

# Rethinking the Lollardy of the *Lucidarie*: The Middle English Version of the *Elucidarium* and Religious Thought in Late Medieval England\*

**Anna Lewis**

In the course of the ongoing enquiry into the nature of Lollardy and the relationship between orthodox and heterodox thought in late medieval England, the accuracy of the designation ‘Lollard’ as a descriptor of various texts, many of them revisions of existing works, has been called into serious doubt.<sup>1</sup> This is partly, and increasingly, a result of unease with use of the term ‘Lollard’ as a synonym for ‘Wycliffite.’ As Andrew Cole has recently observed, contemporary usage suggests that ‘Lollard’ was a multi-layered and contested term describing “complex, contradictory” but not necessarily Wycliffite “identities.”<sup>2</sup> Even if a connection between Wycliffite thought and Lollard identity is assumed (as it is in the work of scholars like Anne Hudson, Fiona Somerset, and Andrew Larsen<sup>3</sup>) and a Lollard is defined as one who holds “a significant

---

\* I would like to express my thanks to the library of St John’s College, Cambridge, for providing access to the manuscript and for granting permission to reproduce f. 15r here, and to Professor Ralph Hanna for his helpful comments and suggestions.

1 Texts whose Lollard associations are now doubted include *The Recluse*, a redaction of *Ancrene Riwe* (see Hanna, *London Literature*, 202-12), the supposedly Wycliffite adaptation of Thoresby’s *Lay Folks’ Catechism* (see Hudson, “A New Look”), and the Middle English Apocalypse Commentary (see Fridner, *A Fourteenth Century Apocalypse*, xxv-xl; and Hudson, *The Premature Reformation*, 267). The origins of a large number of tracts and translations once ascribed to Wyclif himself, such as those in Arnold’s and Matthew’s editions, are also being reassessed.

2 Cole, *Literature and Heresy*, 74.

3 See Hudson, *The Premature Reformation*, 2-3; Somerset, “Introduction,” *Lollards and Their Influence*, 9; Larsen, “Are All Lollards Lollards?” This paper follows these scholars in using the term ‘Lollard’ as a synonym for ‘Wycliffite’ because the term has been used in this way by those who have designated the *Lucidarie* a Lollard text.

number of beliefs associated with John Wyclif and his identifiable followers,” the assumed Lollard identity of certain texts needs to be reassessed when core Wycliffite beliefs turn out to be absent or when the text contains teachings that contradict these beliefs.<sup>4</sup> As Hudson points out in her 1985 article on the so-called Lollard revision of the *Lay Folks’ Catechism*, the Lollard appellation can be nothing more than a “critical commonplace” which does not stand up to careful scrutiny of the evidence.<sup>5</sup> The editors of the Lollard *Lay Folks’ Catechism* ascribed the text to Wyclif himself because of the presence of Wycliffite ideas and the text’s connections with other works assumed to be by the reformer;<sup>6</sup> the connection to Wyclif was later rejected, but the Lollard association remained, despite the fact that aspects of the text are clearly incongruent with Lollard beliefs. As Hudson shows, the text is theologically far too inconsistent (indeed, confused) to be categorized as Lollard, and the designation is therefore a “simplification.”<sup>7</sup> This tendency to gloss over variations in late medieval belief by labelling all religious texts either orthodox or Lollard is, Larsen argues, a consequence of the myth, pervading “English historiography” for much of the last two centuries, that Lollardy was the only heresy in late medieval England.<sup>8</sup> Larsen’s brief survey of examples of non-Lollard heresy in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries and Kathryn Kerby-Fulton’s careful documentation of many more in her *Books under Suspicion* indicate a variety of “radicalisms” in Ricardian and Lancastrian England, rendering any neat distinction between Lollard and orthodox inadequate.<sup>9</sup> Trial testimonies, written texts, and anecdotal reports reveal a broad spectrum of religious opinion, some of it idiosyncratic and much of it potentially shaped by several different ideologies. The mixture of orthodox and heterodox material found in many texts and manuscript collections can be “regarded as a barometer of the cultural context that [they] existed to serve.”<sup>10</sup> The doctrinal flexibility of these works suggests that the boundaries between heterodoxy and orthodoxy had yet to be tightly drawn and points to the complexity of religious belief in the later Middle Ages. An increasing awareness of this complexity is changing the way in which scholars of late medieval literature are responding to heterodox material in religious texts and is prompting a reassessment

---

4 Larsen, “Are All Lollards Lollards,” 69.

5 Hudson, “A New Look,” 243.

6 Simmons and Nolloth, eds., *The Lay Folks’ Catechism*, xxii.

7 Hudson, “A New Look,” 243.

8 Larsen, “Are All Lollards Lollards,” 62.

9 Kerby-Fulton, *Books under Suspicion*, xix-lii.

10 Fletcher, “A Hive of Industry,” 155.

of the texts' connections with Lollardy. Removing the Lollard label from works where it is not only inadequate but actually incorrect allows for both a more accurate understanding of religious writing and a clearer understanding of the Lollard movement.

This paper proposes that the Lollard label be dropped from another text to which it has long been affixed: the text commonly known as the *Lucidarie*, a Middle English adaptation of part of the *Elucidarium* of Honorius Augustodunensis into which additional dialogue passages have been inserted.<sup>11</sup> The *Lucidarie* is extant in two early fifteenth-century manuscripts: St John's College, Cambridge, MS G.25 (where it is entitled *Lucidarie*) and Cambridge University Library MS Ii.vi.26 (where its title is *Lucistrye*). An edition, based on the St John College manuscript, was produced by Friedrich Schmitt in 1909. Largely as a result of the content of the interpolations but also, to some extent, because of its status as a vernacular translation of religious material and because of the nature of the texts with which it circulated, this Middle English *Elucidarium* has been most frequently identified as a Lollard work.<sup>12</sup> The two most detailed discussions of the text and its connections to Lollardy are provided by Schmitt in the introduction to his 1909 edition of the text and by Carmela Giordano in her 1998 article "Tradurre e adattare: il 'Lucidarie' inglese medio fra Onorio d'Autun e Wyclif." In this paper, I challenge the conclusion shared by Schmitt and Giordano that the *Lucidarie* can be clearly identified as a Lollard text. After a brief review of the main elements of Schmitt's and Giordano's arguments, this paper looks again at the content of the *Lucidarie* and demonstrates how a closer examination of the end of the text (where the changes are greatest and where the interpolations occur) problematizes the idea that this translation was the work of a Lollard. Rather, the text seems

---

11 *Lucidarie* is the title most often employed in reference to the Middle English version, probably because the St John's MS copy, which bears this title, is a more careful and more complete version of the text than the CUL copy (the *Lucistrye*); see Schmitt, ed., *Die mittelhochdeutsche Version des Elucidariums*, vi.

12 Utley comments on the "Wycliffite cast" of the questions added to the original text and claims that Wyclif's disciples "reworked" the text; Utley, "Dialogues, Debates and Catechisms," 742. The description of MS Ii.vi.26 in *A Catalogue of the Manuscripts Preserved in the Library of the University of Cambridge*, p. 526, identifies the doctrines in the "part" translation of the *Elucidarium* as "those of the Lollards"; this observation applies not only to the interpolations but apparently also to the text in general. In her 1920 study of the 'Lollard Bible' and other versions of the Bible, Deanesly freely identified the *Lucidarie* as the "Lollard translation of the *Elucidarium*" without feeling a need to provide any supporting evidence; Deanesly, *The Lollard Bible*, 270. Hudson notes the identification of the text with the Lollards but makes no further comment; Hudson, ed., *Selections*, 189.

to engage deliberately with more than one doctrinal point of view and therefore reflects what I have elsewhere described as the “theological mobility” of many late medieval writers.<sup>13</sup> Moving on to a discussion of the contents of the two manuscripts in which the text is found, I argue that these, too, are marked by a doctrinal flexibility which testifies to the highly complex and even idiosyncratic nature of late medieval belief. For the reader’s convenience, and in light of modifications I have made to the existing edition of the text (in particular, the removal of misleading chapter divisions), a transcription of the final section of the work is appended.

Written by Honorius Augustodunensis in the first decade of the twelfth century, the *Elucidarium* is a theological compendium in the form of a dialogue between a master and his disciple.<sup>14</sup> It is divided into three books which are most commonly given the titles “De rebus divinis,” “De rebus ecclesiasticis,” and “De futura vita.” Although originally intended for Honorius’s fellow monks, the work became much more important for the laity than for the monastic community; as a manual of orthodox doctrine it was a useful tool of instruction, and many of the vernacular translations were owned by the richer laity.<sup>15</sup> Over the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, the *Elucidarium* was translated into many European vernaculars and

---

13 Lewis, “Textual Borrowings,” 3.

14 Honorius Augustodunensis remains a shadowy figure. Although he is traditionally known as Honorius of Autun, the connection to Autun is now largely rejected in favour of a likely home among the Irish Benedictine community in Regensburg, Bavaria. For a survey of the debate over Honorius’s place of residence, see Sanford, “Honorius, *Presbyter* and *Scholasticus*,” 397-403. It is generally agreed that he was a one-time student of Anselm. Honorius’s authorship of the *Elucidarium*, though disputed, was upheld by Yves Lefèvre in his comprehensive study of the French manuscripts, *L’Elucidarium et les Lucidaires*, 209-213. As neither the date of the text nor Honorius’s location at the time can be known for certain, the identity of the original audience for the text cannot be ascertained, and both the Regensburg monks and fellow monks and students at Canterbury have been suggested; see Sanford, “Honorius, *Presbyter* and in *Scholasticus*,” 401-402, and Lefèvre, ed., *L’Elucidarium et les Lucidaires*, 218-19. Lefèvre dates the *Elucidarium* to the earliest years of the twelfth century, probably before 1108, which assumes that Honorius’s date of birth is closer to 1080 than the traditionally accepted date of 1090; Lefèvre, ed., *L’Elucidarium et les Lucidaires*, 221-222.

15 Lefèvre describes the waning of the book’s popularity among theologians: with the rapid rise of scholasticism, its dogmatic rather than dialectic style quickly became outmoded. Neglected by the schools and monasteries, it was taken up by the clergy among whom it became a foundational text for the ministry. Whether through the teaching of priests or by direct contact with the vernacular text, the *Elucidarium* was, as Lefèvre states, specifically intended as a manual for a lay audience (“un manuel pratique, spécialement destiné à des laïques”); Lefèvre, ed., *L’Elucidarium et les Lucidaires*, 289.

spawned multiple adaptations and variants. An Old English version dating from the first quarter of the twelfth century is the earliest extant translation of the *Elucidarium* in any European tongue, and it is likely that several Middle English versions existed.<sup>16</sup> The version discussed here dates from the end of the fourteenth or the beginning of the fifteenth century. In the St John's manuscript, the *Lucidarie* is the first of six religious items (ff. 1r-16r); in the CUL manuscript, it follows twelve tracts on the subject of Bible translation (ff. 79v-101v). In terms of the content of the text itself, while the CUL text is a much rougher scribal job than the St John's manuscript, the two are differentiated only by minor variations in spelling and by the fact that several quires are missing from the CUL copy. It is therefore likely that they had a common exemplar. Far from being a complete translation of the *Elucidarium*, the St John's College text (hereafter, the *Lucidarie*<sup>17</sup>) omits Book III altogether and includes only six questions from Book II. At no point does it acknowledge that it is a translation, nor does it refer to any source or sources from which it is taken, simply stating that this is a dialogue between a master and his disciple: "Here bigyneþ a tretis þat is clepid Lucidarie, how a disciple axiþ questiouns of his maistir & þe maistir assoilþ hem. Now þe disciple seiþ þus" (f. 1r).

Book I has been slightly modified and, towards the end, completely altered in both structure and matter by the addition of twelve entirely new questions and answers. The sequence is broken between questions eleven and twelve, at which point the translator has inserted the eighth question from Book II of the *Elucidarium*. After the twelfth interpolated question and response, the translator moves straight into Book II where he translates four questions of that book (questions three, four, and six, on the nature of good and evil, and question seven, on the definition of free will) before adding, and finishing the text with, a further addition of his own consisting

---

16 A Middle English adaptation of much of Book I of the *Elucidarium* exists in the form of a fifteenth-century dramatic dialogue, *Lucidus and Dubius*, found in Winchester College MS 33; see Lee, "*Lucidus and Dubius*," 79. Another manuscript, National Library of Wales MS Peniarth 12 (ff. 1-11v), contains a fragment of a Middle English translation. That an English version was printed twice in the early years of the sixteenth century suggests an existing familiarity with the work. This version contains material from the entire work but in an abridged form; it also transposes material between the three books and includes additional catechetical material (the sacraments, the articles of faith, the commandments). In his edition of the Cambridge manuscript, Simon Hunt cites Andrew Matthew, who postulates a pre-existing Middle English version of the *Elucidarium* on which the text discussed here is based; see Hunt, "An Edition of Tracts in Favour of Scriptural Translation," 78.

17 See above, note 11. Unless otherwise stated, the St John's MS is the source of all quotations provided in this paper.

⁊ in þ<sup>r</sup> þei ben moost wretched for alle oþe haue sun  
 ioye saue þei: Do þei neu to miel þe discipule ariþ. þer  
 maister which is þe beste religiou: þe maist<sup>r</sup> ariþ: ⁊ ⁊  
 pat pat ihu cit grouded in his gospel to loue god wip  
 al his herte wip al his mynde wip al his soule: ⁊ wip  
 al his strengþe. ⁊ his neu he bore as hi self for in yesc  
 two comaundementes: hangy al þe lawe ⁊ pphetes ⁊  
 who þ<sup>r</sup> dow þus. ⁊ eendep his lyf in þis loue: schal si  
 kuryly be saued for his trewe folowig of crist ⁊ haue to  
 his rewarde lyf wipoute eeude: ⁊ an hundrid yere more  
 ioye þan eue he forsooke ⁊ betur religiou can y noon:  
 pat eue cit tauste what man religiouis þ<sup>r</sup> þei late ma  
 de of newes writis. ⁊ not of þe hooly goost in myne  
 vnderstondig: god deeme hi self. for y wole not þe  
 discipule ariþ. who is þe firste autour of hymne: þe ma  
 in answery. Inceþ þe secunde pat bigild firste adam  
 ⁊ eue. ⁊ temptide þe manhede of crist: ⁊ eue is aboute  
 to bigile mankynde. wip tisyng he to hymne ⁊ name  
 ly now in þe cende of þis world: to make antechis cler  
 kes draue a grete partie of þis world. to þe cendelcs  
 pepue of helle: þe discipule ariþ. how greuous is oo deed  
 by hymne to god: þe maist<sup>r</sup> answery. þe leeste deedly  
 hymne pat is. is more greuouse toly. þan to lesen al  
 þis world þe discipule lary. It is writun: Lord you ha  
ndist no þing of hem. whichc pou madist how may  
 it be seide þanne god louey alle goode men: ⁊ hatey  
 alle yuele men: þe maist<sup>r</sup> answery. Alle yuges  
 god louey pat he hay maide. but he ordeyney not alle  
 yuges in oo place ryt as a pepitour louey alle his

Figure 1. The *Lucidarie*, St John's College, Cambridge, MS G.25, f. 15r, containing the twelfth interpolated question and answer; tags are rubricated and scriptural verses underlined. Reproduced by permission of the College Council, St John College, Cambridge.

of two questions on the subject of grace (although this time, one of the questions is asked by the master).<sup>18</sup> The subject of eleven of the twelve new questions in Book I can be loosely described as the corruption of the Church by wealth, and the connection between this corruption and the rise of the Antichrist. This discussion of the end times is curtailed by the insertion of question eight from Book II on the problem of men who enter a religious order but later abandon it, ending up worse than when they started. The Middle English text extends the question to cover the condition of those who continue to live in an order even though they have “forsaken” it in their hearts and regret ever having joined (“& summe bileuen stille in þe ordre, & repenten hem al her lyue” [f. 14v]).<sup>19</sup> This exchange is immediately followed by the twelfth additional question (“which is þe beste religioun?” [f. 15r], see *Fig. 1*) and its answer (true religion is obedience to Christ’s command to love God and to love one’s neighbour).

Both Schmitt and Giordano identify the *Lucidarie* as the work of a Lollard. Both scholars are concerned with the *Lucidarie*’s departures from the Latin *Elucidarium*, and both compare the English text with an authoritative Latin version, Schmitt using Migne’s and Giordano following Yves Lefèvre’s edition.<sup>20</sup> Schmitt notes that the minor changes to the Latin text made throughout Book I (including the omission of questions, the compression of several questions into one, and the removal of material unnecessarily academic or speculative such as a discussion on why the Trinity is understood as masculine rather than feminine) demonstrate the translator’s preference for brevity and for staying with fundamentals.<sup>21</sup> Giordano, who is much more comprehensive than Schmitt in her survey of the entire text, argues that the author of the *Lucidarie* (and she insists that ‘author’ rather than simply ‘translator’ is the right term) has transformed the original *Elucidarium* according to a well thought-out plan based on a three-fold process of translation, adaptation, and addition. She also comments on the *Lucidarie*’s diction, finding in the phrasing of “parfijte louers or ellis children” (f. 12v) evidence of the possibly distinctive Lollard vocabulary discussed

18 The initial two questions of Book II are not translated. The first of these re-introduces the dialogue, and the second opens a lengthy philosophical discussion of the nature of evil.

19 The word *bileuen* here means to ‘remain in a place’ or to ‘stay’ (*MED* s.v. *bileven*, def. 3a).

20 It is worth noting that although both scholars choose this strategy of comparison with an authoritative Latin text, it is impossible to know, given the vast number of Latin manuscripts of the *Elucidarium* and the degree of adaptation and variation even within the Latin tradition, which version of the Latin text the original redactor was working with.

21 Schmitt, ed., *Die mittlenglische Version des Elucidariums*, vii.

by Anne Hudson.<sup>22</sup> Both scholars locate the *Lucidarie* in the context of the Lollard practice of making use of existing material designed for the edification of the laity, and both imply that the *Elucidarium* would have been a text of interest to the Lollards because of its role in instructing the laity.<sup>23</sup>

For both writers, the alterations and additions to the final sections of the text are the key evidence indicating Lollard authorship. Both Schmitt and Giordano point to the substitution of the *Elucidarium*'s definition of the Church for what they consider to be a Wycliffite definition (the "gadering of trewe men þat louen God" [f. 11v]);<sup>24</sup> they also note that additions to the *Elucidarium*'s discussion of "vncleene preestis" assert the responsibility of secular lords to chastise and punish wicked priests, and they suggest that such a view is in harmony with Wyclif's opinion that the king and the secular nobility are responsible for restoring order in the Church (ff. 12r-12v).<sup>25</sup> To some extent, both Schmitt and Giordano see the author's move into a discussion of the imminence of the end times and the emergence of the Antichrist as consistent with a Lollard position although neither scholar clearly explains why, commenting instead on the general (rather than specifically Wycliffite) interest in these matters.<sup>26</sup> In the adaptation of the *Elucidarium*'s question about religious who abandon their vocation Giordano finds implied criticism of the religious orders,<sup>27</sup> and in the *Lucidarie*'s definition of the best religion Schmitt sees a reflection of Wyclif's teaching on the supremacy of Christ's rules and against the monastic and fraternal orders.<sup>28</sup>

22 Giordano, "Tradurre e adattare," 28. See Hudson, "A Lollard Sect Vocabulary?" Hudson's discussion of evidence suggesting that Lollards used a distinctive diction has been extended by Havens, "Shading the Grey Area," and by Peikola, "Individual Voice in Lollard Discourse." While aspects of the *Lucidarie*'s diction are suggestive of a Lollard style, the text would seem to affirm Hudson's warning that the language cannot by itself be taken as evidence of Lollardy. For example, scriptural images whose frequent occurrence in other Lollard texts might seem to support the notion of the *Lucidarie*'s Lollardy — e.g., the blind leading the blind, wolves among sheep, or wolves in sheep's clothing — are, in fact, all drawn from Honorius's text.

23 Schmitt, ed., *Die mittlenglische Version des Elucidariums*, vii; Giordano, "Tradurre e adattare," 31, 15-16.

24 Schmitt, ed., *Die mittlenglische Version des Elucidariums*, xi; Giordano, "Tradurre e adattare," 22-23. The definition, they suggest, echoes Wyclif's teaching on the Church as the invisible community of the predestined.

25 Schmitt, ed., *Die mittlenglische Version des Elucidariums*, xiii-xiv; Giordano, "Tradurre e adattare," 30.

26 Schmitt, ed., *Die mittlenglische Version des Elucidariums*, xxi; Giordano, "Tradurre e adattare," 36.

27 Giordano, "Tradurre e adattare," 39.

28 Schmitt, ed., *Die mittlenglische Version des Elucidariums*, xviii-xix.



Drawing on particular aspects of the text in this way, Schmitt and Giordano make a case for the presence of Lollard opinions in the *Lucidarie*. They both concede, however, that there are aspects of the translator's adaptation and interpolations that do not seem to cohere with a Lollard worldview; in particular, they both mention the teaching on the Eucharist, and the example of the veneration of the saints that occurs in the final interpolated response in the last lines of the text.<sup>29</sup> The latter, with its allegorical reading of the "3ate" at which the Christian knocks as "oure Ladi Goddis modir & oþer [...] seyntis [...] preiynge for us" and with the importance it accords to Mary who shows "to her sone hir brestes" even as Christ shows his wounds to the Father, certainly seems at odds with Lollard emphasis on Christ's role as sole mediator between humanity and God (f. 16r). In the case of the Eucharist, the litmus test for heresy during the Lollard controversy, the translator has not taken the opportunity to insert Wycliffite teaching on the subject; indeed, the question that would seem to provide an opportunity for such comment (question 180 in the *Elucidarium*: "Quare corpus ejus de pane et sanguis de vino conficitur?" [In what manner is bread changed into his body and wine into his blood?]) has been omitted.<sup>30</sup> The *Elucidarium*'s discussion of the Eucharist incorporates an explanation of the transformation of the elements and of the salvific value of the sacrament as well as a clarification of the added benefits associated with practices like touching the Host or communicating more frequently. Reducing the five questions and answers of the *Elucidarium* to the single question "so as liknes of breed & wyne leueþ stille in þis sacrament, how may it be þat it is fleisch & blood?" followed by one answer (f. 11v), the *Lucidarie* incorporates aspects of the Latin discussion but emphasizes the transformative nature of belief in the sacrament to "oonen" (unite) the people with Christ. Giordano attributes the lack of a Lollard response to a general confusion in teaching about the sacrament in Lollard circles and to the *Elucidarium*'s ambiguity concerning the conversion of the elements; Honorius was, after all, writing long before the doctrine of transubstantiation was promulgated.<sup>31</sup> The *Lucidarie* author, Giordano concludes, was simply not as radical as Wyclif on this issue.<sup>32</sup>

A closer look at the *Lucidarie*'s comments on the Eucharist, however, suggests not merely an absence of Lollard teaching but the presence of ideas at odds with

---

29 Schmitt, ed., *Die mittlenglische Version des Elucidariums*, xxii; Giordano, "Tradurre e adattare," 45.

30 Lefèvre, ed., *L'Elucidarium et les Lucidaires*, 394.

31 Giordano, "Tradurre e adattare," 23-24.

32 Giordano, "Tradurre e adattare," 24-25 and 45.

Lollard teaching. The comments are mostly contained in question 116 and its response:

Þe disciple axiþ: so as liknes of breed & wyne leueþ stille in þis sacrament, how may it be þat it is fleisch & blood? Þe maistir answeriþ: if þou siþe in liknesse of fleisch & blood þat blessed sacrament, þou schuldest loþen & abhorren it to resseyue it in to þi mouþ, & þerfore þe liknes of brede & wyne leueþ stille for þi more merijte þat wolt bileeue bi goostly vndirstonding þat it is oþer þing þan þou seest, & wiþ þat bileeue so turneþ to þee beste heele of soule þat may be. For as bodily mete of þe eter turneþ into fleisch & blood, & þe vertu þerof kepiþ þe lijf þat he haþ in þis world, so euery trewe man wiþ etynge of þis precieuse mete þe vertu þerof ȝyueþ strengthe into mannes soule & makeþ him to come to lijf wiþouten eende; for as a man his heere crucified wiþ Crist in forsakinge of alle foule lustes of his fleisch for Cristis loue & þerto ooneþ his soule wiþ Crist wiþ cleer conciense to resseyue þis sacrament in memorie of his passioun, as him silf biddiþ, for þat same good wille Crist wole oonen his blisshed body to þat soule to lyue wiþ him wiþouten eende. (ff. 11v-12r)

Clearly, the master's response does not answer the disciple's question. The disciple wants to know how the sacrament can be Christ's body and blood and yet maintain the appearance of bread and wine — a question which would seem to raise the theologically contentious issue of the relationship between accidents and substance so central to Wyclif's discussion of the sacrament.<sup>33</sup> If the translator is a Lollard, it seems strange that he does not take such an opportunity to offer the Wycliffite teaching on the substantial remanence of the elements.<sup>34</sup> The master's response merely offers a reason *why* the bread and wine remain; he does not explain *how* the body and blood appear to co-exist with the bread and wine. The idea that the appearance of the bread and wine makes palatable what would otherwise be unpalatable was a popular teaching but is surely the last answer Wyclif would have given to explain why believers continue to see the bread and wine. While Wyclif asserted that the sacrament is “verrey Goddus body in fourme of brede,” that body is present in a spiritual, not a corporeal

33 Wyclif was censured for denying the substantial conversion of the elements. Wyclif held that the substance of the bread, while simultaneously becoming the body of Christ, is not annihilated but retains its own nature, as proven by the remanence of the accidents (appearance, texture, taste).

34 This teaching is central to Lollard critiques of eucharistic theology. See, e.g., the Lollard sermon/tract *Vae Octuplex* which criticizes the friars for teaching “þat þis sacrament is an accident wiþowte suget”; *Vae Octuplex*, p. 375, l. 265.

sense, and could not be seen even by “glorified human eyes.”<sup>35</sup> The idea of actually being able to see the bleeding flesh of Christ is typical of the materialism that Wyclif abhorred in contemporary attitudes to the Host and is something he vehemently rejected.<sup>36</sup> Indeed, Wyclif, and Lollards after him, spoke out against the eucharistic miracle stories which fed an excessively materialist and therefore potentially idolatrous attitude to the sacrament. Thus, the decision to incorporate Honorius’s response to this question seems an unlikely one for a Lollard, as does the incorporation of a story about St. Cyprian witnessing a piece of black stone (rather than the Host) enter the sinful priest at Mass — repeated almost verbatim from the *Elucidarium* by the translator.

In the second half of the response, the text borrows, as mentioned earlier, the *Elucidarium*’s image of a man’s sinful nature being crucified with Christ (“a man his heere crucified wiþ Crist in forsakinge of alle foule lustes of his fleisch for Cristis loue” [f. 11v]) but otherwise adds all new material. The points made here — the analogy between consuming food for physical strength and consuming the sacrament for spiritual health, the need to receive the “preciouse mete [. . .] wiþ cleer conciense” (ff. 11v-12r), and its power to unite believers with Christ — are conventional teachings found in a variety of both orthodox and Lollard texts and presumably had wide appeal.

A subject that both Schmitt and Giordano are largely silent on is the *Lucidarie*’s attitude to the pope. The pope, or the “emperour of Rome,” is mentioned only once in the entire text, in the response to the third of the series of twelve interpolated questions. Here, the pope is held up as the one who could, with the aid of “Cristen kyn- ges,” cleanse the corruption found among the “hedes of hooly chirche” (f. 13v). When the disciple follows up with the question of why this cleansing is not happening, he does not explicitly mention the pope but rather asks what is keeping “hedes & officeres of hooly chirche” from their duty (f. 13v). A certain ambiguity therefore enters the discussion: when describing the accumulation of wealth that has been so disastrous for the Church, does the text count the pope among the guilty “hedes & officeres of hooly chirche” or not? When the text refers to the “abhomyacioun of discomforte,” which in Lollard texts is often used to describe the pope and the papal curia, the pope is not mentioned and the examples of “hedes of þe chirche” are given as “prelates & maistris of dyuynyte” (f. 14v). While it seems likely that the pope is

35 “Wyclif’s Confessions on the Eucharist,” in Hudson, ed., *Selections*, 17; Levy, *John Wyclif*, 242.

36 See Levy, *John Wyclif*, 242-43.

regarded as implicated in the sins of the Church, it is not categorically stated and the pope's role is left ambiguous.<sup>37</sup> Indeed, he is mentioned only once, in the context of saving the Church, of “amending” what is wrong.<sup>38</sup>

Such ambiguity about the “emperour of Rome” is not typical of Lollard writings. Lollards certainly held nuanced views about the papacy as an institution, as recent work by Patrick Hornbeck and Ian C. Levy has demonstrated.<sup>39</sup> However, their opinions on the existing papacy — or the “monarchy” it had become — are unambiguous.<sup>40</sup> While Wyclif and many of those who followed him saw a role for a pope, a chief, in the Church militant, this pope is defined by his imitation of Christ and the apostolic martyrs; he is a far cry from the Roman pontiff, elected by fallible cardinals and leading a life utterly at odds with Christ's. Following Wyclif, Lollard writers are clear about the corruption that has entered the papacy (greatly intensified if not initiated by the Donation of Constantine) and their view that the contemporaneous papal curia stands in opposition to the Christian message. Indeed, by defining the pope as the antithesis of Christ, as “þat ilke man þat contrarieþ Crist in lyuyng,” Lollard writers frequently identify him as the Antichrist.<sup>41</sup>

The subject of the Antichrist introduces another difficulty in reconciling the vision of the *Lucidarie* with Lollard views. It is true that the *Lucidarie* connects the corruption in the Church with the imminence of the end; the wealth and disobedience of the prelates signals the emergence of the Antichrist, and the ‘abomination of desolation’ is here identified as “prelates & maistris of dyuynyte” standing in opposition to Christ (f. 14v). This historicizing interpretation can be described as essentially apocalyptic (as opposed to eschatological) as it uses scripture to explain current events.<sup>42</sup> Such a viewpoint can be linked to several influential apocalyptic thinkers,

37 Schmitt also seems to arrive at this opinion in *Die mittelenglische Version des Elucidariums*, xvii.

38 It is also worth noting that the *Lucidarie* does not use the term “abhomyngacioun of discomforte” (f. 14r) with the same specificity as Lollard texts. In answering the disciple's question, the master makes a subtle change and describes the “abhomyngacioun or discomforte” experienced by those who witness wickedness in the place where holiness should be (f. 14v).

39 See Hornbeck, “Of Captains and Antichrists”; and Levy, “John Wyclif and the Primitive Papacy.”

40 Levy, “John Wyclif and the Primitive Papacy,” 159.

41 *Of Mynystris in þe Chirche*, p. 331, ll. 70-71.

42 The idea that an apocalyptic, as opposed to an eschatological, perspective views “the events of one's own time in the light of the End of history” is discussed by McGinn, *Visions of the End*, 4. Bostick, *The Antichrist and the Lollards*, and Kerby-Fulton, *Books under Suspicion*, also apply the term in this way.

and also to Wycliffites.<sup>43</sup> However, simultaneously with this view, the text portrays the Antichrist as a recognizable individual, as one who will be ‘born,’ accumulate disciples, and then perform miracles as a way of confirming “al þat his disciplis haue prechid bifore a 3en Cristis lore” (f. 14r). This understanding of the Antichrist as an identifiable, historical figure was a popular one, derived largely from extra-scriptural tradition and systematized into a full ‘biography’ in the tenth century by Abbot Adso of Montier-en-Der. Well-disseminated vernacular portrayals of the Antichrist, such as those in *The Pricke of Conscience*, the *Cursor Mundi*, and the play of the Antichrist from the Chester cycle are rooted in this tradition. This Adsonian model, in which the Antichrist is a force removed from and external to the Church, typically made no attempt to place the Antichrist narrative in the context of historical events (making it an essentially eschatological perspective). Such a conception of the ‘final enemy’ is utterly at odds with the view of Wyclif and his followers. Indeed, Lollard writers condemn this view of the Antichrist as little more than a fable springing from the people’s imagination which seduces and deceives rather than instructs;<sup>44</sup> a Lollard would have had little interest in drawing from, never mind re-creating, the popular mini-tracts on the Antichrist, as Giordano suggests the *Lucidarie* translator has done.<sup>45</sup> Instead, Wyclif and his followers, seeing parallels between the end times and the current state of the Church, identify the pope (seen as the antithesis of Christ in every way) as the Antichrist whose body incorporates the corrupt structure of the papal curia, the archbishops and bishops, and the religious orders.

The *Lucidarie*’s view of the Antichrist is, then, a curious mixture of the Adsonian tradition and a more apocalyptic perspective that roots the emergence of the Antichrist in the decay of the Church. This mixture of opinion is also apparent in the text’s discussion of the Eucharist; neither section of the text offers its readers specifically Lollard teaching. The Eucharist, the pope, and the end times represent three subjects on which, according to Lollard writings, the evidence of trials, and anecdotal reports, the Lollards had distinct opinions, and yet these opinions are not clearly expressed in the allegedly Lollard *Lucidarie*. When placed back in the context of the

---

43 While interpretations of events varied, the effort to locate current events and leaders in an apocalyptic timeframe is apparent in the prophecies of Hildegard of Bingen and Joachim of Fiore and in the exegesis of Wyclif.

44 This is the view expressed by the Lollard Walter Brut at his trial; see *Registrum Johannis Trefnant*, 285-356. On this subject, see Bostick, *The Antichrist and the Lollards*, 114-43.

45 Giordano, “Tradurre e adattare,” 37.

rest of the *Lucidarie*, these three areas of teaching (along with the text's praise of Mary and the saints) complicate the case for a Lollard provenance of the text. While the translator may have been influenced by Lollardy (and may even have considered himself a Lollard), his theology, as reflected in the *Lucidarie*, is ambiguous, combining a mixture of orthodox and heterodox teaching. However, this ambiguity does not seem to stem from confusion or deliberate obfuscation but from a genuine engagement with more than one point of view. The translator has made a well considered series of deliberate choices about the material to be interpolated and about its placement, and the content of these interpolations suggests an exposure to, and an ability to move between, different theological perspectives with little regard for the doctrinal boundary between so-called heresy and orthodoxy. Both the *Lucidarie* and its translator demonstrate a theological mobility that points to the complex nature of early fifteenth-century religious belief. For further evidence of this mobility, I turn now to the manuscript contexts of the two copies of the *Lucidarie*.

Both Schmitt and Giordano close their analyses of the *Lucidarie* by referring to the manuscript context of the two copies of the text. They point to the presence of other "Wycliffite" works in both instances, which, they conclude, confirm the Lollard origins of the *Lucidarie*. These works are tracts in favour of Bible translation (in CUL MS Ii.vi.26) and a commentary on the Apocalypse (in St John's College MS G.25) which both Schmitt and Giordano ascribe to Wyclif. However, the relationship between the *Lucidarie* and the other texts in the two manuscripts is not as straightforward as either Schmitt or Giordano suggests.

As noted above, CUL MS Ii.vi.26, which dates from the end of the first half of the fifteenth century, contains twelve tracts supporting vernacular translation of the Bible; the *Lucidarie* (or *Lucistrye* as it is called in this manuscript) follows the final tract and is the last item in the collection. According to Simon Hunt, who edited the twelve tracts, the entire manuscript is the work of one scribe, which implies that these thirteen texts were deliberately placed together.<sup>46</sup> The manuscript gives the impression, on the whole, of being a rough and rushed job: decoration is minimal, some initials and entire paraps are missing, running titles are absent, and the ruling of the lines is careless. This carelessness of the work seems even more obvious in the *Lucistrye* than in the rest of the texts as it contains no rubrication at all; the size of the script increases dramatically, and the number of lines decreases from twenty-six to, at one point,

---

46 Hunt, "An Edition of Tracts in Favour of Scriptural Translation," 84.

nineteen. As previously mentioned, several quires are missing from the text of the *Lucistrye* (though this is not indicated by the foliation). As many as seven quires may be missing between ff. 88 and 89 (dealing with the location of paradise, the creation of woman, the nature of the Fall and its consequences, and God's plan for humanity's redemption through Christ) and perhaps another one between ff. 96 and 97 (dealing with the sins, powers, and dangers of corrupt priests and including the opening section of the interpolated dialogue).<sup>47</sup> In the latter case, the leaves have almost certainly been cut out.<sup>48</sup>

Clearly, the central theme that connects the tracts in this collection — the need for Bible translation — is connected to Lollardy, and it is largely on this basis that Schmitt and Giordano claim that the manuscript supports the assertion that the *Lucidarie* is a Lollard text.<sup>49</sup> Hunt, too, argues that, given the 1407 legislation banning unauthorized Bible translations and considering the potential danger associated with piecing together a collection of tracts in favour of scriptural translation, the manuscript is the “production of one of distinctly heterodox leanings.”<sup>50</sup> However, as it seems increasingly likely that Arundel's Constitutions fell far short of their intended effect, an alternative view may be possible. As recent work by Ralph Hanna, Christopher de Hamel, Fiona Somerset, and Kathryn Kerby-Fulton demonstrates, fifteenth-century vernacular scripture found an audience among the orthodox as well as among Lollards.<sup>51</sup> In London at least, vernacular scripture and commentary upon it had been a staple of the book trade since the mid-1300s, satisfying the appetite of a spiritually ambitious merchant class and civil service.<sup>52</sup> This market did not disappear after the Constitutions: vernacular scripture remained available to the “higher-status laity”

---

47 Hunt, “An Edition of Tracts in Favour of Scriptural Translation,” 80; see also *A Catalogue of the Manuscripts Preserved in the Library of the University of Cambridge*, 526.

48 The question why these pages have been deliberately removed is, of course, an intriguing one. The missing pages cover that component of the dialogue which deals, very specifically and practically, with questions of the moral and spiritual authority of members of the corrupt clergy. When the dialogue resumes, it shifts to a more abstract understanding of the role of Church corruption in ushering in the end times. Anyone hostile to a critical scrutiny of a priest's regular responsibilities, such as preaching and the making of the sacrament, may have preferred to remove this section of the text.

49 Schmitt, ed., *Die mittelenenglische Version des Elucidariums*, xxiii; Giordano, “Tradurre e adattare,” 47.

50 Hunt, “An Edition of Tracts in Favour of Scriptural Translation,” 128-29.

51 Hanna, “English Biblical Texts,” 150-53; de Hamel, *The Book*, 176-89; Somerset, “Professionalizing Translation,” *passim*; Kerby-Fulton, *Books under Suspicion*, 397-401.

52 Hanna, “English Biblical Texts,” 142-48.

and even Wycliffite translation “moved quite quickly into the repertoire of the regular book trade, with a clientele decidedly above the rank of peasantry.”<sup>53</sup> Such a clientele, part of a “competing” or alternative orthodoxy to that represented by Arundel,<sup>54</sup> could be sympathetic to the demand for scriptural translation and lay education without approving other heterodox doctrines, doctrines that are notably absent in CUL MS II.vi.26. As Hunt notes, there is “little in the twelve tracts to condemn them as overtly heretical.”<sup>55</sup> The tracts are varied in nature and some do not contain anything clearly heterodox but instead seem to be conventional (even devotional) exhortations to obey and live according to God’s word rather than, necessarily, demanding direct access to *reading* it. The fifth tract, for example, is a quasi-sermon concerned with the obligation to care for fellow Christians, while the fourth meditatively describes the experience of dwelling in the garden of the Gospel, makes metaphorical reference to the Song of Songs, and elevates Mary Magdalene as an example of penance. Indeed, while at least three of the tracts seem to have connections to Lollardy, several of the others are found in orthodox contexts elsewhere.<sup>56</sup> Thus, while Hunt argues that the mixed compilation is a Lollard work emanating from that “sphere of Lollard literary activity in which all texts [...] are seen as fair quarry for revision to further the promulgation of questionable views,” it is equally possible that the volume reflects a compiler’s willingness to draw on Lollard material when making a case for the translation of scripture.<sup>57</sup> Whoever the compiler was, he was anxious, as Anne Hudson remarks, “to assemble as many documents to support the legitimacy of vernacular scriptures

---

53 Somerset, “Professionalizing Translation,” 153; and de Hamel, *The Book*, 176.

54 Somerset, “Professionalizing Translation,” 151.

55 Hunt, “An Edition of Tracts in Favour of Scriptural Translation,” 127.

56 The seventh tract shares large sections of text with a Lollard commentary on the Pater Noster. The ninth discusses the opposition which “trewe men” face from “anticristis disciples,” with some of the criticisms noted here being also advanced in other Lollard texts. The twelfth tract contains a definition of a not necessarily Wycliffite variety of Lollardy; for further discussion of this topic, see Cole, *Literature and Heresy*, 48–50. Tract six appears in two other manuscripts both containing the *Pore Caitif*; tract nine is found in an anthology described as a “priest’s book.” Tract eleven is a revision of the prologue to Robert of Greatham’s *Miroir*. Both Schmitt and Giordano mention that tract two also occurs as the prologue to the Middle English translation of Clement of Llanthony’s Gospel harmony, *Unum ex Quattuor*; see Schmitt, ed., *Die mittlenglische Version des Elucidariums*, xxiii, and Giordano, “Tradurre e adattare,” 47. Although both scholars cite the traditional association of this translation with Wyclif as further evidence of a Lollard connection, there is no reason to link the translation with Wyclif or the Lollards.

57 Hunt, “An Edition of Tracts in Favour of Scriptural Translation,” 80.



as possible, and was not fussy where they came from.”<sup>58</sup> This collection is therefore marked by its “catholicity,”<sup>59</sup> its readiness to combine concepts and ideas typical of orthodox traditions with more radical opinions, a quality which also characterizes the *Lucidarie* and which may have been designed to give the collection broad appeal.

In St John’s College MS G.25, the *Lucidarie* is the first of six items. Both Schmitt and Giordano find evidence of Wycliffism in the second item, the Middle English Apocalypse Commentary, which, drawing on J. Forshall and F. Madden’s conclusions, they identify as Wyclif’s work.<sup>60</sup> This attribution is now rejected. Schmitt and Giordano would have been on much safer ground had they noted the presence of the last two items in this collection: *Vae Octuplex* and *Of Mynystris in þe Chirche*, two tracts that frequently circulated with the Lollard sermon cycle and expound virulently Lollard ideas. Steeped in the eschatological language of Lollard polemic, both of these lengthy sermons draw on Matt. 23 and Matt. 24 in order to denounce the friars as Pharisees and the pope as the Antichrist. Placed between the *Lucidarie* and the Lollard tracts are the Apocalypse Commentary, a Passion narrative taken from the English translation of the twelfth-century Gospel harmony *Unum ex Quattuor* (known in English as *Oon of Foure*) by Clement of Llanthony,<sup>61</sup> and a meditation on the “sacrament of þe auter,” which is to be received “worþili and deuotly” (f. 85r). The Apocalypse Commentary is a translation of a French gloss of Franciscan origin containing several anticlerical interpolations that considerably intensify the invective directed against the Church and identify false prelates and hypocritical clerics as disciples of the Antichrist. Clement’s translation (another work long associated with Wyclif) is a faithful rendering of scriptural passages, arranged chronologically, with citations provided. The tract on the sacrament incorporates theological discussion of the Eucharist while remaining ambiguous about the crucial questions: though it incorporates the kind of devotional (and even mystical) imagery that marks the culture surrounding the doctrine of transubstantiation, the tract consistently emphasizes the sacramental rather than substantial presence of Christ in the Host. Taken together, the six items seem an eclectic mix. Codicological evidence, however, suggests that despite this apparent mixture, one reader at least considered these texts to belong together.

---

58 Hudson, *The Premature Reformation*, 424.

59 Hudson, *The Premature Reformation*, 424.

60 On this text, see above, note 1.

61 According to Hudson, there are fifteen extant manuscripts; Hudson, *The Premature Reformation*, 268. Muir dates the translation to 1375-1400; Muir, “Translations and Paraphrases of the Bible,” 394.

St John's MS G.25 is a composite manuscript made up of several originally separate codicological units or 'booklets' that were bound together. This was partially noted by M. R. James, whose catalogue description identifies the first division between the *Lucidarie* and the Apocalypse Commentary, and more fully by Hanna, who notes the subsequent divisions between the meditation on the sacrament and *Vae Octuplex* and between *Vae Octuplex* and *Of Mynystris*.<sup>62</sup> The evolution of composite manuscripts has been discussed by Pamela Robinson, Ralph Hanna, and J. Peter Gumbert.<sup>63</sup> Robinson, in particular, highlights the role of the reader or 'collector' in gathering booklets into composite volumes, describing it as a "convenient way of assembling some of the works he wanted."<sup>64</sup> Though the contents of these composite manuscripts can be disparate, in many cases, as Gumbert notes, the units that make up the volume seem to be "related," as if "they were made in the same circle at about the same time; perhaps the makers were aware of the others' activities (one might think of monks in a monastery, or laymen in what we call a 'workshop')." <sup>65</sup> This degree of relationship should not be a surprise given that "many composites were composed by a Medieval owner, and there is a good probability that most of the booklets he owned would be of roughly the same date and origin."<sup>66</sup>

The contents of St John's MS G.25, despite the apparent variation in their subject matter, certainly seem to be "related" in the way Gumbert describes. The manuscript demonstrates consistent presentation throughout, with light ruling and twenty-seven to twenty-nine lines per page (see *Fig. 1*). James's description of the manuscript as the work of several hands needs to be modified: there are two, the first for the *Lucidarie* and the second for the remainder of the manuscript. Both hands are relatively informal textura book hands, but distinctive letter forms shared by the last five texts point to a single scribe for both. The texts in the series from the Apocalypse to *Of Mynystris* also have running headers. All six texts have a common decorator. The opening initials, which share features including the infilling of the letter with a simple leaf or vine design, a fern-frond in the margin of each text, and a frame for the letter with invected lines, are clearly the work of the same person. These common characteristics suggest that the booklets may have emanated from the same workshop (of the kind connected to the nascent commercial book trade described by scholars like

62 Hanna, "English Biblical Texts," 149-50.

63 Robinson, "The 'Booklet'"; Hanna, *Pursuing History*, esp. 21-34; and Gumbert, "Codicological Units."

64 Robinson, "The 'Booklet,'" 56.

65 Gumbert, "Codicological Units," 27.

66 Gumbert, "Codicological Units," 27.

C. Paul Christianson and Andrew Taylor).<sup>67</sup> As speculative production, where it existed at all, occurred on a very limited scale, these booklets were almost certainly created at the request of the purchaser. The texts therefore are likely to reflect the reading interests of an individual who ordered these particular texts and who, at some point, had them bound together in one volume.

Binding these booklets together may have simply brought the owner's entire library conveniently together. Alternatively, the owner may have intended, even at the time of purchasing the texts, to incorporate them into a single codex,<sup>68</sup> perhaps because common concerns among them suggested that these booklets formed a collection of biblical translation and commentary regardless of any distinction between 'Lollard' and 'orthodox.' The Apocalypse is a work of biblical exposition, and, regardless of their polemicism, so are *Of Mynystris* and *Vae Octuplex*, as is emphasized by their headers which identify them simply as "Matthew XXIII" and "Matthew XXIV." The Passion narrative, though a harmony of the Gospel texts, diverges hardly at all from scripture. The *Lucidarie* and the treatise on the sacrament offer theologically rigorous discussions of the basics of the faith. Furthermore, three of the texts discuss end times events and the emergence of the Antichrist: the *Lucidarie*, the Apocalypse Commentary, and *Of Mynystris of þe Chirche*. Even though they reflect very different traditions of apocalyptic thinking, all three deal with the role played by Church corruption in ushering in the Apocalypse.<sup>69</sup> Thus, with each text considered in the greater context of the codex as a whole, the collection appears as generically bound, an authoritative, scripture-based, academic anthology of, essentially, biblical exposition in which the end times, and the Church's role in them, are a main focus.

Whatever the reasons for the creation of the codex, the production of its parts reveals that the mixed contents of St John's MS G.25 reflect the varied theological interests of one reader. Like CUL MS II.vi.26, this book deliberately combines orthodox and Lollard content, and in this it resembles the *Lucidarie*. In both of these manuscripts, as in the *Lucidarie* itself, the choice to mix this material seems to emerge not

---

67 Christianson, "Evidence"; Taylor, "Manual to Miscellany."

68 For the practice of producing booklets intended for incorporation into a planned volume, see Gumbert, "Codicological Units," 27, and Hanna, *Pursuing History*, 22 and 24-25.

69 After the *Lucidarie*, the discussion continues with the Apocalypse Commentary, which, especially in the English interpolations, identifies corrupt and hypocritical clerics as nothing less than disciples of the Antichrist. The last word goes to *Of Mynystris*, which takes the other two to what would seem be their logical conclusion, identifying the head of the Church with the Antichrist himself.

from confusion but from a genuine engagement with more than one point of view and from a willingness to use a range of material to comment on the value of vernacular scripture (as in the case of the CUL MS), or to draw on a range of sources when developing a personal intellectual and devotional life (as in the St John's MS). The *Lucidarie* and the manuscripts in which it circulated demonstrate the difficulty of fitting late medieval texts into neat categories of 'orthodox' and 'Lollard.' They point to a willingness in late medieval readers (and writers/revisers) to be open to a wide variety of religious opinion and to incorporate radical material into their reading. This, in turn, suggests that these readers and writers were exposed to, and were able to move between, different theological positions. Thus, the *Lucidarie* may, in part, have been influenced by Lollard ideas, but to call it a Lollard text is misleading. The *Lucidarie* and the books containing it are a reminder that, as Steven Justice puts it, in the late Middle Ages "different people not only thought differently, but were concerned to see their belief in different ways and different contexts."<sup>70</sup>

**University of Ottawa**

---

70 Justice, "Lollardy," 685.

## Appendix

The following is a transcription of text found on ff. 13r-16r of St John's College, Cambridge, MS G.25, which is the more careful and complete of the two copies of the Middle English *Elucidarium*. While Schmitt's edition offers an almost entirely accurate transcription of this same manuscript, Schmitt's choice to use the chapter divisions found in Migne's edition of the Latin text means that his presentation of the text is somewhat misleading.<sup>71</sup> As mentioned earlier, neither the *Lucidarie* nor the *Lucistrye* gives any indication of the division between Books I and II, nor do they contain any chapter division.

In this transcription, modern punctuation and capitalization have been introduced. Abbreviations have been expanded in keeping with the spelling habits of the scribe. Square brackets signal emendation by the addition of letters. I have expanded the abbreviation *ihu* to *Ihesu*. In the manuscript, the tags “þe disciple axiþ” and “þe maistir answeriþ” are rubricated, and they are presented in bold type here for the reader's convenience.

### Transcription of the Final Section of the *Lucidarie* Including the Twelve Interpolated Questions<sup>72</sup>

**þe disciple axiþ:** and whi schulde not oþer men be chastised þat ben opynly false to God & to her euencristen, as false lawiers, & false iurours, & false tirauntes, false spousebrekers, false bacbiters, & lyers, þat ofte vnworþily ben houseled & noon amending han in her lijf? **þe maistir answeriþ:** þe hede preestes of þe chirche schulde chastise suche wiþ trewe officeres and [f. 13v] parfijte lyuers ordeyned þerfore & alle rebel aʒens her chastisement delyuere up to kynges prisonement as for Goddis enemyes.<sup>73</sup> **þe disciple saith:** me þinkeþ þat so it were beste, but whi is it not so? **þe maistir answeriþ:** þe hedes of hooly chirche ne her officeres neiþir ben cleer fro viciouse

71 Migne's edition of Honorius's text divides each book into titled chapters; Migne, *Patrologia Latina*, vol. 172. Lefèvre's edition abandons these divisions on the grounds that they are arbitrary and that there is no indication whether they were part of Honorius's original text or a later edition; Lefèvre, ed., *L'Elucidarium et les Lucidaires*, 353. Schmitt, producing his edition nearly fifty years before Lefèvre's work on the *Elucidarium*, employed Migne's divisions (although without the titles) even though they are not present in the *Lucidarie* and even though some chapters — because of the changes made in the *Lucidarie* — lack more than half of their material.

72 With permission of St John's College, Cambridge.

73 First interpolated question and response.

lyuyng & þerfore al þe puple boþe gentiles & comuns moun seie to hem: blynde leches, heeleþ first 3oure silf!<sup>74</sup> **Pe disciple axiþ:** Alas, who my3te beste amende þis? **Pe maistir answerþ:** þe emperour of Rome wiþ helpe of oþer Cristen kynges my3ten redresse þis bi power þat God haþ 3ouun hem, as hooly writt & doctours witnessen in manye a place; for chyualrie is sworun to mayntene hooly chirche & make hedes & vndir officeres of hooly chirche to rule ri3tfully þe Cristen puple wiþ due preching & good ensaumple 3uyyng of hooly lijf, as dide þe hedes of hooly chirche, þat<sup>75</sup> was Ihesu Crist & his apostelis.<sup>76</sup> **Pe disciple axiþ:** what lettþ now men þat schulden be hedes & officeres of hooly chirche to do her due office? **Pe maistir answerþ:** grete possessiouns of temperaltees, þat weren firste graunted in helpe of hooly chirche to susteyne wiþ þe pore þat may no þing laboren, ben now cau3t to hem silf in feelynge of so grete welþe þat þei fallen into so grete pride þat þei knowen not hem silf ne þe lore of pouerte þat Crist hem tau3te.<sup>77</sup> **Pe disciple axiþ:** Allas, who my3te beste amende þis? **Pe maistir answerþ:** I woot no þing þat my3te amende þis but God him silf, for þe neer þe eende of þe world schal antecrist haue gretter & gretter clerkes & riccher & riccher clerkes, lordes, peeres to his disciples to be strong ynou3 to mayntene al þis errour.<sup>78</sup> **Pe disciple axiþ:** schal antecrist haue [f. 14r] manye disciplis eer he be borun? **Pe maistir answerþ:** 3e, manye hundrid þousand & euermore þe grettest clerkes firste.<sup>79</sup> **Pe disciple axiþ:** whanne bigynnen þei to rise firste? **Pe maistir answerþ:** whanne prelates of hooly chirche ben so weel dowid wiþ possessioun þat þei ben lordes, peeres of þis world, þanne schulen þei wrappþe wiþ alle hem þat prechen of Crist pouerte & namely wiþ hem þat moost dispisen þis world.<sup>80</sup> **Pe disciple axiþ:** what schal antecrist, þat is hede of so grete noubre of disciplis, doen whanne he comeþ firste a place? **Pe maistir answerþ:** conferme bi myraclis schewing al þat his disciplis haue prechid bifore a3en Cristis lore þat it is weel prechid.<sup>81</sup> **Pe disciple axiþ:** schulen clerkes haastily falle to him? **Pe maistir answerþ:** moche sonner þan oþer

---

74 Second interpolated question and response.

75 Due to the missing leaves in Cambridge University Library MS Ii.vi.26, the first two interpolated questions are missing from that manuscript. This is the point at which the interpolations are taken up in the CUL MS after the missing pages.

76 The third.

77 The fourth.

78 The fifth.

79 The sixth.

80 The seventh.

81 The eighth.

lewde men; for his lawes schulen so be borun up wiþ hedis of hem þat schulden be of hooly chirche & so grete peyne sett to hem þat ageynseien hem þat Goddis lawis schulen be borun al doun.<sup>82</sup> **Pe disciple saith:** Allas, þat so moche harm schal falle to hooly chirche for pride & welþe of þis world. **Pe maistir answeriþ:** Crist haþ warned alle Cristen puple bifore in his gospel to be ware ynouȝ of such myscheef & seiþ þus: whanne ȝe seen abhomynacioun of discomforte þat is seid of Danyel þe prophete stondynge in hooly place, who þat rediþ, vndirstonde he, þanne schal be tribulacioun so moche þat neuer was such bifore ne aftir schal be, & in anoþer place he seiþ þus: manye schulen come in my name, seiynge, y am Crist, & manye þei schulen disseyue.<sup>83</sup> **Pe disciple axiþ:** declare me þat abhomynacioun of discomforte þat Danyel seide. **Pe maistir answeriþ:** what [f. 14v] is more abhomynacioun or discomforte to stonde in hooly place þan to se hedes of þe chirche as prelates & maistris of dyuynyte stondynge in grete pompe & pride aȝens þe lore of Ihesu Crist, þat is to seie, aȝen þe meekenes, aȝen þe pouert[e], & aȝen þe chastitee þat Ihesu Crist & his aposteles tauȝten; & what euer þei seien wiþ spekinge of mouþ, þei preuen hem silf wiþ deedes doynge & schewing of riches liche antecristis foregoeris contrarie to þe lore of Crist. And y wole þat þou wite þat þer ben but þre maner men callid of hooly chirche: þe firste men ben goode preyers & techers of Goddis lawe, þe secunde men ben goode defenders as lordes & men of armes, þe þridde men ben trewe laboreris, whiche þre maner of men haue now eche day yuel ensauple of hem for her grete pride & couetise þat þei apperen ynne wiþ lordis in al worschip of þe world & lijk tirauntes of þe world into so moche þat þe blynde lediþ þe blynde, þat al Cristendom is nyȝ fallen into þe diche of eendeles dampnacioun.<sup>84</sup> **Pe disciple axiþ:** leef maister, telle me what þou seist of men of religioun þat forsaken þe world, & manye of hem, whanne þei haue asaied fewe ȝeres, þei forsaken her ordre, & summe bileuen<sup>85</sup> stille in þe ordre, & repenten hem al her lyue? **Pe maistir answereth:** I seie þat eche ordir of religioun þat is grounded bi conseil of þe gospel is good & parfijt & þilke þat taken parfijt religioun & repenten of þat taking al her lijf þei ben wrecchid puple, ȝe, moost wrecchid of alle þat ben borun, wherþi þei dwellen stille or goen away; for in þis world þei haue lital ioye, & for to haue ioye in þe world to comynge, þei deseruen noon for her

---

82 The ninth.

83 The tenth. Although the disciple is not asking a question here, his exclamation of horror and concern serves the same purpose, eliciting further comment (and teaching) from the master.

84 The eleventh.

85 In CUL MS li.vi.26, the word here is “leuen.”

longe repentyng. [f. 15r] & in þat þei ben moost wrecchid, for alle oþer haue sum ioye saue þei, do þei neuer so yuel.<sup>86</sup> **Pe disciple axiþ:** leef maister, which is þe beste religioun? **Pe maistir answerþ:** þat þat Ihesu Crist grounded in his gospel: to loue God wiþ al his herte, wiþ al his mynde, wiþ al his soule, & wiþ al his strengþe, & his neiþhebre as him silf, for in þese two comaundementes hangeþ al þe lawe & prophetes, & who þat doiþ þus & eendeþ his lijf in þis loue schal sikirly be saued for his trewe folewing of Crist, & haue to his rewarde lijf wiþouten eende & an hundrid tyme more ioye þan euer he forsooke, & bettir religioun can y noon þat euer Crist tauȝte. What man[er] religiouns þat ben late made of mennes wittis & not of þe hooly goost in myne vndirstonding God deeme him silf, for y wole not.<sup>87</sup> **Pe disciple axiþ:** who is þe firste autour of synne? **Pe maistir answeriþ:** Lucifer, þe feende, þat bigilid firste Adam & Eue, & temptide þe manhede of Crist, & euer is aboute to bigile mankynde wiþ tisyng hem to synne & namely now in þe eende of þis world to make antecristis clerkes drawe a grete partie of þis world to þe eendeles peyne of helle.<sup>88</sup> **Pe disciple axiþ:** how greuos is oo deedly synne to God? **Pe maistir answeriþ:** þe leeste deedly synne þat is is more greuouse to him þan to leesen al þis world.<sup>89</sup> **Pe disciple saith:** It is writtun, Lord, þou hatidist no þing of hem whiche þou madist; how may it be seide þanne God loueþ alle goode men & hateþ alle yuele men? **Pe maistir answeriþ:** Alle þinges God loueþ þat he haþ maide, but he ordeyneþ not alle þinges in oo place. Riȝt as a peyntour loueþ alle his [f. 15v] colouris, but summe he cheseþ bifore summe & eueri colour to his couenable place he ordeyneþ, & in þis wise God ordeyneþ & doiþ eche good man, as he loueþ, he puttiþ him in couenable place. Summe he loueþ so þat þei be ordeyned to be resseyued into heuenly paleis, & summe he hateþ þat þei be resseyued into þe prisoun of helle, as good gold plate, whanne it is takun out of an oolde clooþ of gold eiþir of an oolde table, is as good as euer it was, & oþere blak coloures þat weren biside þat gold weren forsake & drawun away.<sup>90</sup> **Pe disciple axiþ:** what is it þat me[n] calleþ liberum arbitrium, þat

86 Question 8 from Book II of the *Elucidarium*, with a slight alteration to the question and a different response.

87 The twelfth interpolated question and answer.

88 This is question 3 from Book II of the *Elucidarium*; the conversation moves into Book II without comment or marking.

89 This is question 4 from Book II.

90 This is question 6 from Book II; the *Lucidarie* omits question 5, which expands on question 4 by asking if murder and adultery are not the most grievous sins.



is free choys? **Pe maistir answerēþ:** Freedom of chesyng of good or yuel & þat hadde man in paradys free y nouȝ; now, forsoþe, it is caytif for man now wilneþ no good but grace of God go bifore, ne he may do no good but he folewe him tofore in grace.<sup>91</sup> **Pe disciple axiþ:** may eche man haue grace þat wole haue it? **Pe maistir answerēþ:** Ȝe, forsoþe. Lo, ensaumple here is: a lord of a toun doth make a crye þat what needeful & poore man wole come & aske a good meelis mete, he schal haue it. Panne manye poore men comen & asken þat, & ben weel holpun in her myscheef, & strengþed up to lijf; & oþere þer ben as needeful as þei, but for proude herte or disdeyne wil not come þere & dyen for defaute. Is þis lord cause of her deēþ?<sup>92</sup> **Pe disciple saith:** Nay, forsoþe. **Pe maistir answeriþ:** soþely þus it is of Crist. Siþ Crist hadde bouȝt al mankynde, he haþ be a large lord & curteis & makeþ a crye eche day biddinge euery man aske grace to haue lijf wiþouten eende & seiþ þus in his crye: Aske & Ȝe schal resseyue, [f. 16r] sek iþ & Ȝe schal fynde, ryngē at þe ȝate & it schal be opened to ȝow, which ȝate in myn vndirstonding is oure Ladi Goddis modir & oþer gloriouse seyntis þat ben now in heuene, him biholdyngē face to face in preiyngē for us, þat is to seiē, in þat biholdingē face to face, þat God for her loue ȝyueþ us grace & so qwikeneþ us þe worschip þat we doen to hir on erþe þat of grace may no man fayle þat askiþ bisily of God. While we haue corseintes to schewe Crist her martirdome, oure Lady to schewe to her sone hir brestes, hir sone Ihesu to schewe his fadir his bloddy woundes, þer may no grace be denyed to þe asker, þere so manye loue tokenes ben schewid for hym.

---

91 Question 7 from Book II.

92 A new question and response. The master's response contains a second additional question which prompts further new material.

## Bibliography

### Primary Sources

- Arnold, Thomas, ed. *Select English Works of John Wyclif, Edited from Original MSS.* 3 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1868-1871.
- Forshall, J., and F. Madden, eds. *The Holy Bible, Containing the Old and New Testaments, with the Apocryphal Books, in the Earliest English Versions, made from the Latin Vulgate by John Wycliffe and his Followers.* Vol. 1. Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press, 1850. Rpt. New York: AMS, 1982.
- Fridner, Elis. *An English Fourteenth Century Apocalypse Version with a Prose Commentary.* Lund Studies in English 29. Lund: C. W. K. Gleerup, 1961.
- Giordano, Carmela. "Tradurre e adattare: il 'Lucidarie' inglese medio fra Onorio d'Autun e Wyclif." *Medioevo e Rinascimento* n.s. 9 (1998): 1-48.
- Honorius Augustodunensis. *Elucidarium Sive Dialogus De Summa Totius Christianae Theologiae.* Ed. J. P. Migne, *Patrologiae Latina* 172: cols. 1109-76.
- Hudson, Anne, ed. *Selections from English Wycliffite Writings.* Toronto: Univ. of Toronto Press, 1997.
- Hunt, Simon. "An Edition of Tracts in Favour of Scriptural Translation and of Some Texts Connected with Biblical Scholarship." MPhil thesis, Univ. of Oxford, 1994.
- Lefèvre, Yves, ed. *L'Elucidarium et les Lucidaires. Contribution, par l'histoire d'un texte, à l'histoire des croyances religieuses en France au moyen âge.* Paris: E. de Boccard, 1954.
- Matthew, F. D., ed. *The English Works of Wyclif Hitherto Unprinted.* 2nd ed. EETS o.s. 74. Rev. ed. London: Trübner, 1902.
- Of Mynstris in þe Chirche.* In *English Wycliffite Sermons*, Vol. 2, edited by Pamela Gradon, 328-65. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1988.
- Registrum Johannis Trefnant, Episcopi Herefordensis*, edited by William W. Capes. Canterbury and York Series 20. London: Canterbury and York Society, 1916.
- Schmitt, Friedrich, ed. *Die mittlenglische Version des Elucidariums des Honorius Augustodunensis.* Burghausen a. S.: Königliches humanistisches Gymnasium Burghausen, 1909.
- Simmons, Thomas Frederick, and Henry Edward Nolloth, eds. *The Lay Folks' Catechism.* EETS o.s. 118. London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner, 1901.
- Vae Octuplex.* In *English Wycliffite Sermons*, Vol. 2, edited by Pamela Gradon, 366-78. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1988.

### Secondary Sources

- Bostick, Curtis V. *The Antichrist and the Lollards: Apocalypticism in Late Medieval and Reformation England.* Leiden: Brill, 1998.
- A Catalogue of the Manuscripts Preserved in the Library of the University of Cambridge.* Edited for the Syndics of the University Press. Vol. 3. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1858. Rpt. Munich: Kraus, 1980.

- Christianson, C. Paul. "Evidence for the Study of London's Late Medieval Manuscript-Book Trade." In *Book Production and Publishing in Britain 1375-1475*, edited by Jeremy Griffiths and Derek Pearsall, 87-108. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1989.
- Cole, Andrew. *Literature and Heresy in the Age of Chaucer*. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 2008.
- Deanesly, Margaret. *The Lollard Bible and Other Medieval Biblical Versions*. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1920. Rpt. 1966.
- Fletcher, Alan J. "A Hive of Industry or a Hornets' Nest? MS Sidney Sussex 74 and Its Scribes." In *Late-Medieval Religious Texts and Their Transmission: Essays in Honour of A. I. Doyle*, edited by A. J. Minnis, 131-55. Cambridge: D. S. Brewer, 1994.
- Gumbert, J. Peter. "Codicological Units: Towards a Terminology for the Stratigraphy of the Non-Homogeneous Codex." *Segno e Testo* 2 (2004): 17-42.
- de Hamel, Christopher. *The Book: A History of the Bible*. London: Phaidon Press, 2001.
- Hanna, Ralph. "English Biblical Texts before Lollardy and their Fate." In *Lollards and Their Influence in Late Medieval England*, edited by Fiona Somerset, Jill C. Havens, and Derrick G. Pitard, 141-53. Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2003.
- . *London Literature, 1300-1380*. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 2005.
- . *Pursuing History: Middle English Manuscripts and Their Texts*. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford Univ. Press, 1996.
- Havens, Jill. "Shading the Grey Area: Determining Heresy in Middle English Texts." In *Text and Controversy from Wyclif to Bale: Essays in Honour of Anne Hudson*, edited by Helen Barr and Ann M. Hutchinson, 337-52. Turnhout: Brepols, 2005.
- Hornbeck, Patrick. "Of Captains and Antichrists: The Papacy in Wycliffite Thought." *Revue d'Histoire Ecclesiastique* 103 (2008): 806-38.
- Hudson, Anne. "A Lollard Sect Vocabulary?" In *So Meny People Longages and Tonges: Philological Essays in Scots and Mediaeval English presented to Angus McIntosh*, edited by Michael Benskin and M. L. Samuels, 15-30. Edinburgh: Middle English Dialect Project, 1981.
- . "A New Look at the 'Lay Folks' Catechism." *Viator* 16 (1985): 243-58.
- . *The Premature Reformation: Wycliffite Texts and Lollard History*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1988.
- James, Montague Rhodes. *A Descriptive Catalogue of the Manuscripts in the Library of St John's College, Cambridge*. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1913.
- Justice, Steven. "Lollardy." In *The Cambridge History of Medieval English Literature*, edited by David Wallace, 662-89. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1999.
- Kerby-Fulton, Kathryn. *Books under Suspicion: Censorship and Tolerance of Revelatory Writing in Late Medieval England*. Notre Dame, Ind.: Univ. of Notre Dame Press, 2006.
- Larsen, Andrew E. "Are All Lollards Lollards?" In *Lollards and Their Influence in Late Medieval England*, edited by Fiona Somerset, Jill C. Havens, and Derrick G. Pitard, 59-72. Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2003.

- Lee, B. S. "Lucidus and Dubius: A Fifteenth-Century Theological Debate and Its Sources." *Medium Ævum* 45 (1976): 79-96.
- Levy, Ian Christopher. "John Wyclif and the Primitive Papacy." *Viator* 38, no. 2 (2007): 159-89.
- . *John Wyclif: Scriptural Logic, Real Presence, and the Parameters of Orthodoxy*. Milwaukee, Wisc.: Marquette Univ. Press, 2003.
- Lewis, Anna. "Textual Borrowings, Theological Mobility, and the Lollard Pater Noster Commentary." *Philological Quarterly* 88, nos. 1-2 (2009): 1-23.
- MED. Middle English Dictionary*. Ed. Hans Kurath, Sherman M. Kuhn, et al. Ann Arbor: Univ. of Michigan Press, 1952-2002. Updated and corrected version available at <<http://quod.lib.umich.edu/m/med/>>.
- McGinn, Bernard. *Visions of the End: Apocalyptic Traditions in the Middle Ages*. New York: Columbia Univ. Press, 1979.
- Muir, Laurence. "Translations and Paraphrases of the Bible, and Commentaries." In *A Manual of the Writings in Middle English 1050-1500*, Vol. 2, edited by J. Burke Severs and Albert E. Hartung, 381-409 & 534-52. Hamden, Conn.: Archon, 1970.
- Peikola, Matti. "Individual Voice in Lollard Discourse." In *Approaches to Style and Discourse in English*, edited by Risto Hiltunen and Shinichiro Watanabe, 51-77. Osaka, Japan: Osaka Univ. Press, 2004.
- Robinson, P. R. "The 'Booklet': A Self-Contained Unit in Composite Manuscripts." In *Codicologica 3: Essais typologiques*, edited by A. Gruys and J. P. Gumbert, 46-69. Leiden: Brill, 1980.
- Sanford, Eva Matthews. "Honorius, *Presbyter* and *Scholasticus*." *Speculum* 23 (1948): 397-425.
- Shonk, Timothy A. "A Study of the Auchinleck Manuscript: Bookmen and Bookmaking in the Early Fourteenth Century." *Speculum* 60 (1985): 71-91.
- Somerset, Fiona. "Introduction." In *Lollards and Their Influence in Late Medieval England*, edited by Fiona Somerset, Jill C. Havens, and Derrick G. Pitard, 9-16. Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2003.
- . "Professionalizing Translation at the Turn of the Fifteenth Century: Ullerston's *Determinacio*, Arundel's *Constitutiones*." In *The Vulgar Tongue: Medieval and Postmedieval Vernacularity*, edited by Fiona Somerset and Nicholas Watson, 145-57. University Park, Pa.: Pennsylvania State Univ. Press, 2003.
- Taylor, Andrew. "Manual to Miscellany: Stages in the Commercial Copying of Vernacular Literature in England." *Yearbook of English Studies* 33 (2003): 1-17.
- Utley, Francis Lee. "Dialogues, Debates, and Catechisms." In *A Manual of the Writings in Middle English 1050-1500*, Vol. 3, edited by J. Burke Severs and Albert E. Hartung, 669-745 & 829-902. Hamden, Conn.: Archon, 1972.