>
<td>71v</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>pre-1487</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>LBM Harley 2251</td>
<td>Hc</td>
<td>19r</td>
<td>24 (only)</td>
<td>pre-1464</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>LBM Add.29729</td>
<td>Aa</td>
<td>10r</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>1558</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>LBM Add.12195</td>
<td>Ab</td>
<td>121v</td>
<td>8 (only)</td>
<td>1461-83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>LBM Lansdowne 409</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>265v</td>
<td>64 (+8)</td>
<td>pre-1433</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>*NLS Adv.1.1.6 ('Bann.')</td>
<td>Ba</td>
<td>79v</td>
<td>48 (-8)</td>
<td>1568</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>*USA Ellesmere 4</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>18r</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>pre-1456</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Editions**

CE - MacCracken, EETS 192, 1934:461-4; prints E with collations from all manuscripts except A and Ab *1


Hb - Halliwell-Phillipps 1840:171-3

Ba - Fox and Ringler 1980; Scolar Press Facsimile

Ritchie 1928:201-2

Fitzgibbon 1888:78-9

Sibbald 1802:III, 221-2

Hailes 1770:165-6

**Affiliation**

Henry MacCracken excludes Rate's version from his edition on the grounds that it is "quite altered by the Scots scribe" (1934:461) *2.

I have used Rigg's sigla, except for the following adaptations: H a-c correspond with Rigg's H 1-3; since he assigns no siglum to BM Add.12195, I designate this manuscript Ab, and Add.29729 Aa (his "BM").

---

*1 For a description of E see Manly-Rickert 1940:I, 148-59.

*2 For the arguments against Rate as a Scottish scribe see chapter 3 section 3.4.
A study of the collations reveals that there are two main manuscript groupings, with a peripheral group of variants. The main groups are represented by E B Ha and Hb Aa T, which frequently intersect *3. A mainly follows the Hb-group in its common stanzas, but is set apart by its prolific local variations, and by its three extra stanzas. The single stanza in Ab is substantially different, and bears a nominal correspondence only with A; they agree against the rest in Ab lines 44 ("olde & 3enge") and 46 ("heue nor morne").

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>E</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>Ba</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>Hc</th>
<th>Ab</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A

B

C

*3 See Rigg 1968:58 for full discussion of the affiliations.

*4 Column E also includes Ha B Hb Aa T.
Item 3: The Wise Man Taught his Son

Manuscripts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IMEV 1985</th>
<th>sigla</th>
<th>folio</th>
<th>lines (192)</th>
<th>date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 OBL Ashmole 61</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>6r</td>
<td>100 (-92)</td>
<td>c1500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 LBM Harley 2399</td>
<td>Ha</td>
<td>61r</td>
<td>142 (-50)</td>
<td>15C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| IMEV 1877 | |
|-----------|-------|-------|-------------|------|
| 3 CUL Ff.2.38 | F | 53r | 188 (-4) | 1480-90 |
| 4 LBM Harley 5396 | Hb | 297r | 188 (-4) | 1456 |

| IMEV 1891 | |
|-----------|-------|-------|-------------|------|
| 5 OXF Balliol Coll.354 | B | 157r | 144 (-63+15) | 1503-1536 |
| 6 LON Lambeth 853 | L | p186 | 152 (-56+16) | 14/15C |

Editions

CE Fischer 1889. German edition. Texts edited and all manuscripts discussed. Prints texts from F Hb L; A is collated to Hb.

A Furnivall, EETS ES 8, 1869:52-5
Hb Hazlitt, Remains, 1864:I, 168-77
Ritson 1883:II, 89-97; rpr. 1884:II, 13-22
L Furnivall, EETS 32, 1868:48-52

Affiliation

Since F and Hb agree throughout on the text, and contain a more logical ordering of the stanzas than appears in the other manuscripts, it is assumed that this version represents the correct one, and F is accordingly taken as a base text (stanza numbers refer to F) *1. The first five stanzas in A Ha agree with F Hb, after which A Ha contain a different number of omitted stanzas, and a different arrangement of the remaining stanzas until they agree at stanzas 20-24 (see further below).

*1 Similarly in items 19, 30 and 35b, F provides the base text for the collations since in these cases it appears to be the most consistent, careful and reliable version. This suggests that the compilers of the manuscript took considerable pains to acquire or produce the most authoritative texts for the collection, possibly under the auspices of a bookshop. A detailed study of the entire volume would enable a useful investigation of this view.
The stanza arrangements indicate that at least three traditions exist for this poem. The first, probably closest to the original, is represented by F and Hb. The second, possibly a later tradition, is evidenced by the rearranged order of the final stanzas in A and Ha, although textually they are not closely allied *2. The third tradition contains the very divergent material exhibited by L and B, and this would indicate that there are two main versions of the poem itself; one represented by F Hb A Ha, the other by L B. The only manuscripts which bear a close relationship are F and Hb, although it is not certain whether one was copied from the other.

The omissions in A bring together the three stanzas concerning wives, but in a different sequence to F. They are placed after the opening stanzas on duty to God and the need for self-discipline. The last four stanzas, warning of the superficiality of worldly gain, are re-arranged in an order perhaps thought to be more logical by the scribe or previous redactor. The same order is to be found in Ha, although this omits stanza 23, and 24 is a later addition.

Rate’s text of this poem is valuable because it includes four lines (181-4) which are lost from all the others, except that L B (line 126) pick up A line 182, on setting no price by worldly riches: perhaps Rate had access to a lost exemplar containing these lines (thus one nearer to the original), rather than to one arising from the F Hb tradition.

*2 Ha has too many differing readings from A to be related, but its many agreements with A against the others either in separate words or complete lines (A lines 14, 17, 21, 22, 30, 36-7 rhyme-swop, 145, 152 and 164), corroborate the grouping of A with Ha, rather than with Hb as Fischer.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>F</th>
<th>Hb</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>Ha</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>L</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>[3]</td>
<td>[3]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>(5-8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>(5-8)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>(1-4)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Item 4: The Good Wife Taught her Daughter

Manuscripts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manuscript</th>
<th>Sigla</th>
<th>Folio</th>
<th>Lines</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OBL Ashmole 61</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>7r</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>c1500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emmanuel Coll. 106</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>48v</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>c1350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trinity Coll. 599</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>211r</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>1460-90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lambeth 853</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>p102</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>1425-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunt. HM. 128</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>216v</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>1597</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LST Norfolk</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>225</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Editions


A Furnivall, EETS ES 8, 1869:44-51
L Furnivall, EETS 32, 1868:36-47
Coulton 1918:446-51
H Hindley 1872:II, 2-17
Hazlitt, Remains 1864:I, 178-92
N H.Gibbs 1873:163-71

Affiliation

This item has been thoroughly investigated by Mustanoja, to whose monograph reference may be made for all questions of textual criticism, manuscript affiliation and editions of the texts. My remarks are here confined to the main differences in the text of Ashmole 61. Mustanoja does not discuss the Ashmole text on its own merits, noting simply (1948:124):

A, written in an entirely different metre and full of muddles, is clearly inferior to all other texts of The Good Wife Taught Her Daughter.
A is out on a limb in Mustanoja's stemma, grouped most closely with H (1948:122). It follows the H version in substance, closely enough to be considered a cognate text, but dissimilar to the extent that no line-by-line cross-comparison is practicable. Part of the difficulty arises from the re-working of the stanza form into couplets, which are not grouped together in closely corresponding sections *1: the text in a single four-line stanza in H, for example, may be represented by two to four or more couplets in A. These are often interspersed with additional lines in the form of tags or truisms, and the rhyming lines of the couplets help to expand the ideas embodied in the corresponding stanzas.

1 In this I disagree with Mustanoja who states that "its arrangement of the subject-matter corresponds with that of the original version, as represented by EHLTNN" (1948:117). For clarity I have arranged the couplets in my transcription of the A text in loosely corresponding groups, which show the uneven correlation of the subject-matter.
Item 5: SIR ISUMBRAS

Manuscripts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IMEV 1184</th>
<th>sigla</th>
<th>folio</th>
<th>lines (828)</th>
<th>date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 OBL Ashmole 61</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>9r</td>
<td>822 (-51+45)</td>
<td>c1500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 OBL Douce 261</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>1r</td>
<td></td>
<td>1564</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 OXF University Coll.142</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>p237</td>
<td></td>
<td>15C ex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 CAM Caius College 175</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>p98</td>
<td></td>
<td>c1400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 LBM Cotton Calig.A.2</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>130r</td>
<td></td>
<td>c1450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 LON Gray's Inn 20</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>frag</td>
<td></td>
<td>c1350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 NLS Advocates 19.3.1</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>48r</td>
<td></td>
<td>post-1478</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 *LIN Thornton</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>109r</td>
<td></td>
<td>c1440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 *NLN 13.B.29</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>p114</td>
<td></td>
<td>1457</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Editions

CE Schleich 1901. "Best text" edition in German with collations printed from all manuscripts except U, including three prints (Douce, Copland and Malone). A multi-text edition in English of the romance is long overdue *1.

U Brown 1914:329
L Mills 1973:125-47, 208-14
G D'Evelyn 1918:73-6
T Brewer and Owen 1977; Scolar Press Facsimile
Halliwell-Phillips 1844a:88-120
N Köhlbing 1880:200-2
Wright and Halliwell-Phillips, RelAnt, 1842:II, 67; vv.19 only

Affiliation

I have relied on Schleich’s edition for this text, which is not based on any single manuscript; he prints a stemma of manuscript affiliations on p.87. Two groups, y and z descend from the original; A is assigned to sub-group y which further divides into sub-group w containing T E. Line numbers are taken from Schleich’s edition, except that lines 192a-1 correspond to his unnumbered added stanza XV1b, and lines 708a-1 = stanza L1Xb (total lines therefore 804+24).

*1 See the unpublished thesis by Broh 1969, based on the Caius MS.
## Item 6, 14: The Ten Commandments

### Manuscripts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IMEV 1111</th>
<th>sigla</th>
<th>folio</th>
<th>lines (40)</th>
<th>date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OBL Ashmole 61</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>16v</td>
<td>56 (+16)</td>
<td>c1500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Text Occurring Separately

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IMEV 3687</th>
<th>sigla</th>
<th>folio</th>
<th>lines (40)</th>
<th>date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CUL Ii.1.26</td>
<td>CI</td>
<td>88v</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>15C in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAM Corp.Chr.Coll.423</td>
<td>Cc</td>
<td>p81</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>15C ex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LBM Add.37049</td>
<td>Ad5</td>
<td>20v</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>c1400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LBM Harley 7578</td>
<td>Har10</td>
<td>1r</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>15C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Text in Speculum Christiani

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IMEV 1491</th>
<th>sigla</th>
<th>folio</th>
<th>lines (40)</th>
<th>date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OBL Bodley 89</td>
<td>Bo2</td>
<td>3r</td>
<td>28 (only)</td>
<td>c1400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OBL Eng.th.e.16</td>
<td>Eng</td>
<td>6v</td>
<td>36 (-4)</td>
<td>15C 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OBL Hatton 97</td>
<td>Hat</td>
<td>2r</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>15C in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OBL Laud 513</td>
<td>Lau2</td>
<td>64r</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>15C in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OBL Rawlinson.c.401</td>
<td>Ra1</td>
<td>2v</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>15C in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OXF Corp.Chr.Coll.155</td>
<td>Co2</td>
<td>149r</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>15C in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CUL Add.6150</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>5r</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>15C 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CUL Dd.4.51</td>
<td>CD</td>
<td>7r</td>
<td>(frags)</td>
<td>15C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CUL Ff.1.14</td>
<td>Ff1</td>
<td>25r</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>15C 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CUL Hh.1.13</td>
<td>Hh</td>
<td>6r</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>15C in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAM Jesus College 51</td>
<td>Jes</td>
<td>4r</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>15C in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAM St John's Coll.176</td>
<td>Jo</td>
<td>5r</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>15C in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAM Pembroke Coll.285</td>
<td>Pem</td>
<td>4r</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>15C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LBM Add.10052</td>
<td>Ad2</td>
<td>22r</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>15C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LBM Add.21202</td>
<td>Ad3</td>
<td>6r</td>
<td>32 (-8)</td>
<td>15C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LBM Add.22212</td>
<td>Ad4</td>
<td>6r</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>14C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LBM Harley 206</td>
<td>Har1</td>
<td>20v</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>15C med</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LBM Harley 6580</td>
<td>Bas</td>
<td>6r</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>15C med</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LBM Lansdowne 344</td>
<td>Lan</td>
<td>7r</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1425</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### IMEV 3687

| OBL Bodley 61 | Bo1 | 4r | 40 | 15C in |
| OBL Bodley 423 | Bo3 | 351v | 40 | 1430-40 |
| OBL Douce 107 | Do | 51r | 40 | 15C in |
| OBL Greaves 54 | Gr | 1v | 32 (-8) | 15C in |
| OBL Laud 104 | Lau1 | 3r | 40 | 15C in |
| CAM Trinity Coll.376 | Tr | 103v | 16 (only) | 15C |
| LBM Add.15257 | Ad1 | 11r | 40 | 15C |
| LBM Harley 1197 | Har2 | 82r | 40 | 15C |
| LBM Harley 2250 | Har4 | 51r | 40 | 1477 |
| LBM Harley 2379 | Har5 | 65v | 40 | 15C |
Other Manuscripts

For the full list see Holmstedt.

Editions

CE  Holmstedt, EETS 182, 1933. Brief descriptions, discussion and parallel texts printed of Harley 6580 and Lansdowne 344 with collations from all other manuscripts except CUL Add.6150 (CA), CUL Dd.4.51 (CD), and CUL II.i.1.26 (CI), which were not known to him. I have used his other sigla, except that the superscripted numbers have had to remain infra-linear, and that Ashmole 61 (A) is designated Ashl in his list; the line numbering is my own.

A  Zupitza 1890:46-8
Jes  Wright and Halliwell-Phillips, RelAnt, 1841:I, 49-50

Affiliation

The manuscripts listed under IMEV 1491 share an introductory couplet, as printed by Holmstedt (1933:16):

In heuen schal dwelle al cristien men
That knowen and kepe goddes byddynges ten

Otherwise the texts are the same as those listed under IMEV 3687. For the purposes of cross-comparison I have ignored this couplet, and my remarks are confined to Rate's text. The A text is listed separately in the IMEV on account of four unique stanzas which set it apart from the 36 manuscripts containing the Commandments listed above (1933:cxviii-cxix). Holmstedt lists 66 manuscripts and fully discusses the manuscript groupings and collations, excluding A and the other manuscripts which do not contain the entire Speculum Christiani. The differences between the separately-occurring group are minimal; Ad5 shows more variation than A. The introductory stanza in A is numbered in roman numerals i-iv, and the concluding stanzas as lines 41-52. Apart from this variant the body of the text does not differ
from the Speculum version except in minor changes of vocabulary which are noted in the transcription.

Item 14, repetition of first two stanzas

The Prayer to Mary (15) is 'prefaced' by a re-copy of the first two stanzas of the Commandments. No cancellation marks are used, but this is typical of Rate's practice in allowing errors to stand.

If the first introductory stanza alone had been copied, it might have been thought a deliberate device to ally the Commandments and Prayer as texts suitable for public recitation, either in a sermon context or separately. But to re-copy the second stanza containing the first commandment as well undermines such a conjecture. Robinson's explanation is that Rate was working from different exemplars and thoughtlessly began re-copying a poem he already had, which accounts for the minor variations in spelling. However, there may be a different interpretation.

Each error in the first two stanzas of the Commandments is corrected in the re-copy prefacing the Prayer: erasures and expunctions in lines 1 and 2 do not appear; "kne" (line 3) is corrected to "knele", and "eter" (line 5) to "enter". I believe that item 14 represents a fairer copy of the Commandments, but that Rate saw no necessity for re-copying the whole poem, and fitted it onto the Prayer as convenient preface. Alternatively, he could have re-used the opening address which he composed for or added to the Commandments, absent-mindedly continuing with the first commandment and allowing the error to stand unmarked.

I have not seen any, despite Pamela Robinson's statement to the contrary (1972:38).
If Robinson is correct in assuming that item 14 is from a second exemplar, then the conjecture that Rate composed stanzas 1 and 12-14 is disproved, for the longer poem would then have existed elsewhere — unless he was copying his own redaction. If my interpretation is correct it not only supports the attribution of the added lines to Rate, but also indicates that he may have been in the habit of making preliminary drafts, and this may account both for the re-copy of Eustace and for many errors which creep in through successive stages of the copying process.
Item 7: Stans Puer Ad Mensam

Manuscripts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IMEV 1694</th>
<th>sigla</th>
<th>folio</th>
<th>lines</th>
<th>date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 OBL Ashmole 61</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>17v</td>
<td>252 (-3)</td>
<td>c1500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IMEV 2233</th>
<th>lines (99)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 OBL Ashmole 59</td>
<td>Aa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 OBL Bodley 48</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 OBL Bodley 686</td>
<td>b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 OBL Laud 683</td>
<td>Ld</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 OBL Rawl.c.48</td>
<td>r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 OBL Rawl.c.86</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 OBL Rawl.d.328</td>
<td>Rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 OBL Rawl.f.32</td>
<td>Rp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 OXF Balliol Coll.354</td>
<td>Ba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 CUL Ff.4.9</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 CUL Hh.4.12</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 CAM Jesus Coll.56</td>
<td>J</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 CAM Pembroke Coll.120</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 LBM Add.5467</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 LBM Cotton Calig.A.2</td>
<td>Cl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 LBM Harley 2251</td>
<td>Ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 LBM Harley 4011</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 LBM Lansdowne 699</td>
<td>Ls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 LBM Stowe 982</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 LON Lambeth 853</td>
<td>Lb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 *LEY Vossius 9</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 *USA NIM Washington 4</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IMEV 4153 (Urbanitas)</th>
<th>lines (99)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24 LBM Cotton Calig.A.2</td>
<td>Cl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 NLS Advocates 19.3.1</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Editions

CE MacCracken, EETS 192, 1934:739-44. Prints Ld with collations from all manuscripts except A F P E N.

A Furnivall, EETS ES 8, 1869:56-64
Rd Thomson 1979
Ba Browning, Thesis, 1935:322-4; edition of manuscript
J Hazlitt, Remains, 1866:III, 23-8
Wright and Halliwell-Phillips, RelAnt, 1841:I, 156-8
Ha Lb, Furnivall, EETS 32, 1868:26-33
Lb Coulton 1918:90-3
Affiliation

The line numbers refer to my own numbering of the Ashmole 61 text; in discussing the cognate texts I have supplied MacCracken's line numbering in brackets. The manuscript groupings are not easily determined, since the readings are much diversified. There appear to be two main groups: B b Ld F C P M Cl Ld, which read "sone" for "chyld" (line 1), and "it is" for "also" (line 50); and Aa r R Rp Ba J Ba H Ls L which read "chyld" and "also", but these are hardly substantive variants. The A lines in common with the usual text belong with the second group reading "chyld" in line 49, but since Rate uses the words interchangeably throughout the manuscript this is no proof of affiliation. The brief extract his text shares with the others is not long enough, and contains too many individual readings, to determine which version the scribe was copying (or imperfectly remembering) *1.

In the next section I have drawn up a table which shows the concurrence of ideas between Stans Puer (7), Dame Curtasy (8), the Advocates (7), and their cognates. The table shows that the greater amount of concurrence is between the two Ashmole texts and not with their cognates: Ashmole (7) shares ideas with Ashmole (8) alone in lines 13-15, 79-80, 87-8, 121-2, 145-8, 169-70, and 212; with Ashmole (8) and Advocates (7) in lines 71, 156 and 167-8; with Advocates (7) alone in lines 113-14 and 181-4; with the (8) cognates alone in lines 149-50, and with its own cognates alone in lines 49-67, 97-8, and 161-2.

*1 See chapter 2 section 2.2.e, on the argument for re-naming this text.
Item 8: Dame Curtasy

Manuscripts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IMEV 4127</th>
<th>sigla</th>
<th>folio</th>
<th>lines</th>
<th>date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 OBL Ashmole 61</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>20r</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>c1500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IMEV 1920</th>
<th>lines (108)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 OXF Balliol Coll.354</td>
<td>O 141r 104 (-4) 1503-1536</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 CUL Ee.4.35/1</td>
<td>C 22v 104 (-4) post-1503</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 LBM Add.8151</td>
<td>L 201v 108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 LBM Harley 541</td>
<td>H 210 87 (-21) c1480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 LBM Egerton 1995</td>
<td>E 58v 106 (-2) c1470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 NLS Adv.19.3.1</td>
<td>S 84v 107 (-5+4) post-1478</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Editions

CE Breul 1885:58-63. Prints emended text based on S, with collations from all manuscripts and early prints except A and L. I have used his sigla, except to substitute S for his A (= Advocates).

A H Furnivall, EETS 32, 1868:16-25
O Flügel 1903:151-6

Affiliation

Rate’s text shares only lines 5-10 with its cognates, and therefore a detailed collation of all the versions was unjustified. The Ashmole text is compared with the Advocates text printed by Breul. His stemma is given on p.55. It is clear from studying Breul’s collations that the main version is represented by H E C O and two prints, while the Advocates version is the variant; this is clear on the stemma, where S is in sub-group x, with the others in y. L follows the main group and should be placed with H. Since it alone contains the full text with few individual variants, it would prove a reliable base text for a future new edition.
The six lines that Ashmole 61 shares with the other versions promote the idea that courtesy was sent into the world when Gabriel first greeted the Virgin Mary. There are few significant differences with the cognates; the "seyvon artys" of line 3 in the main version is changed to "scyens seuen" (line 5), and the rhyme adjusted accordingly. As with Stans Puer (7), Rate abandons the usual text and his own version diverges greatly. The greater proportion of the unique material in (7) and (8) is in the early part of the texts, in (8) mainly devotional instructions prefacing the more mundane lessons in table etiquette, in the unique prologue to (7) and also in the latter part of (7) (eg. line 170 onwards), which suggests that at least the introductory and concluding material in these variant versions was added by Rate.

As introduced in the previous section, in the following table the disposition of line numbers for Dame Curtasy is as follows: the Ashmole (8) shares ideas with the Ashmole (7) alone in lines 1-2, 25-6, 29, 55, 103-4, 105-6, 137-8, 143-4; with Ashmole (7) and Advocates (7) in lines 57, 101, and 137-8; with Advocates (7) alone in lines 70-1, 83-4, and 119; with the Stans Puer cognates alone in lines 91-2, and 95; and with its own cognates alone in lines 5-10, and 123-4. The two Ashmole texts are given first (A 7, A 8) followed by the base text of Stans Puer, Laud 683 (L 7), and the base text of Dame Curtasy, Advocates 19.3.1 (S 8), and the Advocates Stans Puer, (S 7). The lines are given according to their sequence in Ashmole (7), and the subject of the reference is given in the final column.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A7</th>
<th>A8</th>
<th>L7</th>
<th>S8</th>
<th>S7</th>
<th>Subject</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>5-10</td>
<td>3-8</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>Courtesy came from heaven</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>70-1</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>77-8</td>
<td>Don’t boast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>83-4</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>Be careful what you say</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>91-2</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>Sit where you’re told to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>Take leave of your neighbour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>Keep your knife clean and sharp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>123-4</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>61,81</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>Keep the tablecloth clean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-15</td>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>To thrive, learn courtesy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49-67</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>1-17</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>In hall keep still and be polite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54-6</td>
<td>65-6</td>
<td>6-7</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>Keep still while conversing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>141-2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>53-4</td>
<td>50-1</td>
<td>Don’t pick your nose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>Don’t scratch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65-6</td>
<td>66-7</td>
<td>15-17</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>63-4</td>
<td>Look at person speaking to you</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>63-4</td>
<td>Scorn nobody</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>89-90</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>13-14</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>Don’t sit until invited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79-80</td>
<td>25-6</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>Say grace before meals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>Don’t gobble your food</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87-8</td>
<td>103-4</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>Be content with what you’re given</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93-4</td>
<td>125-6</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>Keep your spoon clean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97-8</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>Clean hands and nails before meals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>Don’t stuff your mouth full</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109-10</td>
<td>109-10</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>35-6</td>
<td>57-8</td>
<td>Don’t talk/laugh with mouth full</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113-14</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>41-2</td>
<td>Cut only what you will eat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119-20</td>
<td>127-8</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>Don’t slurp while drinking soup</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121-2</td>
<td>105-6</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>Wipe your mouth before drinking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>133</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>Don’t pick teeth with knife</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>145-8</td>
<td>143-4</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>Don’t play with animals at table</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>149-50</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>Don’t dip food in the salt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>153</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>30-1</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>Use a clean knife in the salt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>156</td>
<td>137-8</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>3-9</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>Bare your head/bow when spoken to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>157-8</td>
<td>115-18</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>87-8</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>Spit discreetly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>161-2</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Don’t sit above your station</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>167-8</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>Don’t repeat all you hear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>169-70</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>Don’t speak until spoken to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>181-4</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>29-30</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>To thrive, respect parents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201-6</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>81-4</td>
<td>Walk behind/outside your better</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>212</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>Say pater noster, ave and creed *1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>237-8</td>
<td>133-4</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>69-70</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>Make sure your better has the cup</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>247</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>Don’t speak ribaldry</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

1 See also Prayer to Mary (15) lines 53-5, and Libeus (20) line 2204e.
Items 9, 11a, 11b: Latin Proverbs

Item 9: Walther 31228
Item 11a: Walther Not present
Item 11b: Walther Similar lines in 31559 and 12306
(Ashmole version not given)

Manuscripts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>sigla</th>
<th>folio</th>
<th>lines</th>
<th>date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OBL Ashmole 61</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>21v</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>c1500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes

I am indebted to Dr Telfryn Pritchard for providing the following notes on the Latin lines.

(9) Tempore felici multi numerantur amici
Cum fortuna perit nullus amicus erit

(In time of success many friends are counted
When fortune fails not one friend will there be)

This is a commonplace saying reminiscent of Ovid, Tristia 1, 9, 5-6
(Wheeler 1987:44). The two Ashmole lines form an elegaic couplet,
while the idea behind them can be traced back to Ennius, Scenica:

(11a) O Asside asside [O Aeacide] dico te Romanos superare

(O Pyrrhus, I declare you to be conqueror
of the Romans, or, the Romans to be your conqueror)

This is a hexameter line made hypermetric by the repetition of
"asside", which is a corruption of a proper name, probably "Eacide".
It is a well-known line again found in Ennius, Annales 6, 179 (Skutsch
1985:85, 334; Warmington 1967:66; Vahlen 1928:32), and referred to by
Cicero, De Divinatione 2, 56, 116 (Falconer 1971:500), in a slightly
different form. It is a famous example of advice which can be taken
in two opposite ways. Pyrrhus, King of Epirus, was a descendant of Aeacus. In doubt whether to invade Italy he consulted the Delphic oracle and got this reply. He took it in a favourable sense and gained Pyrrhic victories, but it could have meant the opposite. The accusative and infinitive construction provides the ambiguity so typical of an oracle. In a devotional tract it would reinforce respect for divine guidance which must not be taken lightly nor in accordance with our own wishes.

(11b) Tres infelices in mundo dicimus esse
Infelix qui pauca sapit spernitque doceri
Infelix qui multa sapit spernitque docere
Infelix qui sancta *1 docet si viuat inique

(We say that there are three unfortunates in the world
Unfortunate is he who knows little and scorns to be taught
Unfortunate is he who knows much and scorns to teach
Unfortunate is he who teaches sacred things
if he lives unjustly)

These hexameter lines are clearly taken from a collection of proverbs; the source has not yet been identified. Although the underlying thought has been retained, the Classical form of the material would naturally have undergone change down the centuries.

1 Walther no.31559 reads: "Infelix qui recta docens operatur inique".
Item 10: Land Purchase

Manuscripts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IMEV 4148</th>
<th>sigla</th>
<th>folio</th>
<th>lines (22)</th>
<th>date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 OBL Ashmole 61</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>21v</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>c1500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 OBL Douce 54</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>64r</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>16C in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 OBL Capesthorne</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>101v</td>
<td>20 (-5+3)</td>
<td>c1500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 OBL Rawl.B.252</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>1r</td>
<td>24 (+2)</td>
<td>17C in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 OXF Balliol Coll.354</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>100v</td>
<td>24 (+2)</td>
<td>1503-1536</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 CUL Hh.2.6</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>58v</td>
<td>18 (-6+2)</td>
<td>16C in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 CAM Trinity Coll.1157</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>24r</td>
<td>20 (-5+3)</td>
<td>15C ex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 LBM Add.25001</td>
<td>Ab</td>
<td>2v</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>pre-1579</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 LBM Add.6702</td>
<td>Ac</td>
<td>109r</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>pre-1589</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 LBM Lansdowne 470</td>
<td>La</td>
<td>298r</td>
<td>20 (-5+3)</td>
<td>pre-1445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 LBM Lansdowne 762</td>
<td>Lb</td>
<td>2v</td>
<td>24 (+2)</td>
<td>1509-47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 LBM Royal 17.B.47</td>
<td>Ry</td>
<td>59r</td>
<td>24 (+2)</td>
<td>1452-56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 LON Lambeth 306</td>
<td>Lm</td>
<td>203r</td>
<td>20 (-2)</td>
<td>16C in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 LON Linc.Inn Misc.2</td>
<td>Li</td>
<td>iir</td>
<td>24 (+2)</td>
<td>15C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 *PRI Cooke 30</td>
<td>Ck</td>
<td>fly</td>
<td>10 (22?)</td>
<td>16C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Editions

D H Robbins 1955:70-1, 249-50
C Robbins 1950:275-8
R Clermont 1869:543-4
B Dyboski, EETS ES 101, 1907:137-8
Flügel 1903:133
La Ellis, Cat., 1812:130
Ry McFarlane 1981:193
Lm Furnivall, EETS 15, 1866:24
Gairdner 1880:xxvi
Li Lincoln's Inn Newsletter 1986/87:5
Ck Jeaffreson, HMC 6th Report 1877:420

Affiliation

The attached table shows the line arrangements of the texts. Three main groups are indicated; the core of the poem comprises 22 lines, represented by Group 1: D A Ab Ac Ry Lb Lm. Group 2 comprises four manuscripts, Li B R Ck, in which two extra lines are added after line 4, cautioning purchasers to check that the seller is not in prison or of unsound mind. Group 3, La T C H, represents a version of the poem in which the order of lines is disarranged.
Rate’s version mainly follows D, although in line 7 it agrees with La against the Group 1 reading (lond:tenure), and in line 21 with Im against the rest (10:15 years). Local variations are few; rhyming “per jnne” with “purchasyng” in line 2 is clearly a careless error and should read “folowying”. In line 16 the reference to Court Baron is replaced by a very weak line, evidently to avoid the legal term (similarly C); lines 15-16 are omitted altogether from Im. According to Jowett’s Dictionary of Law the practice of Court Baron was never actually discontinued but had long fallen into disuse; I can find no mention of the practice in the printed Leicestershire records (Bateson 1901).

Table of Line Arrangements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>D</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>Ab</th>
<th>Ac</th>
<th>Ry</th>
<th>Lb</th>
<th>Lm</th>
<th>Li</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>Ck</th>
<th>La</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>H</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

--

22a 22b
Items 12-13: Night and Morning Prayers

Manuscripts

(12) Night Prayer

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IMEV_2345</th>
<th>sigla</th>
<th>folio</th>
<th>lines</th>
<th>date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>OBL</td>
<td>A 22r</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>c1500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>CAM</td>
<td>T 276r</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1425-50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(13) Morning Prayer

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IMEV_1720</th>
<th>sigla</th>
<th>folio</th>
<th>lines</th>
<th>date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>OBL</td>
<td>A 22r</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>c1500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>CAM</td>
<td>T 276v</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>1425-50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| IMEV_2174 |       |       |       |        |
| 6         | DUR   | D 9v  |       |        |

Editions

A Brown, RL15, 1939:194-6
T Perry, EETS 167, 1925: cxxx-ii
MacCracken 1913: 286, 304-5
D Robbins 1939: 339, 1942: 142

Affiliation

It is not certain that the Ashmole texts were copied directly from the Thorney manuscript (T) since there the last stanza of item 12 is re-copied at the beginning of item 13 with the Latin and English lines in reverse order; however,Rate may have deemed this repetition unnecessary and thus simplified his copying of the two texts. The variations in A are insignificant and readings from T are given to the right of the A text transcriptions. D contains only the final stanza from item 13.
## Item 15: Prayer to the Virgin Mary

### Manuscripts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manuscripts</th>
<th>sigla</th>
<th>folio</th>
<th>lines (62)</th>
<th>date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IMEV 2119</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>OBL</td>
<td>Ash1</td>
<td>22v</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>OBL</td>
<td>Bo4</td>
<td>92v</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>OBL</td>
<td>Ly</td>
<td>142r</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>OBL</td>
<td>Ra2</td>
<td>4v</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>CUL</td>
<td>It</td>
<td>93v</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>LBM</td>
<td>Ad6</td>
<td>156v</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>LBM</td>
<td>Ad7</td>
<td>58r</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>LBM</td>
<td>Ro3</td>
<td>82r</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>LON</td>
<td>Lam</td>
<td>19r</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>*BTH</td>
<td>L1</td>
<td>57v</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Text Occurring in the Speculum Christiani

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manuscripts</th>
<th>sigla</th>
<th>folio</th>
<th>lines (62)</th>
<th>date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>OBL</td>
<td>Ash2</td>
<td>100r</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>CUL</td>
<td>Ff2</td>
<td>74v</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>CUL</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>20v</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>LBM</td>
<td>Har6</td>
<td>86v</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>LBM</td>
<td>Har8</td>
<td>274v</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>MAN</td>
<td>Ch</td>
<td>121r</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Text Occurring Separately (Lambeth group)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manuscripts</th>
<th>sigla</th>
<th>folio</th>
<th>lines (62)</th>
<th>date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>OBL</td>
<td>Ad</td>
<td>63r</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>OBL</td>
<td>Bo1</td>
<td>28v</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>OBL</td>
<td>Bo2</td>
<td>26v</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>OBL</td>
<td>Eng</td>
<td>42r</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>OBL</td>
<td>Hat</td>
<td>33v</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>OBL</td>
<td>Lau1</td>
<td>12v</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>OBL</td>
<td>Lau2</td>
<td>78r</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>OBL</td>
<td>Ra1</td>
<td>12r</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>CUL</td>
<td>Dd</td>
<td>41r</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>CUL</td>
<td>Ff1</td>
<td>68r</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>CUL</td>
<td>Hh</td>
<td>42v</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>CAM</td>
<td>Jes</td>
<td>23v</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>CAM</td>
<td>Jo</td>
<td>24r</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>CAM</td>
<td>Pem</td>
<td>26v</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>CAM</td>
<td>Sid</td>
<td>23v</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>LBM</td>
<td>Ad2</td>
<td>49r</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>LBM</td>
<td>Ad1</td>
<td>8r</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>LBM</td>
<td>Ad3</td>
<td>40v</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>LBM</td>
<td>Ad4</td>
<td>42r</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>LBM</td>
<td>Har1</td>
<td>43v</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>LBM</td>
<td>Har3</td>
<td>16r</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>LBM</td>
<td>Bas</td>
<td>35v</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>LBM</td>
<td>Lan</td>
<td>38v</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Other Manuscripts

For the full list see Gustav Holmstedt’s edition.

Editions

CE Holmstedt, EETS 182, 1933. Prints parallel texts of Harley 6580 and Lansdowne 344, with collations of all other texts in the Speculum group; the Lambeth group is printed with collations on pp.336-42.


Ash Robbins 1939:468-9
Ly Brown, RL14, 1924:216-17
Ad6 Baugh 1956:143-4, edition of manuscript
Ad7 Day, EETS 155, 1921:74-5
Förster 1918:172-5
Ff2 Wright and Halliwell-Phillips, RelAnt, 1842:II, 212-3
C Patterson 1911:139-41
Warton 1840:III, 153, extract only

Affiliation

The Prayer is ‘prefaced’ by a re-copy of the first two stanzas of the Ten Commandments (q.v. Section 6). As with the Commandments, the Prayer is printed, edited and discussed by Gustav Holmstedt. Ashmole 61 is collated to Lambeth 599 in Holmstedt, pp.336-40. The text is also edited by Sarah Jane Ogilvie-Thomson, who discusses the 20 separately-occurring texts of the Prayer, and reference should be made to these editors for full discussion, including the Longleat, Greg and Yale texts which I have not consulted. I have used Holmstedt’s sigla, with Ogilvie-Thomson’s for the manuscripts he omits, except that the superscripted numerals have had to remain infra-linear.
Since the Lambeth group ends at line 52, and the Speculum group at 62, it was necessary to conflate the line numbers because the Ashmole 61 text preserves readings from both types. Thus the numbering of the Speculum text is adjusted as follows: 1-34 (Lambeth 35-8 omitted) 39-42 (Lambeth 43-4 omitted) 45-50 (Lambeth 51-2 omitted; Lambeth group ends here) 53-62.

From my own study of the collations I note that the two groups are distinguished from each other at lines 11-12 *1:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speculum</th>
<th>Lambeth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To knowe and kepe ouer al thynge ffor the teres that thou weptist vndir the rode Cristen fayth and goddes biddyng Send me grace of lyuis fode</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One sub-group of the Lambeth text may be identified as sharing a different arrangement of lines 15-20 (15 16 19 20 17 18): Lm Ii Ro3 Lt; and a second as ending at line 48: Bo4 Ly Ii Ra2; Bo4 and Ra2 add two lines following (48ab).

Holmstedt places the Ashmole 61 text with the Lambeth group of nine manuscripts which represent a form of the poem between the original version and the Speculum type *2. Within the Lambeth group Holmstedt identifies three sub-groups. Ashmole 61 belongs to group (c), comprising Bo4, Greg, and Ra2. Of these, Holmstedt states that Greg appears to be the nearest to Ashmole 61, but he erroneously states that "Ash[mole 61] and Greg differ from the rest and agree in line 33, "that in wrathe neuer thay die" (Greg)" (1933:cci); since this line is

1 Quotations from the Speculum group are taken from Harley 6580.

2 I agree with Ogilvie-Thomson that the Vernon text is a revised expanded form, and not as Holmstedt states, the original 6-foot-line poem. As Holmstedt points out, the shorter verse form is "more easily learnt by heart, and more widely disseminated among both the clergy and the laity" (1933:cxcviii); this supports the mnemonic function of much of Rate's verse.
omitted in Ashmole (27-38 omitted), there is evidently some confusion here. Both omit lines 41-4, but so does Ad6; the only line in which they agree against the rest is 14, "to lede" instead of "lede", a variation too commonplace to be significant. In lines 49-50 Ashmole agrees only with Ra2.

The extra manuscripts discussed by Ogilvie-Thomson are not relevant to Ashmole 61, to which she refers by its former mis-numbering of Ashmole 60 (see introduction to chapter 2). She identifies two main groups with a number of sub-divisions, and places Ashmole 61 in Group B, which contains all Holmstedt's Lambeth group plus Longleat 29, Lyell 30 and Yale 163. She considers that this group (1980:635):

must have had a single common ancestor. This ancestor was either the original text of the poem, which was then incorporated into the Speculum in slightly altered form, or a revised text which changed the conclusion and a number of individual readings.

Similarly Holmstedt (1933:cci):

It was a manuscript belonging to this last sub-group [Ashl Bo4 Greg Ra2] that was the source of the Speculum type, as in the Speculum version lines 17-18 are also inserted after line 20.

Ogilvie-Thomson dismisses Rate's variations as irrelevant (1980:636):

A2 is another poor manuscript which appears to be unrelated, if, as with Ad1, its shared omissions are held to be insignificant. It has unique readings at lines 4, 12, 15, 16, 19, 20, 27-8, 31-2, and 46. Its readings from lines 51-53 are similar to those of the A group, but it diverges again in its three concluding lines.

Since Ashmole 61 lines 27-38 are omitted, her statement that unique readings occur in lines 27-8, and 31-2, is mistaken. Neither she nor Holmstedt was able to establish manuscript affiliations, owing to the great number of extant copies which indicate many more lost versions, and to the "degree of conflation which is apparent at almost every
line" (1980:637). She admits the possibility of conflation and post-Speculum revision, whereas Holmstedt interprets additional lines as belonging only to original versions (1933:cci):

As Ashl has three lines [53-5] that occur only in the Speculum version it is possible that it was a manuscript of the Ashl type that was the original source of the Speculum version of this hymn.

He does not consider the possibility that Rate may have conflated the two versions, just as Gillespie assumes that the extra material in the Ashmole Commandments indicates an original source rather than a later scribal redaction (q.v. item 6).

There are unique readings in Ashmole 61 lines 12, 16-17, 19, and 53. This is the only manuscript to omit lines 27-38 *3, although lines 35-8 are also omitted in the Speculum version; similarly lines 41-4 are omitted in Ashmole 61, and 43-4 in the Speculum version. Both Ashmole and the Speculum group omit Lambeth lines 51-2; Ashmole then includes Speculum lines 53-5 *4 (Holmstedt lines 45-7), and adds 55a-d to finish. Ashmole preserves the Lambeth readings in lines 11-12 and 17, and is the only text to thus combine both versions.

3 And therefore cannot have been the source for Greg.

4 Holmstedt notes that Rate's version of the Prayer is the only one of the Lambeth group to contain the three lines taken from the Speculum (53-5), referring to the Pater Noster, Ave Maria and Creed (see chapter 2 section 2.4.b, Preaching).
Item 16: Debate of the Carpenter’s Tools

Manuscripts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IMEV 3461</th>
<th>sigla</th>
<th>folio</th>
<th>lines</th>
<th>date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 OBL Ashmole 61</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>23r</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>c1500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Editions

A Conlee 1991:222-35
Wilson 1987:445-70 *1
Hazlitt, Remains 1864:I, 79-90
Halliwell-Phillips 1844b:13-20

Notes

This unique item has been edited and discussed, with full explanation of the technical vocabulary (see also Salzman 1952:340-7) by both Conlee and Wilson. The text is valuable because of its connection with a craft guild, and is the only item in the manuscript to have any distinct social background among the anonymous family and religious texts with which it is copied. Wilson gives the fullest discussion of this background.

I am indebted to him for his kind correspondence.
**Item 17: Levation Prayer**

**Manuscripts**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IMEV 3883</th>
<th>sigla</th>
<th>folio</th>
<th>lines (36)</th>
<th>date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 OBL Ashmole 61</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>26r</td>
<td>35 (-1)</td>
<td>c1500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 OBL Vernon</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>115r</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>1380-1400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 LBM Add.37787</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>160r</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>post-1386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 LBM Harley 5396</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>273r</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>1456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 LON Lambeth 559</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>25r</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>15C in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 *BRU Bibl.Royale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>139r</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 *USA Glazier G.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Editions**

V McGarry 1936:228-9
   Horstmann, EETS 98, 1892:24-5
   Doyle 1987, facsimile of manuscript

B Baugh 1956:149-50

**Affiliation**

Prayers used during Mass at the Elevation of the Host occur in many versions. The variants within them "point to an oral diffusion by the clergy", who utilised their sermons as a means of teaching prayers (Robbins, 1942:142). This version is type 5 on Robbins' list. The text is central to all five manuscripts; none contains extraneous material or major corruptions of form: one line is omitted and two reversed in A, two reversed in V and B. There was probably an intervening version between V B and H L, giving rise to some of the variants in A H L.
Item 18: The Forgiving Knight

Manuscripts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manuscript</th>
<th>sigla</th>
<th>folio</th>
<th>lines (114)</th>
<th>date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IMEV 516</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 OBL Ashmole 61</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>26v</td>
<td>116 (-2+4)</td>
<td>c1500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Text in Handlyng Synne

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manuscript</th>
<th>sigla</th>
<th>folio</th>
<th>lines (114)</th>
<th>date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IMEV 778</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 OBL Bodley 415</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>24v</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>c1400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 LBM Harley 1701</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>25v</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>c1400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 *USA Osborn 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 *USA Folger V.b.236</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Editions


A Horstmann, Aeleg, 1881:339-40
H Furnivall, EETS 119, 123, 1901:130

Affiliation

The text in A is separately listed in the IMEV because it is the only manuscript which extracts the tale of the Forgiving Knight from Robert of Brunne's Handlyng Synne, the full text of which occurs in six manuscripts, two of these being excluded as they do not contain the same version of the Forgiving Knight. A different version of the same story occurs in ten manuscripts of the Northern Homily Cycle (IMEV 1647); this is a re-writing of the same basic elements, but as it has no bearing on the Ashmole text it is ignored.

In Sullens' stemma A is placed between the Revised copy and B, as it preserves readings from both B and H, but most of Rate's text correctly follows B with only a few unique readings which Sullens attributes to Rate: "we may assume that the variants in A are scribal choices" (1983:xxiv).
Item 19: THE EARL OF TOLOUSE

Manuscripts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manuscript</th>
<th>sigla</th>
<th>folio</th>
<th>lines (1224)</th>
<th>date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IMEV 1681</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 OBL Ashmole 61</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>27v</td>
<td>1211 (-13)</td>
<td>c1500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 OBL Ashmole 45</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>3r</td>
<td>1224</td>
<td>post-1509</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 CUL Ff.2.38</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>63r</td>
<td>1218 (-6)</td>
<td>1480-90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 LIN Thornton</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>114v</td>
<td>1108 (-123+7)</td>
<td>c1440</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Editions


F Rumble 1965:134-77
French and Hale 1930:I, 383-419
Ritson 1802:II, 93-144
T Brewer and Owen 1977; Scolar Press Facsimile

Affiliation

Although B contains the fullest version of the poem with no added or omitted lines, it appears to be a different version to the one shared by the other three manuscripts, with numerous divergent readings in complete lines; accordingly F is taken as the base text as it shows the least individual variation. The manuscripts divide neatly into two groups, AT and FB, but there is too much individual variation in B for it to be closely related to F. Rather it is a case of AT descending from a common exemplar which accounts for their variants against the others, as this example illustrates (lines 535-7):

F B
Than spake that lady free
Syr y see now well be the
Thou haste not all thy wylle

A T
The lady seyd stond vppe my kny3ht
who has wrethyd pe [by] dey ore nyght
It schall lyke hym full yll

in which the AT version is the more dramatic. They also share certain line arrangements, as in the reversal of the half stanzas

1 See the unpublished thesis by Clark 1969.
103-8 with 96-102, and 352-4 placed after 360.

There are two omissions in F, of one tail-rime unit (three lines) each, occurring at lines 286-8 and 850-2. In both cases the other three versions contain completely different readings from each other, from which phenomenon it may be inferred that the copy text contained such obscure readings that F omitted the lines altogether, while each scribe of B A T supplied his own reading.
Item 20: LIBEUS DISCONEUS

Manuscripts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IMEV 1690</th>
<th>sigla</th>
<th>folio</th>
<th>lines (L 2204)</th>
<th>date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 OBL Ashmole 61</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>38v</td>
<td>2251 (-113+160)</td>
<td>c1500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 LBM Percy Folio</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>p317</td>
<td></td>
<td>17C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 LBM Cotton Calig. A.2</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>42v</td>
<td></td>
<td>c1450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 LON Lambeth 306</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>73r</td>
<td></td>
<td>16C in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 LON Hale MS</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>1r</td>
<td></td>
<td>15C in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 *NAP Royal 13.B.29</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>p87</td>
<td></td>
<td>1457</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Editions

CE Mills, EETS 261, 1969. Prints texts C and L, with variants from all others. Introduction and notes on affiliations with brief manuscript descriptions. Ashmole 61 variants printed separately in the appendix (pp.286-9).

Cooper, thesis, 1961
Kaluza 1890

P Hales and Furnivall 1868:415-97
C Hippeau 1860:241-330
Ritson 1802:1-90
N Wright and Halliwell-Phillips, RelAnt, 1842:II, 65-7; selections

Affiliation

This text has been edited and discussed by Maldwyn Mills. He identifies two main groups, C L and a revised version, ANP. H is imperfect but follows the ANP group. Line numbers are taken from text L, but I have not calculated the disposition of lines for each text since C and L are separately numbered in the printed edition, and the omitted and added lines are not remarked.
Item 21: Sir Corneus and the Cuckolds’ Dance

Manuscripts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IMEV</th>
<th>sigla</th>
<th>folio</th>
<th>lines</th>
<th>date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>219</td>
<td>OBL</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>59v</td>
<td>255</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Editions

- A  Furrow 1985:273-91
- Hazlitt, Remains, 1864:1, 35-49
- Hartshorne 1829:209-221

Notes

Hazlitt provides a discursive introduction on some of the background details and analogues, and includes a story outline. Furrow provides a more scholarly introduction to the analogues, metre and language of the poem, which she localises in Essex or London as regards authorship, but notes that the scribal language is more northerly. The inclusion of the poem in Rate’s compilation is due to its themes of the betrayal of marital fidelity, its Arthurian setting, and its humorous nature. For discussion of its relation with the Lai du Corn and similar tales, see Child 1883:267.
Item 22: The Jealous Wife

Manuscripts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IMEV 1987</th>
<th>sigla</th>
<th>folio</th>
<th>lines</th>
<th>date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OBL Ashmole 61</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>62r</td>
<td>396</td>
<td>c1500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Editions

A Boyd 1964:92-104
Horstmann, Aenleg, 1881:329-33

Notes

Beverly Boyd notes that the alterations in grammar and vocabulary suggest that the poem seems "to have been tampered with by the scribe" (1964:137). It is unfortunate that the end of (22) and the beginning of (23) are lost, but we can calculate the likely number of lines lost. At least two folios are missing, since from the cognates we know that 117 lines are gone from the beginning of (23), more than double Rate's page-length. It is likely that these texts, like items 12-13 and 35a-b, would have been copied together, probably without an intervening signature. Taking an average page length of 54 lines, we may assume that (22) should finish within about ten lines of 490, not allowing for explicits, signatures, drawings, or re-copying of lines:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>65v</th>
<th>Lost 1r</th>
<th>Lost 1v</th>
<th>Lost 2r</th>
<th>Lost 2v</th>
<th>66r</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(22)1-396</td>
<td>397-451</td>
<td>452-496</td>
<td>9-62</td>
<td>63-117</td>
<td>118-294</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the point in the story reached when the leaves were lost, it is unlikely that more than two leaves are missing. As this is a Marian miracle story, we can predict that the story ends with the Virgin restoring the wife and her children to life, to live a good life in peace with the devout husband until they all died and went to heaven.
Item 23: The Incestuous Daughter

Manuscripts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IMEV 1107</th>
<th>sigla</th>
<th>folio</th>
<th>lines (294)</th>
<th>date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OBL Ashmole 61</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>66r</td>
<td>177 (-135+18)</td>
<td>c1500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OBL Rawlinson F.118</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>116r</td>
<td>264 (-48+18)</td>
<td>15C iii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CUL Ff.5.48</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>44r</td>
<td>283 (-11)</td>
<td>15C ex</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Editions

R  Heuser 1907:201-5
   Horstmann 1887:421-4
C  Downing 1969; edition of C, with full introduction and texts
   Horstmann, Aeleg 1881:334-8; A collated
   Hartshorne 1829:151-64

Affiliation

The Incestuous Daughter (23) is copied with that of another repentant sinner, the Adulterous Falmouth Squire (35b), in all three manuscripts. This suggests that these texts were regarded as a pair, and appeared together in a common exemplar *1. However, fundamental differences between A R and C in (23) suggest that two traditions are present. The majority of agreements are between A R against C, but the number of minor disagreements between A and R show that they do not follow each other closely. C has substantially different readings on many occasions and contains lines which do not appear in A R (145-50) *2; R omits lines that appear in A and C in differing forms. The first 117 lines are lost from A, which also omits 163-8 and 277-282; it mainly agrees with the first three lines of the final stanza in C (283-5), but thereafter adds 15 lines which are unique. Of the opening lines lost to A, R contains two added introductory stanzas (lines i-xii), and lines 58-60, 117-18, 289-94 are lost from

1 There is no apparent relationship between R and C in the texts of either (23) or (35b).

2 Line numbers are taken from Horstmann's edition of C.
C. R C agree in minor readings but with frequent divergences. The internal variants, which are too prolific to list here, show that the three manuscripts are not copied from each other nor from a common exemplar, nor are they closely related. They illustrate how a simple tale can undergo textual changes in detail, but still retain the substance.
Item 24: SIR CLEGES

Manuscripts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IMEV 1890</th>
<th>sigla</th>
<th>folio</th>
<th>lines (576)</th>
<th>date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OBL Ashmole 61</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>67v</td>
<td>570 (-6)</td>
<td>c1500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*NLS Advocates 19.1.11</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>1r</td>
<td>531 (-45)</td>
<td>15C ex</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Editions


A  McKnight 1913:38-59
Brydges and Haslewood 1814:IV, 17-19; end stanzas only

E  Speed 1987:169-92
Spearing and Spearing 1974:174-92
French and Hale 1930:II, 877-95

Affiliation

Rosemary Ginn has made a full and authoritative comparison of the two texts, and reference should be made to her thesis on all points. When a particular text is preserved in only two manuscripts, it is a difficult task to determine which omissions in one text are rather additions in the other, and I have calculated the disposition of lines according to the parallel texts printed by Treichel. I would suggest that lines 40-2 and 130-2 are indeed dropped from A and 366-9, 527 from E, but that lines 166-8, 223-5, and 418-20, are rather additions in A, being domestic and devotional variants typical of Rate's handling, as Ginn notes. It is more difficult to say how much of the ending preserved only in A is unique, but I agree with Ginn that lines 553-64 may be attributed to Rate.

* See also the unpublished thesis by Housum 1988, which I have not been able to consult.
Item 25: The Feasts of All Saints and All Souls

Manuscripts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>sigla</th>
<th>folio</th>
<th>lines</th>
<th>date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OBL Ashmole 61</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>73r</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>c1500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Editions

A  Horstmann 1887:435-40

Notes

The Ashmole text is uniquely worded but in content is closest to the Harley 4196 version (Horstmann, 1881:142-6). The Harley text concentrates more on the pagan use of the Pantheon temple, and the acts of penance associated with its consecration by Pope Boniface as a Christian church. This matter is much contracted and reworked in A, which focuses more fully on the exemplum story which is used to illustrate the founding of All Souls day. There is more detail in A on hell's torments and heaven's joys, while the episodes of the beggars at the feast in Paradise, the funeral of the monk, the revelation of the vision to the Pope, and the subsequent exegesis on the founding of the Feasts are all omitted from Harley.
Item 26: The King and Four Daughters

Manuscripts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manuscript</th>
<th>sigla</th>
<th>folio</th>
<th>lines</th>
<th>date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IMEV 1677</td>
<td>OBL</td>
<td>Ashmole 61</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>78v</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Editions


A  Horstmann, Aeleg, 1881:349-54

Notes

This item is one of several different versions of the Four Daughters story in Grosseteste's Castle of Love, which has been edited and discussed by Kari Sajavaara. The Ashmole text is referred to as the 'English C-Version', and I have adopted his title of The King and Four Daughters. Reference should be made to his edition on all questions of manuscript affiliation, analogues, sources, and previous editions. The Four Daughters includes additions from the Rex et Famulus story, the episode of the four torturers which appears only in the Ashmole and Cotton texts. Sajavaara refers to Four Daughters as item 25, obviously following Black's numeration. He notes that in the Vernon and Simeon manuscripts Four Daughters is also followed by Ypotis, as in A. We may posit the existence of an exemplar containing these items, together with item 25, All Saints and All Souls, which has a similarly-worded opening.

Sajavaara's analysis of the language localises Rate's text in the region of southern Lincolnshire or Nottinghamshire, which out of all the various editorial speculations on provenance is the closest to McIntosh's North-East Leicestershire. The Ashmole version is linked
closely with the H-text of the Chateau, but separated from it by certain "peculiarities" which are "obviously due to a French exemplar that resembled H but differed from it" (1967:220). He does not consider scribal editing as a possible reason for the variants. The translation is regarded as interpreting the spirit of the original but very simply and unrhetorically; Sajavaara gives a detailed analysis of the translation technique.

The abrupt ending of Four Daughters does not assist us in determining the scribe's contribution. Sajavaara points out that the translator obviously intended to continue the narrative proper after the allegory of the Four Daughters, by including the narrator's comment "he[r] on schall my mater duelle / ffor a tale I wyll 3ou telle" (lines 219-20). He does not consider the likeliest explanation, that the translator did indeed finish rendering the Castle of Love but that it was Rate who dropped the allegory of Mary's Body and preserved only the family debate and its preceding scriptural exegesis; or, if Rate was the translator, that this was the only part that interested him, despite the implication to the contrary in lines 219-20. That he did not thereafter alter these lines is typical of Rate's practice of not marking departures from his copy-text.
Item 27: The Emperor Hadrian and Ypotis, the Wise Child

Manuscripts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IMEV 220</th>
<th>sigla</th>
<th>folio</th>
<th>lines (674)</th>
<th>date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>OBL</td>
<td>Ashmole 61</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>83r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>OBL</td>
<td>Ashmole 750</td>
<td>Ba</td>
<td>148r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>OBL</td>
<td>Douce 323</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>160r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>OBL</td>
<td>Vernon</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>296v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>OBL</td>
<td>Eng.poet.c.3</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>OBL</td>
<td>Rawlinson Q.b.4</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>90r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>CAM</td>
<td>St John's Coll.29</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>1r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>CAM</td>
<td>Trinity Coll.61</td>
<td>Tr</td>
<td>95v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>LBM</td>
<td>Arundel 140</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>1r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>LBM</td>
<td>Cotton Calig.A.2</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>79v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>LBM</td>
<td>Cotton Titus A.26</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>163r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>LBM</td>
<td>Simeon</td>
<td>Aa</td>
<td>87v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>LBM</td>
<td>Add.36983</td>
<td>Ab</td>
<td>264r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>YRK</td>
<td>Cath.16.L.12</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>58r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>*USA</td>
<td>Brome MS</td>
<td>Bb</td>
<td>5r</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Editions


Gruber 1877:7-27; German edition, prints texts Ba D

VC Horstmann, AeLeg 1881:341-8, 511-26; A B T: collated to C
Tr AB, Suchier 1910:465-89
Bb Smith 1886:20-46

Affiliation

I have found it necessary to re-number all the versions based on a conflation of C B A T Ba D, as the different sets of line numbers used by the editors proved too confusing to work with. The poem has been unevenly edited to date, as the editions list shows. Of the English editions only Josephine Sutton discusses the textual affiliations, modifying Hugo Gruber’s study which was based on the premise that Vernon was nearest the original, whereas Sutton shows that Ashmole 750 is the closest and Vernon a variant. In Sutton’s stemma, Ashmole 61 (B) appears out on a limb in sub-group m with T, which descended from sub-group r containing A. The two fragments (F) are from the same MS.
Item 28: The Northern Passion

Manuscripts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Manuscript</th>
<th>Sigla</th>
<th>Folio</th>
<th>Lines (2090)</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>OBL Ashmole 61</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>87v</td>
<td>1913 (-211+34)</td>
<td>c1500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>CUL Dd.1.1</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>6r</td>
<td>post-1345</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>CUL Ff.5.48</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>11r</td>
<td>15C ex</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>CUL Ii.4.9</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>1r</td>
<td>15C in</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>LBM Thornton</td>
<td>Ad</td>
<td>33r</td>
<td>c1440</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>OBL Rawl.c.86</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>1r</td>
<td>16C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>OBL Rawl.c.655</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>1r</td>
<td>14C med</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>CUL Gg.1.1</td>
<td>G1</td>
<td>122r</td>
<td>14C in</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>CUL Gg.5.31</td>
<td>G5</td>
<td>167r</td>
<td>14C ex</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>LBM Harley 215</td>
<td>H2</td>
<td>161r</td>
<td>15C in</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>LBM Cotton Vesp.D.9</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>191r</td>
<td>c1450</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>*USA Harv.Eng.1031</td>
<td>frag</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Editions

CE Foster, EETS 145 (1912) and 147 (1913). A is collated to D and Ad in EETS 145, together with F and I. Brief descriptions of manuscripts, notes on affiliations, and textual discussion. For the expanded version see IMEV 170.

Affiliation

This text is fully edited by Frances Foster, and her discussion in EETS 147 should be referred to on all questions of manuscript affiliation, sources and analogues; I have used her sigla. A is linked closely with F and I, but from my own study of the collations it shares many line agreements with Ad also. Since I have relied on Foster's edition, I have not calculated the disposition of lines except for A. I follow Foster's line numbering, although she does not take into account the variants unique to D; for example, lines 1519-20, 1521-2 are listed as being reversed in A F Ad I G H, when they are truly reversed only in D; similarly several lines are noted as omitted in these manuscripts, when they are really added in D alone. I have made these distinctions clearer in the transcription.
Item 29: The Short Charter of Christ

Manuscripts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IMEV 4184</th>
<th>sigla</th>
<th>folio</th>
<th>lines (34)</th>
<th>date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>OBL</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>106r</td>
<td>30 (-4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>OBL</td>
<td>Aa</td>
<td>109r</td>
<td>41 (+7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>CUL</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>1r</td>
<td>30 (-4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>CUL</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>p270</td>
<td>36 (+2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>CAM</td>
<td>Ca</td>
<td>25v</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>CAM</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>53r</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>LBM</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>118v</td>
<td>36 (+2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>LBM</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>6v</td>
<td>36 (+2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>LBM</td>
<td>Ba</td>
<td>23r</td>
<td>36 (+2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>LBM</td>
<td>Ch</td>
<td>frag</td>
<td>32 (-2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>LBM</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>97v</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>LBM</td>
<td>Ha</td>
<td>100r</td>
<td>33 (-1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>LBM</td>
<td>Hb</td>
<td>138r</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>LBM</td>
<td>Hc</td>
<td>239v</td>
<td>32 (-2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>LBM</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>11v</td>
<td>36 (+2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>LBM</td>
<td>Sa</td>
<td>40r</td>
<td>32 (-2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>LBM</td>
<td>Sl</td>
<td>2r</td>
<td>40 (+6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>JRL</td>
<td>Jr</td>
<td>202v</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>71v</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>LST</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Editions

CE Spalding 1914. Brief manuscript descriptions, related only to Charter text. Discussion, affiliations and transcriptions of both Short and Long Charters. For a different form of the Short Charter, see IMEV 1828. Texts printed: Sl S Ch (with Hc collated) Ba H B Ca A Ha F Aa J. A text printed p.12.

A Förster 1918:195-6
F Stevens 1961:383-4
Hb Riley 1870:457-8
S1 Fehr 1901:69-70
D Printed in Gentlemen’s Magazine 1848:612, without comment. Location and description of manuscript unknown. From collations, however, it may simply be a copy of Jr.

Affiliation

Mary Spalding has edited all but six of the Short Charter texts; she omits Sa Hb Jr D I C, and for this reason I have assigned my own sigla. For manuscript affiliations, see her introduction pp.lxiii-v. She groups A with Ha (manuscripts I and J in her stemma), purely from their agreement on "Witnes wele" in the first line, where other
versions have "now" or nothing for "wele". But this common word cannot be considered sufficient evidence to deduce a "special relationship" between these manuscripts, nor should it be "regarded as a perversion" (1914:lxv). A agrees first with one manuscript and then another, with no clear pattern of agreement.
Item 30: Lament of the Virgin Mary

Manuscripts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manuscript Code</th>
<th>sigla</th>
<th>folio</th>
<th>lines (88)</th>
<th>date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IMEV 1447</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 OBL Ashmole 61</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>106r</td>
<td>96 (-16+24)</td>
<td>c1500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 OBL Rawlinson C.86</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>72v</td>
<td>95 (-17+24)</td>
<td>16C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMEV 2619</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 CUL Ff.2.38</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>55v</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>1480-90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 CUL Ff.5.48</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>73r</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>15C ex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 MAN Chetham 8009</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>119v</td>
<td>89 (+1)</td>
<td>15C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Editions

A R Sandison 1913:104-9
R Cords 1916:300-2
F Davies 1963:210-11
Wright 1843:II, 207-9
C Brown, RL15, 1939:13-16
Wright and Halliwell-Phillips, RelAnt, 1842:II, 213-15
M Förster 1918:167-72

Affiliation

The poem is preserved in two versions. The main tradition is represented by F C M and the second by A R. The second version prefixes three stanzas to the head of the poem, omits stanzas 5 and 7, and reverses stanzas 4 and 6. The omission and reversal of these stanzas in A R must have occurred in a common exemplar, as the order in the earlier manuscripts (F C M) is the more logical: the poet visualises the wounds of Christ in turn (head-head-breast-hands-feet, stanzas 2-6), then 'steps back' to view the whole wounded body (stanza 7); he contrasts the dead body of Christ with the living children (stanza 8), and describes the death of Christ as the gateway to everlasting life (stanzas 9-11). In A R the stanzas on the hands and the whole body are omitted, although this is compensated for by their third prefixed stanza C *1, which provides a differently-worded overview of Christ's wounds on the cross (feet-hands-head-heart).
The collations show that R agrees with FCM in more lines than with A: wholly in lines 9, 74, and 76, and partly in lines 4, 6, 15, 20, 25, 26, 29, 44, 59, 69, and 71, compared with only three lines (9, 18, 31) where A matches FCM against R. AR agree together against FCM in lines 41, 57-8, 61, 68, 78 and 79; and they preserve a different version of the final stanza. With Rate's predilection for changing the beginnings and endings of his poems, it is possible that the first three and last stanzas are his own, passed down to R through an intervening exemplar which introduced some of the variants in R. Other texts throughout A have a changed order of stanzas, with omissions and additions, and the overall pattern suggests that Rate is responsible for the variants in versification here. If this is the case, then R must have followed an exemplar which drew on both the A and the F versions, since it is closer to the main tradition than A.

Line 43 caused divergent readings in all versions, owing to the confusion between "fete" (feet) and "fete" (comely) or "fetis" (elegant). The most sensible reading is that shared by FM, "Ye fele ther fete so fete ar thay". The line is garbled and miscopied in C: "he fele per for sittys ar day". R takes a middle course between the readings of A and FM: "Thow handilist hys fete fetys arn þey". Rate abandons the line altogether and invents a sensible but unrelated reading: "Thou be holdys hys fase & hys aray". Since neither A nor C mention "fete" at all, it may suggest that Rate's exemplar was descended from this manuscript of the F-group, and that line 43 in A made sense out of the line in C.

As these stanzas have evidently been added to the main poem (rather than representing an original longer version), it would not have been valid to re-number the FCM texts from the fourth stanza of AR. I have resorted to the rather clumsy device of labelling the appended stanzas ABC and the lines in roman numerals from i-xxiv.
The refrain at the end of the added stanza A is that of the F-group ("for now lyes dede my dere son dere"); that at the end of stanza B is the refrain usual to AR ("ffor pi sone dy3ed my dere son dere"), which distinguishes the two groups; while a variation at the end of stanza C ("why ne had I dy3ed wyth my dere son dere") occurs also at the end of stanza 6 in AR but not in FCM.

A was not copied from R, since in line 22 the words "busschyd out" have been omitted from R, and it is not a common reading for Rate to have supplied in default. Similarly, A preserves the F reading at the start of the first common stanza, "All women" against "All mankynde" in R, which is clearly a repetition-through-eyeskip from the previous stanza C.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stanza Table</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>FCM</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanza Table</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Item 31: John Lydgate: Dietary

#### Manuscripts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IMEV 824</th>
<th>sigla</th>
<th>folio</th>
<th>lines (80)</th>
<th>date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>OBL</td>
<td>Ashmole 61</td>
<td>A 107r</td>
<td>80 (-1+1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>OBL</td>
<td>Bodley 48</td>
<td>Ba 332v</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>OBL</td>
<td>Bodley 686</td>
<td>Bb 187v</td>
<td>79 (-1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>OBL</td>
<td>Bodley 912</td>
<td>Bc 15v</td>
<td>24 (only)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>OBL</td>
<td>e.Museo 52</td>
<td>M 80v</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>OBL</td>
<td>Laud 683</td>
<td>Ld 60r</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>OBL</td>
<td>Rawl.c.48</td>
<td>Ra 129r</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>OBL</td>
<td>Rawl.c.86</td>
<td>Rb 61r</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>OBL</td>
<td>Rawl.poet.f.35</td>
<td>Rc 17v</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>OBL</td>
<td>Latin th.d.15</td>
<td>Lt 132r</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>OBL</td>
<td>Add.B.60</td>
<td>Bd 122v</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>OXF</td>
<td>Univ.Coll.D.60</td>
<td>O 192v</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>CAM</td>
<td>Jesus College 56</td>
<td>Js 44r</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>CAM</td>
<td>St John's Coll.191</td>
<td>J 167v</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>CAM</td>
<td>Trin.Coll.263/III</td>
<td>Ta 26v</td>
<td>79 (-1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>CAM</td>
<td>Trin.Coll.1117</td>
<td>Tb 132r</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>CAM</td>
<td>Fitz.Museum 261</td>
<td>F 30r</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>LBM</td>
<td>Add.10099</td>
<td>Aa 211v</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>LBM</td>
<td>Add.11307</td>
<td>Ab 124r</td>
<td>104 (+24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>LBM</td>
<td>Thornton</td>
<td>Ac 97r</td>
<td>63 (-17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>LBM</td>
<td>Add.34360</td>
<td>Ad 63r</td>
<td>79 (-1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>LBM</td>
<td>Harley 541</td>
<td>Ha 209v</td>
<td>72 (-9+1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>LBM</td>
<td>Harley 941</td>
<td>Hb 24r</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>LBM</td>
<td>Harley 2251</td>
<td>Hc 4v</td>
<td>79 (-1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>LBM</td>
<td>Harley 2252</td>
<td>Hd 1v</td>
<td>24 (only)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>LBM</td>
<td>Harley 4011</td>
<td>He 143r</td>
<td>58 (-22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>LBM</td>
<td>Harley 5401</td>
<td>Hf 103r</td>
<td>61 (-19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>LBM</td>
<td>Arundel 168</td>
<td>Ar 14v</td>
<td>16 (only)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>LBM</td>
<td>Cotton Calig.A.2</td>
<td>C 15v</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>LBM</td>
<td>Cotton Titus D.20</td>
<td>T 93r</td>
<td>46 (only)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>LBM</td>
<td>Egerton 1995</td>
<td>E 77v</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>LBM</td>
<td>Lansdowne 699</td>
<td>L 85v</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>LBM</td>
<td>Royal 17.B.47</td>
<td>Ry 2r</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>LBM</td>
<td>Sloane 775</td>
<td>Sa 54r</td>
<td>43 (-38+1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>LBM</td>
<td>Sloane 989</td>
<td>Sb 134r</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>LBM</td>
<td>Sloane 3534</td>
<td>Sc 1r</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>LBM</td>
<td>Stowe 982</td>
<td>St 11r</td>
<td>74 (-6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>LON</td>
<td>Lambeth 444</td>
<td>La 177v</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>LON</td>
<td>Soc.Antiquaries 101</td>
<td>S 43r</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>LON</td>
<td>Wellcome 406</td>
<td>Wa 39v</td>
<td>74 (-6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>LON</td>
<td>Wellcome 411</td>
<td>Wb 2v</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>*NLS</td>
<td>Adv.1.1.6 (Bann.)</td>
<td>B 73r</td>
<td>79 (-1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>EDI</td>
<td>Univ.Library 205</td>
<td>Ed 190r</td>
<td>79 (-1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>NOT</td>
<td>Mellish MeLM1</td>
<td>N 1r</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>*DUB</td>
<td>Trinity 516</td>
<td>27v</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>*DUB</td>
<td>Trinity 537</td>
<td>p83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>*GLA</td>
<td>Hunterian 259</td>
<td>p50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This text was prolifically copied, and for this reason the manuscript affiliations are exceptionally complex. I do not intend to analyse them here, except to state that from the original version the variants split into two groups, one (including A) preserving "cover" in line 1 and the other "keep". Thereafter the variants branch minutely, even within a single line, and it is difficult to isolate any consistently recurring groups, except for Hg Lb which represent a second tradition. It has not been possible to affiliate A within a sub-group, since it shares line and part-line readings with many different versions. The table of stanza arrangements shows the disposition of disarranged and fragmented stanzas.

1 This reference is as cited by IMEV; but it does not appear to be in volume 7, and I have not been able to find it in the other volumes; however, it may be in error for volume 1, which is missing from CUL, Department of Rare Books.
| Al | Ha | Hf | He | Sa | Hd | Bc | Ar | Ac | T | Hg | Lb | Tb | S | Ab |
|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|
| 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | -  | -  | 2  | 2  | 9  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  |
| 2  | 2  | 2  | 2  | 2  | 2  | 2  | -  | -  | 1  | 1  | 6  | 7  | 2  |    |    |
| 3  | 3  | 3  | 3  | 3  | -  | 3  | -  | 3  | 9  | 9  | 8  | 4  | 3  |    |    |
| 4  | 4  | 4  | 4  | 4  | 4  | -  | 4  | -  | -  | 3  | 2  |    | 4  |    |    |
| 5  | 5  | 5  | 5  | 5  | -  | -  | -  | 5  | 5  | 7  | 7  | 10 | 3  | 5  |    |
| 6  | 6  | 6  | 6  | 6  | 6  | (1-4) | -  | -  | -  | 6  | 6  | 3  | 3  | 1  | 5  |
|    |    |    |    |    | A  | (+4) |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| 7  | 7  | 7  | 7  | -  | -  | -  | 7  | 7  | 6  | 6  | 2  | 9  | (1-4) | 7  |    |
| 8  | 8  | 8  | 8  | (1-2) | -  | -  | -  | 8  | 8  | -  | 4  | 8  |    | 8  | (+4) |
| 9  | 9  | -  | -  | -  | -  | 9  | 9  | 5  | 5  | 7  | 6  |    |    | 9  |    |
|    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| 10 | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 5  | 10 |    | 10 |    |

2 The first column represents the normal order of stanzas in the other manuscripts (Aliis).
### Item 32: Richard Maydestone: Seven Penitential Psalms

#### Manuscripts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IMEV 1961</th>
<th>sigla</th>
<th>folio</th>
<th>lines (952)</th>
<th>date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 OBL Ashmole 61</td>
<td>Ash</td>
<td>108r</td>
<td>908 (-44)</td>
<td>c1500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 OBL Digby 102</td>
<td>D2</td>
<td>128r</td>
<td>15C med</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 OBL Douce 232</td>
<td>Do</td>
<td>1r</td>
<td>15C in</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 LBM Add.11306</td>
<td>Add</td>
<td>1r</td>
<td>15C in</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 LBM Add.36523</td>
<td>Add2</td>
<td>71v</td>
<td>15C med</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 LBM Harley 3810/1</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>17r</td>
<td>15C in</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 LBM Royal 17.C.17</td>
<td>Ro</td>
<td>83r</td>
<td>15C in</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 LBM Wheatley</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>15v</td>
<td>15C in</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 *BTH Longleat 30</td>
<td>Lh</td>
<td>26r</td>
<td>934 (-19+1)</td>
<td>15C iii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 *DUB Trinity Coll.156</td>
<td>Du</td>
<td>136r</td>
<td>15C in</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 *NLW Porkington 20</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>96r</td>
<td>15C i</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 *USA Hunt.HM.142</td>
<td>Hm</td>
<td>22v</td>
<td>15C iii</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 *USA Morgan 99</td>
<td>Pm</td>
<td>92r</td>
<td>15C ii</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### IMEV 3824

| 14 *CUL Dd.12.39 | C2 | 161r | 14C med | |

#### IMEV 3755

| 15 OBL Laud 174 | L | 1r | 15C med | |
| 16 OBL Digby 18 | D | 38r | 15C i | |
| 17 OBL Rawl.A.389 | R | 13r | 1386-1398 | |
| 18 OBL Eng.poet.e.17 | E | 9r | 14C ex | |
| 19 MAN JRL Eng.51 | M | 117r | 1410 | |
| 20 *LON Windsor E.1.1 | G | 32v | 15C in | |
| 21 *USA Ireland-Blackburne | | 1r | c1400 | |

#### IMEV 2157: Psalm 50

| 22 OBL Douce 141 | Do2 | 145v | 15C 1 | |
| 23 *OBL Rawl.C.891 | R2 | 127v | 15C i | |
| 24 OBL Vernon | V | 114r | 1380-90 | |
| 25 CUL Dd.1.1 | C | 226r | 15C in | |
| 26 LBM Add.10036 | Add3 | 96v | 15C in | |
| 27 LBM Thornton | T | 102r | c1440 | |
| 28 NLS Adv.19.3.1 | Ad | 87r | 15C 2 | |
Editions

CE  Edden 1990. I have used her sigla, except in retaining A for Ashmole 61, and in including T.

W  Day, EETS 155, 1921:19-59
E  Blanchfield 1987:465-7
Do2  Kreuzer 1951:226-31
V  Horstmann, EETS 98, 1892:12-16
Add3  Furnivall, EETS 15, 1866:251-6
Cook 1915:403-4
T  Thompson 1988:38-55
Du  Pm, Ellis 1894

Affiliation

In the following notes I have limited my remarks to Ashmole 61, using Valerie Edden's edition *1. The manuscripts listed under IMEV 3755 share an introductory stanza; those listed under IMEV 2157 contain an excerpted version of Psalm 50 alone. C2 (IMEV 3824) contains a single stanza (21) from the IMEV 1961 version; R2 is listed in Edden's edition and does not appear in IMEV or SUPP *2. Edden divides the manuscripts into three basic groups (Beta, Gamma and Alpha), with a group of 'mixed' manuscripts comprising H Hm Lh A Add2. She notes that "Ash follows a Beta exemplar throughout, if inaccurately, but throughout Psalm L both Alpha and Beta readings are to be found" (1990:36). She lists a number of similarities between Ash and Hm Lh, which suggest "contamination of Ash by Hm or a text closely related to it", rather than any direct relationship. In a private communication (1988) she notes that A was not copied from Hm, as lines 809-16 are present which are omitted in Lh and Hm; while the reverse is not

---

1 I am indebted to her for long and helpful correspondence on the place of the Ashmole text within the manuscript affiliations.

2 As these manuscripts were brought to my notice after the decision to exclude the original catalogue had been taken, and after the publication of Edden's edition, I did not deem it necessary to see them personally.
possible, given the extent of the variants in A. The Ashmole collations for Psalm 50 are given on pp.128-37, Appendix B in Edden's edition. The collations given to my own transcription also show a number of agreements between A and Ir, and A Ir Hm Lh, against the rest.
Item 33: The Prick of Conscience Minor

Manuscripts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IMEV 244</th>
<th>sigla</th>
<th>folio</th>
<th>lines (784)</th>
<th>date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>OBL</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>120r</td>
<td>784</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>OBL</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>99r</td>
<td>772</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>CUL</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>14v</td>
<td>768</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>CAM</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>78v</td>
<td>764</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>LBM</td>
<td>Aa</td>
<td>69r</td>
<td>770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>LBM</td>
<td>Ab</td>
<td>96v</td>
<td>782</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>LBM</td>
<td>Ry</td>
<td>36r</td>
<td>768</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Editions

CE Currently in preparation for MET by Robert Lewis.

Ry Horstmann 1896:II, 36-45. As his line numbering is misleading (because Ry has many omissions and displacements which are not remarked), the line numbers are my own.

Affiliation

There are two traditions for this text, one represented by Ab F P A, the other by Ry R Aa. For example, line 296 reads "Of þe godes þat er in heuen to knawe" in the first group, and "Of heuenly godes þat to know" in the second. Lines 219-22, 307-10, 657-666 are omitted in Ry R Aa, and they share a different stanza at lines 617-24. Within the Ab group F P and A often diverge from Ab and from each other.

The authority cited for the Latin extract written below lines 736, 744 and 760 of A is Thomas Aquinas, Veritate Theologie, Book 1, penultimate chapter, and deals with the presence or absence of justice and mercy on Judgement Day. This is present in its fullest form in Ab, and excerpted in A F P. The fact that the excerpt was undoubtedly copied from the exemplar does not tell us how familiar Rate was with the original work. There are a number of careless errors in the copying of the Latin.
Item 34: A Pilgrimage to Jerusalem

Manuscripts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IMEV 986</th>
<th>sigla</th>
<th>folio</th>
<th>lines</th>
<th>date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>OBL</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>128r</td>
<td>848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>*USA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>67r</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IMEV 883

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IMEV 883</th>
<th>sigla</th>
<th>folio</th>
<th>lines</th>
<th>date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>OBL</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>8r</td>
<td>357 (only)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Editions

A  Horstmann, Aegi, 1881:356-66
B  Meech and Allen, EETS 212, 1940

Williams 1857

Affiliation

The B version is the itinerary of William Wey. Rate's text does not bear any close relation to it, but was probably based on a similar account. They share the main events of the Passion: the scourging, crucifixion and Resurrection, but differently worded. A is far more expansive and more detailed though badly ordered, and contains a number of incidents which are absent from B.
Item 35a: Lament of a Lost Soul

Manuscripts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IMEV 172</th>
<th>sigla</th>
<th>folio</th>
<th>lines (96)</th>
<th>date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 OBL Ashmole 61</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>136r</td>
<td>98 (-2+4)</td>
<td>c1500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 OBL Rawl.c.813</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>4v</td>
<td>92 (-4)</td>
<td>16C in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 OXF Corp.Chr.Coll.237</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>146r</td>
<td>104 (+8)</td>
<td>15C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 LON Lambeth 560</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>98v</td>
<td>18 (only)</td>
<td>15C med</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 *LIN Thornton</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>51v</td>
<td>80 (-18+2)</td>
<td>c1440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 NLS Adv.19.3.1</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>174r</td>
<td>64 (only)</td>
<td>15C iv</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Editions

A Furnivall, EETS 15, 1866:93-6
A R Bolle 1911:292-6
A T Horstmann, Aeleg, 1881:367-8, 529-30
R Padelford and Benham 1908:317-20
T Perry, EETS 26, 1867:115-18

Affiliation

Each text of Lost Soul exhibits a very great degree of individual variation, so that it proves impossible to deduce the manuscript groupings. Each text is flawed by a number of transpositions and omissions, which suggests that the adaptability of the poem proved more valuable than the preservation of its original form. The divergent readings in A, as with the other texts, are probably due to liberal adaptations of the poem at several stages, including Rate's own scribal editing; Rosemary Woolf notes the "inappropriate adaptation" and "further confusion in the last two lines" (1968:321).
Item 35b: The Adulterous Falmouth Squire

### Manuscripts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IMEV 2052</th>
<th>sigla</th>
<th>folio</th>
<th>lines (196)</th>
<th>date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 OBL Ashmole 61</td>
<td>A 137r</td>
<td>195 (-1)</td>
<td>c1500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 OBL Rawl. Poet. f.118</td>
<td>R 113v</td>
<td>204 (-16+24)</td>
<td>15C iii</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 CUL Ee.4.35/I</td>
<td>E 1r</td>
<td>126 (only)</td>
<td>post-1503</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 CUL Ff.2.38</td>
<td>F 56r</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>1480-90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 CUL Ff.5.48</td>
<td>C 67r</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>15C ex</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 LBM Harley 5396</td>
<td>H 276r</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>1456</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 LON Lambeth 306</td>
<td>L 107r</td>
<td>195 (-2+1)</td>
<td>16C in</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 *USA Delamere</td>
<td>162v</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Editions

- A Horstmann, Aelec, 1881:368-70
- R Horstmann 1887:419-21
- F Retr. Review 1853:II, 101-4
- C Hartshorne 1829:169
- L Furnivall, EETS 15, 1866:96-102

### Affiliation

There is a great diversity of readings, but a certain pattern can be discerned. The main tradition is represented by FCH. A does not differ substantially from this version in that it does not add extra text or change the ideas expressed, but its mode of expression diverges enough to distance it from the main group. Its variant readings are largely the result of scribal preference and liberality of treatment.
Item 36: The Story of the Resurrection

Manuscripts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manuscripts</th>
<th>sigla</th>
<th>folio</th>
<th>lines</th>
<th>date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IMEV 3980</td>
<td>OBL</td>
<td>Ashmole 61</td>
<td>138v</td>
<td>605</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Editions

A Horstmann 1887:441-7

Notes

The relationship of this unique text with the Passion text on which it is based has already been discussed in chapter 2 section 2.2.e, Textual Correlations; notes on the common and complementary passages are given there. There does not appear to be any direct relationship between the Resurrection and the N-Town passion play in Vespasian D.8 (Block, 1922), although the plays themselves were also based in part on the Passion. The most interesting correlation between the Resurrection and the plays is the similarity of the names attributed to the four knights guarding the tomb. These also occur in slightly different forms in Tanner MS 407 (Louis, 1980:32, 257, 459).

Several of the same ideas in the poem (36) and the Passion (28) are present also in the play, but differently expressed, as the following table shows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Poem</th>
<th>Passion</th>
<th>Play</th>
<th>Subject</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>57-68</td>
<td>1943-6</td>
<td>1176-99</td>
<td>Plan to guard tomb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-1</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>1202</td>
<td>Naming of the knights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66-8</td>
<td>1947-52</td>
<td>1204-7</td>
<td>Charging of the knights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69-72</td>
<td>1960-8</td>
<td>1216-23</td>
<td>Boasts of the knights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99-110</td>
<td>1955-60</td>
<td>1232-43</td>
<td>Positions of the knights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114-37</td>
<td>1969-76</td>
<td>1320-42</td>
<td>The knights fall asleep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138-529</td>
<td>1977-2000</td>
<td>1416-63</td>
<td>The Resurrection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>530-77</td>
<td>2001-78</td>
<td>1480-1647</td>
<td>The knights awake</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It is likely in view of the coincidence of names and correlation of these passages that the poem drew from both the Passion and the play, and not the play from the poem *1, which in any case is chronologically infeasible. Louis suggests that the names arose out of the dramatic need for characterisation, hence the anonymity of the soldiers in the Passion account. There was probably an intermediate source which assigned the names to flesh out the characters, perhaps a romance-style narrative which gave rise to both the poem and the play.

1 As Falke suggests, cited in Foster, EETS 147, 1916:95-6.
Item 37: The Life of St Margaret

Manuscripts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manuscript</th>
<th>sigla</th>
<th>folio</th>
<th>lines</th>
<th>date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IMEV 2673</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>OBL</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>145r</td>
<td>618</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>*USA</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>39r</td>
<td>365</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Editions

A Horstmann, Aeleq, 1881:236-41
B Smith 1886:107-18; edition of manuscript

Affiliation

This later redaction of the popular Margaret legend *1 is a tighter narrative than the version which appears, for example, in Bodley 779 (Horstmann 1887:411-19). Much of the prayer and pious philosophising by Margaret is omitted in favour of swifter action, with less emphasis on the horror of the martyrdom. The end of B is lost. Lucy T. Smith states that B "is another copy of the Ashmolean poem" (1886:107), but they were not copied from each other, since A reverses lines 57-60 which appear in a more sensible order in B, but preserves a more sensible reading at lines 69-70: Margaret has been given to a nurse to protect her from being murdered by her father; she grows up tending the nurse's sheep, and not those of her own father, as incorrectly stated in B. Otherwise, A and B do not differ significantly, except that B inserts four lines of pious verse at 50a-d. B omits lines 184-5, 194-7, 267, which are present in A and in the earlier version of Bodley 779 and can therefore be designated careless errors.

*1 According to Wells' Manual, this version of Margaret's life is dated "before 1450" (1916:314).
Item 38: The Wounds of Christ against the Seven Deadly Sins

Manuscripts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manuscript</th>
<th>sigla</th>
<th>folio</th>
<th>lines (32)</th>
<th>date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IMEV 4200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 OBL Ashmole 61</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>150v</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>c1500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 CUL Ff.2.38</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>33r</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>c1480-90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 CAM Pepys 1584</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>107v</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>15C ex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 CUL Ee.5.13</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>15v</td>
<td>28 (-4)</td>
<td>14C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 LBM Harley 2339</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>117v</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>14C ex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 LBM Sloane 2275</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>245r</td>
<td>8 (only)</td>
<td>14C ex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 LBM Add.37049</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>30r</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>c1400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 *BTH Longleat 30</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td>1lr</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 *USA Hunt.HM.142</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td>10r</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMEV 4185</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 CUL Ff.5.48</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>43v</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>15C ex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMEV 1565</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 CUL Mm.4.41</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>147v</td>
<td>32 (-16+10)</td>
<td>15C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Editions

P C M, Person 1953:68-9, 10-11, 9
P Brown, RL14, 1924:227-8
C Downing 1969; edition of manuscript
Davies 1963:207-8

Affiliation

The manuscript groupings for this version of the Sins, suggested by the different stanza arrangements given in the stanza table, is reflected also in the collations. The main tradition is represented by H F P S, where F P are identical; a disarranged version by A B; and divergent versions by C E M, which agree partly among themselves. Similarly A B share the same arrangement except that A additionally reverses 7 and 5. They agree in several readings against the rest, such as lines 1 (be : weren full), 10 (drynke was : drynkys weren), and 18 (And suffryd : To suffre; also S).
### Stanza Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HFP</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>S</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Manuscripts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IMEV 3868</th>
<th>sigla</th>
<th>folio</th>
<th>lines</th>
<th>date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 OBL Ashmole 61</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>151r</td>
<td>603</td>
<td>c1500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 LBM Harley 3810/I</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>1r</td>
<td>509</td>
<td>15C 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 NLS Auchinleck</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>300r</td>
<td>604</td>
<td>c1330</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Editions

CE Bliss 1966. Discussion of manuscripts and transcriptions of texts. I have retained Bliss's sigla for this romance, as to do otherwise would be unnecessarily confusing. In Bliss's edition the lines in each text are separately numbered, so I have not calculated the added and omitted lines.

Zielke 1880 (German edition)

B Rumble 1965:206-26
Stevenson 1902:30-8
Hazlitt 1875:83-100
Halliwell-Phillips 1845:37-55
H Ritson 1802:248-69
A Alexander and Riddy 1989:158-76
Speed 1987:121-47
Lester 1986
Garbáty 1984:349-64
Lesley and Williams 1984:1-21
Schmidt and Jacobs 1980:1, 151-71
Burrow 1977:4-27
Pearsall and Cunningham 1977b; Scolar Press Facsimile
Spearing and Spearing 1974:128-47
Dunn and Byrnes 1973:216-30
Owen and Owen 1971:121-41
Sisam and Sisam 1970:76-98
Stevick 1967:3-26
Gibbs 1966:84-103
Haskell 1966:247-62
Sands 1966:185-200
Bliss, thesis, 1954
Ford 1954:271-87
French and Hale 1930:1, 323-41
Sisam 1921:14-31
Cook 1915:88-107
Shackford 1913:141-60
Hazlitt 1895:64-80
Child 1883:1, 215-17; rpr. Neilson and Webster 1916:262
Laing 1822:115-36

The article is simply signed "B". J.H.Stevenson is the general editor. The IMEV cites the author as "Scott".
Affiliation

The references cited above include only those editions which print the full text in one or other of the manuscripts. The extensive critical literature is listed in Joanne Rice's bibliography. The wording of the three versions is close but not exact, probably due to the presence of other copies, now lost, and oral reshaping in the course of transmission. Therefore I have not made full collations but highlighted only those variants which are most significant to B. For manuscript affiliations see Bliss 1966:xiii-xv. He concludes that H B descended independently from a common ancestor which was probably much inferior to A. He gives a list of omitted and added passages.

The Ashmole version is prefaced by lines 1-6 from the Prologue of Arthour and Merlin, which are given in Bliss's edition for comparison. Lines 7-10 were then added to join the Arthour lines to Orfeof proper *2. The order in the lists of subjects suitable for lays in the romance prologue is more closely shared by A B than H, but H B share "happys" for "auentours" in A (line 8) *3. For discussion of Rate's alterations to this romance, see chapter 2.

---

2 see chapter 2 section 2.2.e, Textual Correlations.

3 As a noun, "auentours" is used slightly more frequently than "happys" throughout the texts in B.
Item 40: On the Vanity of the World

Manuscripts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IMEV 2576</th>
<th>sigla</th>
<th>folio</th>
<th>lines</th>
<th>date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 OBL Ashmole 61</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>156v</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>c1500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Editions

A Brown, RL15, 1939:238-40

Notes

In content and style Vanity resembles the only other satirical lyric in the manuscript, Ram's Horn (2). It deals with the transience of life, fortune, youth, virtue, and worldly gain; stanzas 3 and 4 expatiate the vanity of manly prowess and female frivolity respectively, thus conforming to Hargreaves' notion of "anti-feminism" (see chapter 2 section 2.3.a, Omission).
Item 41: King Edward and the Hermit

Manuscripts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manuscript</th>
<th>sigla</th>
<th>folio</th>
<th>lines</th>
<th>date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IMEV 1764</td>
<td>OBL</td>
<td>Ashmole 61</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>157r</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Editions

A Furrow 1985:237-69; prints text (also item 21), commentary on manuscript and notes.
Hazlitt, Remains, 1864:1, 11-34
Hartshorne 1829:293-315
Brydges and Haslewood 1814:IV, 81-95

Notes

The last tale in Ashmole 61 is imperfect, since the last five or so leaves are lost from the end, probably accidentally as a result of wear and tear on the back folios of the last quire in the manuscript. The tale is inferior in quality, being little more than a contest between a disguised king and a lowly hermit to drink each other under the table, shouting nonsense toast words. The text is interrupted apparently in the middle of the tale, after the encounter of the King with the Hermit in the forest, and before the Hermit’s adventures at court.

The tale has elements in common with other texts in the manuscript, such as its popular forest setting *1, and its theme of the hero outwitting his opponents *2. But it was evidently included because it provides, under cover of an amusing tale to be recited at feasts, a moral satire on the perils of drink *3.

1 Compare the forest motifs in Eustace (1), Isumbras (5), Tolouse (19), Libeus (20), Orfeo (39).
2 Compare Tolouse (19), Corneus (21), Cleges (24) Orfeo (39).
3 Compare Carpenter’s Tools (16) and Corneus (21).
The toast words "fusty bandias" (lines 347, 355, 364, 368, 370, 379, 499) and "stryke pantner" (lines 350, 359, 380, 500) were dismissed by Hazlitt as "the usual gibberish introduced, on such occasions, into poems and plays" (1864: 26) *4, but they may not be wholly meaningless. MED records forms of "pautener(e" ('rascal, scoundrel, villain') with "n" in place of "u", and although it does not recognize "fusty" as a ME form, OED does; the sense 'mouldy' would be appropriate here. This would suggest a perjorative sense for "bandias" to parallel that for "pantner" (compare MED "bond(e n. (1) 3 'serf'). If these interpretations are correct it would appear that the King and Hermit taunt each other with phrases like "(you) mouldy slave" and "strike (you) villain" *5, probably setting up a later comical scene. We may predict the discomfiture of the embarrassed poacher on discovering his imprudence when he arrives at court according to their agreement (lines 510-16), and realizes that not only had he unguardedly revealed to the King that he had been poaching the royal deer, but that he had been insulting the King himself.

*4 Brydges describes them as "terms of merriment" and notes the obscurity both of their meaning and the game itself (1814:90); Chambers cites similarly nonsensical toast words in King Edward and the Shepherd, as well as the similarity of Rate's text to other King and Subject tales (1947:128-9).

*5 Although I am probably trying to make sense out of what was intended to be comic nonsense.