

The Readers of the *Manuel des péchés* Revisited

KRISTA A. MURCHISON

IN HER BOOK-LENGTH STUDY OF William of Waddington's *Manuel des péchés* (Dean no. 635), Ulrike Schemmann laments that the Anglo-Norman guide for penitents "has not yet found the interest it deserves."¹ Despite her contribution and several others on the subject, the situation remains largely unchanged. The text is in many ways an important one for understanding vernacular theological literature of the late medieval period. Written sometime between 1250 and 1260, it is one of the earliest of the comprehensive devotional guides that became increasingly popular in the second half of the thirteenth century. It survives in twenty-eight medieval copies and fragments, and sparked three independent adaptations into English, including *Handlyng Synne*, which itself survives in nine copies.² Extracts of it were translated into Latin and Icelandic.³ Given this popularity, it stands as a valuable witness to late medieval literary tastes.

My present purpose is to take up one question that has become central to studies of the *Manuel des péchés* and of late medieval vernacular pastoral texts more generally: who read it? I will answer this question as best as possible given the available evidence by surveying all available catalogue information for copies of the text. As we shall see, discussions of the audiences of the *Manuel* generally focus on the number of copies owned by the clergy, but this has obscured the significant number owned by the laity. The question of who read the text is important, because the *Manuel* was written on the cusp of an emerging wave of texts concerned with penitents. This development was described perhaps most famously by Leonard Boyle in several groundbreaking studies of medieval *pastoralia*—a "very wide term indeed" in Boyle's estimation that "embraces any and every manual, aid or technique, from an episcopal directive to a mnemonic of the seven deadly sins, that would allow a priest the better to understand his office, to instruct his people, and to administer the sacraments, or, indeed, would in turn enable his people the readier to respond to his efforts in their behalf and to deepen their faith and practice."⁴

According to Boyle, “the first wave of manuals of confession—that up to about the year 1260—is largely concerned with educating priests,” while “the second wave of penitential *pastoralia*,” “that around or about 1260—has a broader basis and is more directly concerned with the penitent as such and with the education of the penitent.”⁵ Given the relatively early date of the *Manuel des péchés*, it is an important witness to this emerging emphasis on educating the penitent. Indeed, Rob Lutton calls it “one of the earliest” of the vernacular works on confession produced in wake of the Fourth Lateran Council.⁶

To date, most discussions of the text’s audiences—both intended and actual—have focused on the clergy. In an early discussion of its intended audience, Charlton Laird supposed that, “our author did not expect penitents to use the *Manuel* as a reference work,” and suggested that it was instead intended for preachers. He argued that clerical readers were also part of its actual audience: “The manuscripts leave us in no doubt that the *Manuel* became popular as a reference book for preachers.”⁷ Matthew Sullivan examined the issue of audience at length in his dissertation on the text and in a subsequent series of articles. Like Laird, Sullivan argued emphatically that the *Manuel* was intended for the clergy. Although the *Manuel*’s prologue contains several lines explicitly addressing a lay audience, Sullivan suggested that these were later additions that had no bearing on William’s original. Sullivan also held that clerical readers were the text’s actual audience. He based this claim on an examination of about half of the surviving copies and fragments.⁸

In a more recent study, Schemmann examined the text’s intended audience. She offered a correction to Sullivan’s approach to the text by showing that Waddington intended it for lay audiences in addition to, and, perhaps, before, religious ones. Among the evidence she provided was a refutation of Sullivan’s theory of textual corruption. Yet although she questioned Sullivan’s view of the intended audience of the text, she nevertheless supported his view of the text’s actual audience, writing that the “real value of his work” lay in “his study of the later owners of manuscripts of the *Manuel dé Pechez*.”⁹

Around the same time as Schemmann was reevaluating the work’s intended audiences, Alexandra Barratt took up the question of its actual ones. In a chapter on works of religious instruction in the *Cambridge History of the Book in Britain*, Barratt wrote that, “The *Manuel* seems to have had wide appeal among male religious,” and provided several examples of lost and surviving copies that circulated among the clergy. She did, however, mention that at least one copy was commissioned by a lay patron.¹⁰

None of the studies of the actual audiences of the *Manuel* hitherto mentioned have been based on a systematic analysis of available medieval circulation evidence, so this is the aim of the current study. As we shall see, Barratt and Sullivan were right that many copies of the *Manuel* were owned by members of the clergy. Its English translator, Robert of Brunne, was apparently aware of his source's appeal to them when he suggested that a member of the clergy would recognize it: "Yn frenshe þer a clerk hyt sees / He clepyþ hyt manuel de pecchees."¹¹ But when we take a comprehensive look at the evidence concerning the circulation of the *Manuel*, we find that the text also appealed to lay owners. Indeed, the numbers suggest that lay owners were nearly as important as clerical ones in its circulation.

Before proceeding, it is worth noting that the term *clergy* carried different connotations in the medieval Church than it does now. The Middle English *clergie* could be used either to describe one who was ordained within the Church or one who had attributes related to such a position (i.e., possessing clerical learning or training). Complicating the situation further, there was what Nicole Rice describes as "slippage between these two categories."¹² In common parlance, *clergy* is often used to describe those whose professions fall primarily within the established Church, while *laity* refers to those whose professions fall outside of it. This categorization can obscure some of the complexities of the medieval Church organization, especially for those whose roles do not fit cleanly into either group. But since previous studies of the *Manuel's* readers have adopted this categorization, and since it provides a useful framework for analyzing medieval manuscript circulation, I have adopted it here, while acknowledging its obvious limitations.

It is also worth noting that the information about the owners of a manuscript presented here can tell us only so much about its audience. A volume containing the *Manuel* might be acquired for any number of reasons, not all inspired by or even related to a desire to read the text. Some owners received their copies through charitable donations or wills, and may have had no interest in reading the text. Some fragments of the *Manuel* circulated as binding material, and one, placed in a loan chest as a surety, was exchanged as part of a financial transaction, rather than strictly as reading material.¹³ Even owners who commissioned the text for themselves might not have done so with the intent of reading it or having it read to them, since the acquisition of religious literature could serve any number of social functions, including advertising one's piety to others. Other difficulties arise when using the owners of a text to identify and distinguish between its lay and clerical readers. A layperson could acquire or commission a copy of a text for the use of a sponsored group of religious or for a private chaplain or

confessor, so lay ownership does not necessarily suggest lay readership, and, conversely, a religious institution or individual might acquire a copy with the intent of reading it to the laity. Nevertheless, ownership information can be a valuable source of evidence for determining the readership of a text in cases, such as that of the *Manuel*, where little other information is available, and I will therefore rely on it here, while approaching such evidence with necessary caution.

The list below includes all the medieval evidence I could gather regarding who owned and commissioned copies of the *Manuel des péchés*. Most of the the manuscripts in question have been studied in depth, so this study is in many ways a synthetic one, aimed at bringing together and evaluating provenance information from disparate sources. It therefore draws heavily on the detailed descriptions provided by Arnould, Laird, and Sullivan, which have been checked against catalogue descriptions and the information provided by Ruth Dean and Maureen Boulton.¹⁴ But I have also sought to build on the findings of others, and in many cases supplement these with my own.

MEDIEVAL OWNERS OF THE *MANUEL DES PÉCHÉS*

My intention is to gather together all known medieval provenance information about copies of the *Manuel*. Since my focus is on ownership and audience, and since these manuscripts have, for the most part, been described in depth already, I have omitted, in the interest of concision, aspects of manuscript descriptions that have limited bearing on questions of audience. In all cases, I have aimed to be cautious about drawing inferences, since inquiries into the owners of medieval texts provide limited certainties.¹⁵ I have been especially cautious when using the contents of a manuscript to draw inferences about its owners, since we know that lay and clerical owners had similar tastes in many respects. I therefore avoid making conclusions based on contents unless these would be of direct use to one group alone (as in a text on estate management, which would be of direct use to a lay household alone). In the list below, I have adopted manuscript *sigla* from Arnould's study and have assigned new ones to those not described by Arnould. Numbers in parentheses refer to folio numbers unless otherwise indicated. The language of a work is specified when this is not clear from its title.

Lengthy and Structurally Coherent Copies

A – London, British Library, Harley 273¹⁶

Date: Six parts, bound together by the early fourteenth century

Place of production: Unknown; bound together in the West Midlands

Foliation: ff. iii + 1* + 217 (with ff. 1*, 216 and 217 flyleaves)

Contents:**Part 1:** Calendar, ff. 1r–6v

Indulgences, f. 7r

Oxford Psalter (A-N) (Dean no. 445), ff. 8r–53r

Canticles and hymns (A-N) (Dean no. 457), ff. 53r–57v

Prayer, f. 57v

Litanies, ff. 57v–58v

Pater Noster (A-N) (Dean no. 840), ff. 58v–59r

Hours of the Virgin, Prayers, Magnificat (A-N) (Dean nos. 680, 814, 821, 823, 827, 828, 834, 835, 838, 860, 868, 939), ff. 59r–67v

Hours of the Dead (A-N) (Dean no. 829), ff. 68r–69v

Part 2: Richard de Fournival, *Bestiaire d'amour*, ff. 70r–81rRobert Grosseteste's *Reules Seynt Roberd* (A-N) (Dean no. 392), ff. 81r–85r

Rules of Friendship (A-N) (Dean no. 246), ff. 85r–85v

Charms, f. 85v

Part 3: *Pseudo-Turpin Chronicle*, ff. 86r–102v

Text on Penance (A-N) (Dean no. 672), ff. 103r–110r

Prayers (A-N) (Dean nos. 772, 781, 891, 951), f. 110r

Guide to Meditations (A-N) (Dean no. 861), ff. 110v–112v

Charms, f. 112v

The Seven Gifts of the Holy Spirit (A-N) (Dean no. 615), f. 112v

Ave Maris Stella (A-N) (Dean nos. 811, 815), f. 112v**Part 4:** *Manuel des péchés*, ff. 113r–190vNotes on confession in Latin and French, including a passage from Richard Wethringsette's *Summa*, ff. 190v–191r*Purgatoire de S. Patrice* (Dean no. 550), ff. 191v–197v**Part 5:** Nicholas Bozon's *Pleinte d'Amour* (Dean no. 690), ff. 199r–203r**Part 6:** Prayers, ff. 204r–209r

Charms, prayers, and recipes for dyes (Latin and A-N) (Dean no. 387), 209r–213v

Prayers against danger, ff. 214r–v

Charms and prognostications, ff. 215r–v

Ownership Category: **Part 4:** Unknown; **whole MS:** clerical possession (14th C), based on contents; lay possession (15th C), based on ownership inscription

Sullivan suggests that the part of this manuscript containing the *Manuel* “was designed for and originally owned by a (probably wealthy and well-educated) layman,” based on the “presence of the charms and the pragmatic content and presentation of the others texts.”¹⁷ But Sullivan bases his claim on the assumption that the *Manuel* part of the manuscript formed a booklet along with parts 2 and 3, which contain, among other texts, Robert Grosseteste's *Reules Seynt Roberd* (Dean no. 392) (81r–85r), a discourse on the proper management of an estate. In the most recent catalogue description, the *Manuel* is listed instead in a part containing only one other text: *Purgatoire de S. Patrice* (Dean. no. 550).¹⁸ This latter text provides little insight into the intended audience of the part containing the *Manuel*, so Sullivan's assumption may be incorrect.

The other parts were bound to this one by the early fourteenth century, according to the catalogue description. Both the calendar and a list of indulgences (7r) which was, according to the description, copied between 1314

and 1329, suggest that the booklets were joined while the manuscript was owned by a religious institution. This was probably in the West Midlands, as the calendar records the dedication of the Church of St Lawrence in Ludlow (1v).¹⁹ Moreover, a hand added to this calendar “thome herford” (5v), referring to Thomas de Cantilupe, whose feast day was established in 1320.²⁰ On these grounds, the manuscript has been listed among those owned by the clergy in the fourteenth century.

By the fifteenth century, the manuscript was in lay hands, according to an inscription: “Iste liber constat John Clerk grocero apocethario regis Edwarde quarti post conquestum” (1r). The catalogue notes that this is “John Clerk, warden of the London Company of Grocers in 1467 and 1475 and appointed grocer and apothecary to Edward IV.”²¹

B – London, British Library, Harley 4657²²

Date: Three parts, all from the first quarter of the fourteenth century, bound together by the early fifteenth

Place of production: Northern

Foliation: ff. 1–104

Contents:

Part 1: *Apocalypsis Goliae*, ff. 1v–4v

Didactic verses, including verses on table manners (Latin), f. 4v

Poem addressed to the Virgin, alternating French and Latin (Dean no. 808) f. 4v

Part 2: *Manuel des péchés*, ff. 5r–85r

Alphabet, f. 86v

Part 3: *Distichs of Cato* (A-N) (Dean no. 256), ff. 87r–97r

Prayer for Mercy (A-N) (Dean no. 773), ff. 97v–98r

Alexandrine Prayer (A-N) (Dean no. 889), ff. 98v–99r

Proverbial Follies (A-N) (Dean no. 266), ff. 99r

Une petite sume de set pechez morteus (*The Mortal Sins*) (A-N) (Dean no. 653), ff. 99v–103v

Ownership Category: **Part 2:** Unknown; **whole MS:** lay possession (date unknown), based on contents; clerical possession (15th C), based on an inscription

This manuscript is composed of a series of booklets. Sullivan finds that they were all written in the early fourteenth century and bound together by the early fifteenth.²³ The first contains the *Apocalypsis Goliae* (a Latin satire of the clergy) (1v–4v), some verses on table manners, a poem to the Virgin, and more didactic verses, the last of which warn against foolish spending (4v). Next is a booklet of the *Manuel* (5r–85r), and the final booklet contains the *Disticha Catonis* (87r–97r), two Anglo-Norman prayers (97v–99r), an Anglo-Norman list of thirty-six follies (99r), and *Une petite sume de set pechez morteus* (99v–103v)—a late thirteenth-century French text for penitents. Describing the *Manuel* booklet alone, Sullivan writes that its “neatness” “might suggest that it was a clerical production,” but of course, neatness does not necessarily signal a clerically produced manuscript. The contents of the other booklets, including the texts on manners, suggest lay

use, and Sullivan notes that these “seem slightly more common.”²⁴ It seems likely, then, that the booklet was in lay hands at the time that it was bound with the others, sometime before the early fifteenth century. On these grounds, the manuscript has been counted in the lay possession category.

A fifteenth-century inscription in the final booklet describes a number of gifts: “Ista sunt dona mihi data: de priore xl d; de Mascam xl d; de Gisborn xl d; de Graystayus xl d; de Poklyngton xx d; de Fowne xx d; de Berry xl d; de Esche xij d; de Helaw xx d; de Wessyngton xl d; de Mors xx d; de bursaris xl d” (104r). The use of “mihi” here suggests a single individual writing on his own behalf. A. W. Taubman suggests that “Gifts from a prior and bursar could indicate a religious or someone lodging at religious houses.”²⁵ The manuscript is therefore included among those in clerical possession. The presence of Yorkshire town names has led several to suggest that the manuscript circulated in that region.²⁶

Sullivan finds that this copy is one of three that were owned by the Tempest family in the seventeenth century.²⁷ He notes, moreover, of the above inscription, that “several identifiable places listed are within a few miles of Tempest family seats in Yorkshire and Co. Durham.”²⁸ He finds several connections, dating back to the thirteenth century, between the Tempest family and the area where the author of the *Manuel* was born, but he notes that these links could be coincidental, so we cannot conclude from these that the Tempests owned the volume in the medieval period.²⁹

C – London, British Library, Harley 4971³⁰

Date: four previously independent parts, dating from the early 14th to 15th centuries, bound together after 1390

Place of production: Unknown

Foliation: ff. 1–131 (with ff. 1 and 129–131 flyleaves + 4 unfoliated flyleaves at the beginning and 4 at the end)

Contents:

Table of contents (fifteenth-century hand), f. 3r

Part 1: Grammatical, legal, and household management texts, including:

Orthographia Gallica (A-N) (Dean no. 287), ff. 4r–6v

Various Vocabularies (Dean no. 300), ff. 4r–6v, 33v

Domestic Economy (A-N) (Dean no. 397), ff. 7r–9r

Ars Dictaminis (A-N) (Dean no. 317), ff. 9r–22v

Conjugations from Donatus (A-N) (Dean no. 293), ff. 23r–26r

Expense roll of John Bromleye, clerk of the household of Ralph, Earl of Stafford, f. 27r–v

Record of a loan from Roger E. to Isabella Cornwayl, f. 33r

Medical Prescriptions (A-N) (Dean no. 439), f. 34r

Part 2: Legal formulary, ff. 42r–65v

Statutes, ff. 66r–92v

Part 3: *Manuel des péchés*, ff. 93r–127r

The Fall, Harrowing of Hell, and Passion (A-N) (Dean no. 599), f. 127v

La Rounde Table, f. 127v

Grant of land at Aldwinkle, f. 128v

Capitulum de Purificatione beate Marie moralisata, f. 128v

Verses on love (English), f. 128v

Part 4 (flyleaves): Aristotle's *De Anima*, ff. 129r–131v

Ownership Category: Part 3: lay possession (14th C), based on contents and inscription;

whole MS: clerical possession (15th C), based on ownership inscription

This manuscript is composed of four previously independent parts.³¹ At the end of the first, a fifteenth-century hand wrote the name “Willelmus Smyth” (41v). A different fifteenth-century hand wrote that the book belonged to Bury St Edmunds’ and also copied a table of contents of the major parts (3r), which indicates that these were bound together by the fifteenth century.³² They could not have been bound together before 1390, since the second part contains a statute dating from 1388–90.³³ The *Manuel* appears at the beginning of the third part (93r–127r). Following it is *The Fall, Harrowing of Hell, and Passion* (127v), and, in a later hand, a short selection from Chrétien de Troyes’ *Erec et Enide*, entitled “la rounde table” (127v).³⁴ The last folio of this part contains what J. A. Herbert describes as a grant of land at Aldwinkle (in Northamptonshire) from Simon de Repindon to John de Aldewyncl and his wife Agnes, dating to July 5th, 1308 (128v). Herbert also finds a Latin text on the Virgin, entitled “Capitulum de Purificatione beate Marie moralisata,” which is followed by some verses on love in a later, fifteenth-century hand (128v).³⁵

The *Manuel* part dates to the early fourteenth century, but its origins are unknown.³⁶ Sullivan writes that “The simple and tidy presentation of the *Manuel* (rubrics and initials only, with almost no annotation) suggests that the MS. in which it appears was produced by and for clerics,” and he holds that this part may have been produced at Bury St Edmunds, since it was there at some point in the fifteenth century.³⁷ Yet the 1308 land grant in this part suggests a more complicated provenance. The Agnes and John de Aldewycle mentioned in this grant are clearly layfolk, and there is some evidence to suggest the same of Simon de Repindon. In Lincolnshire in 1331, a Simon de Repindon was charged with prosecuting a debt on behalf of one Joan Orger of Freston.³⁸ Since Lincolnshire and Northamptonshire are close, it seems likely that the Simon who was prosecuting a debt in Lincolnshire is the Simon from the land grant. It is therefore likely that all three parties in the grant were layfolk. This suggests that the manuscript was in lay hands at the time of the grant in 1308, although we cannot rule out the possibility that the manuscript was in clerical hands and the grant was recorded in it for safekeeping, or for some other reason.

The *Manuel* part features another fourteenth-century inscription, the name “William Cartere” (128v). Sullivan notes this, but does not remark upon it.³⁹ The name is not uncommon, but, given the date of the inscription

and the manuscript's ties to Lincolnshire, it could be that of the William Cartere who, in 1328, was tried for two acts of thievery in the area: the first in Lincolnshire, and the second in York.⁴⁰ Cartere's name, and those of the layfolk in the early grant, make it likely that this part of the manuscript was in lay hands in the fourteenth century.

D – London, British Library, Royal 20 B.X IV⁴¹

Date: early 14th C

Place of production: “Probably Southwestern”⁴²

Foliation:⁴³ ff. i + 176 + ii

Contents:

Manuel des péchés, ff. 1r–52v

Mirour de Seinte Eglise (Dean no. 629), ff. 53r–65v

Exhortation to Love God (Dean no. 618), ff. 65v–68r

Le Roman de Philosophie, by Simund de Frene (Dean no. 243), ff. 68v–77v

The Corruption of the World (Dean no. 602), ff. 77v–87v

Le Chasteau d'Amour (Dean no. 622), ff. 87v–95v

Le Roman des Romans (Dean no. 601), ff. 96r–102v

Miracles of the Virgin (Dean no. 559), ff. 102v–170r, 173r–v

The Life of St. Mary of Egypt (A-N) (Dean no. 576), ff. 119r–121v

Record of 1307 burial of Thomas Button, Bishop of Exeter, f. 166r

Le Petit Sermon (Dean no. 636), ff. 170r–172v

Ownership Category: produced for clerical owners, based on contents; lay possession (14th C), based on ownership inscription; lay possession (15th C), based on ownership inscription

This is an early fourteenth-century manuscript containing a range of religious texts. It begins with the *Manuel* (1r–52v), followed by the French version of Edmund of Abingdon's *Speculum*, the *Mirour de Seinte Eglise* (53r–65v).⁴⁴ The version in this manuscript is the one that A. D. Wilshere, in his study of this text, terms the “unrevised ‘religious’ version.”⁴⁵ Next is a poem on the love of God (65v–68r), Simon de Fresne's *Le Roman de Philosophie* (68v–77v), a poem on the corruption of the world (77v–87v), *Le Chasteau d'Amour* (87v–95v), the *Roman des Romans* (96r–102v), Miracles of the Virgin (102v–170r, 173r–v) and *Le petit sermon* (170r–172v). There is also a single folio recording the 1307 burial of Thomas Button, Bishop of Exeter (166r).⁴⁶ Both this folio and the religious version of Edmund's *Mirour* suggest clerical origins. The freedom with which the scribe adapted the opening description of the contents of the *Chasteau d'Amour*, along with other strange aspects of this text, has led Evelyn Mackie to posit that the scribe copying the manuscript may have designed it for his own use.⁴⁷

An inscription records that it was owned by Lord Walter Hungerford (1368–1449) of Wiltshire, so the manuscript is counted among those in lay possession in the fifteenth century.⁴⁸ It is not clear who owned it prior to Walter. There is a tantalizing inscription in a late fourteenth-century hand: “Iste liber est Iohannis Colyford de manu eiusdem scriptus (sic)

apud Glametun anno domini millesimo trisentesimo sexagesimo primo” (172v). The catalogue notes that the date, 1361, is too late for the hand of the manuscript itself.⁴⁹ “Glametun,” surely a variant of “Galmetun” could be any of three areas, two in Devonshire and one in Yorkshire.⁵⁰ The Yorkshire Galmetun is possible, given the *Manuel’s* Yorkshire connections, but a Devonshire Galmeton is more likely given both the folio recording the burial of the Bishop of Exeter, and the manuscript’s connection to Wiltshire through Hungerford.

I have found several people from the period named “Johannes Colyford,” some with southwestern connections. A prior of St John’s Hospital, Exeter had this name, but he died in 1468, so he is surely too late to be our John.⁵¹ A “Johannes de Colyford” was serving as the Member of Parliament for the south western region of Bridport (Dorset) in 1313, and he, or one of his relatives, seems a likely candidate.⁵² Although the attribution is uncertain, the manuscript can be tentatively included among those owned by layfolk in the fourteenth century.

E – London, British Library, Arundel 288

Date: late 13th C⁵³

Place of production: Unknown

Foliation: ff. 126 (with 2 paper flyleaves at the beginning, and 1 at the end)

Contents:⁵⁴

Poem on the passion (A-N) (Dean no. 892) (later hand), ff. 1r–3v

Prayers and meditations (A-N) (Dean no. 942) (later hand), ff. 3v–4r

Manuel des péchés, ff. 5r–83v

De Poenis Purgatorii (A-N version) (Dean no. 645), ff. 84r–91v

Sermo de passione Domini (A-N), ff. 91v–97r

Le Petit Sermon (Dean no. 636), ff. 97r–103r

Mirour de Sainte Eglise, by Edmund of Abingdon (Dean no. 629), ff. 103r–122r

The Nine Words of Charity (A-N) (Dean no. 617) (later hand), ff. 122r–123r

On Monastic Obedience (A-N) (Dean no. 715) (mid-14th C hand), ff. 123r–v

Desputeison de l’Alme et du Corps (A-N) (Dean no. 691) (later hand), ff. 123v–126v

God’s Mercy (A-N) (Dean no. 616) (later hand), f. 126v

Ownership Category: possibly produced for lay owners, based on contents; clerical possession (14th C), based on contents

This may be the oldest copy of the *Manuel*.⁵⁵ Sullivan guesses that it was prepared for the clergy, judging from two supposedly clerical texts that accompany the *Manuel des péchés* in this manuscript: *De Poenis Purgatorii* and Edmund’s *Mirour*.⁵⁶ But neither of these was limited to clerical readers; *De Poenis Purgatorii* appears in the *Compileison*, which is addressed to lay and religious readers alike.⁵⁷ And Edmund’s *Mirour* was, as Wilshire notes, adapted for lay circles.⁵⁸ Indeed, Reeves finds that “the redaction of the *Mirour* that it contains is one that is meant to provide the basic requirements of the life of a Christian layperson,” and on this account decides “to

suspend judgment and note the possibility that it could have been prepared for a lay owner.⁵⁹ A forty-four-line poem on monastic obedience, added in the fourteenth century, suggests that the manuscript fell into clerical hands in this period.

F – Oxford, Bodleian Library, Hatton 99 (4057)⁶⁰

Date: two MSS joined together (probably after 1454); **MS 1:** early 14th C, **MS 2:** later, possibly 15th C⁶¹

Place of production: Unknown

Foliation: iv + 180 leaves (with 178–79 flyleaves)

Contents:

initial flyleaves: Latin grammatical treatise, ff. iii–iv

MS 1: *Manuel des péchés*, ff. 1r–153v

MS 2: *Château d'amour* (Dean no. 622), ff. 154r–177v

closing flyleaves: miracles of tomb of the Archbishop of Canterbury Robert Winchelsey, ff. 178–79

Ownership Category: **MS1:** lay possession (15th C), based on a gift inscription; **whole MS:** unknown

This manuscript is composed of two sections which, according to Arnould, circulated independently. The first, which Arnould dates to the early fourteenth century, is the *Manuel* (1–153v). The second is the *Château d'amour* (154r–177v), and Arnould notes that the hand of this section is clearly different, and probably later, than that of the first.⁶² In his edition of the *Château d'amour*, J. Murray suggests that this copy is from the fifteenth century.⁶³ It is not clear when the two parts were joined, but it was probably in the fifteenth century or later, since Laird finds the initial flyleaves (iii–iv) are from “an early 15th c. Latin grammatical treatise.” The closing flyleaves (178–79), which Laird dates to ca. 1319, and which record the miracles of the tomb of the Archbishop of Canterbury Robert Winchelsey, tell us little about the early provenance or binding of the manuscript.⁶⁴

Toward the end of the first section, an inscription records that Margaret Cokfeld gave the manuscript to Margaret Byngham in 1454 (138v).⁶⁵ According to Laird, this means that this section was “in private hands” at this time, and it is therefore counted among those owned by the laity in the fifteenth century.⁶⁶ The inscription’s position toward the end of the *Manuel* section suggests that it had not yet been joined with the *Château*, offering further evidence that the two were separate until at least the fifteenth century.⁶⁷

G – Oxford, Bodleian Library, Greaves 51 (3823)

Date: two parts, joined together (date unknown);⁶⁸ **part 1:** second half of the 13th C; **part 2:** early 14th C

Place of production: Southwest⁶⁹

Foliation: ff. i + 73

Contents:**Part 1:** *Manuel des péchés*, ff. 1r–66v**Part 2:** *De Planctu Virginis Marie* (A-N) (Dean no. 954), ff. 67r–70r**Ownership Category:** produced for clerical owners, based on the scribe; lay possession (14th C), based on marginal inscriptions

The *Manuel* text in this manuscript concludes with the name of its copyist, one Adam de Furches.⁷⁰ This Adam has not yet been identified, but may be the “Adam de Fourches of Cropthorn” listed in the register of William Gainsborough, bishop of Worcester.⁷¹ This register records Adam’s ordination as subdeacon in 1306. The same Adam de Fourches of Cropthorn also appears in the register of the next bishop of Worcester in 1312.⁷² This Adam fits with Laird’s description of the manuscript as “early fourteenth century, Southwestern.”⁷³ It is not clear if Adam copied the *Manuel* text before or after his ordination, but we can tentatively conclude that it was copied in a clerical context.

There are two relevant fourteenth-century inscriptions on the last folio.⁷⁴ Laird gives the first as: “the statement that Johannes Prohin “prestravit unum palladium in pasco de Cronham” (“lays down a stake in the field at Cronham”), and he posits that this refers to “Cronham-Hurst, Surrey.”⁷⁵ Arnould gives only the name, and Barratt, drawing on this reading, suggests that John “may have been a priest,” but does not explain her reasoning for this.⁷⁶ Since the full inscription apparently describes the demarcation of land, this John was more likely a layman, but the evidence is hard to read. I can find no other “Johannes Prohin” or “de Prohun,” but the *Victoria County History of Surrey* mentions “a certain John Prudhomme” who “held lands in Heywood in Cobham in 1317” and who granted lands in Cobham to Newark priory, near Guildford, in 1331.⁷⁷ It is apparently the same John in the fourteenth-century obituary calendar of the Monastery of Guildford, his name transcribed as “John Prodomine [? Prudom].”⁷⁸

The second inscription identified by Laird is “Dominum Johein Burgeys preceptis.”⁷⁹ This John may be the same as the recipient of a 1334 land grant, described in the *Calendar of Patent Rolls* as “John Burgeys of Ledred of the bailiwick of Coppedethorne of Effyngham co. Surrey.”⁸⁰ In sum, there is reason to suspect that the manuscript was produced in the southwest in a clerical context and, within a century of its production, moved into a lay one in Surrey.

H – Cambridge, University Library, Mm. 6.4**Date:** early 14th C**Place of production:** possibly Devonshire**Foliation:** ff. 262**Contents:**⁸¹

Manuel des péchés (end missing), ff. 1–99v
De Sex Alis Cherubim by Alain de Lille, ff. 99v–103r
 Poem by John Goddard (Latin), ff. 103v–118r
 Story about a repentant woman (Latin), ff. 119r–121r
 Miracles (Latin), ff. 121v–122r
Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs (Latin), ff. 122r–159r
 Vision story from Essex (Latin), ff. 160r–177r
 Blank, ff. 177v–181v
Vita sancte Marine virginis, ff. 182r–188v
Vita, vel Passio, sanctorum Amici et Amelii, ff. 188v–199v
Libellus magistri Petri Alfunsii, ff. 200r–228r
Inventio Sancte Crucis sub Helena, ff. 228v–236v
 Letter by John Goddard to Margaret, abbess of Tarente, ff. 237r–256r
Narratiomire temptationis cuiusdam novicii Reymundi, ff. 256r–259v
Liber Florum Aurelii Augustini, ff. 259v–261v
Tristan and Yseut, f. 262r

Ownership Category: produced for clerical owners, based on contents; clerical possession (14th C), based on ownership inscription

Sullivan states that this manuscript was “originally owned by and probably copied at the Cistercian house at Quarr, on the Isle of Wight.”⁸² He bases this on a fourteenth-century ownership inscription toward the middle of the manuscript (178r).⁸³ This inscription indicates that we can count this manuscript among those owned by the clergy, but it tells us little about the origins of the manuscript. Its contents, however, are somewhat more suggestive. Following the *Manuel* is Alain de Lille’s *De Sex Alis Cherubim* (99v–103r), a poem by John Goddard, abbot of Newnham (in Devonshire) (103v–118r), a story about a repentant woman (119r–121r), miracles (121v–122r), the *Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs* (122r–159r), and a vision story from Essex (160r–177r). This is followed by the aforementioned inscription and eight blank leaves. After these appear more short Latin works, including a letter by Goddard to Margaret, abbess of Tarente (237r–256r). A single folio at the end contains lines from *Tristan and Yseut* (262r). Most of these works suggest clerical origins, and the writings of Goddard might indicate Devonshire origins.

I – Cambridge, University Library, Ee.1.20

Date: first quarter of the fourteenth century

Place of production: Unknown

Foliation: ff. i + 142 + i

Contents:

Manuel des péchés, ff. 1r–79r

Prose Brut (Intermediate Version) (Dean no. 44), ff. 79v–142r

Ownership Category: Unknown

This manuscript is from the early fourteenth century.⁸⁴ Its medieval provenance is unknown.⁸⁵ The *Manuel* appears first (1r–79r), followed by the

French *Prose Brut* to 1307 (Dean no. 44) (79v–142r).⁸⁶ Sullivan holds that “The contents and the almost complete lack of annotation suggest that the volume was clerically-produced,” but some copies of the *Brut* were owned by lay readers, so we cannot make any conjectures. It contains the name “Thomas Knyuett” (1r). Sullivan identifies him as the early seventeenth-century bibliophile Thomas Knyvett of Ashwellthorpe, but Arnould suggests a different Thomas Knyvett (m. 1512).⁸⁷

K – Cambridge, St John’s College, F.30 (167)

Date: two parts bound together, both ca. 1300⁸⁸

Place of production: Unknown

Foliation:⁸⁹ ff. iv + 157 + iv

Contents:

Part 1- *Lumere as lais* by Pierre D’Abernon (Dean no. 690), ff. 1r–83v

Part 2- *Manuel des péchés*, ff. 84r–157v

Ownership Category: **Part 2:** unknown; **whole MS:** lay possession (15th C), based on ownership inscription

Arnould dates this manuscript to cc. 1300.⁹⁰ Pierre D’Abernon’s *Lumere as lais* (1267) appears first (1r–83v), followed by the *Manuel* (84r–157v). Arnould finds the following fifteenth-century inscription at the end of the *Manuel*: “Iste liber constat Johanni Strelley de Lyndeby.”⁹¹ This is surely the “Johannes Strelley de Lyneby” who is listed as an “armiger” (i.e., a person with a coat of arms) in Nottingham County in 1450.⁹² A “Johannes Strelley” was a knight in the neighboring county of Derbyshire in 1412, and the manuscript can therefore be counted among those owned by the laity.⁹³ Hanna and Turville-Petre find some connections between the seventeenth-century members of the Strelley family and the Willoughbys, who owned the Nottingham manuscript.⁹⁴ It has been suggested that this manuscript is the same as the Southwell Minster one described below, since, as Sullivan notes, Linby is 10 miles west of Southwell Minster.⁹⁵

L – Paris, Bibliothèque nationale, Français 14959

Date: late thirteenth century

Place of production: Unknown

Foliation: ff. i+ 64

Contents:

Manuel des péchés, ff. 1–62v

Blank, f. 63

Les Voeux du paon (30 lines), f. 64r

Ownership Category: Unknown

Laird suggests that this copy was produced on the continent, “since it formerly rested in the abbey library at Saint-Evroult.”⁹⁶ In an eighteenth-century catalogue of Saint-Evroult, it is listed as “Le manuel des pechés, ou la maniere de se bien confesser en vers Français fort anciens,” but it is not clear

when it arrived in the collection.⁹⁷ Laird writes that it might have been in England at one point because it contains “thirty lines of ecclesiastical verse in a fifteenth century English hand on the last folio (64r).”⁹⁸ But these lines are from Jacques de Longuyon of Lorraine’s 1312 *Les Voeux du paon*, and this provides few clues about the manuscript’s provenance. The romance was popular on the continent but had limited circulation in England, and Dean does not list an Anglo-Norman version. It was, however, a source for the insular 1438 *Buik of Alexander*.⁹⁹

M – York Minster XVI.K.7

Date: late 13th C

Place of production: Unknown

Foliation: ff. 70

Contents:

Part 1: *Manuel des péchés*, f. 1r–65r

Part 2: *Chasteau d’amour* (frag.) (Dean no. 622), ff. 66r–70v

Ownership Category: clerical possession (date unknown), based on marginal inscription

This manuscript is composed of two booklets, each in a different thirteenth-century hand.¹⁰⁰ The first is our text (1r–65r), and the second is part of the *Chasteau d’amour* (66r–70v). These provide no provenance clues. Arnould finds the following inscription, which he suggests is later than the manuscript itself: “De Cauntebrige fu frer Hue; out a noun de Wodefot, frere prechur de seint conversaciun” (52). Arnould takes this as a connection to Canterbury.¹⁰¹ So, we can tentatively count this manuscript among those owned by clerical institutions.

N – San Marino (California), Huntington Library, HM 903

Date: mid-14th C

Place of production: Unknown

Foliation: ff. ii + 205 + ii

Contents:

Manuel des péchés, ff. 1–66v

Misbound:

Robert de Greatham, *Miroir des domnees* (Dean no. 589), ff. 140r–205v, 68r–123v

—lacuna between 205v and 68r

Three metrical sermons, ff. 123v–139v

Ownership Category: clerical possession (15th C), based on ownership inscription

Neil Ker traces this copy to St Mary’s abbey based on a mid-fifteenth-century ownership inscription.¹⁰² It does not appear in the abbey’s fifteenth-century library catalogue in *Benedictine Libraries*.¹⁰³ But the editors of this catalogue note that “The limited scope of the catalogue may indicate that it was not an official list,” so the omission of the manuscript does not tell us anything about when it arrived at St Mary’s.¹⁰⁴ Another inscription, noted by Laird, reads: “ex pensis augusti prima septi mana xiiij. s xj d.” Laird takes this as the

sum paid for the book initially, and surmises from this and the clean layout of the manuscript that it was produced by “a professional scribe.”¹⁰⁵ Yet the inscription does not necessarily pertain to the book’s initial commission, so it tells us little about its origins.

O – Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Pal. lat. 1970

Date: late 13th C

Place of production: Unknown

Foliation: ff. iii + 95 + ii

Contents:

Section of the Book of Jeremiah, f. iii^r (flyleaf)

Section of the Gospel of Matthew, f. iii^r (flyleaf)

Sermon, f. 1r

Manuel des péchés, ff. 1r–92r

Blank, ff. 92v–95v

Ownership Category: Unknown

Aside from some Latin biblical texts used as flyleaves, the *Manuel* is the only text in this manuscript, and there are no signs of its medieval provenance. Arnould dates it to the late thirteenth century.¹⁰⁶

Z – Leeds, University Library, 1

Date: early 14th C

Place of production: possibly in the Yorkshire area

Foliation: ff. ii + 101 + ii (paginated)

Manuel des péchés, pp. 1–200

Medical prescription (Dean no. 439), p. 201

Ownership Category: clerical possession (date unknown), based on an inscription

The *Manuel* is the only extensive text in this early fourteenth-century manuscript. Laird finds that “An inscription connects the manuscript with the Augustinian Priory at Newburgh, Yorkshire, near Coxwold.”¹⁰⁷ It seems that it remained in the Yorkshire region; in the nineteenth century it belonged to William Constable Maxwell of Everingham Park, Yorkshire.¹⁰⁸

Pr – Princeton, University Library, Taylor Medieval MS. 1¹⁰⁹

Date: second half of the 13th C

Place of production: East Midlands or upper East Anglia

Foliation: ff. i + v + 204 + i

Contents:

Moral diagrams, ff. ii^v–iv^r

Table of contents (19th C), f. iv^v

Prayer to the Virgin (Latin), f. v^r

Manuel des péchés, ff. 1r–150v

Le Roman des Romains (Dean no. 601), ff. 151r–164v

Lament of the Virgin (Dean no. 955), ff. 165r–170r

Homilies of Maurice de Sully (Latin with A-N translation) (Dean no. 587), ff. 170v–171r

Blank, ff. 171v–172r

Chasteau d’amour (Dean no. 622), ff. 172v–198r

Blank, ff. 198v–199v

Ownership Category: produced for a lay owner, based on an illustration

Joan Tateshal, a wealthy Lincolnshire landholder, commissioned this copy in the late thirteenth century for her own use. Adelaide Bennett, who has studied this manuscript in depth, finds that Joan wanted her involvement in the production of this manuscript recorded; the *Manuel* begins with an initial containing a drawing of her and the scribe who she employed.¹¹⁰

Incomplete Copies and Longer Fragments

P – London, British Library, Harley 337¹¹¹

Date: five previously independent parts, bound together (date unknown; after the early 14th C); **part 1:** second half of the 13th C; **part 2:** ca. 1314; **part 3:** last quarter of the 12th C; **part 4:** second half of the 13th C; **part 5:** last quarter of the 12th C

Place of production: **part 1:** The Benedictine Abbey of St. Augustine, Canterbury

Foliation: ff. 72 (with 4 unfoliated flyleaves at the beginning and 3 at the end)

Contents:

Part 1: Miscellany, including a cartulary from St. Augustine's Abbey, Canterbury, ff. 1–11v

Part 2: *Manuel des péchés*, ff. 12r–31v

Part 3: Origen's *Commentary on Leviticus* (frag.), ff. 32r–53v

Part 4: Pope Innocent III's *De contemptu mundi*, and short theological texts, ff. 54–65v, 65v–71v

Part 5: Pseudo-Hippocrates's *Capsula eburnea, Analogium, Indicia valetudinum* (frag.), ff. 72r–v

Ownership Category: **Part 2:** lay possession (14th C), based on marginal illustrations; **whole MS:** clerical possession (date unknown, after the early 14th C), based on contents

Sullivan finds that this is a collection of five previously independent parts. The *Manuel* part, the second of these, is badly damaged (12r–31v). Sullivan writes that its hand dates from the early fourteenth century. He describes a series of armorials in its margins, and notes that the names corresponding to them were added in the early fourteenth century.¹¹² The lay associations of these arms makes it likely that the *Manuel* part was in lay hands before it was bound with the others. They do not necessarily indicate that this was a lay commission. At least one was drawn over the decoration of the *Manuel* text (27r), so they must have been added after the *Manuel* was decorated.¹¹³

It is not clear when the five parts were joined, but Sullivan finds that it happened before the mid-seventeenth century, and he suggests the third and fourth at least were bound by the mid-fourteenth.¹¹⁴ The first part is a cartulary from the Benedictine Abbey of St Augustine at Canterbury, which suggests that the entire manuscript was put together there.¹¹⁵ Sullivan finds a table of debts from the early fourteenth century in the third fragment of the manuscript (71v), including the name “R. rune”, which he claims is visible in ultraviolet light. He suggests that this refers to the translator of the *Manuel*, but since we do not know when the fragments were bound

together, the name tells us little about the origins of the *Manuel* fragment.¹¹⁶ It seems likely that the part containing the *Manuel* was in lay hands in the early fourteenth century, and the entire manuscript was in the collection of St Augustine's at some point after that.

Q – London, British Library, Harley 3860¹¹⁷

Date: early 14th C

Place of production: Unknown

Foliation: ff. 82 (with ff. 1 and 2 flyleaves)

Contents:

Harley Epitome (A-N), ff. 3r–11v

Genealogies of the Kings of England (A-N), ff. 12r–18r

Chronicle of Scottish wars (1291–1303) (A-N), ff. 18r–22r

Seven Sages of Rome, ff. 23r–47v

Chateau d'amour (Dean no. 622), ff. 48r–61r

Manuel des péchés, ff. 61v–77v

Walter Henley's *Housbondrie* (Dean no. 394), ff. 77v–82v

Ownership Category: Unknown

This early fourteenth-century manuscript begins with chronicle material (3r–11v, 28v), including the early fourteenth-century *Harley Epitome*, edited by A. G. Rigg.¹¹⁸ Following this is the *Seven Sages of Rome* (23r–47v), and the *Chateau d'amour* (48r–61r). Two books of the *Manuel* follow (61v–77v) and are followed in turn by an extract from Walter Henley's *Housbondrie* (77v–82v).¹¹⁹ Sullivan writes that the manuscript is “written in three booklets by four co-operating scribes and probably originally bound as one volume.” Its contents reveal little about its initial owners.

An early fourteenth-century note, described by Sullivan, refers to the Bishop of Durham (2r). A hand that Sullivan dates to the fifteenth century inscribed “John Dent” on a flyleaf (1v).¹²⁰ A Johannes Dent appears in a Yorkshire land dispute record from 1567, possibly the same John, or a relative.¹²¹ This suggests that the manuscript was in lay hands in the fifteenth century, but given the mention of the Bishop of Durham and its later ties to Durham, discussed below, it is safest not to make assumptions.

It is inscribed with the name of Sir Thomas Tempest (d. 1743), who, according to A. I. Doyle, wrote his name in his books between 1662 and 1692.¹²² Cyril Ernest Wright suggests that it came from the Benedictine Priory of St Cuthbert, Durham since many of Tempest's books came from there.¹²³ Doyle finds that a monk of Durham, Nicholas Marley, left many of the priory's books with the Tempest family after the dissolution. Doyle notes, however, that not all of Tempest's books came from Durham, so this attribution is conjectural.¹²⁴ Since the evidence is hard to read, the manuscript has not been counted in any ownership category.

R – Oxford, Bodleian Library, Rawlinson Poetry 241 (14732)**Date:** first quarter of the 14th C**Place of production:** Unknown**Foliation:** Paginated vi + 290 (with blank pages at the end)**Contents:**

Theological and other notes (Latin)(in a later hand), pp. 1–7

Proverbes de bon enseignement (Dean no. 252), pp. 8–19

Dimensions of St Paul's Church and Monastery, London, p. 20

La Plainte d'Amour, by Nicholas Bozon (Dean no. 690), pp. 21–37*Le Petit Sermon* (Dean no. 636), pp. 37–50*Le Dialogue de Saint Julien* (Dean no. 628), pp. 50–77*Miracles of the Virgin* by Everard Gately (Dean no. 560), pp. 77–96*Manuel des péchés*, pp. 96–162Edmund of Abingdon's *Mirour de Seinte Eglise* (A-N) (Dean no. 629), pp. 163–89*Liber Metodii Episcopi* (Latin), pp. 189–96*The Marriage of the Devil's Nine Daughters* (A-N) (Dean no. 686), pp. 196–207*Dyete Pretious* (different hand) (Dean no. 420), pp. 207–10*Petite Philosophie* (different hand) (A-N) (Dean no. 325), pp. 211–46*Lunarie de Salemon* (continental) (Dean no. 366), pp. 246–57*The Beginning and End of the World* (A-N) (Dean no. 606), pp. 259–71**Ownership Category:** Unknown

This manuscript contains a series of *exempla* from the *Manuel* (pp. 96–163), alongside French devotional works, including two ascribed to Nicholas Bozon: the *Proverbes de bon enseignement* (pp. 8–19) and the *Plainte d'Amour* (pp. 21–37).¹²⁵ Paul Meyer dates the hand in the *Manuel* portion to the first half of the fourteenth century. He notes that the provenance of the manuscript is unknown.¹²⁶ Sullivan suggests that it might have originated at Bury St Edmunds because it contains a text by a member of this house.¹²⁷ The notes on St Paul's London might also suggest clerical origins. But it is worth noting that Bozon's *Proverbes* states that it is for “amis / Ke de clergie n'unt apris” (“Friends / who lack learning/clerical training”) and that, like Arundel MS 288, this manuscript contains the lay version of Edmund's *Mirour*.¹²⁸ Moreover, it contains what Sullivan describes as “notes on military fees.”¹²⁹ These contents seem most helpful for lay readers, but tell us nothing conclusive about the manuscript's provenance, and the manuscript has therefore not been placed in an ownership category.

S – Cambridge, University Library, Gg. 1.1¹³⁰**Date:** first quarter of the 14th C**Place of production:** Unknown**Foliation:** ff. ii + 633 + ii**Contents:** Various texts, most in Anglo-Norman, but some in Latin and Middle English, including:*Lumere as lais* by Pierre D'Abernon (Dean no. 690), ff. 17r–110v*Image du Monde* (A-N), ff. 346r–390r*Seven Sages* (A-N), ff. 440r–463v

Birth Predictions (A-N), ff. 466v–469r

Excerpts from the Bible (Latin), ff. 491r–494v

Thirty-Two Follies (A-N), ff. 629r

Ownership Category: produced for lay owners (based on contents)

This is a lavish and substantial volume, with an abridged copy of the *Manuel*. A number of its texts seem most useful for a lay patron, such as the text that Sullivan describes as a “list of knights’ fees in England and Ireland,” and the “rules of love for clerks and knights.” It also includes Walter Bibbesworth’s *Tretiz*, a French vocabulary text addressed to a lay reader. Sullivan concedes that these contents are “occasionally appropriate for secular reception,” but claims that they “are collectively so vast, varied, and so demanding of an exceedingly patient and educated mind that one must doubt that the book’s patron was a layman.”¹³¹ But it was not unusual for lay readers to own luxury manuscripts. Given the contents, it seems likely that it was commissioned by a lay patron, and this is certainly Mary Carruthers’s view.¹³²

T – York Minster XVI.K.13

Date: late thirteenth or early 14th C

Place of production: Unknown

Foliation: ff. 128 (with seven unnumbered folios)

Contents:

Manuel des péchés (end missing), ff. 1r–103v (including 7 unnumbered folios)

La Vie de Saint Eustache, by William de Ferrers (A-N) (Dean no. 540), ff. 104r–119v

La Vie Seint Margeurite (A-N) (Dean no. 573), ff. 119v–128r

La Vie Seint Marie Magdalene (A-N) (Dean no. 577), ff. 128r–v

Ownership Category: lay possession (14th C), based on marginal inscription

Laird dates this manuscript to the late thirteenth century, but Arnould suggests the early fourteenth.¹³³ The *Manuel* appears first, its ending apparently lost (1r–103v), followed by the French lives of saints Eustace (104r–119v), Margeurite (119v–128r), and Mary Magdalene (128r–v).¹³⁴ Saints’ lives, of course, can appeal to a variety of readers. The name of “Joannes Pye” appears toward the end of the *Manuel* (98r), and, as noted below, he can plausibly be identified with the Pye who was a Northern landowner and bookowner in the late fourteenth century, so the manuscript has been included among those owned by layfolk in the fourteenth century. The other two names in the manuscript, “Johannes Smyth” (13r), and “Thomas Smyth” (80r), are not helpful for tracing its medieval owners, since Arnould has traced them to the manuscript collector Thomas Smith (1638–1710).¹³⁵

W – Nottingham, University Library, MiLM4¹³⁶

Date: second half of the 13th C

Place of production: Unknown

Foliation: ff. 171 (with 2,181 lines [~12 folios] missing from the beginning)

Contents:

Manuel des péchés, ff. 1r–56r

Robert of Gretham's *Mirur* (A-N) (Dean no. 589), ff. 57r–171r

Ownership Category: Unknown

The manuscript is entirely in one late thirteenth-century hand.¹³⁷ The *Manuel* appears first, its beginning missing (1r–56r), and it is followed by the only complete copy of Robert of Gretham's *Mirur* (57r–171r).¹³⁸ Rob Lutton notes that it was in the collection of the Willoughbys of Willoughby-on-the-Wolds by the sixteenth century, but it is unclear when it fell into their possession. He writes that “it was probably after 1460 and possibly as late as the second decade of the 16th century.”¹³⁹ Given the uncertainty of the dates in this attribution, I have not counted this manuscript in an ownership category.

Shorter Fragments

V – Blackburn, Stonyhurst College, 27 (A.VI. 22) (HMC 31)¹⁴⁰

Date: two parts first quarter of the 14th C

Place of production: Unknown

Foliation: ff. 115

Contents:¹⁴¹

Part 1: *Summa de Officiis Ecclesiasticis*, ff. 1r–72v

Part 2: French legal tract, f. 73v

John Beleth's *Summa de Officiis Ecclesiasticis*, starting on f. 75 and interspersed with

Notes on the former, f. 74v, 100r, 108r

Latin legal tract, f. 82v

Manuel des péchés (frag.), ff. 103v–107r

Novem filie diaboli (Latin); Proverbs on folly (French) ff. 107r–v

Ownership Category: produced for clerical owners, based on contents; lay possession (14th C), based on marginal inscription; clerical possession (15th C), based on marginal inscription

This manuscript is composed of two originally separate parts, and it is not known when they were joined. The first contains a text which, in its *explicit*, is entitled *Summa de Officiis Ecclesiasticis* (1r–72v). The second contains a different *Summa de Officiis Ecclesiasticis*—that of John Beleth.¹⁴² Arnould notes that the latter appears in a series of fragments, and a number of texts have been inserted before and among its leaves, written either in spaces left blank or on parchment scraps. These include a French legal tract from 1300 concerning royal forests, land ownership, and metal work (73v). There is also a Latin legal tract from 1299 (82v), also concerning royal forests and addressed to the Duke of Norfolk. There are notes on Beleth's *Summa* (74v, 100r, 108r), which Arnould suggests were written by a student. The *Manuel* fragment is the last substantial one (103v–107r). Arnould dates its hand to 1310. On the last folio of the *Manuel* and in the same hand is a brief Latin text on the Devil's daughters, and, in two different hands, French proverbs (107r).¹⁴³

Based on these contents, Sullivan suggests that this was “used as a text-book for clerics.”¹⁴⁴ He is undoubtedly right that the main works suggest clerical origins, but since the *Manuel* is in a later hand than these, we cannot assume that it was added while the manuscript was in clerical possession. Nevertheless, this does seem likely, since it was apparently added within a few decades after the clerical texts were copied. The two legal tracts tell us very little; they could be useful for either group.

The name John Pye appears in both this manuscript and York Minster XVI.K.13. Sullivan suggests that Pye “may have been a collector of MSS.”¹⁴⁵ Arnould notes that it is difficult to determine who Pye was, finding two by that name in the *Dictionary of National Biography*.¹⁴⁶ There is, however, reason to suspect that this Pye, whose name is inscribed “Joannes Pye” in the York Minster manuscript (103r), was the “Johannes Pye” who held lands in the late fourteenth century in Ulverston, in the Northern county of Cumbria.¹⁴⁷ Both Pye manuscripts seem to have Northern origins, which makes it plausible that the Ulverston landholder owned them.¹⁴⁸

The manuscript also contains the name of Hugh Damlett, who was a fifteenth-century book collector and the rector of St Peter Cornhill in London.¹⁴⁹ The evidence therefore suggests that this fragment of the *Manuel* was copied in a clerical context, moved to a lay one within a century of its production, and then returned to a clerical context within another century.

X – London, British Library, Arundel 372¹⁵⁰

Date: second half of the 13th C

Place of Production: Unknown

Foliation: ff. i + 70 + (unfoliated) flyleaves

Contents:

Manuel des péchés (frag.), ff. 2r–3v

Many Latin theological texts, including Anselm of Canterbury’s *Monologion* and several prayers

Ownership Category: clerical possession (14th C), based on loan chest inscription

Two badly damaged leaves of the *Manuel* precede a series of Latin theological texts, including several by St Anselm. The manuscript contains a 1394 inscription regarding its placement in a loan chest: “Caucio Willelmi [. . .] exposita in ciste neel pro xiiij s. iiiij d. in pesto apostolorum petri et pauli [i.e., 29 June] Anno domini millesimo CCC nonagesimo quarto” (4r).¹⁵¹ This indicates that it was placed as surety for a loan in one of two chests donated by the fourteenth-century alderman Walter Neel, at Oxford and Cambridge respectively. In his study of loan chests, Graham Pollard notes that their use was restricted to students or graduates of the University. By comparing the value of this loan to the typical loans for various ranks of students given by Pollard, we can conclude that William was in the lowest

rank, a scholar. Based on Pollard's findings, it seems that the erasure of William's name means that his loan was never repaid.¹⁵² Since most scholars of the time would have been members of religious orders, it seems probable that, prior to this inscription being written in 1394, the manuscript was in clerical hands.

The name "Anna Hoeham" appears in a fifteenth-century hand on the first folio, but I can find no record of anyone by that name active in the fifteenth century.¹⁵³

Y – London, British Library, Arundel 507¹⁵⁴

Date: Compiled in the late 14th C; some items 13th C

Place of Production: Compiled in Durham

Foliation: ff. 100 (with unfoliated paper flyleaves)

Contents:

Many theological texts, most in Latin, but including three French texts:

Manuel des péchés (frag.), ff. 81r–v

Proverbes de bon enseignement (Dean no. 252), ff. 95r–99r

Proverbial Follies (Dean no. 266), ff. 99v–100r

Ownership Category: produced for clerical owners, based on contents; clerical possession (14th C), based on inscription

This manuscript is not mentioned by Arnould, Laird, or Sullivan, perhaps because it contains only a single leaf of the *Manuel* (81r–v).¹⁵⁵ It is primarily a collection of theological works, many of which would be best suited to a monastic context, such as a tract entitled "De quator generibus monachorum in omni clauastro" (39r) and the Latin list of rules for monks (78v–79v). It is therefore counted among manuscripts produced for the clergy. It also contains a Middle English poem ascribed to Richard Rolle (54v–66r).¹⁵⁶ According to a list on folio 92v, it was, in 1396, in the possession of Richard Segbruck, a monk of the Benedictine Priory of St Cuthbert in Durham.¹⁵⁷

Wr – Worcester, Cathedral Library, Q.35

Date: 14th C

Place of Production: Unknown

Foliation: ff. 66 (with 2 binding leaves at the beginning and 2 at the end)

Contents:

Manuel des péchés (frag.), front and back flyleaves

Commentary on Peter Lombard's *Sentences*, ff. 1–66v

Ownership Category: clerical possession (date unknown), based on current location

Dean notes that the flyleaves to this fourteenth-century manuscript contain parts of Book II of the *Manuel*.¹⁵⁸ The manuscript also contains commentary on Peter Lombard's *Sentences* (1–66v). It was likely in the library at Worcester cathedral in the late medieval period, judging from the provenance of the library's collection.¹⁵⁹

Ub – Oxford, Brasenose College, UB S.1.23**Date:** Pastedowns in a late 15th C printed book**Place of Production:** Book printed in Speyer, Germany**Foliation:** 120 leaves**Contents:***Manuel des péchés* (frag.), pastedownsBernhard von Breydenbach's *Peregrinatio in terram sanctam* (2nd edition)**Ownership Category:** clerical possession (15th C), based on donor inscription

Dean, citing Ker, notes that the paste-downs in this printed book are two bifolia of the *Manuel*. They contain “passages on the Creed and the Ten Commandments.”¹⁶⁰ The book contains Bernhard von Breydenbach's *Peregrinatio in terram sanctam* (1490) and was owned by William Smith, Bishop of Lincoln and founder of Brasenose College (d. 1514).¹⁶¹ As noted above, the name William Smith appears in Harley MS 4971, and it would be interesting if the folios used as pastedowns in the Brasenose book had originated in the Harley one, but this seems unlikely, since the Harley text is copied in three columns, while the Brasenose one is in two.¹⁶²

Pc – Cambridge, Pembroke College, 258¹⁶³**Date:** early 14th C**Place of Production:** possibly Lincolnshire**Foliation:** ff. 141 (with wrapper containing medieval accounts)**Contents:**

A variety of theological texts, most in Latin, including:

Stories of the saints (Latin), ff. 1r–6v

De confessione (Latin), ff. 7r–8v

On the Articles of the Faith, Sacraments, etc., ff. 9r–12v

Stories, including miracles, ff. 13r–20v

Richard Wethringsette's *Summa*, ff. 58r–90v*Manuel des péchés* (frag.), ff. 134r–v**Ownership Category:** produced for the clergy, based on contents

This early fourteenth-century manuscript contains four tales from the *Manuel* on one leaf (134r–v).¹⁶⁴ James suggests that the manuscript “was probably compiled by a parish priest.” It contains a variety of *exempla*, some of which pertain to the powers of confession.¹⁶⁵

OTHER COPIES

We have records of some copies, now lost, which nevertheless offer insight into the medieval readers of the *Manuel*. One copy appears in a 1369 list of the books available to Richard of Normanton, the vicar of **Southwell** Minster, in Nottinghamshire.¹⁶⁶ Taubman suggests that this was St John's College MS F.30, since this manuscript also has connections to Nottinghamshire.¹⁶⁷ Barratt notes that a copy appears in a 1400 catalogue of the

books of **Titchfield** Abbey, in Hamshire.¹⁶⁸ There is also one in the 1389 catalogue of **Dover** Priory and another in the 1396 catalogue of **Meaux** Abbey. **Leicester** Abbey might have had a copy; their fifteenth-century catalogue lists a “manuale in gallico” which might be the *Manuel*, although the attribution is uncertain and it has consequently been left off the list below.¹⁶⁹ Barratt also finds that **St Augustine’s** Abbey, Canterbury had one, a gift from “the monk Richard of Canterbury (*fl.* ca. 1320).”¹⁷⁰ This could be the booklet of the *Manuel* that was eventually bound into Harley MS 337, since, as noted above, the first fragment in this manuscript is a cartulary from St Augustine’s. A physician and fellow of Merton College, Oxford, Simon Bredon, granted his copy to the nuns of **Malling** Abbey in 1368.¹⁷¹ Stacey Gee finds that one John Affordeby, “a master of the hospital of St Mary in York,” bequeathed in his 1452 will a copy to the **Moxby** Convent library.¹⁷² Finally, William Creyke, rector of **All Hallows**, London, left a copy to one of his parishioners, named John Milton.¹⁷³

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

The type of evidence used for determining provenance appears beside each copy. Since a manuscript produced for one audience may not necessarily have reached it, copies listed in the “produced for” categories are not included in the “possession” categories, unless, as in the case of Y, there is other evidence to suggest that they were in the possession of a certain group.

Copies in lay possession

	Produced for lay owners		Lay possession (14th C)		Lay possession (15th C)	
Total	3		6 and 1 fragment		4	
Copies	E Pr	contents (uncertain) illustration	C (booklet) D G	inscription, contents ownership inscription marginal inscriptions	A D F K	ownership inscription ownership inscription gift inscription ownership inscription
Lost			All Hallows	will		
Incomplete	S	contents	P (booklet) T	armorials marginal inscription		
Short fragments			V	marginal inscription		

Copies in clerical possession

	Produced for clerical owners		Clerical possession (14th C)		Clerical possession (15th C)	
Total	3 and 3 short fragments		9 and 2 short fragments		5 and 2 short fragments	
Copies	G H D	scribe contents contents	A E H	contents contents ownership inscription	B C N	inscription ownership inscription ownership inscription
Lost			Meaux Southwell Dover All Hallows Malling St Augustine's	library catalogue book list library catalogue will will gift inscription	Titchfield Moxby	library catalogue will
Incomplete						
Short fragments	V Y Pc	contents contents contents	X Y	loan chest inscription inscription	Ub V	donor inscription

Copies in lay possession (date unknown) (1)

B (contents)

Copies in clerical possession (date unknown) (3 and 1 short fragment)

M (marginal inscription), Z (inscription)

Incomplete: P (contents) (may be the same as St Augustine's)

Short fragments: Wr (current location)

Medieval provenance unknown (6)

I, L, O

Incomplete: Q, R, W

CONCLUSIONS

Perhaps the most surprising of these findings is that we have an equal number of copies containing evidence of having been produced for lay owners (3) as those containing evidence of having been produced for clerical ones (3). Early copies can be found among both those produced for lay owners

and those produced for clerical ones, and this strongly suggests that, from early on, the text was understood as holding value for both lay and clerical audiences.¹⁷⁴ An objection might be raised that some of the layfolk for whom the text was produced did not intend to use it themselves, but wanted it instead for its perceived benefit to a religious reader in their acquaintance, such as a private confessor. Yet we have in the case of manuscript Pr, which was commissioned by Joan Tateshal for her own use, a testament to genuine lay interest in the text.¹⁷⁵ And manuscripts E and S, both counted among lay commissions because they contain clearly lay-oriented texts, were surely intended for, if not used by, their lay patrons themselves or their families. So at least a few copies of the *Manuel* were intended for lay readers from their inception.

Also surprising is the number of copies owned by layfolk in the fourteenth century (6 copies and 1 fragment) compared to the number owned by the clergy or its institutions (9 copies and 2 fragments). Its lay connections indicate that the *Manuel* participated, to a larger extent than usually acknowledged, in the growing emphasis on lay education that developed in England over the course of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. Early lay interest in the text is especially interesting given that the *Manuel* was, as Lutton notes, among the earliest of the vernacular manuals about confession produced after the Fourth Lateran Council. The number of layfolk who apparently commissioned copies for themselves, and who owned copies in the late thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries, suggests that a desire to prepare oneself for confession took hold among the laity in the century following the Fourth Lateran Council. It is also worth acknowledging that at least four copies were either commissioned by, or owned by, women—a surprising fact, given how rarely women are mentioned among its readers.¹⁷⁶

Claire Waters speaks of the proliferation of texts for religious education in this period and finds that these “offered audiences able to read or hear them a new way of imagining themselves as religious subjects.”¹⁷⁷ By providing the basics of theological instruction alongside lists of sins through which penitents could examine themselves in preparation for confession, the *Manuel* helped foster in its readers both theological knowledge and a deeper awareness of their own behaviors, habits, and failings in the eyes of the Church—in other words, a kind of self-knowledge. The *Manuel*'s circulation among the laity, then, is suggestive of the methods of self-reflection and the kinds of self-knowledge available to the laity in this period.

The *Manuel*'s circulation among clerical owners is well recognized, but the ownership information above reveals some surprising aspects of clerical ownership. First, the number of copies that moved from lay to clerical

hands, or vice versa, is notable and provides fascinating insight into some of the connections between these groups in the late medieval period. The number of fragments and incomplete copies in clerical possession is also notable. Some of these are limited to series of *exempla* from the *Manuel*.¹⁷⁸ This offers support for E. J. Arnould's suggestion that the clergy were particularly drawn to this aspect of the text.¹⁷⁹ Probably these *exempla* served to vivify and exemplify moral teachings in contemporary sermons. It is also notable that there was significant diversity even among clerical owners of the text. Communities of monks, individual brothers, scholars, and the occasional parish priest are all represented among its owners, and this speaks to its broad appeal.

The study of manuscripts above offers additional support for the powerful Yorkshire connections of the text, which have been described by Andrew Reeves, Matthew Sullivan, and others. The remarkable number of copies that circulated in this region soon after the text's production suggests that A. W. Taubman is right that "the *Manuel* had a notable regional circulation."¹⁸⁰ Yet these findings also suggest how far the text travelled from this area. In the fourteenth century, copies were owned by several southern institutions, including Dover Priory (Kent), Titchfield Abbey (Hampshire), and the Abbey of St Mary the Virgin (Quarr). Two have connections to the West Midlands, and another two to Oxford. The text appealed to owners in a variety of different orders, with copies circulating among Benedictines (MS N), Augustinians (MS Z) and Cistercians (MS H).

The wide circulation of the *Manuel* contributes to our growing awareness of the role of Anglo-Norman in lay households in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. While Anglo-Norman in this period was once seen as a dying language severed from its origins, this paradigm has been revised in recent years.¹⁸¹ We are increasingly recognizing that Anglo-Norman persisted as a respectable language for the clergy, but also for business, agriculture, and other lay affairs.¹⁸² The circulation of the *Manuel des péchés* across a relatively varied cross section of the medieval population in the fourteenth and fifteen centuries offers further evidence of the importance of Anglo-Norman in lay contexts well into the late medieval period.

Leiden University

NOTES

- 1 Ulrike Schemmann, *Confessional Literature and Lay Education: The Manuel dé Pechez as a Book of Good Conduct and Guide to Personal Religion* (Düsseldorf: Droste, 2000), 3. Throughout this article, I use “Dean no.” to refer to the numbers assigned to Anglo-Norman texts by Ruth Dean and Maureen B.M. Boulton in their comprehensive Anglo-Norman Literature. A Guide to Texts and Manuscripts (London: ANTS, 1999).
- 2 For the most recent dating of the *Manuel* see Schemmann, *Confessional*, 3. For copies of the *Manuel*, see Dean and Boulton, *Anglo-Norman*, 349–51. For copies of *Handlyng Synne*, see Idelle Sullens, ed., *Robert Mannyng of Brunne: Handlyng Synne* (Binghamton: Medieval and Early Renaissance Studies, 1983), xxiii–xxxiii.
- 3 For the Latin version, see E. J. Arnould, *Le Manuel des Péchés: Étude de Littérature Religieuse Anglo-Normande (XIII^e siècle)* (Paris: Droz, 1940), 290. For the Icelandic one, see Matthew Sullivan, “A Brief Textual History of the ‘Manuel des péchés,’” *Neuphilologische Mitteilungen* 93 (1992): 345–46n29.
- 4 Leonard E. Boyle, “The Inter-Conciliar Period 1179–1215 and the Beginnings of Pastoral Manuals,” in *Miscellanea Rolando Bandinelli Papa Alessandro VIII*, ed. Filippo Liotta (Siena: Accademia senese degli intronati, 1986), 46.
- 5 Leonard E. Boyle, “The Fourth Lateran Council and Manuals of Popular Theology,” in *The Popular Literature of Medieval England*, ed. Thomas J. Heffernan (U. of Tennessee Press, 1985), 35.
- 6 Rob Lutton, “Vice, Virtue and Contemplation: The Willoughby’s Religious Books and Devotional Interests,” in *The Wollaton Medieval Manuscripts: Texts, Owners and Readers*, ed. Ralph Hanna and Thorlac Turville-Petre (Woodbridge: York Medieval, 2010), 69. Lutton repeats Sullivan’s statement that the text has been called “one of the most important extant thirteenth-century vernacular texts written in England.”
- 7 Charlton G. Laird, “Character and Growth of the *Manuel des pechiez*,” *Traditio* 4 (1946): 259. For an overview of discussions of the text’s audience, see Matthew Sullivan, “The Original and Subsequent Audiences of the *Manuel des Péchés* and Its Middle English Descendants” (PhD thesis, Oxford, 1990), *ProQuest* (U481994), 81.
- 8 Sullivan, “Original,” 22–29, 99–119, and 267–74. Sullivan based his findings on an analysis of fourteen of the surviving twenty-eight manuscripts and fragments (102–17). Sullivan repeated these conclusions in “A Brief Textual History,” claiming that the *Manuel* was intended for “repeated study by clerics” (343). See also Matthew Sullivan, “Readers of the *Manuel des péchés*,” *Romania* 113 (1992): 233–42.
- 9 For Schemmann’s refutation of Sullivan’s theory of textual corruption, see *Confessional*, 324. The quotation appears at 329.
- 10 Alexandra Barratt, “Spiritual Writings and Religious Instruction,” in *The Cambridge History of the Book in Britain*, ed. N. J. Morgan and R. M. Thomson (Cambridge U. Press, 2008), 354.
- 11 See Sullens, ed., *Robert Mannyng of Brunne*, 5.81–82.

- 12 Nicole Rice, *Lay Piety and Religious Discipline in Middle English Literature* (Cambridge U. Press, 2012), 14.
- 13 See London, British Library, Arundel MS 372 below.
- 14 Arnould, *Manuel*, 359–98; Sullivan, “Original,” 102–19; Charlton G. Laird, “Manuscripts of the Manuel des Pechiez,” in *Stanford Studies in Language and Literature*, ed. Hardin Craig (Stanford U. Press, 1941), 99–123; Dean and Boulton, *Anglo-Norman*.
- 15 For scholars who describe some of the problems of using documentary evidence (such as ownership inscriptions and wills) to establish the “actual” audiences of a text, see Ruth Evans, “Readers/Audiences/Texts,” in *The Idea of the Vernacular*, ed. Jocelyn Wogan-Browne et al. (Pennsylvania State U. Press, 1999), 112.
- 16 This description based on the most recent catalogue description for this MS, “Harley MS 273,” *British Library Digitised Manuscripts*, http://www.bl.uk/manuscripts/FullDisplay.aspx?ref=Harley_MS_273.
- 17 Sullivan, “Original,” 114.
- 18 “Harley MS 273.”
- 19 Contents of the manuscript are listed at “Harley MS 273,” *British Library Digitised Manuscripts*, http://www.bl.uk/manuscripts/FullDisplay.aspx?ref=Harley_MS_273.
- 20 For the inscription, see Sullivan, “Original,” 115. For Cantilupe’s feast day, see William Smith, *The Use of Hereford: The Sources of a Medieval English Diocesan Rite* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2015), 601.
- 21 “Harley MS 273.”
- 22 For descriptions of this MS, see Arnould, *Manuel*, 365; and Tony Hunt, “Une petite sume de les set pechez morteus (MS London BL Harley 4657),” in *Medieval French Textual Studies in Memory of T. B. W. Reid*, ed. Ian Short, ANTS OPSI: 1 (London: ANTS, 1984), 65–69.
- 23 Sullivan, “Original,” 107.
- 24 Sullivan, “Original,” 107.
- 25 The original and its translation are printed in A. W. Taubman, “Clergy and Commoners: Interactions Between Medieval Clergy and Laity in a Regional Context,” (PhD thesis, U. of York, 2009), *ProQuest* (U513726), 48.
- 26 Hunt, “Une petite,” 65; Taubman, “Clergy,” 48; Sullivan, “Original,” 107.
- 27 Matthew Sullivan, “Historical Notes on Some Readers of the *Manuel des péchés* and Its Middle English Descendants,” *Scriptorium* 46 (1992): 84.
- 28 Sullivan, “Original,” 107.

- 29 Sullivan, "Historical Notes," 85–86.
- 30 Arnould, *Manuel*, 367–69.
- 31 Sullivan, "Original," 105.
- 32 A fifteenth-century hand has written both a table of contents which describes all the major parts of the manuscript, and, on the same folio, "Liber monachorum Sancti Edmundi in quo subscripta continentur" (f. 3r). Arnould, *Manuel*, 369. Arnould also finds an ownership inscription, "Liber Johannis Norton" (f. 3r). Arnould suggests that this may refer to the prior of Mount Grace in Yorkshire, who was active in 1485 (*Manuel*, 369n1).
- 33 Arnould, *Manuel*, 367.
- 34 Sullivan, "Original," 105; Dean and Boulton, *Anglo-Norman*, 351.
- 35 J. A. Herbert, *Catalogue of Romances in the Department of Manuscripts British Museum*, vol. 3 (London: Longmans, 1910), 289.
- 36 Arnould, *Manuel*, 369.
- 37 Sullivan, "Original," 106.
- 38 H. C. Maxwell Lyte, ed., *Calendar of the Close Rolls Preserved in the Public Record Office: Edward III, A.D. 1330–1333* (London: Eyre and Spottiswoode, 1898), 323.
- 39 Sullivan, "Original," 106.
- 40 H. C. Maxwell Lyte, ed., *Calendar of the Patent Rolls Preserved in the Public Record Office: Edward III A.D. 1327–1330*, vol. 1 (London: Eyre and Spottiswoode, 1891), 293, 281.
- 41 "Detailed Record for Royal 20 B XIV," *Catalogue of Illuminated Manuscripts, British Library*, <http://www.bl.uk/catalogues/illuminatedmanuscripts/>.
- 42 Laird, "Manuscripts," 102.
- 43 Evelyn Anne Mackie, "Robert Grosseteste's *Chasteu d'Amur*: A Text in Context" (PhD thesis, U. of Toronto, 2002), ProQuest (NQ69209), 33.
- 44 Arnould, *Manuel*, 369.
- 45 A. D. Wilshere, "Introduction," *Mirour de seinte eglise: St. Edmund of Abingdon's Speculum ecclesiae*, ed. A. D. Wilshere (London: ANTS, 1982), vi.
- 46 "Detailed Record for Royal 20 B XIV."
- 47 Mackie, "Robert," 9.

- 48 The inscription is: “iste liber constat Waltero Hungerford” (fol. i v). “Detailed Record for Royal 20 B XIV”; Barratt, “Spiritual,” 352. Susan Hagen Cavanaugh, “A Study of Books Privately Owned in England: 1300–1450” (PhD thesis, U. of Pennsylvania, 1980), *ProQuest* (8028845), 203, 452.
- 49 “Royal MS 20 B XIV: Early 14th Century,” *Explore Archives and Manuscripts*, British Library, http://searcharchives.bl.uk/IAMS_VU2:IAMS040-002107673.
- 50 “Galmetun,” *Historical Gazetteer of England’s Place Names*, Queen’s U. Belfast et al., place-names.org.uk/. Sullivan identifies this location with “Galmington, Somerset (in Taunton)” but he does not provide evidence for this identification (“Original,” 116, 124n97).
- 51 George Oliver, *The History of Exeter* (Exeter: R. Cullum, 1821), 169. Mackie mentions this Colyford in her examination of this manuscript, but suggests that he is too late to be the owner of the MS (“Robert,” 28).
- 52 “Parliament of England: 7 Edward II (1313),” in *Parliaments of England, 1213–1702*, Public Record Office (UK: Parliament, 1879), 43.
- 53 Laird, “Manuscripts,” 102.
- 54 Herbert, *Catalogue*, vol. 3, 293.
- 55 Andrew Reeves, *Religious Education in Thirteenth-Century England* (Leiden: Brill, 2015), 154.
- 56 Sullivan, “Original,” 115.
- 57 Hunt, “Une petite,” 72.
- 58 Wilshere, “Introduction,” xi–xii.
- 59 Reeves, *Religious*, 154.
- 60 This description draws on Mackie’s description in “Robert,” 35.
- 61 J. Murray, *Le Château d’amour de Robert Grosseteste, évêque de Lincoln* (Paris: Champion, 1918), 32.
- 62 Arnould, *Manuel*, 374.
- 63 Murray, *Château*, 32.
- 64 Laird, “Manuscripts,” 116.
- 65 Arnould, *Manuel*, 374. Laird reads “Margaret Dyngham” (“Manuscripts,” 116).
- 66 Laird, “Manuscripts,” 116.

- 67 Mackie entertains the possibility that the *Manuel* and *Chateau* had been joined before the inscription was made, but considers it unlikely (“Robert,” 28).
- 68 Sullivan considers the bindings original but does not date them (“Original,” 125); but the bindings are from the fifteenth century according to Falconer Madan, *A Summary Catalogue of Western Manuscripts in the Bodleian Library at Oxford*, vol. 2, pt. 2 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1937), 747.
- 69 Laird, “Manuscripts,” 111.
- 70 Arnould, *Manuel*, 376.
- 71 William Gainsborough, *Register of Bishop William Gainsborough, the Bishop of Worcester (1302–1307)*, ed. J. W. Willis-Bund and R. A. Wilson (Worcester Historical Society, 1907), 156.
- 72 Walter Reynolds, *The Register of Walter Reynolds, Bishop of Worcester: 1308–1313*, ed. Rowland Alwyn Wilson (Oxford U. Press, 1928), 153.
- 73 Laird, “Manuscripts,” 111.
- 74 Sullivan, “Original,” 125.
- 75 Laird, “Manuscripts,” 111n49.
- 76 Arnould, *Manuel*, 375; Barratt, “Spiritual,” 354.
- 77 “Parishes: Cobham,” in *A History of the County of Surrey*, ed. H. E. Malden, vol. 3 (London: Victoria County History, 1911), 442–47, <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/vch/surrey/vol3/pp442-447>.
- 78 J. S. Purvis, “Obituary Calendar of the Dominican Friary of Guildford,” *Surrey Archaeological Collections* 42 (1934): 94.
- 79 Laird, “Manuscripts,” 111n49.
- 80 H. C. Maxwell Lyte, *Edward III, A.D. 1330–1334*, 564.
- 81 Cambridge University Library, *A Catalogue of the Manuscripts Preserved in the Library of the University of Cambridge*, vol. 4 (Cambridge U. Press, 1856), 80–83.
- 82 Sullivan, “Original,” 117.
- 83 Sullivan, “Original,” 124; “Manuel de pechez (in French), etc.—Quarr, Isle of Wight. Cistercian abbey of St Mary the Virgin,” *Medieval Libraries of Great Britain*, Bodleian Libraries, U. of Oxford, 2015, <http://mlgb3.bodleian.ox.ac.uk/>.
- 84 Arnould, *Manuel*, 379.
- 85 Laird, “Manuscripts,” 106.

- 86 Paul Meyer, "Manuscrits Français de Cambridge," *Romania* 15 (1886): 351.
- 87 Sullivan, "Original," 112; Arnould, *Manuel*, 378.
- 88 Meyer, "Manuscrits," 325.
- 89 "Cambridge St John's College F 30," *Spreading the Light: The 'Elucidarium' in French and Occitan*, Huw Grange, 2016, http://www.huwgrange.co.uk/elucidarium/EP_Cambridge_St-John's-College_F30.xml.
- 90 Laird, "Manuscripts," 107; Arnould, *Manuel*, 380.
- 91 Arnould, *Manuel*, 379.
- 92 "Parliament of England: 38 Henry VI," in *Parliaments of England, 1213–1702*, Public Record Office (UK: Parliament, 1879), 353.
- 93 H. C. Maxwell Lyte, ed., *Inquisitions and Assessments Relating to Feudal Aids, With Other Analogous Documents Preserved in the Public Record Office*, vol. 6 (London: His Majesty's Stationery Office, 1920), 412.
- 94 Ralph Hanna and Thorlac Turville-Petre, "The Catalogue," in *The Wollaton Medieval Manuscripts: Texts, Owners and Readers*, ed. Ralph Hanna and Thorlac Turville-Petre (Woodbridge: York Medieval, 2010), 94.
- 95 Taubman, "Clergy," 49; Sullivan, "Original," 125.
- 96 Charlton G. Laird, "The Source of Robert Mannyng of Brunne's *Handlyng Synne*: A Study of the Extant Manuscripts of the Anglo-Norman *Manuel des Pechiez*" (PhD thesis, Stanford U., 1940), 115.
- 97 Bernard de Montfaucon, *Bibliotheca bibliothecarum manuscriptorum nova*, vol. 2 (Paris: Briasson, 1739), 1271.
- 98 Laird, "Manuscripts," 112.
- 99 Emily Wingfield, "Ex Libris domini duncani / Campbell de glenwrquhay / miles': *The Buik of King Alexander the Conquerour* in the Household of Sir Duncan Campbell, Seventh Laird of Glenorchy," in *Medieval Romance, Medieval Contexts*, ed. Rhiannon Purdie and Michael Cichon (Woodbridge: Brewer, 2011), 161.
- 100 Laird, "Manuscripts," 119. For a description of the contents of this manuscript, see Frederic Spencer, "The Old French Manuscripts of York Minster Library," *Modern Language Notes* 3 (1888): 246.
- 101 Arnould, *Manuel*, 381.
- 102 "Manuel des peches, etc. (in French)—York, Yorkshire. Benedictine abbey of Saint Mary the Virgin," *Medieval Libraries of Great Britain*, Bodleian Libraries, U. of Oxford, 2015, <http://mlgb3.bodleian.ox.ac.uk/>. The inscription reads, "Liber monasterii beate Marie Ebor' emptus per fratrem Clementem Warthwyk qui alienaverit anathema" (fol. 1r).

- 103 R. Sharpe et al., ed. *English Benedictine Libraries: The Shorter Catalogues*, vol. 4 (London: The British Library, 1996), 678–748.
- 104 R. Sharpe et al., *English*, 681.
- 105 The inscription and this commentary are given by Charlton Laird, “A Fourteenth Century Scribe,” *Modern Language Notes* 55 (1940): 603.
- 106 Arnould, *Manuel*, 383.
- 107 Laird, “Manuscripts,” 111.
- 108 Arnould, *Manuel*, 384.
- 109 Description based on that given in D. C. Skemer, *Medieval and Renaissance Manuscripts*, vol. 1 (Princeton U. Press, 2013), 402.
- 110 Adelaide Bennett, “A Book Designed for a Noblewoman: An Illustrated ‘Manuel des Péchés’ of the Thirteenth Century,” in *Medieval Book Production: Assessing the Evidence, Proceedings of the Second Conference of the Seminar in the History of the Book to 1500, Oxford July 1988*, ed. Linda L. Brownrigg (Palo Alto: Anderson-Lovelace, 1990), 173.
- 111 Description based on that in “Detailed Record for Harley 337,” *Catalogue of Illuminated Manuscripts*, British Library, <http://www.bl.uk/catalogues/illuminatedmanuscripts/>.
- 112 Sullivan, “Original,” 102–3.
- 113 I have drawn this conclusion from a digitized copy of the folio, available at “Detailed Record for Harley 337.”
- 114 Sullivan finds that the same mid-fourteenth-century hand made notes in both the third fragment (on fols. 42v–43r) and the fourth fragment (on fols. 56v, and 71v) (121), and concludes from this evidence that the entire manuscript was bound together by the middle of the fourteenth century (120n24). While his supposition may be correct, all we can conclude from this finding with any certainty is that the third and fourth fragments had been joined together at this stage.
- 115 “Detailed Record for Harley 337.”
- 116 Sullivan, “Original,” 105.
- 117 The description of this MS is based on that given by A. G. Rigg, ed., *A Book of British Kings, 1200 BC–1399 AD* (Toronto: PIMS, 2000), 18. This description has been supplemented with information from J. A. Herbert, *Catalogue of Romances in the Department of Manuscripts British Museum*, vol. 2 (London: Longmans, 1910), 199–206, and from Mackie, “Robert,” 33.
- 118 Rigg notes that its provenance is unknown (*Book*, 4). It is, however, worth noting that Rigg believes the chronicle was composed near York (4–5).

- 119 Arnould, *Manuel*, 385–86.
- 120 Sullivan, “Original,” 121n61; 108. The note reads “epm. dunelmensis” (i.e., “episcopum dunelmensis”) (fol. 2r) (121n61).
- 121 “Yorkshire Fines: 1567;” in *Feet of Fines of the Tudor Period (Yorkshire)*, ed. Francis Collins, Part 1: 1486–1571 (Leeds: Yorkshire Archeological Society, 1887), 329–50, <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/feet-of-fines-yorks/vol1/pp329-350>.
- 122 Anthony Ian Doyle, “The Library of Sir Thomas Tempest. Its Origins and Dispersal,” in *Studies in Seventeenth-Century English Literature, History and Bibliography*, ed. G. A. M. Janssens and F. G. A. M. Aarts (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1984), 83.
- 123 Cyril Ernest Wright, *Fontes Harleiani: A Study of the Sources of the Harleian Collection of Manuscripts in the British Museum* (London: British Museum, 1972), 325.
- 124 Doyle, “Library,” 83.
- 125 Arnould, *Manuel*, 389–91. This manuscript has been described in detail by Paul Meyer in “Notice du MS Rawlinson Poetry 241,” *Romania* 29 (1900): 1–84.
- 126 Meyer, “Notice,” 1.
- 127 Sullivan, “Original,” 109.
- 128 For the beginning of the *Proverbes*, see Paul Meyer, “Notices et extraits du ms. 8336 de la bibliothèque de Sir Thomas Phillips à Cheltenham,” *Romania* 13 (1884): 540. For the version of the *Mirroir* contained in this manuscript, see Wilshere, “Introduction,” vi.
- 129 Sullivan, “Original,” 109.
- 130 Description based on that at “Trilingual Compendium of Texts (MS Gg.1.1),” *University of Cambridge: Digital Library*, University of Cambridge, <http://cudl.lib.cam.ac.uk/view/MS-GG-00001-00001/1>.
- 131 Sullivan, “Original,” 111.
- 132 Mary Carruthers, *The Book of Memory: A Study of Memory in Medieval Culture*, 2nd ed. (Cambridge U. Press 2008), writes, “This book was evidently made for an aristocratic household” (67).
- 133 Laird, “Manuscripts,” 119; Arnould, *Manuel*, 392.
- 134 Spencer, “Old French,” 247–48.
- 135 Arnould, *Manuel*, 392.
- 136 Description based on Hanna and Turville-Petre, “The Catalogue,” 93–94.

- 137 “WLC/LM/4,” *Manuscripts and Special Collections Online Catalogue*, U. of Nottingham, <http://mssweb.nottingham.ac.uk/catalogue/>.
- 138 Hanna and Turville-Petre, “The Catalogue,” 93.
- 139 Lutton, “Vice, Virtue and Contemplation,” 68.
- 140 N. R. Ker, *Medieval Manuscripts in British Libraries*, vol. 4 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1992), 397–99.
- 141 These contents are described in detail by E. J. Arnould, “Un Manuscrit Partiel du *Manuel des péchés*,” *Romania* 63 (1937): 226–40.
- 142 An edition of this text is Iohannis Beleth, *Summa de ecclesiasticis officiis*. ed. H. Douteil (Turnhout: Brepols, 1976). For a discussion of Beleth, see Gary Macy, “Commentaries of the Mass during the Early Scholastic Period,” in *Medieval Liturgy: A Book of Essays*, ed. Lizette Larson-Miller (New York: Garland Science, 1997), 25–59.
- 143 Arnould, “Un Manuscrit,” 226–40.
- 144 Sullivan, “Original,” 106.
- 145 Sullivan, “Original,” 107.
- 146 Arnould, *Manuel*, 392.
- 147 The inscription is printed in Laird, “Manuscripts,” 119. For the Ulverston landholder, see *The Coucher Book of Furness Abbey*, ed. J. C. Atkinson, vol. 2 (Manchester: Chetham Society, 1887), 430–34.
- 148 Laird notes that “Both manuscripts are preserved in the North, in collections which seem generally to have been local” (“Manuscripts,” 119).
- 149 Ker, *Medieval*, 397–99. Mary C. Erler, *Women, Reading, and Piety in Late Medieval England* (Cambridge U. Press, 2002), 78–79.
- 150 Description based on “Arundel 372,” *Catalogue of Illuminated Manuscripts, British Library*, <http://www.bl.uk/catalogues/illuminatedmanuscripts/>.
- 151 “Arundel 372.”
- 152 Graham Pollard, “Mediaeval Loan Chests at Cambridge,” *Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research* 17, no. 51 (1940): 121, 114, 116, 115.
- 153 “Arundel 372.”
- 154 Description based on that in “Arundel 507,” *Catalogue of Illuminated Manuscripts, British Library*, <http://www.bl.uk/catalogues/illuminatedmanuscripts/>.
- 155 “Arundel 507.”

- 156 For this work, see P. S. Jolliffe, *A Check-list of Middle English Prose Writings of Spiritual Guidance* (Toronto: Pontifical Inst. of Mediaeval Studies, 1974), 195. For the contents of this manuscript, see J. Forshall, ed., *Catalogue of Manuscripts in the British Museum, New Series*, vol. 1, pt. 1 (London: British Museum, 1834), 143–45.
- 157 Forshall, *Catalogue*, 145. In his *Northern English Books, Owners, and Makers in the Late Middle Ages* (Syracuse U. Press, 1995), John B. Friedman gives “John Segbruck” (245), but does not provide any indication of where he got this name.
- 158 Dean and Boulton, *Anglo-Norman*, 350.
- 159 John Kestell Floyer, *Catalogue of Manuscripts Preserved in the Chapter Library of Worcester Cathedral* (Oxford: James Parker, 1906), 25–26. Floyer writes that “Of the 275 volumes which now remain in manuscript, only a few seem to have belonged to other religious houses” (xi).
- 160 Dean and Boulton, *Anglo-Norman*, 350.
- 161 Margaret Lane Ford, “Private Ownership of Printed Books,” in *The Cambridge History of the Book in Britain*, Vol. 3, ed. Lotte Hellinga and J. B. Trapp, 1400–1557 (Cambridge U. Press, 1999), 212. “Breydenbach, Bernhard von: Peregrinatio in terram sanctum,” *Early Bookowners in Britain: British Provenances from 1450 to 1550*, <http://ebob.cerl.org/>.
- 162 Herbert, *Catalogue*, 288. Dean and Boulton, *Anglo-Norman*, 350.
- 163 M. R. James, *A Descriptive Catalogue of the Manuscripts in the Library of Pembroke College, Cambridge* (Cambridge U. Press, 1905), 233–37.
- 164 Dean and Boulton, *Anglo-Norman*, 349.
- 165 James, *Descriptive*, 233.
- 166 Barratt, “Spiritual,” 354; Cavanaugh, “Study,” 616–17. In the register printed by Cavanaugh, the *Manuel* is described as “unus liber qui vocatur ‘manuale peche; lingua gallica conscriptus, pretii iij.s. iiij. d.” (Cavanaugh, 617).
- 167 Taubman, “Clergy,” 49.
- 168 Barratt, “Spiritual,” 354; “List of Identifications,” *Corpus of British Medieval Library Catalogues*, U. of Oxford, <http://www.history.ox.ac.uk/research/project/british-medieval-library-catalogues.html>, 933. It is described in this list as a “manuale peccati et xii articuli fidei” (933).
- 169 Barratt, “Spiritual,” 354; List of Identifications,” 933. But Hanna and Turville-Petre qualify this identification, stating that “perhaps the Augustinians of Leicester” owned a copy (“The Catalogue,” 94). In *Anglo-Norman in the Cloisters: The Influence of the Orders upon Anglo-Norman Literature* (Edinburgh U. Press, 1950), Mary Dominica Legge expresses the same reservation (116).
- 170 Barratt, “Spiritual,” 354.

- 171 Barratt, "Spiritual," 354. Cavanaugh, "Study," 129.
- 172 Stacey Gee, "At the Sygne of the Cardynalles Hat': The Book Trade and the Market for Books in Yorkshire, c. 1450–1550," (PhD thesis, U. of York, 1999), *ProQuest* (U117066), 265.
- 173 William Creyke, "Excerpts from Ancient Wills," in *Transactions of the Essex Archaeological Society*, ed. H. W. King, vol. 3 (Colchester: Wiles & Son, 1889), 232. Barratt, "Spiritual," 354.
- 174 Of the manuscript produced for the laity, E and Pr were both produced in the thirteenth century, and S in the early fourteenth century. Of those produced for the clergy, G was produced in the thirteenth century, and H and D in the early fourteenth century.
- 175 Bennett, "A Book," 173.
- 176 These are the copies described above as F, Pr, Malling, and Moxby.
- 177 Claire Waters, *Translating Clergie: Status, Education, and Salvation in Thirteenth-Century Vernacular Texts* (Philadelphia: U. of Pennsylvania Press, 2016), 5.
- 178 See, for example, copies Pc, V, and Y.
- 179 Arnould, *Manuel*, 290.
- 180 Taubman, "Clergy," 49.
- 181 Important studies for challenging this paradigm include Richard Ingham, "The Persistence of Anglo-Norman 1230–1362: A Linguistic Perspective," in *Language and Culture in Medieval Britain: The French of England, c. 1100–c. 1500*, ed. Jocelyn Wogan-Browne et al. (Woodbridge: York Medieval, 2009), 239–53; Serge Lusignan, "Le français médiéval: perspectives historiques sur une langue plurielle," in *L'introuvable unité du français: Contacts et variations linguistiques en Europe et en Amérique (XIIe–XVIIIe siècle)*, ed. Serge Lusignan et al. (Laval: Presses de l'U. Laval, 2011), 5–107; and Jocelyn Wogan-Browne, "The Invisible Archive: Later Medieval French in England," *Speculum* 90 (2015): 653–73.
- 182 See, for example, Nicholas Watson and Jocelyn Wogan-Browne, "The French of England: The *Compileison*, *Ancrene Wisse*, and the Idea of Anglo-Norman," *Journal of Romance Studies* 4 (2004): 35–59; William Rothwell, "Sugar and Spice and All Things Nice: From Oriental Bazar to English Cloister in Anglo-French," *Modern Language Review* 94 (1999): 647–59; and William Rothwell, "Husbandrie and Manaungerie in Later Medieval England: A Tale of Two Walters," in *The Anglo-Norman Language and Its Contexts* (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2010), 44–51.