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ABSTRACT

The Middle English *Three Kings of Cologne* is a translation (c. 1400) of the *Historia trium Regum* (1364-75) attributed to John of Hildesheim, a much copied work setting the story of the biblical Magi in a wider context.

The edition of C. Horstmann (EETS, 1886) printed parallel texts of abridged English versions. With the discovery of many new MSS -- 20 manuscripts of the 15thC and several early prints are now known -- it is possible to define the stemmatic relationships within each of Horstmann's three groups, and to clarify the relations between the groups. Notably, the Royal MS is confirmed as the archetype of the 1st group; subgroups of the 2nd group are defined; the archetype of the 3rd group is identified as Stonyhurst MS B.23; and the 1st group text is shown to depend directly on a 3rd group base.

The present edition presents a diplomatic transcription of Durham MS Hunter 15 pt.2, of particular interest among the recently discovered witnesses as being the unique, albeit defective, witness of an unabridged version of the translation. The many thousands of words of hitherto unpublished text contain antedatings and other lexicographic discoveries. However, the identification of this witness further complicates the evolutionary problems relating to the text, the central dilemma being whether the unabridged version is the primary version of the translation or whether an abridged translation was later...
expanded. On a number of grounds, including an analysis of a number of closely related Latin versions, the present study argues in favour of the latter alternative, a conclusion which has obvious bearing on the edition of the text. Finally the problems surrounding the nature of the prototype abridgement are explored, if not fully resolved (Horstmann's verso text is probably the closest approximation to this prototype).

A better understanding of the Latin MS tradition allows a reconstruction of the exemplar used by the ME translator, and permits a detailed examination of the problems of translation. The Latin text printed in parallel with the Durham version aims to reconstruct this exemplar.

This thesis is thus principally the study of a manuscript tradition. However the Latin original, which attained widespread distribution in the 15thC, constitutes an important document concerning the extent of contemporary Western knowledge and interest in the historical, religious, and cultural background of the Orient, matters which are covered in the annotations. The present edition includes a fresh examination of the author's sources, with a tentative reconstruction of a lost source.

A summary of other ME versions of HTR, and a survey of the other works included in the Durham MS, are also included.
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PRELIMINARY REMARKS

Folio numbers unless otherwise stated refer to the Hunter MS, superscript "v" indicating the verso and the absence of a superscript letter indicating the recto, the left and right hand columns on a page being further distinguished as "a" and "b" respectively. References to the printed texts in Horstmann's edition are by page and line (an oblique stroke separating the two), or, especially in the case of the Latin text, by page and footnote (in which case the second number is distinguished by the addition of an "n").

"The author" refers to the composer of the original work; "the translator" to the hand who composed the abridged English translation (as opposed to the F-editor, who was responsible for the unabridged version); "the scribe" to the scribe of Durham MS Hunter, pt.2. The text of the original work is commonly referred to as "the original" or "the Latin"; however in its archetypal (authorial) form it is referred to as "the original Latin", as opposed to the text available to the translator, which is termed "the (translator's) exemplar".

Bibliographic details are given at the end of the section or note in which the first citation of a work appears, and again in the full listing in WORKS CITED. The form of documentation for the most part follow the recommendations of the MLA style manual.

STANDARD BIBLIOGRAPHIC ABBREVIATIONS

Square brackets enclose conventional titles. Full bibliographic details for the less familiar items are to be found in WORKS CITED.

Linguistic abbreviations are listed in the introduction to GLOSSARY. Common abbreviations generally follow MLA guidelines and are not listed.

BC [Book of Cologne], ed. Röhricht and Meisner.
EJ Encyclopaedia Judaica.
ERE Encyclopaedia of religion and ethics.
Hm. Horstmann, The Three Kings of Cologne.
IMEP Index of Middle English prose.
LALME Linguistic atlas of late Middle English.
MED Middle English Dictionary.
MV Monneret de Villard, Le leggende orientali. . .
OCD Oxford classical dictionary (2nd ed.).
ODCC Oxford dictionary of the Christian Church (2nd ed.).
Peake Peake's Commentary on the Bible (ed. Black).
PG [Patriologia Graeca].
PL [Patriologia Latina].
RMLW Revised Medieval Latin word-list.
STC Short-title catalogue . . . (2nd ed.).
.xi.
GLOSSARY OF SPECIAL TERMS

A-additions: short passages of original matter preserved in the A-text firstly, as well as in other related versions
A-subgroup: a branch of the 2nd group
A-text: the reconstructed archetypal text of the A-subgroup; characterised by the presence of A-additions
B-subgroup: a closely related group of inferior MSS of the 2nd group
B-text: the reconstructed archetypal text of the B-subgroup; characterised by the absence of A-additions
F-base: the abridged text which served as base for the F-text
F-editor: the hand responsible for producing the F-text
F-text: the prototype of the unabridged tradition, of which F is the sole witness
K-text: the primitive text reconstructed from K and the B-text; characterised by the absence of A-additions
non-A witnesses: those 2nd group witnesses not belonging to the A-subgroup (i.e. K and the B-subgroup)
R-base: the R-editor's base text
R-editor: the 1st group editor, i.e. the hand responsible for producing the 1st group (or R-)version
R-exemplar: the Latin exemplar used by the R-editor
R-text: the text in R; the archetypal text of the 1st group
Y-additions: supplementary passages characteristic of the Y-text
Y-text: the text in Y; the archetypal text of the 3rd group
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1 THE AUTHOR

1.1. Sources

The information we possess on the life and writings of John of Hildesheim is summarised most accessibly in the introduction to Hm. (xiiff) and, in more up-to-date form, in Worstbrock and Harris.

The main primary sources are the works of later commentators, the earliest of which, the De viris illustribus . . . of Arnoldus Bostius of Ghent, was composed c1475, in other words a century after John of Hildesheim's death. These sources are listed in the secondary literature (Hm. xii, Worstbrock and Harris 638, Harris (1954) xi-xii). I have not always had the opportunity to make an independent examination of the primary sources, so my remarks in the present chapter are necessarily dependent to an extent on the secondary literature. My preliminary examination of a large number of MSS of the Historia trium Regum has not revealed anything that in any major way adds to or contradicts the evidence gathered in the literature.

The details furnished by the commentators can be supplemented by internal evidence in John of Hildesheim's correspondence and other writings -- though perhaps not as fully as a biographer might wish, since the correspondence seems to belong primarily to the genre of the literary or moral epistle (perhaps modelled on the Letters of Seneca, a classical author whom John of Hildesheim evidently admired; see e.g. letters 31,
33). Such information as can be extracted is gathered and analysed in the introduction to Hendricks's edition of the correspondence.

Further background information is found in the secondary literature: for example, Di Nola's introduction to his translation adumbrates the author's context, while Christern (1959/60) critically reviews the source material and adds biographical details concerning Florentius of Wevelinghoven, the person to whom the story of the Three Kings is dedicated (concerning whom Colberg's article in Stammler supplies further details).


1.2. Title and authorship of the *Historia trium Regum* (HTR)

1.2.1. The external evidence

The headings in the Latin MSS and prints of the story of the Three Kings vary considerably (see Hm. ix/xi). For convenience the title *Historia trium Regum* (HTR) is adopted by modern scholarship. This is the form in which the title appears in MS clm 14186, which is also one of the rare witnesses to contain a statement of authorship (*Johannes Hildesiensis carmelitae historia trium regum*). Otherwise we are dependent on the statements of later commentators such as Bostius (1445-99) and Trithemius (1462-1516) for the attribution (Hm. xii-xiii; Harris (1954) xi). Bostius lists among John of Hildesheim's works a *De tribus regibus*. Trithemius in his entry on the author notes that John of Hildesheim wrote a *prolixum volumen De tribus sanctis regibus* dedicated to *Florencium episcopum monasteriensem 'Florentius bishop of Münster'* (Harris (1954) xi). As a small proportion of the MSS preserve, usually after the table of
contents (see Hm. 211), a dedication to Florencio de Wevelkouen [i.e. Wevelinghoven, NE of Cologne] Monasteriensis ecclesie episcopo dignissimo, this reference identifies the work unambiguously, but still amounts only to saying that in Trithemius's day the work we know as HTR was attributed to John of Hildesheim; to clinch the assignation of authorship, we would need to be certain that the commentator based his remark on independent evidence (see further at 1.5 below).

(HTR. Jo(h)annes (John) of Hildesheim. Historia trium Regum. Hm. 206-312.


1.2.2. The case against the accepted authorship

The statements of later commentators provide the main evidence for assigning the authorship of HTR to John of Hildesheim. There is no explicit statement of authorship in the work, nor is there any indication in John of Hildesheim's correspondence (which is unquestionably genuine) that he was contemplating such a work or that he had any interest at all in the subject of the Three Kings. The extant corpus of correspondence contains no letter indicating any relation between John of Hildesheim and Florentius of Wevelinghoven. There is one passage in HTR that seems to furnish a specific link with the career of John of Hildesheim, and that is the reference at the end of ch.34 to the princes of Vaus at Avignon in 1351; the passage seems to derive from personal observation, and as we know
from his biography that John of Hildesheim was present at the Papal Curia in Avignon around this time, this reference seems to provide one convincing, though still circumstantial piece of internal evidence for the accepted authorship. Aside from this reference there is little evidence in the work either to support or refute the accepted authorship. On the basis of internal evidence alone it would not be possible to deduce much more about the author than that he was alive and composing the work sometime between c1349 (internal dates and references; see 1.5.3) -- or 1364, if the dedication is accepted as original -- and 1389 (date of the earliest German translation of the work), that he held orthodox views, had access to a variety of sources including recent accounts of travels in the Near East, and as well, perhaps, had some connections with Florentius of Wevelinghoven (and with Cologne, as implied by the use of the word *patrie* '(our) homeland' in the context of 306/n20: (Indi) vltierius Coloniam transire desiderarent si frigus et statum patrie possent tollerare).

It would seem from the previous discussion that there is a case to be made for challenging the accepted authorship. Hendricks's reference to the work as "the history of the Three Kings which has been handed down under his [John of Hildesheim's] name" indicates his scepticism on the subject (116; cf. Christern (1959/60) 43-44). Hendricks's ostensible reasons for his reservations are primarily stylistic: he notes that "the Latin of the Historia trium regum differs rather much from that of the letters . . . so that, judging from the style, one would not easily ascribe them to the same author" (116-17). Certainly the
ornate and rather distinctive style characteristic of the letters, not to mention their humanist content, finds little echo in HTR. However the stylistic evidence is equivocal, as the same author can adopt different styles for different genres, and so offers no conclusive evidence for separate authorship. But apart from stylistic differences between the correspondence and HTR, the latter reflects surprisingly little of the background and career of the historical John of Hildesheim. An additional consideration is that John of Hildesheim was a writer of evident distinction and copious and varied literary output, so his name could have suggested itself to later commentators in the attribution of authorship to anonymous works.

All in all there seems to be a prima facie case for rejecting the accepted authorship, or perhaps for limiting John of Hildesheim's role to the transmission of the information concerning the Princes of Vaus, as well perhaps as the discovery at Avignon or elsewhere of their "books", which the compiler of HTR cites among his sources (see 3.3.3). It is interesting to record that in the same period there was another John of Hildesheim, younger than our John, also a baccalaureus biblicus, but a conventual of the Strasbourg monastery, where he died in 1384 (Hendricks 132-33); if one were seeking a specific alternative candidate for the authorship, one might look no further than this figure.

However, the fact remains that the case against the accepted authorship rests on speculation revolving around stylistic criteria, arguments from silence and so on, and as such does not
constitute a convincing refutation. Consequently in the present study HTR will continue to be described as the work of John of Hildesheim. However it has perhaps been of some value to assess the weight of the evidence for and against the accepted authorship. Much writing in the past concerning various aspects of HTR has proceeded on the assumption that the author of the work is the John of Hildesheim familiar from the primary sources, and it is worth bearing in mind the limitations of the evidence on which this assumption rests. An alternative analysis of the same issues that started from the assumption that HTR is not the work of John of Hildesheim might at least offer some new perspectives.

1.3. Life of John of Hildesheim

John of Hildesheim's birth is placed between 1310 and 1320. That he was actually born at Hildesheim seems to be a matter of dispute (see Hm. xii-xiii; Harris (1954) xii); but in a letter he refers to himself as Johannes de Brulone, which seems to be a reference to a district Brühl in the city of Hildesheim (Hendricks 124/n17). According to Oudinus his surname was Gleuel (Boisserée 264); however it is noteworthy that a John of Gluel is recorded as having been appointed prior at Strasbourg after John of Hildesheim (Hendricks 129), which suggests the possibility that Oudinus confused the two Johns. His studies and his career in the Carmelite order took him successively to Marienau (W of Hildesheim), Avignon (c1351 and later), Paris (1358-61), Kassel (1361-64), Strasbourg (1364-68), Rome (in 1367), Spires (after 1368), and back to Marienau, where he was prior of the convent.
till his death in 1375 (Hm. xii-xiii; Worstbrock and Harris 638; Harris (1954) xii). Another perspective on his biography is provided by the correspondence he maintained with many influential political and literary figures, which incidentally attests to his importance as one of the first in Germany to betray the influence of the new Italian Humanism (cf. Worstbrock and Harris: "[Er darf] zu den ersten in Deutschland zählen, die für die Zeichen einer neuen literarischen Kultur bei den Italienern empfänglich waren" (639); cf. 640-41). Trithemius in his Catalogus illustrium virorum speaks highly of John of Hildesheim not only as a theologian and scholar but also as a philosopher, poet, and preacher: the entry, which also lists the author's works, is worth quoting (note that the text as cited in Harris (1954) xi under the title Catalogus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum seems somewhat fuller):

John of Hildesheim's correspondence amply confirms the testimony of the commentators concerning the author's eloquence and learning. On the other hand it would probably be going too far to draw too close a connection between these wider influences and the composition of HTR. The assumption that John's scholarship, career, and connections brought him in contact with a wealth of sources which made him eminently qualified for the task of writing the work before us is an exaggeration in my opinion and not really borne out in the work itself. On the contrary it is notable that contemporary references which cannot be traced back to the author's limited number of sources are exceptional; that there is little in his work that can be directly linked to his travels or his personal experiences; and that given his career and the opportunities it afforded he made surprisingly little use of the sources which he would presumably have had access to, and relied instead for the most part on ones that would have been as readily available in his homeland as anywhere else. This indeed could be taken as further evidence against the accepted authorship.


1.4. Works

The earliest reference to John of Hildesheim's works is in Bostius, where the following list of titles appears: Fons Vitae; *De Antichristo; De tribus Regibus; *Contra Iudaeos; *Contra
quendam turpia pingentem; *De modernis monstruosis abusionibus ("in verse"); Liber epistolarum 80; Dialogus inter directorem et detractorem de ordine carmelitarum. The works marked with an asterisk are no longer extant, though a reference in letter 48 to De monstruosis abusionibus confirms the authenticity of this entry (Hendricks 224). Comparison of Bostius's list with the previously cited passage from Trithemius allows certain other items to be added to the list; at the same time it reveals parallels in the order of listing in the two commentators, suggesting that the two sources are not entirely independent. In the codex containing the letters appears a work listed under the title Epistola sive Collatio de morte et fine, which the editor prefers to regard as a sermon rather than a letter, and a Notabilia super Iob, which he suggests may also be by the author (Hendricks 118, 119).

The Dialogus was printed in 1680, the Fons Vitae is unpublished, and the corpus of over 100 separate letters is divided between two collections, one of which has been edited by Hendricks, and another which is unpublished (Worstbrock and Harris 639-41; cf. Hm. xiii. For the corpus of correspondence see Hendricks 117-23). That so little survives of the writings of an author of John of Hildesheim's evident contemporary success and distinction, and that those that do generally survive only in unique witnesses, is perhaps surprising. Certainly it is clear from the number of surviving MSS that HTR was by far the author's most popular work.
1.5. The date of HTR

The standard termini for the date of composition of HTR are 1364-75: the author died in 1375 (Hm. xiii; Harris (1954) xi), and in the dedication Florentius of Wevelinghoven is referred to as bishop of Münster, an office he entered upon in 1364.

There have been attempts to date the work more precisely. The suggestion that HTR was composed to celebrate the 200th anniversary of the translation of the relics of the Three Kings to Cologne by Rainald of Dassau in 1164 (e.g. Worstbrock and Harris 642/III.1) is attractive, especially as it means that a work finished that year could have served at the same time as an inaugural gift for the new bishop of Münster; nevertheless it remains speculative.

Behland on the other hand questions the validity of the dedication as a criterion for the establishment of the terminus post quem. Noting that not all MSS preserve the dedication, he suggests that the author composed the work before 1364, and that the words monasteriensis ecclesie episcopo dignissimo are an insertion into copies of the work completed after Florentius's new appointment. Having rejected the evidence of the dedication, he falls back on other internal evidence which by his argument would push the earlier terminus back to 1361.

This again seems to be a speculative argument. There is little justification either on internal or external grounds for questioning the authenticity of the dedication in the form transmitted in the MSS and prints. A dedication to some person or persons is implied by the words vestro iussu 'at your bidding' in ch.1 in reference to the composition of the work -- words
which occur even in texts (such as that printed in this edition) which lack the dedication. Furthermore, while it is true that only a minority of MSS preserve the dedication, those that do so preserve it in the same wording; there is none I have seen which refers to Florentius by any other title, or without a title, nor any that preserve a dedication to some other person.

In any case there are problems in accepting the internal evidence that Behland prefers. He notes that the latest date to be found in the text is 1361, for which he cites the reference to the reigning emperor of Tartary (300/n2); however, as I interpret it, the reading of the text at this point in his MS is in fact 1340 (nor have I been able to find the date 1361 elsewhere in the text). It is nevertheless true that the MSS of HTR have different readings at 300/n2, such as 1340, 1341, and 1371. This illustrates the problem with this sort of evidence, namely the notorious unreliability of dates, and numerals generally, in manuscript traditions. Of the dates in the text, the most recent are 1341 (found three times -- at 266/7, the church columns; 284/n22, the uprising in Egypt; 300/n21, the emperor of Tartary) and 1351 (at 260/5, the princes of Vaus at the curia Romana). Only for the reference at 260/5 is there any basis for independent verification: we have seen that John of Hildesheim is believed to have been at Avignon at this time, so it is not implausible that this piece of information derives from personal observation. One indisputable terminus post quem is provided by the allusion to the pestilencia in istis partibus (284/n26); it is known that the Black Death reached Germany and the Low
Countries in 1349. Apart from the last two references the dates cited above derive from the sources of HTR, and as the relationships between the HTR and its sources have not been fully elucidated, perhaps all this evidence amounts to is the truism that HTR is no earlier than its sources. In short, the only incontrovertible evidence for an alternative date for the early terminus is the evidence of events for which external evidence is available; in other words, we can feel sure that the work was not composed earlier than 1349, or 1351 if the MS reading at 260/5 is accepted as reliable.

2.1. The early history of the text

2.1.1. MSS and prints

The popularity of John of Hildesheim's story of the Three Kings is attested by the large number of extant MSS, editions, and vernacular versions. Some sixty MSS in the original language are cited in published listings, the fullest being Hm. x-xi, BC 6-7, MV 182-83; but these are simply the more accessible, and the total number of surviving MSS is likely to be considerably higher. In addition, a number of printed editions are reported: at Mainz (or Cologne?) in 1477, 1478, and 1486; Cologne, 1481 (the readings of this witness are cited in Hm. under the siglum P); Modena, 1490; Cologne, 1514 and 1517 -- see Hm. xi; MV 182-3/n2.

At the same time it is interesting to note that the earliest print was not in Latin but in German (Augsburg, 1476; see Worstbrock and Harris 645/4c), an indication of popular interest in the story (MV 183/n2).


2.1.2. **Vernacular versions**

HTR was translated into German no fewer than seven times (this is the figure given in Harris (1958) 366; the later analysis in Worstbrock and Harris 644-45/4 appears to identify six groups); in all over 40 witnesses survive. The version dedicated to Frau Elisabeth of Katzenelnubogen (widow of Eberhard III of Erbach) and dated 1389 is apparently the earliest (Worstbrock and Harris 645/4a), and so the earliest version in any vernacular, and indeed the earliest witness of the text.

Two distinct English prose translations survive: one is the widely diffused version here termed the "standard" Three Kings of Cologne (3KCol), dated by Hm. "about (before rather than after) 1400" (viii), and represented by the text in the present edition as well as the versions in Hm. (over 20 witnesses in all); the other is an independent and probably slightly later translation, preserved, apart from an excerpt in Huntington MS 114, uniquely in Lambeth Palace MS 491. The English tradition is dealt with in detail in INTRODUCTION 4.

There are also extant early Dutch (Delft, 1478/9), Flemish (Antwerp, 1530), Danish(?), and French versions (Hm. x/n3; Harris (1954) xxxiii-xxxv; Di Nola 64. For the French tradition see Hm. x/n3 and compare Elissagaray 79ff).


Harris, Sylvia C. "German translations of the 'Historia Trium Regum' by Johannes de Hildesheim". *MLR* 53 (1958): 364-73.)
2.2. The rediscovery of the work

The vast majority of the MSS and prints, both Latin and vernacular, are of the 15thC and early 16thC. The work seems to have passed from early popularity into almost complete obscurity in the 17thC and 18thC, and was not rediscovered and reidentified until early in the 19thC. The credit for the rediscovery belongs to the German poet J.W. Goethe. The story can be traced in the correspondence between Goethe and Boisserée; Christern (1958) assembles this and other relevant material.

In 1818 Goethe wrote a letter to the art collector and historian Sulpiz Boisserée telling of his discovery of a Latin MS containing an unknown account of the Three Kings. He spoke enthusiastically of the work, describing it as a Volksbuch (for which term see Harris (1954) xxxix-xl) containing an engaging concoction of fact and fable:

Geschichte, Überlieferung, Möglicheres, Unwahrscheinliches, Pabelhaftes mit Natürlichem, Wahrscheinlichem, Wirklichem bis zur letzten und individuellsten Schilderung zusammen geschmolzen, entwaffnet wie ein Märchen alle Kritik. ... genug ich wüsste kein Volksbuch neben dem dieses Büchlein nicht stehen konnte. (Boisserée 255)

After a month's research and with the aid of Crombach's Primitiae genium Boisserée was able to identify both text and author and to supply Goethe with many further details (Boisserée 256-64; Hm. ix-x must be mistaken in stating that Crombach scorns to mention HTR. Goethe's three articles on "Die Heiligen Drei Könige" originally published in Uber Kunst und Altertum are collected in Beutler's edition of his works, 14: 287-99).

Boisserée later discovered in a MS at Heidelberg a German translation of the work, and arranged for the young poet and
scholar Gustav Schwab to prepare a modernised text based on this version and the Latin text in Goethe's MS (Boisseree 267ff; for the Heidelberg MS see Harris (1954) xxxi). Some years later another philologist interested in such Volksbücher, K. Simrock, found a text of the 1389 German translation and an old print, and published a modernised version (see Harris (1954) xl).

Other scholars brought to light new Latin witnesses. In his Dreikoenigenbuch (1864), H.I. Floss published the location of a number of MSS and prints, and in 1878 Köpke brought out an edition of the work based on an early Latin MS, the Brandenberg MS (now in Berlin), one of those containing a text which Horstmann was to characterise as the short version. New Latin MSS continued to emerge, in particular two MSS relevant to the English versions, and Horstmann, disappointed in aspects of Köpke's edition (Hm. xi/n2), published a fresh and more ambitious edition while still retaining the same "short version" as his primary text (curiously, on the question of how or when the English versions themselves came to light I can find no information in Hm. or elsewhere).

The remainder of this chapter will be devoted to a critique of Horstmann's standard edition of HTR.
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2.3. Horstmann's edition

2.3.1. Overview

The edition of the Three Kings of Cologne which Horstmann published in 1886 for EETS contains, in addition to parallel texts of the English versions, an edition of two versions of the the Latin text, plus an introduction covering many aspects of the work. His edition proved a landmark, and remains the standard text and the nearest approach we have to a critical edition both of the English versions and of the Latin (see Hm. xii). Although the introductory material has in some respects been superseded by subsequent research, it remains a valuable source of information on the author, the MSS, and the legend of the Three Kings.

The edition is thus a great contribution to scholarship. All scholars who work in this area owe a huge debt to Horstmann for his singlehanded labours on both the Latin and English versions. Not only did he assemble information from a diverse array of arcane sources, but his texts were transcribed and edited according to the highest standards of accuracy and
scholarship. The edition represented an enormous advance in the field, and my own work has been immeasurably aided by the existence of this printed text. I stress this because I want to make it clear that if my subsequent remarks at times point to what I see as areas of weakness in the edition it is in no way my intention to denigrate the work as a whole. Subsequent research inevitably finds gaps and faults in the efforts of earlier scholars; but if my remarks seem overly critical of aspects of Horstmann's edition I would wish them to be taken in the context of my overall regard for his work and the standards he incorporated in his edition.

2.3.2. Two versions of the Latin text

2.3.2.1. Horstmann's recension

Horstmann based his edition of the Latin on the same MS as Köpke had used (collating it with a second very similar witness); however the version in these two MSS was shorter than that found in the majority of MSS, and he added the readings of the generally received wider text in the form of discontinuous footnotes, thus including what amounts to a second text in parallel at the foot of the page. The decision to present the texts in this manner came about as the result of conclusions Horstmann reached from his recension of an unspecified number of MSS:
I have only seen part of the MSS. [of the Latin]; but so far as I can see, they differ very much. There are at least 2 versions: one with a far shorter and simpler text . . . [extant in two MSS]; here the biblical text is only intimated, not executed, the digressions are mostly abridged or sketched, or wholly omitted, the style is simple and clear, so that it looks like a first draught, though some of the omissions are mentioned in the index [i.e. the table of contents at the head of the work]. The vast majority of the MSS. contain a widely-enlarged text, in which all the details are broadly executed, and many digressions added, in a style made pompous by accumulations, doublings and treblings of words, circumlocutions and repetitions, so that the clear sense is stifled under verbosity, and frequently obscured. The latter became the generally-received text, and was printed in the old editions. It seems that the former version contains the first text, from which the wider was formed; but it is to be noted that some of the very oldest MSS already contain the wider text. (xii)

The editor goes on to say that he leaves open the question of which is the original version, contenting himself with reprinting the shorter version, and with adding the readings of the "common text", especially for the MSS extant in England (his C and CC) as being of importance for the English version. This longer version "common text" is the one that appears in the footnotes, and will be discussed in more detail later; let us however first examine more closely the validity of the opinions Horstmann formed concerning the relationship between the different versions of the Latin text.

2.3.2.2. Horstmann's views on the short version

The reader may detect a certain ambivalence in the tenor of the arguments put forward in the passage cited above. On the one hand the editor gives his opinion that the short version -- only found in two MSS -- represents the first text, or a first draft, and so implicitly justifies his printing of the version
in those MSS as the primary text. On the other hand the passage is replete with qualifications: only a portion of the MSS has been examined; the vast majority of MSS, including some of the very oldest, contain the enlarged text; passages omitted in the short version are nevertheless mentioned in the table of contents. His final conclusion seems to be that the question of which version is original is still open.

A careful reading of this passage leaves one with the impression that the editor had a higher regard for the shorter version primarily because of that version's perceived literary merits ("the style is simple and clear"; cf., of the widely enlarged text, "the clear sense is stifled under verbosity"); internal evidence and the evidence offered by the MSS tradition seem to have been secondary considerations. Yet it is evident that in traditions that survive in two versions, one shorter and one longer, there is implicit dilemma regarding the question of originality, in judging which stylistic arguments can appear rather subjective. One might question why it should be assumed in the first instance that the longer text evolved by a process of expansion at the hands of some person intent, for reasons best known to himself, on tricking out a satisfactory text with endless insertions of obscure and repetitious material. One might equally well argue the reverse, that the shorter version arose as a result of an understandable impulse of readers and copyists in any age to moderate the excesses of a wordy and diffuse original by judicious use of precis and excision. Perhaps we might have expected the arguments in favour of the
latter at face value equally plausible alternative explanation to have at least received an airing, especially as the editor had other grounds for reservation, even if for practical purposes his ultimate decision was in favour of printing the shorter version as the base text.

As it turns out subsequent progress in tracing the immediate sources of HTR has lent support to the alternative explanation of the evolution of the text. These sources will be discussed more fully in the next chapter. Here it suffices to note that on many occasions the author of HTR lifted long passages almost word for word from his sources, where close comparison reveals that the verbal correspondences are invariably with the fuller text of HTR, not with the text in the shorter version. This effectively delivered the coup de grace to the notion of the primacy of the shorter version, for, as Harris (1959) makes clear:

No one would take the trouble to seek Johannes' sources in order to enlarge upon his already lengthy account which, on the other hand, benefits by being cut down, since much wearisome repetition and circumlocution is omitted from the shorter text. (27; cf. (1954) xx)

So with the wisdom of hindsight Horstmann's favouring of the short version may seem a little capricious. However in his defence it should be noted that printed versions of these sources were not then generally available. He may or may not have known of Ludolf of Sudheim's Description of the Holy Land; in any case Deycks's edition, published in 1851, presented HTR as one of Ludolf's sources rather than the reverse (I have not had an opportunity to examine this particular edition of the work, and owe this information on the editor's views to Harris -- Harris
(1954) vii, (1959) 25-26). As for the other main source, the so-called Book of Cologne, a printed edition of the complete text did not appear until the year after Horstmann's edition of HTR was published. One cannot help feeling that if these two sources had been readily available for comparison, Horstmann would not have failed to appreciate the implications of their evidence, and may well have revised his conclusions in consequence; in which case we might now have access to a more convenient form of -- though it should be stressed, not essentially a different version of -- the text of HTR.


2.3.2.3. A fresh perspective on the short version

As a result of these source studies it is now generally accepted that the longer version of HTR is the original one (Worstbrock and Harris 643/III.2). But the impact of Horstmann's seminal analysis lives on. The very edition as he presented it, with the text divided on every page into two parts, reinforces the notion of two versions of the work, so that scholarly literature (e.g. Worstbrock and Harris 643/III.2) continues to speak of HTR as a text which survives in at least two versions. My contribution will be to question the whole notion of a rigid
division of the tradition into a langer Redaktion and a verkürzte, basing my remarks on a more extensive recension than appears to have been undertaken by Horstmann.

To begin it is helpful to give an updated perspective on the textual tradition of HTR. As previously noted, some sixty MSS of the work as well as several prints are cited in printed listings; however merely by following up these citations the number of MSS which I have been able to locate and examine cursorily from microfilm copies has risen to over one hundred (and I might note in passing that distance and limited resources have prevented me consulting any but the most accessible bibliographic tools; consequently there is no reason to believe that the recension is yet complete, as the known total of extant copies continues to rise through chance discoveries).

Now it is difficult to gain a clear impression of just how many witnesses Horstmann examined. Obviously for a start there is the base and the witnesses cited for their variant readings -- B, C, CC, P, and F (Hm. 206). But he admits that there were many MSS that he did not collate, such as those at Munich (the largest single collection, though as it turns out not all containing texts of HTR), and apparently those at Vienna. He lists four in Berlin, two of which he used. The Treves MS he mentions only to dismiss. There are also the prints. All in all it would not be unreasonable to conclude that the number of witnesses with which he had the opportunity to acquire a detailed familiarity was not altogether large (even though phrases like "the vast majority of the MSS" (Hm. xii) might seem to belie this impression).
In truth we cannot make an accurate estimate on the basis of his own statements. Nevertheless if we total the witnesses that he specifies individually, it turns out that there are in all some 32 MSS, plus a number of prints, for which he has some information, even if this only amounts to a location and number. So even if we assume that he had at his disposal for each one of these texts the information as to whether any particular one was "long version" or "short version", it does not seem possible that his analysis of the tradition could have been based on the evidence of a much higher number of witnesses than this.

Now in handwritten traditions it is common to discover instances where the original version of a text has been altered and transformed in an arbitrary manner, often on more than one occasion, by the various scribes who played a part in the textual transmission, so that the text ended up circulating in a number of transformed versions, each generating its own subtradition (such for example being the case with 3KCol, as we will see). In the course of my independent recension of HTR I have discovered versions that survive in various forms of abridgement or textual degeneration. In fact abridgements of various types and degrees are not uncommon in this tradition, and the version preserved in Horstmann's two "short version" texts would more accurately be classified as just another, perhaps rather radical example. However what is also apparent from a wider recension is that these two texts appear to be the only surviving exemplars of that version: no other MSS have to date emerged that can be assigned to Horstmann's short version group.
One of the functions of recension is to attempt to group witnesses in a textually meaningful way, and the decisions an editor makes in classifying his texts will inevitably be to some extent subjective. However, when a text is extant in several dozen witnesses all of similar form, and two single exemplars survive representing the text in a much shorter form, it would seem questionable to maintain, without special reasons to support one's case, that the whole tradition should be conceived in terms of a fundamental cleavage between the text in that pair of exceptional witnesses on the one hand and all other witnesses on the other. Given that the primacy of Horstmann's "short version" can no longer be defended, and given the existence in the tradition of HTR of other abridged texts which can also be arranged in groups, it would make more sense to treat the version in these two witnesses simply as one modified version among others. Now it may be that Horstmann originally imagined that these witnesses were the accessible representatives of a more extensive subtradition, for which future research would uncover further evidence. However it seems by now unlikely that this will prove to be the case. Rather, the pair appear to be exceptional products of the tradition; they did not generate an independent subtradition, and consequently represent a dead end, so to speak, in evolutionary terms.

My own feelings in regard to the textual tradition of HTR are that, as the vast majority of MSS and prints are of the wider text, and as it is in this form that the earliest vernacular translators encountered it, it would be of advantage if henceforth this form of the text were recognised as the standard
text of HTR, and Horstmann's two MSS of the "short version", along with any other such anomalous versions, were relegated to a separate -- and secondary -- category of "abridged and altered versions". This would mean that as anomalous versions the latter would henceforth exert a much less significant and less central influence on the question of the original text of the work. It might even mean that the notion of two separate traditions could quietly be dropped from discussion, and future reference be made simply to the one standard version. In practice this would not only simplify discussion of the textual relations but pave the way for what would then emerge as the next issue, namely a new edition of HTR, based on a revised perception of the textual tradition as a whole and a fresh examination of both the older and the newly discovered witnesses.

As it is, Horstmann's editorial decisions had a number of practical consequences, some more fortunate than others.

2.3.3. The nature and value of Horstmann's text

2.3.3.1. The problem of format

The most obvious consequence is apparent in the matter of format. The reader who turns to the edition to consult the text in the form normally encountered, viz. the "common" or wider version, encounters an awkward typographic division of the text into two "bands", the running text (i.e. the "short version") as primary text and the footnotes representing the additions of the common text, so that at every few words the eyes must travel from
one area of the page to another. The arrangement is further complicated by the added element of variant readings. In practical terms the irksomeness of any prolonged consultation of the printed text as it stands was one of arguments in favour of the incorporation of a parallel and continuous text of the Latin in the present edition.

(Horstmann's decision to present the fuller text in the form of discrete footnotes seems curious all the same. One would have imagined that reproducing it in full, in continuous form, would have been simpler all round and less controversial. The decision was perhaps based on typographic considerations and intended to save space. In the circumstances the printed text, while awkward to consult, turns out to be remarkably accurate, the most common fault being occasional instances where variant readings are assigned to incorrect sigla.)

2.3.3.2. The establishment of the "common text"

The other consequence of Horstmann's editorial conclusions is that he never finished his recension, but established his common text on the basis of the examination of a limited number of witnesses and the selection of an even smaller number from among these as the source of his variant readings. The method by which the common text was establishing and the consequences of the limited recension will now be examined.
Let us consider first the constitution of the text. Horstmann does not actually specify how he arrived at his common text. Nevertheless it seems clear that he aimed to produce a consensus text, that is, a text arrived at by collating the witnesses and printing the agreed text, variant readings being noted where the witnesses differ. This evidently meant in practice that the editor did not feel obliged to record all variants, but just such variants as he considered significant.

It is not entirely clear how many witnesses form the basis of this common text. There are four sigla that repeatedly feature in the apparatus, viz. P, the print of Bartholomaeus de Unckel; F, apparently chosen for its early date; and the two MSS of English provenance, C and CC, chosen for their relevance to the English versions. However a note saying the editor gives "occasionally [the readings of] other MSS and prints" (Hm. 206) implies there were other witnesses which he consulted, though these are never cited in an identifiable way.

Now it turns out that the consequences of this limited recension are less serious than might seem. Indeed, further research suggests that the editor's selection of these four particular witnesses as a basis for the text reveals his shrewd instinct in evaluating the textual tradition. Although in the present state of research it is impossible to make a definitive classification of the tradition, it would seem that the witnesses selected by Horstmann for collation offer a broad representation of the spectrum of textual variation (specifically, P seems to belong to a late but widely representative group; CC represents the "English" branch of the tradition; C is a contaminated text,
part "P" and part "English"; and F, though itself an exemplar of mediocre value, belongs to what is perhaps the more original stratum of the text). In any case the decision to base the edition on the common text method is hard to fault given a tradition so vast and the enormous difficulties involved in attempting a complete recension. Indeed more extensive researches on the editor's part might actually have been counterproductive, since they would have delayed publication pending a more thorough recension which in the end might have produced a not appreciably superior or more original text -- to say nothing of the burden of the formidable apparatus which would have been generated in any attempt to arrive at a full critical edition.

2.3.3.3. A critique of Horstmann's "common text"

Thus in practice neither the limited recension nor the limited basis of the text constitute in themselves major faults in Horstmann's edition. It is true that there still exists no critical edition of the work; but the text as he published it was never specifically offered as a critical edition of HTR (it was perhaps given in the first instance as an adjunct to the study of the English versions). As previously noted, a full recension of this very popular text would have been extremely laborious and perhaps actually counterproductive. While the common text is selective in its variants, this limitation is probably felt more by the textual critic than by the general reader, who may feel more comfortable with a clear and unencumbered text.
For the specialist however there are a number of drawbacks in the way the text was edited. Enough has been said of the practical disadvantages of the typographic division between main text and footnotes; this is an primarily an inconvenience, and does not diminish the value of the common text as such. There are more basic faults. One is the problem of selectivity in the citation of variants, which on occasion results in well attested readings being given no mention at all in the apparatus (to give one example, at 218/n30 the reading \textit{flatus montis} is very common in the tradition and as such a valuable textual "marker"; but in Hm. it is not cited as a variant, clearly because the sense it gives is impossible). Rather more serious is the subordination of the tradition overall to the "short version" text. In textual terms this introduces a subtle bias in favour of the readings of the primary text (an example: in the same passage the printed text describes the mountain as \textit{spinosus et amenus} (219/n6) even though the reading \textit{spinosus} occurs nowhere but in the short version and all other texts give the contextually more appropriate \textit{formosus}).

A further blemish is perhaps to be attributed to haste. While the editor generally made perceptive choices between the variants when his witnesses presented a clear and unambiguous option, one also notices a tendency to skirt around difficulties, to avoid emendation, and to print mediocre or even impossible readings in cases where the original sense could not be immediately elicited on the basis of the clear superiority of one transmitted variant or on deduction from context. Now while emendation at this level is perhaps a higher art, it is the one
by which editors tend ultimately to be judged. Of course it is easy to find fault with the efforts of previous editors in particular cases. But here it is difficult not to feel a more general sense of disappointment that readings pass without comment which a greater degree of critical alertness would have signalled as inappropriate or even quite impossible in the context, and where an attempt at emendation or at least the recording of a note of warning might reasonably have been expected (examples include the reading *intrare* printed without comment at 213/n8; and the confused text at 218/n22ff).

However, this said, I would again like to dispel the notion that I am carping at Horstmann's overall achievement. Indeed I think I have said enough to indicate the debt owed to him not only for his elucidation of a difficult textual tradition (cf. Hm. xxi), but the many virtues which the edition displays. We have him to thank for a text which is printed and accessible; which is straightforward and uncluttered; which gives a reasonable indication of the range of variation in the text; which on the whole shows admirable soundness in choosing among the variants to be printed; and which represents the text in a state comparable to that in which it is preserved in the best of the surviving witnesses, and in fact which may not be too different from the text in its original, or at least archetypal, form. Indeed, whether we will ever come much closer to the archetypal text, at any rate without a great deal of further labour, is far from clear. A brief discussion of this question will occupy the final section in this chapter.
2.4. The present state of research

Horstmann's edition is not outdated, since it presents a full and plausible reconstruction of the text on the basis of a broad spectrum of witnesses. At this stage I can make no major recommendations for the direction of a reedition. At best I could point to better witnesses within the groupings represented by the four witnesses regularly cited in the apparatus of Hm. A reexamination of the text on the basis of these newer witnesses might clear away a number of the peculiar variant readings that remain in Hm. (though one of the advantages of the common text method is that peculiar readings tend to be eliminated automatically). Otherwise no progress can be expected until a great deal more work has been expended on examination and collation of the newer witnesses. On the face of it there seem to be no great surprises among the newer witnesses nor obvious signs that any of these texts are markedly superior to the ones already examined. This may stem partly from the fact -- surprising in itself -- that none of the earliest witnesses seem to be extant; among over a dozen MSS which can be precisely dated hardly one is earlier than the beginning of the 15thC, and so at least a quarter century later than the accepted terminus ante quem of the work (in fact the earliest witness is the 1389 German translation, but its textual value is diminished by the fact that it is a translation, and an abbreviated one at that). This may mean that the surviving exemplars are all to a greater or lesser extent secondary, and the original version of the text virtually beyond recovery.
In short there are still many outstanding problems concerning the text of HTR, and it remains to be seen whether there is any possibility of arriving at a text markedly superior to the one we possess in Hm.
3.1. The legend of the Three Kings

The first section of this chapter summarises the evolution of the legend of the Three Kings from the gospel account of the Magi to the work of John of Hildesheim. The history of the legend is treated in detail in Kehrer, MV, Kaplan 20ff, Elissagaray 11ff, and in summary form in Harris (1954) i-x, Harris (1959), and Christern (1959/60) 46-48. The outline which follows is necessarily selective and dependent in large part on the secondary literature. The development of particular motifs will be discussed in detail at appropriate points in NOTES.

The single gospel account of the visit of the Magi (Matt. 2) early attracted speculation surrounding these enigmatic figures. Subsequent elaboration often introduced traditions from non-Christian religions, and much variation is apparent in the development of individual motifs. For example in some Eastern traditions the number of the Magi is set at twelve (a tradition echoed in our account by the Twelve Astronomers on Mt. Vaus), and the gift of myrrh was commonly interpreted as a symbol of Christ the Doctor, a concept not familiar to medieval Europe and apparently of Manichean origin (MV 92, 104).

The identification of the Magi as kings develops early in the West. It probably has its basis in OT passages such as Isa. 60:3, and Ps. 72:10, "The kings of Tarshish and of the isles shall bring presents, the kings of Sheba and Seba shall offer gifts"; compare Tertullian's comment that 'the East regarded the
Magi almost as kings' (or 'generally as kings') (Adversus Marcionem 3.3: Reges Arabum et Saba munera offrent illi. Nam et Magos reges habuit fere Oriens). In artistic representation as early as the 2ndC and in written sources from St. Jerome their number is fixed at three, a figure presumably deriving from the three gifts and reinforced by the symbolism of the Trinity. However only much later do we encounter the familiar names Melchior, Balthazar, and Caspar (or Jaspar) (in the 9thC Excerpta Latina Barbari, 12thC Ps.-Bede Collectanea, and Peter Comestor's Historia Scholastica), or the explicit statement that the third King was black (see Harris (1954) ii; Freeman 66b, cf. 67a; MV 218/n1, 224; Hm. xv/n1. The origins of the motif of the black Magus are fully explored in Kaplan). Apocryphal gospels (e.g. the Protevangelium of James, Pseudo-Matthew, the Evangelium Infanciae, the Acts of Thomas) are the ultimate source of a number of motifs not found in Matthew.

A significant new component of the tradition makes its appearance in the West in a work known as the Opus Imperfectum in Mattheum (Op.Imperf.), a gospel commentary attributed to St. Chrysostom and perhaps composed in the 4thC or 5thC though apparently not widely known till the 13thC (see MV 20ff, 236). Here the Magi figure as twelve star gazers who keep an annual watch on the Mount of Victory for the Star prophesied in the 'Book of Seth'; the Star duly appears, 'having in it the form of a child and above the likeness of a cross' (or 'the Cross'), and commands the Magi to set out for Judea, a journey which they complete in two years without need for food or drink; when they
return to their kingdoms, they are visited in due course by St. Thomas, receive baptism at his hands, and become associates in his preaching (facti sunt adjutores praedicationis illius). Even from this summary one can recognise a number of motifs that reappear in HTR, for example the description of the Star (see 9v15-19) and the alternative name hille of victorie (mons Victorialis) for Mt. Vaus (see 4b17). A particularly significant aspect of this new strand is the introduction of a link between the story of the Kings and the legend of St. Thomas, whose missionary activities in the East figure prominently in various apocryphal gospels. Another figure who was to play an important role in the European concept of the Orient was Prester John; this fabulous ruler makes his appearance in documentary sources in the 12thC, and from the start his name was linked with the biblical Magi.

Western interest in the Three Kings increased markedly after their alleged relics came to light in Milan during the course of one of Frederick the Great's Italian campaigns and were brought to Cologne in 1164 by Reinald of Dassel Archbishop of Cologne (Harris (1954) iii-iv; MV 223ff. This much of the story of the relics is historical, whereas the accounts of the earlier translations are contradictory and generally held to be an elaboration after the event; the story of the original discovery of the relics by St. Helena is no doubt a pious fiction which attached itself to the name of this celebrated relic hunter -- see Freeman 68b-70a).
The subsequent efforts of various Western authors to complete the story of the lives and deeds of the Three Kings are detailed in Harris (1954) iv-x and xiv-xvii. One can trace in various 13thC and 14thC German sources the introduction of such motifs as Balaam's prophecy, the escape from Tharsus and Herod's revenge, the death and burial of the Kings, and the earlier translations of the relics, all of which appear in HTR (for comparable developments in French sources see Elissagaray 38-57). From Harris's researches it would seem that the main elements of the story were already fixed when John of Hildesheim came to write his account, though the traditions varied and were in some cases contradictory.

But before we turn to an assessment of his contribution in compiling what was to be virtually the last and at the same time the definitive medieval version of the legend, it is worthwhile to offer a summary of the story of the Three Kings as Johannes presents it.

(Freeman, Margaret B. *The story of the Three Kings.* NY: Metropolitan Museum of Art, 1955.


3.2. A summary of HTR

Table of contents.

Dedication to Florentius of Wevelinghoven Bishop of Münster: (ch.1) the fame of the Kings has spread from East to West, and their story is here compiled at your bidding. (ch.2) It begins with the prophecy of Balaam, "A Star shall arise of Jacob ...". (ch.3) A watch was kept for this Star upon the highest mountain in the East, Mt. Vaus (the Mount of Victory); and (ch.4) in later times when the crusader city of Acre was at the height of its prosperity, princes of the family of Vaus, descendants of King Melchior, came to this city, bringing with them books on which the present account is based. (ch.5) In due course the prophecies in the Jewish books of scripture became known to the Persians and Chaldeans, and the watch for the Star was intensified. (chs.6-7) In the fullness of time, as the gospel tells, Christ was born of Mary in Bethlehem, in the reign of King Herod. (ch.8) At the same hour the Star arose over Mt. Vaus, and a voice in the Star commanded the Kings to set out to find the new-born King of the Jews. (chs.9-13) Coming from their separate kingdoms, each of which was the source of one of the three Gifts, the Kings and their magnificent retinues traversed valley and mountain to complete their journey miraculously in thirteen days without need of food, drink, or rest. (chs.14-15) As the Kings approached Jerusalem a thick mist delayed Melchior until the other two Kings arrived; whereupon after an emotional meeting the Three Kings rode together into the city. (chs.16-18) The Kings learnt from Herod and the scribes of the birthplace of the Child, and set out for Bethlehem with the Star to guide them; on the way
they met the shepherds, who related their visitation by the Angelic Host. (ch.19) The Kings rode into Bethlehem to the manger, where by the dazzling light of the Star they offered the Child the first gifts that came to hand — gold, incense, and myrrh. (chs.20-23) The significance of the Three Gifts, and an account of the Apple of Gold.

(ch.24) The Kings rested in Bethlehem and related the story of their journey; then being warned against Herod in a dream they set off home by a different way. But Herod pursued them, and burnt the ships of the people of Tharshish when he found that they had ferried the Kings safely over the sea. (chs.25-26) Returning to Mt. Vaus after a journey of two years the Kings consecrated a chapel in honour of the Child. (ch.27) Meanwhile the Holy Family fled to Egypt, where balm still grows in memory of their sojourn; on the way Mary lost Melchior's gift of the Thirty Golden Pennies. (chs.28-29) The history of the Thirty Pennies.

(ch.30) Our Lord sent St. Thomas to convert the East. (ch.31) On his mission Thomas saw many replicas of the Child and the Star, learnt of the Kings, and finally met them in their old age. Thomas consecrated them as the first archbishops of their lands; they in turn made provision, since they had no children, that their temporal power should pass to one of their kin bearing the hereditary title of "Prester John", while spiritual power should rest with an elected "Patriarch Thomas". (ch.32) Two years after retiring from the world to their new city Seuwa [Sculla, Suwella] at the foot of Mt. Vaus, the present residence
of Prester John and the Patriarch Thomas, and (ch.33) after arranging their affairs and (ch.34) transferring their lands to the Princes of Vaus, (ch.35) the Kings passed away, their bodies being laid to rest in the chapel at Mt. Vaus according to their wishes.

(ch.36) Their remains rested uncorrupt for long after their death, until the Devil began to spread heresy among their subjects; then the dissenting parties removed the bones of each King to their separate lands, where they remained until the coming of St. Helena, the discoverer of the True Cross and other holy relics. (chs.37-39) After building many noble churches in the Holy Land, (ch.40) St. Helena turned her attention to the acquisition of the relics of the Three Kings; after obtaining the first two, Melchior and Balthazar, she surrendered the relics of St. Thomas to the heretical Nestorians in return for the relics of the third King, Jaspar. (ch.41) Thereupon St. Helena transported the relics with all reverence and ceremony to Constantinople. There they remained until the time of the Emperor Maurice (alternatively, Manuel), when the relics were given to Milan. Finally the relics came into the hands of Reinald Archbishop of Cologne in the course of the Emperor Frederick's siege of Milan, whereupon they were translated to Cologne cathedral.

The Kings are held in the highest honour by all the peoples of the East, not only by the various sects of schismatic and heretical Christians, namely Nubians, Soldini, Nestorians, Latins, Indi, Armenians, Greeks, Syrians, Georgians, Nicholaites, Jacobites, Copts, Ysini, Maronini, and Mandopulos, all of whom
(chs.42-43) hold special ceremonies in honour of the Epiphany, but even by Saracens, Jews, and Persians. (chs.44-45) In A.D. 1268 the Tartars subjugated the heretical Nestorians and defeated Prester John; but the Nestorians still possess the relics of St. Thomas, which according to prophecy are destined one day to be transferred to Cologne from the East, where his festival is celebrated with great honour. The people of Inde show great devotion to the Three Kings, and would come to visit the relics if only they could bear the cold in this part of the world.

The Three Kings may thus be likened to the Labourers in the Vineyard. Cologne is specially privileged to have the custody of the relics of the Kings, (ch.46) whose praises are sung in East and West.

[Some texts end with a passage by a later annotator on the names of the Magi, their journey, and the Three Miracles that occurred on the night of the Nativity.]
3.3. The structure and sources of HTR

The present chapter has so far outlined the earlier evolution of the story of the Three Kings. The remainder of the chapter will analyse the structure and origins of HTR and assess its contribution to the development of the legend. Modern scholarship has made considerable progress in shedding light on the principal sources on which our author drew; nevertheless there are still considerable gaps in our understanding of this question, and the concluding sections of the chapter suggest possibilities for further investigation.

3.3.1. The three strands composing the work

The summary given in 3.2 does scant justice to the detail and complexity of HTR, a work whose text runs to some hundred printed pages in Horstmann's edition. Yet even from this resume it is apparent that the work is more than a straightforward narrative of the story of the Kings. A useful distinction can be drawn between three main strands in the work. The first is the narrative proper, the account of the life and deeds of the Kings and the story of their relics; the second is the homiletic additions, which offer doctrinal and exegetic commentary on aspects of the narrative; and the third is the descriptive portions, which provide information on localities, customs, natural history, political conditions and other aspects of the contemporary Orient relevant to particular episodes in the narrative. In practice these different strands are easy enough to distinguish on the basis of their content or from an explicit authorial reference to a source. What gives this threefold
distinction particular value in the present context is that it can often be related to what modern research has been able to uncover about the author's sources. Furthermore, each of these three strands can be identified with items that appear in the author's own statement on the subject of his sources (see 3.3.3 below).

Of the three the narrative component is perhaps the one whose composition and origins are the most complex and difficult to identify. We have already seen that Harris has been able to trace through earlier German versions various elements which appear in the narrative portions of HTR. As I am not in a position to make an independent assessment of Harris's sources, it will have to suffice to repeat her conclusions, namely that the outline of the story was already fixed when the author began to compile his account of the legend, but that there is some dispute as to his primary sources and so it is impossible to be dogmatic in ascertaining the direct sources from which Johannes derived the backbone of his account (Harris (1954) xiv-xvii).

It is, however, the contribution of the other two strands, the homiletic and descriptive, that in many ways gives our work its special place in the history of the legend. In tracing the origins of these two stands, we seem to be on firmer ground; Harris (1959) notes:

Compared with the question of Johannes' sources for the framework of his story the problem of the sources for his numerous interesting digressions is relatively simple, for, in quoting material which was less familiar to him than the main events of the story, Johannes was naturally inclined to follow his sources more closely and sometimes to lift whole passages from them almost word for word. (28-29)
Moreover in introducing this secondary material the author often inserts a reference either directly or in general terms to some particular source or sources. In the homiletic additions, for example, he may either name his source (Fulgentius, say, or Gregory), or make a more general reference, for example to what "the Jews say"; in other instances his sources can often be traced by modern scholarship. Likewise much progress has been made on the origins of the descriptive strand since the identification of the two works most directly relevant to the question, namely Ludolf of Sudheim and the Book of Cologne; in these passages the debt generally remains unacknowledged, but the borrowing can usually be confirmed by the close verbal parallels with the corresponding passage in one or other of these two texts.

3.3.2. Ludolf of Sudheim, the Book of Cologne, and HTR

An intimate link has been shown to exist between the descriptive portions of HTR and two near contemporary works dealing with conditions in the East -- even though no specific allusion to these sources appears in our work, apart from a general acknowledgement of the author's debt to "diverse other books" in his statement concerning his sources. The two works were probably both composed around the middle part of the 14thC. Both apparently derive at least in part from their authors' personal experiences in the East; but each account is based on somewhat different perspectives and experiences, and the contribution of each work to HTR in some ways reflects this
difference. In addition the works have certain material in common (e.g. the description of the fate of the caliph of Baghdad -- not included in HTR), which would seem to indicate that their authors drew on common literary sources.

The first is a description of the Holy Land compiled c1350 (certainly before 1361) by one Ludolf rectore ecclesiae parochialis of Sudheim (formerly but incorrectly spelt ''Suchem'') near Lichtenau, Nordrhein-Westfalen on the basis of his experiences in the East in 1336-41 while in the service of the Kings of Armenia. The work may not have had a formal title; in the present study it will be referred to simply as ''Ludolf''. The author supplemented his personal experiences from written sources: he relied heavily on the writings (composed A.D. 1336) of William of Boldensele (Bulst-Thiele 984, Stapelmoehr 13-15), but appears to have used other sources as well, including, presumably, the common source(s) noted in the preceding paragraph. There appear to be many unresolved problems regarding the history and transmission of this text, which survives in at least two Latin versions and one low German one (Bulst-Thiele; MV 196-98. The Latin version edited by Neumann is dealt with below). Nevertheless it is generally held that this work was one of John of Hildesheim's immediate sources and the origin of many of his descriptions of places of interest in the Holy Land, as well as the stories of the Roses of Jericho and the Garden of Balm. The additions which derive from Ludolf are scattered at various points through HTR. Further details about this author and his work are to be found in Bulst-Thiele; Stapelmoehr 1-18; MV 196-98; Harris (1954) xviii.
The second work relevant to the descriptive strand of HTR is an anonymous travel account generally known today as the Book of Cologne. The text of this work was published first by Ennen in 1862 and more fully by Röhrich and Meisner in 1887; I have not had the opportunity of consulting the earlier edition, and it is from the later one ("BC") that citations will be made. Both editions were based on the text in Cologne Historisches Archiv MS W 261 A (formerly Stadtarchiv M. G. nr. 1.). However, apparently unbeknown to the editors the text is also preserved, as Harris (1954) xvii notes, in MS W* 3 of the same collection; the latter version, judging by the incipit and explicit in the catalogue, is similar in text to (indeed, according to Harris, probably a copy of) the former. The work as it survives is defective in its beginning, middle, and end. The account, at least in its surviving form, was composed in a low German dialect, which dialect, and the interest the author shows in the Three Kings, is taken as an indication that he was a native of Cologne (BC 4; Harris (1954) xvii). The work may or may not be earlier than Ludolf: the first MS of the text dates to 1408 and the second to c1412 (Harris (1954) xvii and xvii/n5), but the work was undoubtedly composed at an earlier date, since the author was someone who had been in Egypt in 1338 and in Armenia in 1348. According to MV the author made use of a no longer identifiable Armenian source (198). The first part of the work is a description of the peoples of the East, to which the last chapters of HTR owe much for their information on Christian sects and other Eastern religious groups, while the second deals with
the flora and fauna of the East and makes a lesser contribution to our work; indeed the editors suggest that the two sections may have been composed at different times and in different places (BC 4/n9). If one had to make a distinction between the character of this work and Ludolf, one could describe BC as an account of contemporary conditions in the East with particular emphasis on the broader areas of ethnography, political and sectarian relations, and natural history, whereas Ludolf is more in the nature of an itinerarium or pilgrims' guide pure and simple. For further on BC, see the editors' introduction; MV 198-99; Harris (1954) xvii-xviii; Kaplan 65ff.

It is worth including at this point a little more on the aforementioned text edited by Neumann. This text was composed in bad Latin and edited from two corrupt exemplars. According to the incipit in one of the exemplars the work was set down in 1348 and condensed into its present form by one brother Nicholaus de Huda (Hude, W of Bremen). The stated source of the first part, the bulk of the work, was a certain clericus Osnaburgensis who spent five years in the East with his master, an Armenian knight (miles Armenie) (Neumann 329, 362); however it is clear that this part of the work is little more than a condensation of Ludolf. The second part of the work on the other hand shows clear affinities with BC (for example it contains at 367-70 a list of Christian sects of the East cited in almost exactly the same order as in BC 9); but it is much more abbreviated. The final section according to the editor is taken from Thietmar. This is not the place to explore the many problems associated with this text, which are dealt with at length in the editor's
introduction. In any case the work may not be of direct relevance to the text of HTR, though this is a matter which perhaps deserves more detailed analysis. The main importance of the work is as an independent witness of the text of Ludolf and BC, since in spite of its condensation it preserves occasional details that do not survive in the fuller versions.

From this survey of Ludolf and BC it must be apparent that there are many aspects of the origins and transmission of both these works about which we could wish for fuller and more precise information. Unfortunately matters become even more complicated when we set about to assess the contribution of either to HTR -- a "messy problem", as Kaplan has noted (65; his discussion of the relationship between these three texts is nevertheless a valuable contribution in the context of his central theme).

In the first place it is worth pointing out that the customary reference to these two works as the sources of HTR requires some qualification. Close comparison of the text of relevant passages in HTR and the "source" reveals that there are frequently small variations, omissions, and anomalies between the respective versions (the notes at relevant places in the text will point to many specific instances; to take one example, the account of the history of the Thirty Pennies in our work (248/n27-251/n16) shows many variations in detail from the version in Ludolf 110-12 -- cf. MV 214-15). These discrepancies make me hesitate to believe that the author of HTR made direct use of either of these works, at least in their extant form.
This in itself is not surprising. In the case of Ludolf the work is avowedly a mixture of personal observation supplemented by material from written sources. Many passages in Ludolf bear clear indication of anecdotal origin -- the sailor's story (16), the Christian captives (70-71), or the Saracen woman (101) are examples. That the corresponding passages in HTR seem rarely to reflect the anecdotal material is understandable given the different purposes of our work, though it could be taken as evidence that our author was not using Ludolf directly but his written sources. Alternatively, it may be that our author had access to a somewhat divergent form of Ludolf.

With BC the picture is more complex. Here too we encounter minor textual discrepancies; but the difficulties in explaining the relationship between HTR and BC are more fundamental. The central problem lies in the definition of the exact limits of this relationship. Cursory comparison of the three texts might lead one to conclude that whereas the passages in HTR with parallels in Ludolf are diverse and inserted at numerous different points throughout the work, BC accounts for little except a large and continuous block of material on Eastern sects (which includes a number of references to the Three Kings and Prester John). However the assumption that these parallels are a genuine reflection of the extent of our author's dependence on the respective sources may be an oversimplification. A number of additional passages in HTR have an echo in the text of BC; for example the account of the topography of the East at the end of ch.6 (8v b3-9b1) has echoes in the wording of a shorter passage at BC 64; the description of women's apparel at the end of ch.37
(20a18-20va2) seems to have a parallel at BC 66; and the account of the investiture ceremony at the end of ch.29 (251/n16) seems to be intimated in the wording of BC 68. Indeed it is possible that this defective source originally had even more parallels with our text than can now be detected.

The issue is a significant one, since there seems to be tacit agreement in the secondary literature that the two works, Ludolf and BC, account between them for most or all of the borrowings in the descriptive portions of HTR. This assumption will be examined more closely below. However before we do so let us turn our attention to a piece of evidence which offers a different and, indeed, surprising perspective, namely our author's own statement on the matter of his sources.


3.3.3. The author's own statement on his sources

The relevant passage appears in ch.4 of HTR following the account of the arrival of the Princes of Vaus in the crusader city of Acre in AD 1200; it tells of the treasures in the possession of this noble family when they settled in Acre, and in particular refers to certain books which they brought with them
from their homeland in "Inde". The author's words on the latter subject are worth quoting in full:

Ceterum iijdem principes de Vaus portauerunt et detulerunt secum de India libros hebrayce et caldayce scriptos de vita et gestis et omnibus materijs trium Regum beatorum: qui in Acre in gallicum fuerunt translati et transcripti et in ipsis partibus apud quosdam principes et nobiles iijdem libri translati in alijs partibus adhuc permanserunt. Et ex ijs libris transcriptis, et ex auditu et visu et aliorum relatu, hec sunt conscripta, et quedam ex alijs diversis libris et sermonibus et omelijjs sunt extracta et hijs addita et presentibus sunt inserta, et in hoc libello in vnum conscripta et redacta. (215/n9-n19)

In short the author claims to base his account on certain books in Hebrew and "Chaldean" brought by the Princes of Vaus to Acre and there translated into French, as well as on what the author has seen and heard from others and on material extracted from diverse other books, sermons, and homilies.

These claims are surprising to say the least. But simply on internal grounds the statement has a certain plausibility and consistency. We can broadly identify the source of the three strands of HTR distinguished in our previous analysis -- the narrative component in the books recounting the vita et gestis of the Kings, the homiletic component in the reference to 'sermons and homilies', while the descriptive material could be taken to be covered by the reference to 'diverse other books', together with the auditu et visu et aliorum relatu which presumably lies beyond the more or less explicit personal observations the author occasionally introduces into his text.
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What modern scholarship has found difficulty in accepting at face value is the references to the Princes of Vaus and their books. A basic problem is that outside the present work the existence of the Princes of Vaus is ill-attested (see in particular MV 195ff) and their identity in dispute; moreover absolutely no outside evidence survives of their books on which our author would have us believe he placed such great reliance. It is recognised that a medieval writer's appeals to his authorities may be based on considerations at variance with the standards of a modern readership respecting the identification and citation of sources. Nevertheless in the light of the known facts, the author might seem by modern standards guilty at least of disingenuousness. Much of the material in his work can be paralleled in contemporary sources (here apparently cursorily alluded to as 'other books'), so the prominence assigned to his untraced 'Books of the Princes of Vaus' appears disproportionate to any demonstrable contribution.

In the circumstances it is hardly surprising that modern scholarship has reacted with scepticism to the author's claims. Horstmann -- even without knowledge of Ludolf and BC -- dismisses this passage in a sentence: "These Hebrew and Chaldaic books are, no doubt, a mere fiction, or perhaps mention was made of them in his real sources" (Hm. xiv). Harris gives rather more consideration to the possibility that such translations existed, but concludes in much the same vein: "That Johannes, however, actually made use of such sources from the East is doubtful. . . . The mention of books brought from the East was no doubt intended to increase the credibility of his tale" (Harris
Nevertheless I believe that the issues raised by the author's claims cannot be regarded as settled. The prospect of a final resolution of the problem may be remote given our imperfect understanding of the sources of HTR. However the present context affords an opportunity to review the claims and to introduce some fresh speculation on the question, even if a full investigation falls outside the scope and competence of the present study.

In the first place it is generally acknowledged that there is nothing inherently improbable in the notion of such translations being undertaken in the Crusader states at the period in question. There were bilingual scholars in the Frankish kingdoms, both Jews and Syrian Monophysites, who were competent to carry out such a task (assuming that Syrian is the most likely language to be covered by the term Chaldean), and we know of learned men resident in the Holy Land at this period who concerned themselves with Oriental studies (MV 203-05). Nor is it impossible that after the fall of the Crusader states refugees from Acre settled in France, where during his stay in Avignon John of Hildesheim had the opportunity of meeting their descendants and gaining access to their libraries (see 260/1-6: et hec progenies [sc. of Vaus] ut supra dictum est in Acon . . . castrum fecerunt . . . de quorum semine anno domini McccIjO adhuc strenui principes fuerunt superstites in curia romana ambasiatoris). Now who these so-called Princes of Vaus were, and how far back their Oriental connections really went, is another matter, and not one we need enter into in the present context (the question is discussed in some detail in MV 195ff, with
particular emphasis on the origins of the name Vaus; see also BC 8/n8, Kaplan 252, etc.). It is the question of translations of Oriental texts relating to the Three Kings that concerns us, and MV stops short of admitting any real contribution to HTR from such a source (205).

Nevertheless in the light of internal evidence I believe that it may well be premature to dismiss the author's claims out of hand. While it is true that detailed analysis of the work allows much of the descriptive material to be related to known sources, nevertheless there remain considerable portions of the text which cannot be referred to any surviving part of the known sources, which nevertheless show a confidence of assertion and specificity of detail that make me loath to believe that these are purely the product of the author's imagination (cf. MV 205). It is quite possible, indeed highly likely, that if fuller versions of the known sources were available, they would prove to be the source of a proportion of these hitherto unassigned passages. Even so in a number of them it seems as though sources other than the known ones are intimated, albeit often in very general terms. A case in point are certain references to what 'the Jews' assert on matters of exegesis (e.g. 3\textsuperscript{v}b26); unfortunately there appears to have been no study which has succeeded in tracing these passages to their original (Hebrew?) source or sources, yet the citations are consistent with the author's claims to have used such sources. A particularly intriguing problem is the identity of the source behind the references to the 'books of the men of Inde' which occur in a number of passages not paralleled in the known sources (e.g. item
dicunt indi et in eorum libris legitur 304/25, 305/2 etc.); MV suggests the source may be none other than Marco Polo's Il Milione (234), but I find it difficult to believe that John of Hildesheim used this source directly.

Given the vagueness of such references and the gaps in our knowledge of the extant sources, it is clearly going to be difficult to arrive at specific conclusions about any non-extant sources. However I will outline some approaches which allow the question to be explored a little further.

3.3.4. The reconstruction of a lost source

Assuming that our author made use of a source or sources now lost, the next question is how far it is possible to advance towards a more precise definition of them.

One approach would be to begin by a process of elimination: set aside all passages already accounted for by Ludolf or BC, and examine the residue for the light they shed on the nature of some independent source or sources. A number of linked source references offer additional clues. We have noted the references at various points to the 'books of the men of Inde'; there are also more general references to Eastern sources (e.g. 234/n34: volunt quidam libri in Oriente . . .), all in passages not traceable to the known sources. It is therefore arguable that the lost source(s) and the books of the men of Inde are at least to a point one and the same. If so, there is nothing exceptional in the further identification of these books with the books of the Princes of Vaus (as indeed in MV 215).
To define more clearly the contribution of this source the next step would be to look for signs of internal consistency. In the passages attributed to the books of the men of Inde, the common underlying theme is the city of Cologne as an object of pilgrimage for travellers coming from the Eastern Mediterranean, as recounted by Eastern informants. In another group of passages the source of information is given as the 'Indians and Chaldeans who come to Jerusalem for pilgrimage' (or 'travel'), 'trade or pleasure'. For example at 218/n21 (cf. 306/5) the text begins Asserunt Indi et Caldei qui Iherusalem et ad alias circa partes causa peregrinacionis mercimoniorum vel delectacionis frequenter perueniunt, qui pro maiori parte omnes in astrologia sunt periti et docti. The sentence continues with information about Mt. Vaus, the context suggesting that these informants were the source of information for certain astronomical facts concerning Mt. Vaus, and by inference for the ensuing details concerning the mountain; it might also be inferred that they were the source of a later reference to the Star of the Sea in Persia (297/4-n11; 29^Va17-33). These sources are also cited for information on the state of the city of Seuwa, elsewhere described as being the residence of Prester John.

Moreover it may be the influence of the lost source extends even into our known sources. An interesting insight is provided by the story of the Thirty Pennies. One version is found in chs.38-39 of HTR, while another version with divergences in detail appears in Ludolf 110-12 (the story was used by Godfrey of Viterbo before 1191, according to Freeman 67a). Now Ludolf avowedly supplements the account of his travels from written
sources; but in this instance whereas our author refers vaguely to 'other books' (248/27 prout in alijs libris continetur; the reading 248/18 prout in libris Indorum legitur is secondary), Ludolf specifically cites a 'history of the Kings from the East who offered gifts to our Lord' -- Legitur in quadam historia regum orientalium qui domino munera optulerunt quod Thare pater Abrahe fecisset monetam seu denarios ... (qtd. in Harris (1954) vii). To the extent that the respective sources can be equated, Ludolf's reference provides independent confirmation of our author's claims. (Elsewhere Ludolf's statement has led to the confusion that this 'history' is none other than HTR -- a very unlikely notion on textual, and probably also on chronological grounds. All the same one could wish that Ludolf had been more precise about his source on this occasion.)

Elsewhere the parallels between HTR and Ludolf can be accounted for on the assumption that our author used a somewhat divergent form of the text of Ludolf. The problem becomes more complex when we try to define the debt to the imperfectly preserved BC; indeed the question becomes the more general one of defining the limits of borrowing from any of the sources.

Some progress on these issues can be made through analysis of the clues provided by internal evidence in the sources themselves. In the case of the borrowings from Ludolf, these passages almost all prove to relate to places and buildings. It may therefore be that our author resorted to this source primarily for information on such matters. The subject does not seem to have been a prominent concern of the author of BC, who
instead reveals a particular interest in the customs and beliefs of the various nations and religious sects who peopled the contemporary Near East. A considerable amount of material on these topics in HTR can be paralleled in the extant portions of this source. We might therefore tentatively assign to this source (as opposed to any separate lost source) other ethnographic matter of unknown provenance, including the references to the Nestorians and Prester John. On the other hand BC does not seem to have been interested in the topic of pilgrimages as such, so material on this topic is probably to be assigned either to Ludolf, or, in passages with an "Eastern orientation", to the 'books of the men of Inde'.

The above discussion contains only a selection of the evidence that could be presented. At relevant points in NOTES the implications of particular passages will be explored. But in this introduction the question has probably been pursued as far as it is profitable. The evidence is very speculative, and discussion of further examples would advance us little further towards a clearer perception of the issues.

Enough has been said to suggest a prima facie case for a lost source or sources. The details attributed by our author to sources of Eastern origin, while perhaps not all of uniform origin, are not inconsistent with the notion of a lost source perhaps in the form of an Eastern account of pilgrimage to the Holy Land and beyond, containing special reference to Cologne, the Three Kings, and possibly the connections between the latter and the princely house of Vaus --- in other words, a source similar to the numerous comparable examples in Western pilgrim
literature, but with the novel feature of being told from the perspective of an Oriental traveller. In this light the author's claims for the Books of the Princes of Vaus can be granted a further hearing.

As a final caution, however, it is worth placing the question of the lost source in perspective. Even if such a source were recoverable, it might well turn out to provide few surprises; in particular there is no need to feel that the claims relating to 'books of the princes of Vaus' imply sources of any great antiquity, since there is no sign in the citations in HTR of other than late traditions regarding the story of the Magi or anything else. At the same time it is worth emphasising that the issue is of primary importance to one of the questions which this chapter sets out to address, namely the place occupied by our text in the development of the legend of the Three Kings. If the sources were simply of relevance for background material on life and conditions in the contemporary Orient, we could treat the discrepancies between our work and its sources as of minor importance. But as it is, both Ludolf and BC even in their extant state have not a little to contribute on matters directly relevant to our subject: Ludolf has the story of Melchior's Thirty Pennies, and BC has many references to Prester John, St. Thomas and the Nestorians, the kingdoms of the Three Kings and so on. It is in the context of such material that the question of the relationship between HTR and its sources, extant or otherwise, assumes its importance.
3.3.5. The scope of the author's use of his sources

We noted in the first chapter that John of Hildesheim (whether or not he is indeed our author) can hardly be said to have gone out of his way in his search for material relevant to his theme. Disregarding the question of the Vaus books, most of the material would probably have been available to any of his countrymen with access to the traditions of Cologne and to the burgeoning corpus of contemporary travel accounts. It is perhaps worth noting the names of certain works which the author appears not to have consulted. One of these is Jacobus a Voragine's *Legenda Aurea* (1260-70); this work was one of the most popular in the Middle Ages, but there is no trace in HTR of direct use of its chapter on the Epiphany (87-94; ch.14). Another work apparently not directly consulted is the previously discussed *Opus Imperfectum in Mattheum*, though the influence of this strand of the tradition is evident enough. Finally it should be noted that there is no sign that our author had any knowledge of what was to become perhaps the most famous of all the medieval travel accounts, Mandeville's Travels, a work which appears to have been composed a little earlier than HTR. Given their popularity it is perhaps surprising that no direct trace of the influence of these three works can be detected.


3.4. An interpretation of the structure of HTR

In discussing the contents, construction, and sources of HTR, Harris (1954) makes the following observation:
The construction of the historia trium regum might be compared with a series of posts loosely connected by festoons, the posts being the digressions which arise out of or lead up to the main events and at the same time add to the attraction of the story proper. (xiv)

The comparison that I would prefer is with a modern biblical commentary. The narrative proper is accompanied by supplementary material designed to demonstrate the intimate link between the events of a remote era and the conditions in the contemporary or near contemporary world, a link which provides a commentary on the narrative and at the same time reinforces its credibility. The intention is thus perhaps less to add to the attraction of the narrative than the stern purpose of strengthening faith — ad roborandum fidem, as our author is wont to say (e.g. 224/n23).

3.5. The influence of HTR in other areas

It is not clear the extent to which works of literature influence the representation of their subject matter in other art forms, no matter how widely disseminated such literary works may be. HTR seems to be no exception; indeed the reverse is generally the case, as the influence of non-literary forms can be detected in a number of passages.

The author was clearly sensible to the influence of pictorial art, for in describing the Star he notes that it was 'not formed as it is painted in churches in our land' (224/n17: prout in partibus istis in ecclesijs depingitur non fuit formata). There also seems to be a strong visual component in his description of the scene of the Adoration of the Magi and the persons of its protagonists; in particular, Freeman detects in
the portrait of the Virgin Mary as 'fleshy and somewhat brown' (236/30: carnosa et aliquantulum fusca) the influence of the Sienese school of painting (65).

To turn to another form, the medium of drama, it has been claimed that HTR exerted an influence on the representation of the Magi in mystery plays, the entry of three actors from three sides of the church reflecting the description in HTR of the meeting of the Three Kings at the trivium outside Jerusalem; but the history of the development of medieval drama suggests that this was already a well established convention in dramatic performances long before HTR was composed (see Elissagaray 31-40; MV 210-12).

In other words it would seem that the influence normally passed from other art forms to our work, rather than the contrary. One reasonably convincing exception is noted by Freeman (72a-b): the pictorial representation of the Adoration as taking place in the midst of ruins, which was to become a very popular motif in art a century after the composition of HTR, perhaps owes its origin to the description of the ruined house of King David in ch.6 of HTR. Another example may be the new form of the Star found in iconography (MV 206).
4.1. Introduction

The English versions of John of Hildesheim's Historia trium Regum are normally grouped under the common title The Three Kings of Cologne. This title, or some form of it, is sometimes found in the MSS; for example, it appears as a running title in the version in Lambeth Palace MS 491, and the concluding words in B are Thus endythe be lyffe of be iij kyngys of Coleyne. Three distinct ME literary works are known under this title, each of which derives in large part from HTR. The present chapter presents an overview of these works.

4.2. The "standard" prose Three Kings of Cologne (3KCol)

Of the three, that most widely preserved is the prose translation represented both by the abridged versions collated and published in Hm. and by the unabridged text of which the unique witness, the Durham version, is reproduced in the present edition. This, the most familiar Three Kings of Cologne, may for want of a distinct designation be termed the "standard" translation, and the abbreviation "3KCol" will be used to refer to it. This designation will be used for all versions of this translation, including that in the prints (see INTRODUCTION 5) -- but not for the independent prose version (4.3.2), nor the verse version (4.3.1); cf. the MED terminology referred to at 4.3.1.
(It should be appreciated that the Durham text which serves as base for the present edition represents only one of several versions in which this particular translation circulated in the 15thC; the reader may find it helpful at this point to read the review of the major textual strands of 3KCol at INTRODUCTION 10.2.)

There is no evidence for the authorship of 3KCol; some clues to the provenance of the translation may eventually emerge from dialect analysis (see 12.8). As for the date, there is little external evidence; estimates offered by the catalogues for individual witnesses are generally unhelpful. The accepted date is that given in Hm., viz. "about (before rather than after) 1400" (viii). This judgement seems to have been based on arguments which are primarily linguistic (viii/n2) and by today's standards perhaps of questionable validity. However no compelling evidence has emerged to suggest that the editor's estimate needs substantial modification. The newly examined MSS -- we now have access to almost twice as many witnesses as Hm. lists (v) -- have shed little light on the question, and an authoritative dating for the Hunter MS to "s. xv in." (Ker 493) supplies no more than a terminus ante quem in general agreement with the accepted dating. The colophon to the only dated Latin MS of the relevant branch of the tradition states that it was copied in A.D. 1424; it contains a rather more corrupt, and so presumably later text than that reconstructed for the exemplar used by the translator of 3KCol (it is evident that caution must be exercised in applying the evidence of the Latin MS tradition to the dating of the English versions).
Aside from the above intimations, the only "hard" evidence for the dating of 3KCol is the date of the original Latin (1364-75; cf. INTRODUCTION 1.5), which supplies the terminus post quem, and the colophon date 1442 in the only dated English MS, B, which provides a terminus ante quem.


4.3. Other English versions

Apart from the standard Three Kings of Cologne, there are two other less well known Middle English versions, both of which derive substantially from John of Hildesheim's Historia Trium Regum.

4.3.1. A verse version

There survives a unique ME verse account of the story of the Three Kings. In MacCracken's edition the text bears the traditional title and is printed with a brief introduction under the general heading of "Lydgatiana". The entry for the poem in Hartung describes it as a "fragment of 123 rime royal stanzas with two lines of [the] first stanza missing" and summarises its content, adding that "[Lydgate's] authorship . . . is considered at best doubtful" (1862-63). The fragmentary state is due to the loss of a folio at the commencement of the tale which according to MacCracken contained probably the first hundred lines of the poem. He offers no speculation on the authorship, merely noting that the story is told "in the style of" the monk of Bury.
The verse account is divided into three passus: the first (to line 173) describes the journey to Jerusalem, the second (174-509) the Kings' return and St. Thomas's ministry, and the third (510-859) the Kings' passing and the translation of the relics. While John of Hildesheim's work supplies the framework of the story and many incidental details, the poet takes considerable liberty with his material, omitting many of the digressions (e.g. the story of the Thirty Pennies) but including motifs which do not find a place in HTR (e.g. the Nativity scene, 76-82; see MacCracken 50). Owing to the extent of the reworking it is not immediately apparent whether the poet went to the Latin for his material or to one of the English translations. However, close inspection identifies elements which have parallels in the original but which do not survive in the known English prose versions (e.g. 396 marras = 229/6 paludes, cf. Hm. 50/6; 835 (Asson) de la Tour = 275/n21 Asso de turri, cf. 136/26, Lambeth 257 assone a lorde). MacCracken is therefore justified in regarding the verse version as an independent English translation of HTR. However, the freedom of the verse translation makes it very difficult to identify the precise stemmatic location of the Latin text which served as a basis for this version. The reading at 715 Two hundrethe 3ere and thretty fulle and foure at least suggests that the translator's exemplar had a better text than that preserved in the witnesses of the Late Group -- see INTRODUCTION 6.4. -- which at this point all have the inferior reading A.D. 1234.
The edited text was printed from a MS (?Lincoln Cathedral Chapter Library MS 91 (A.5.2); cf. BM Add. 31042) copied by a resident of Lincolnshire, but the language contains signs that the poem may be of Scottish origin (see MacCracken 50-51). MED assigns the date c1450 to the verse version; MacCracken specifies "some time in the first half of the fifteenth century, perhaps soon after Lydgate had compiled his Legend of St. Edmund (1433)". The editor judges the style "straightforward and efficient" but "not inspired"; however I feel it is fair to add that the author's enthusiasm for his subject together with his rhetorical skills sometimes succeeds in achieving a telling effect.

(In MED the abbreviation "3KCol.(2)" is applied to the verse version, while "3 KCol.(1)" is used to refer to the standard prose translation in its abridged form, the various versions of the latter being distinguished where necessary according to the MS in which they are preserved -- e.g. 3 KCol.(1) (Cmb 3e); 3 KCol.(1) (Hr1) etc.)


4.3.2. The second prose ("Lambeth") version

Two witnesses survive of a second ME prose version of HTR: London, Lambeth Palace MS 491, ff. 228-74b (henceforth "Lmb") is the more substantial, the other being a short excerpt preserved in San Marino, Huntington HM 114, ff. 190V-92V ("Hnt"). Textual
comparison provides indisputable proof that these are witnesses of an independent translation. However neither preserves a complete version of HTR. The former omits the table of contents and the first five chapters of the original, beginning in ch.6 with Luke's gospel and the journey to Bethlehem, into which it inserts extraneous material (the story of the two midwives, ultimately from Infancy Gospels); from ch.7 on it adheres exclusively to HTR, but even so the text is defective owing to the loss of a number of single folios. The second preserves a self contained episode (the story of the Garden of Balm) from ch.27 of HTR; the text of the second witness thus "overlaps" the first (Hnt 190v-92v = Lmb 241v-432). Both witnesses -- indeed the whole of the Huntington MS and the first 290 folios of Lambeth, as well as portions of B.L. Harley 3943 -- were copied by the same scribe (Hanna 121; Hanna's article explores the wider literary implications of the scribal oeuvre).

It is unlikely that the two witnesses represent independent translations by the scribe on separate occasions, since the common text differs only in minor details. However the exact relationship between the two is not immediately obvious. At first sight it might appear that the Huntington fragment depends directly on the longer Lambeth text, since the former contains a number of variants and elaborations which do not appear in the latter (cf. Hanna 128) and which have no warrant in the Latin (e.g. after noting that the Sultan kepith [the balm] in grete specialite Hnt adds and vndir stronge wardis bat no man may come berto but he, cf. Hm. 247/n27).
However certain other passages suggest rather that the relationship is one of descent from a common archetype:

(a) where Lmb reads and every man kepith his busshe as his owne body and they close hem and pyke hem, Hnt reads for close the more plausible close; cf. 247/n15: ipsum rubum quasi corpus suum custodit irrigat et mundat (but it could be argued that the Hnt reading arose as an scribal emendation of an obvious error in Lmb);

(b) where Lmb reads and than be Sowdon gothe with the pot of bawme and kepith hym soft in grete specialite, Hnt reads for hym soft the preferable it himself; cf. 247/n27: Et tunc Soldanus recipit omnem balsamum solus (again, the Hnt reading could be a scribal emendation);

(c) finally, where Lmb reads and mat bawme mat is boyllid is callid sodyn bawme, Hnt after callid adds Bawme coct mat is to sey; cf. 248/n13: et alter balsamus bullitus vocatur ibidem balsamus coctus (in this last example the Hnt reading could hardly be an independent addition, unless the scribe had access to the Latin).

In short, we have in Hnt three variant readings closer in sense to the original than those in Lmb. The material available for analysis is limited; but on this evidence it is preferable to conclude, rather than that the Huntington extract is a direct copy of the scribe's previous Lambeth version, that both versions descend from some earlier exemplar. At the same time it is evident that in copying the Huntington extract the scribe allowed himself greater liberty in adapting and expanding his copy.
Hanna does not raise the issue of the evolutionary relation of Lmb and Hnt; however he cites both witnesses in their context to argue for the relative dating of the Lambeth MS before Huntington (122).

Even without the evidence of Hnt there are reasons for believing that Lmb does not represent the original draft of this translation. The evidence consists of textual errors of a rather patent nature, such as:

(a) Lmb 235: and the kyngis in pe Cite þan bysily enquerid and askid of be blisse [?read birthe] of this kyng -- cf. 233/n6: extunc hij tres Reges de rege Judeorum nuper nato ab omnibus in ciuitate querebant et interrogbant;

(b) Lmb 252: And a litil fro þe autur in a vale ('wall') is be cherche [?read cracche] of lengpe of thre or four fete -- cf. 266/n4: et non longe ab hoc altari est presepe lapideum in quodam muro circa tres vel quatuor pedes longum;

(c) Lmb 257: And hit is red þat Manuel Emperour of Grece sent a wyse and discrete religious man Eustorche a Greke bery [?read born] in legacye to þe syte of Mediolane whom þe Mediolanences plesyn [?read chesyn] to her bisschop -- cf. 275/4: et legitur quod manuel grecorum imperator Eustorgium virum religiosum et prudentem nacione grecum in legacione misit mediolanum quia prudens erat quem in Episcopum elegerunt mediolanenses.

Similar errors appear regularly in the text of Lmb, and are more plausibly regarded as evidence of scribal inattention than the inaccuracy of the original translator; in fact they resemble the examples cited above in discussion of the relationship between Lmb and Hnt. Whatever exactly this relationship may be, it would be safe to say that both witnesses are derivative and presuppose some earlier archetype. On this argument it would be difficult to identify the scribe who copied the two texts with the translator himself.
Theoretically we can postulate two separate points in the transmission, say "alpha" and "beta", immediately preceding Lmb and Hnt respectively. The hypothesis that alpha and beta were a physically identical witness, and furthermore that this archetype was also the original version of the translation, would represent the most economical model for the transmission of the text; at any rate the relative soundness of the text vis-a-vis the Latin -- and the translator's exemplar can be reconstructed quite precisely, as the following chapter will show -- suggests that not many stages of copying intervened between the original draft of the translation and the surviving witnesses. As to the question of whether the original translation was a full and uninterpolated version of the text of HTR, or when the modifications at the beginning of Lmb were introduced into the tradition, these are issues which cannot be answered on the surviving evidence.

The scribe's hand in the two MSS has been dated to the second quarter of the 15thC by I.A. Doyle, who adds that Ralph Hanna has traced a number of the watermarks in the Huntington MS to Briquet which tends to confirm the dating (private communication). In his published study Hanna concludes that the scribe's activity should be "placed in the later 1420s or early 1430s" (122). Unless a marked interval intervened between the completion of the translation and the activity of the scribe, this would mean that this second prose translation was produced two or three decades after the standard version (on the accepted dating of the latter to c1400). This in turn fits with what is
known of the dates and stemmatic interrelations of the group of Latin MSS relevant to both these ME prose versions: compared with the standard translation the second prose translation reflects a more corrupt stage of the tradition, represented by a group of closely related witnesses ("the Late group") one member of which dates to 1424. The identity of the scribe, as also the presumably independent identity of the translator, is unknown, but a combination of dialectal and bibliographical evidence suggests that the former was "a person from south-eastern Essex probably employed in the London booktrade" (Hanna 122ff).

The credit for the discovery of this translation and the recognition of its independence from the standard version falls to Bülbring, who also noted its dependence on a Latin exemplar related to the versions in C and CC, the two Latin witnesses identified in Hm. as of particular relevance to the standard translation (Bülbring 385; Hm. vi, vii, xi, 206). A description of the Lambeth MS is to be found both in the earlier catalogue (A catalogue of the archiepiscopal manuscripts . . .) and in James's catalogue of the Lambeth collection (63a; 681-84); Hanna supplies more extensive details and corrections to the latter description (130). HM 114 is described in the forthcoming catalogue of the Huntington collection, as well as in MEP 1: 10-12, and in Hanna's article (129-30, with references to descriptions by Root and by Seymour).
This is an appropriate point to clarify a problem of terminology. At present there is no established way of referring to this independent prose version of HTR nor any accepted abbreviation for it (the text is not cited by MED). I therefore propose to refer to this second translation henceforth as "the Lambeth (version/translation of the) Three Kings of Cologne" -- 3KCol.(3), with the addition (Lmb) and (Hnt) for the separate texts, would serve as abbreviations should the need arise. We already have a precedent in Hanna's use of the term "[the] Lambeth Three Kings"(128). One possible objection is that a text of the standard translation occurs in another Lambeth MS, namely Lambeth 72 (L in the present edition); but as the latter is not a primary witness of 3KCol and is not normally cited in APPARATUS, this coincidence is unlikely to occasion much confusion.

In literary terms the Lambeth translation is inferior, exhibiting a lesser degree of competence, control, or linguistic feeling than is apparent in the standard version. The translator reproduces Latin word order and idiom with a literalness bordering at times on unintelligibility, though to be sure the latter is often simply a reflection of the corrupt state of the exemplar which he was working from. A single sample of his style will suffice:

and aftir that thes thre glorious kyngis with her tresours ornementis and peple as hit is byfor seyd had made hem nobly redy goyng and takyng her iourne eche of hem of the intencioun and purpos of othir for the distance of cuntre bytwene hem vnware and vnknownyn natheles eche kyng with his ost and cariage the sterre evyn y lich 3af light goyng byfor hem And the Sterre with the goers of eche kyng yede and wip the stonders stode (cf. 228/n17: et stella cum euntibus ibat et cum stantibus stabat) in his ful vertu and all her weyes lightyd. (233)


James, Montague Rhodes. A descriptive catalogue of the manuscripts in the library of Lambeth Palace: the medieval manuscripts. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1932.)
The prolific MS tradition of 3KCol suggests the work was popular and in demand. It is therefore not surprising to find a printed version appearing a little over two decades after the introduction of the new art into England -- the printing of Caxton's first book, his translation of the History of Troy, is dated c1473 -- to be followed by further editions over some 25 years.

Four editions (by Caxton's principal assistant Wynkyn de Worde, to whom Caxton left the business on his death) are listed in STC, with brief details (cf. Hm. v, 159, 186). They are STC 5572, printed at Westminster and dated "1496?"; STC 5573, "another edition", also printed at Westminster and dated "after July 1499"; 5574, "another edition", printed according to the colophon in the year 1511 at London in flete strete at the sygne of the sonne; and 5575, "another edition", dated 1526.

I have not succeeded in tracing outside Hm. the 1530 edition to which the editor cites the colophon (This was brought unto me in englyssh of an olde translacyon rugh and rude, and requyred to amend it, I thought lesse labour to wryte newe the whole. I beseche you take all unto the best and praye for the olde wretched brother of Syon Rycharde Whytforde).

Further details can be added to the information in STC. In each edition the text of 3KCol is virtually identical (a notable peculiarity is the displacement of the chapter on the siege of Milan, and the corresponding adjustment of the surrounding text).
The first two STC editions belong together along with the version reprinted in the English Experience series; these will subsumed under Hm.'s siglum W. These three versions have the same pagination (in the sense that the corresponding pages contain exactly the same material and begin and end with exactly the same words), but differ in lineation (the words in any single line) and language (spelling variants and so on), as well as the page sequence in one part of the text (the section on the Garden of Balm and the Thirty Pennies, where the pages appear in correct order in 5572, but suffer minor displacement in 5573, and more substantial disorder in the reprint).

In the 1511 edition, though the text is unaltered, the pagination (as defined above), font, and illustrations all differ from the earlier versions. Moreover the apparently unique exemplar cited in STC lacks A3-6 (these pages containing material between chs.2-6); however the Garden of Balm material appears in the correct order.

The 1526 edition is identical with the 1511 edition in text and in all other respects -- pagination, lineation, spelling, and font -- with the following exceptions: a) there is a different illustration preceding the text; b) the loss of text between chs.2-6 does not recur; c) the explicit has minor differences in lineation and spelling, and of course a different date; d) there are some very minor typographic differences (e.g. added hyphens, a macron in place of the letter n in kynrede in the last line of Aij, and the reading but for put at line 6 of the first page).
3KCol generated quite an extensive MS tradition, and it is not surprising to find ever increasing modification and corruption in all branches of the tradition during the course of the 15thC. By the time the work came to the attention of the printers, the likelihood of any randomly procured exemplar exhibiting a high degree of fidelity to the archetypal text was bound to be small. Even so the quality of the printed text is surprisingly poor (at least by modern standards). There are frequent instances where the wording is ungrammatical or simply nonsensical. The previously mentioned displacement of a whole chapter of the narrative is a particularly striking example of the textual quality. At the same time the misguided attempt to adjust the surrounding text in the latter instance would indicate that the printers, or some other contemporary reader, had become aware of the problems and had gone so far as to introduce cosmetic remedies into the text (these include sporadic corrections against a Latin exemplar).

The reprint version provided the basis for textual analysis in the present study; fortunately all the editions proved to contain virtually an identical text. The anomalous stemmatic position of W is discussed in 8.6.


6 THE LATIN EXEMPLARS RELEVANT TO THE ME VERSIONS

6.1. Introduction

Of some 100 MSS of HTR which I have classified in a preliminary way, a small group are of particular relevance to the English translations. Their common feature is the presence in their texts of peculiar readings and errors (for examples, see 6.4.1); correspondingly, turns of phrase in the English prose versions indicate that the group must originally also have included the lost exemplars that lie behind both translations (at 4.3.1 it was noted that the verse version is too free to permit precise identification of the nature of the Latin exemplar on which it is based). For convenience the witness of the exemplar used by the translator of the standard version will be referred to as Eng¹, and that behind the Lambeth version as Eng²; both of course are reconstructions based on the evidence each translation preserves of the peculiarities of the Latin text lying behind it.

6.2. A list of the relevant MSS and their sigla

The following nine MSS have been identified as belonging to this group of Latin texts (as the recension of HTR is incomplete, this list cannot be considered definitive):
The first whose relevance was recognised was CC (Hm. xii; however the present study reveals that the editor overestimated the authority of this witness in stating that the English version was "founded on that very text MS").

In addition a second witness is cited in Hm. as being of direct importance to the English text (xii), namely:

C = London, B.L., Cotton Cleopatra D VII.

It will be shown that C is in fact a contaminated witness.

We have already posited two reconstructed exemplars on the basis of the witness of the English translations:

Eng¹ = the witness of the standard translation
Eng² = the witness of the Lambeth version.

Furthermore it will be shown that the Latin exemplar consulted by the editor of the R-version (EngR) also belonged to this group.

For completeness our list requires one further addition, viz.:

O = the "common text" of HTR, as printed in Hm. (we have seen that this common text is the best available approximation to the original or archetypal text of HTR).
(Certain of the witnesses came to my attention late, or in the form of excerpts. Of these the ones that admit of analysis proved not to be of prime importance to the reconstruction of Eng\textsuperscript{1}, and their identification has not required modification of the parallel text.)

6.3. Some methodological problems

At the start of an analysis of the Latin tradition certain problems immediately present themselves. The first concerns the authority of the common text, O. As pointed out in 2.3.3, the editor printed what is evidently a consensus text based on a small number of MSS; as a result it is not always apparent how representative the readings of the edited text are generally, what MS support any particular reading may have, or what readings have been rejected. There is always a suspicion that the main or sole authority for the adoption of a particular reading was the editor's subjective assessment of its plausibility. This diminishes the value of the common text for stemmatic analysis. A particular difficulty lies in the fact that two of the four witnesses regularly cited in the apparatus to O belong to the group we are setting out to examine, which one might suspect favours the adoption of their readings into the common text.

A second problem arises from the nature of the evidence of the translations. The witness of Eng\textsuperscript{1} and Eng\textsuperscript{2} is, at best, at one remove from the Latin; consequently evidence afforded by stylistic variations in the original, or the permutations of a corrupt reading, which might well reflect significant areas of
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variation in the tradition, is likely to be obscured or eliminated. In short, care must be exercised in assessing the evidence of these witnesses in view of the distorting nature of the translation process.

But broadly speaking these difficulties are more apparent in particular textual instances; their distorting effects tend to disappear in the wider context. Overall the problems of textual analysis have not been so formidable as to prevent a convincing resolution of the broader issues. Indeed, one of the more satisfying results is the discovery that the Latin witnesses relevant to the prose translations, even the reconstructed ones, can not only be identified and grouped, but can be linked in precise stemmatic relationships with a considerable degree of confidence -- a finding which has far ranging implications for textual reconstruction.

6.4. A reconstruction of the Latin tradition

To summarise in advance the conclusions of the present chapter, this group of Latin MSS falls into two, or perhaps three, subgroups; the first two represent an earlier type with a better text, the third a later type with a more degenerate text. The earlier witnesses are V, Z, M, and K, D, Eng¹ (the latter subgroup including Eng²); the later are CC, T, A, Eng², G (as well as C).
The later witnesses are very similar in their readings, and their common peculiar readings are almost invariably inferior to those found in the earlier witnesses. Collectively they will be referred to as "the Late Group". Within the Late Group a further subgroup can be isolated, namely Eng², C, G. C is anomalous in that it contains a contaminated text, but its closest links in the present group appear to be with Eng².

On the basis of present evidence A appears to be a member of the Late Group, and is perhaps most closely linked to T. However only a small passage of this MS (the Collation Passage -- see 6.4.1) was available for analysis, so it will not be possible to cite its readings in the discussion which follows.

The conclusions of the analysis presented in this chapter are summarised in the stemmatic diagram over.
Fig. 1. Stemma of the Latin witnesses relevant to the English prose translations (contaminated witnesses are enclosed in brackets, reconstructed witnesses in square brackets; dotted lines indicate less certain linkages).
6.4.1. An early contaminated witness: M

Of the several witnesses the one giving the appearance of greatest originality is M. This witness has numerous peculiarities, especially in terms of omission of text; yet at other times M can stand alone in preserving the text of O when the other witnesses of our group omit a passage or give a less plausible reading.

To cite two examples, a sentence at the end of ch.5 (219/9-10) in the common text reads:

\[ \text{et (dicunt quod) ab illo monte omnes regiones Orientis per montana et signa et stellas vndique lucide considerentur;} \]

M follows O's text, but the other witnesses of our group replace the last two words with \textit{luci ditentur} (or variants thereof), an unlikely and elsewhere unattested reading (the resultant obscurity in sense probably accounts for the omission of an equivalent English sentence at 6^v^b^1^1).

Again, at 292/n20 in his account of the Jordan the author follows his source in deriving the name of the river from those of its two tributaries:

\[ \text{Et oritur Iordanis ad radices montis Libani ex duobus riuis, quorum vnus Jor et alter Dan vocatur.} \]

M alone among the witnesses of our group preserves the original etymology; in the others the text has been corrupted to \textit{quorum vnus est maior altero (alteri V)}, which accounts for the reading in the Durham text and \textit{bat one is more than that other} (28^v^a^3^2).
In addition M often preserves material omitted in the other witnesses; for example, the substantial omissions at 269/n9 and 269/n21 common to the other witnesses of our group do not appear in M.

Indeed, whereas M's closeness to O is demonstrable, what is less clear is whether M belongs to our group at all. The evidence is not abundant, and a resolution of the question is beset by the problems regarding the authority of the common text. However one piece of analysis supplies a partial corrective to the latter difficulty. This is a passage of 400 words of continuous text for which all available witnesses -- not just those of our group -- have been collated ("the Collation Passage", 218/n1-219/13). This collation is the most exhaustive source of data available both for stemmatic analysis of the witnesses of HTR, and for a broadly based and reliable reconstruction of the original text of at least one short excerpt of the work.

Examination of the collated readings shows that whereas M normally agrees with the reconstructed original text of the extract, it nevertheless on occasion shares readings with the MSS of our group. The most notable of these shared readings are the following two: pulcherimos gradus for plurimos gradus (219/n1; but Eng¹ has many grees!?) , and fructuosus for formosus (219/n6; D has the equivalent fructifer. The printed reading spinosus has limited authority).
Even in this passage the evidence is somewhat ambiguous. Unfortunately the authenticity of the common text is even less firmly established elsewhere. It is therefore not enough to identify readings shared by M with the other MSS of our group (such readings are not uncommon, e.g. at 207/n29 all witnesses in our group read moris est for the semantically equivalent inoleuit of the remainder of the tradition; all have the equally plausible variant in transitu for universum (tempus) at 229/n8, and suspicantes for sperantes at 232/n13). In such instances it is always possible that the common reading of our group, not O's reading, is the original one. Rather, the search must be directed to finding agreement in demonstrably inferior readings.

Examples prove to be less than numerous. One occurs at 219/n33, where O reads:

(Bethleem) habet petrosum fundamentum ita quod ibi sunt multe caverne et spelunce subterranee;

O's apposite reading petrosum 'stony' has been changed to the improbable preciosum 'precious' in M and in all the other witnesses of our group; cf. the note at 7b15.

Another notable example is at 227/n15 where O reads:

et eciam ibidem inventur in monte vena smaragdina

(the reference is to a 'vein of emerald' in a mountain). Here M has the reading in monte Bena smaragdina, reflected in the other witnesses of our group (in monte bona smaragdina V, in monte bona smaragdus CC, etc.), and the source of the phantom name in the English text:

There is also an hille that is cleped Bona (var. Bena) and in this hille is founde a precious stone that is clepid Smaragdus. (11a24-27)
This evidence seems sufficient to justify the inclusion of M in the present group. So at this point, in view of the relatively pure state of the text, one might conclude that M is the sole witness of a very early stage of development of this branch of the tradition.

However the truth of the matter turns out to be rather different. Collation against other branches of the tradition reveals that M is actually a contaminated witness: while it shares some readings with our group, it frequently, indeed normally, exhibits a different pattern of readings, namely those of a close knit group of Munich texts, of which the type text is clm 26921 (a notable feature of this group -- one found also in M -- is an expansion of the description of the Kings at 237/n18-n20 with material from an extraneous source). There are also conflated readings in M, a predictable feature of contaminated texts: for example at 235/n4 Et dicunt eciam iudei in oriente conversi, where the other witnesses of our group read modo for iudei, M reads modo iudei. (In fact given its provenance M may originally have been a "Munich" type text which was corrected at points against a MS of our group; but this is not a hypothesis which admits of proof.)

This contamination of course explains why M often seems to have a more original reading than the other witnesses of our group; but by the same token the arbitrary basis of its text drastically compromises its value for stemmatic analysis and textual reconstruction.
In stemmatic terms one can say with some confidence that M (or rather, the stratum of readings deriving from our group and embedded in the text of M) belongs with the earlier stages of our tradition, since it shows none of the peculiar corruptions and modifications characteristic of the later witnesses of our group. In fact we shall see later that it may be possible to discover a little more about the stemmatic relations of this witness. But for the present purposes the discovery of contamination in the text of M renders its readings of little practical relevance. Fortunately the tradition includes more immediately relevant witnesses so that the reconstruction of Eng\textsuperscript{1} can be undertaken without the necessity of reliance on the authority of the more remote witness M. It is to the evidence of these more closely related witnesses that we will next turn.

6.4.2. Other early witnesses: V, Z, K, D

This section examines the links between the four extant witnesses most immediately related to Eng\textsuperscript{1} -- for practical purposes, the heart of this aspect of the present study.

Of the four, V proves to be the earliest in stemmatic terms (ignoring the evidence of M for the time being). V frequently agrees with O against the consensus of K and D and the Late Group. Thus V preserves O's reading at 262/n24, as do K and D partially, where the Late Group have a shorter and demonstrably inferior text; similarly at 275/n6 V follows O, where the Late Group substitute an implausible variation; and the lacuna of the later witnesses at 297/n14, which destroys the sense of the
passage, does not appear in V. On the other hand we have cited examples in our discussion regarding M that show that V will on occasion share a palpably inferior reading with the other witnesses of our group. This justifies placing V in an intermediate position in the line of descent between O and the later witnesses; this means the text in V will generally be poorer than the original, but better than that in the other witnesses of our group.

Finally it should be noted that the many peculiar readings of V demonstrate its stemmatic independence (in other words, none of the remaining witnesses descends directly from V).

Z is a witness which came to my attention at a very late stage in the present study. Cursory inspection suggests that textually Z is close to V (e.g. it is the only one to preserve the peculiar form of V's chapter headings). Examples gleaned from a limited collation indicate that Z's readings generally agree with V (and O) against K and D and the Late Group (e.g. preserving *illis sicut cera mollis abstrahitur* at 228/n8; and preserving at 227/n1 the original in *terram ex oceano* with V against in *terram et oceaneum* of K and D and the Late Group). But occasionally Z reads with the later witnesses against V (e.g. omits *per eos* at 229/n21; reads *virtute* for *virtutibus* at 244/n37). The latter agreements suggest that Z occupies an intermediate stemmatic position between V and the later witnesses; however it is possible that these agreements are coincidental, and that Z forms an independent subgroup with V. At the same time peculiar errors (e.g. the omission at 224/17 of *habuit . . . in stella*) demonstrate Z's independence.
Interestingly, Z in some passages shares peculiar readings with the contaminated witness M (e.g. both have the peculiar reading *conuenerunt* for *habuerunt ortum* at 206/6; both read *nisi quod* for *ita quod nil nisi* at 221/n38; both preserve the dedication). However the shared readings never correspond to those of the other textual component of M (the "Munich" type text), so it is not possible to explain these readings on the hypothesis that Z is a contaminated text of the same component strands as M. Now if M is a contaminated text, but Z is not, then these peculiar shared readings must reflect an independent textual element in Z. This implies that the component of the text of M which belongs with our group derives from an exemplar with a text especially close to Z. (However this conclusion should be treated with caution in view of the sporadic nature of the data).

It is unfortunate that time has not permitted the inclusion of the readings of Z in the apparatus to the parallel text, since overall this witness has a sound text without an appreciable quantity of peculiar errors, and would provide a useful additional control over this area of the stemma (in practice it has been possible to check the text against Z's readings at a number of disputed points). Nevertheless this witness is not indispensible to the reconstruction ofEng¹, as even more closely related witnesses are available.
As previous analysis has suggested, K occupies a stemmatic position between V (and Z) and the later witnesses: it often agrees with the earlier witnesses against the Late Group (e.g. preserves the more original *cuius corpus* at 280/27; reads with O and V *allocucione* against the Late Group reading *illuminatione* at 234/n31); but on occasion it agrees with the Late Group against the earlier witnesses (e.g. at 208/n34 M and V follow the common reading *ordinantur in milites*, whereas K has the reading *fiunt inde milites*, otherwise peculiar to the Late Group; at 228/n11 it shares with the Late Group the not readily predictable omission *et terrarum ... Melchior*, a loss which does not occur in V and Z; at 280/n11 it shares with the Late Group the loss of the significant word *tripedis*).

D can be grouped with K; D not only shows the same agreements as K in the examples cited above, but shares so many peculiar readings with the other witness that the two must be regarded as constituting a subgroup in their own right. In particular, their common text ("KD") bears witness to editorial intervention in the form of a light revision which introduced into the transmitted text many plausible, but not original, emendations of real or perceived corruptions.

For example, the text at 265/n13 had already in V become corrupted to *(illa pars camisie) secundum facultatem mulierum portantur ditissime est ornata*. The corruption is dealt with in KD by simple omission of the impossible plural form *portantur*; other witnesses attempt various emendations, but none of these agrees with the solution opted for by KD (it seems that the correct emendation is actually *(facultatem) mulieris portantis*).
Another example occurs at 280/n11:

> et super illam oblatam ponunt stellam in modum tripedis flexam

(describing a three pronged instrument 'bent like a tripod'). In our group only V preserves the original text, in the other witnesses the essential word *tripedis* has been lost; but KD uniquely emends *modum* to *medium* (as if the object was 'bent in the middle'), which at least restores some sense to the passage.

At the same time, K and D exhibit independent variation: K occasionally has peculiar readings (e.g. K at 222/n31 omits *est circa trium ... lapideum presepe*, which D does not); D on the other hand alters the text freely, introducing arbitrary stylistic variants and large scale omissions (e.g. D omits the second half of ch.17 from 234/n1 *quia Iherusalem ...*). The extensive textual reworking in D makes it a particularly trying witness to work with; at the same time it will be shown that D's readings in one regard have a significance greater than those in any other witness.

(For practical reasons it was decided not to include the mass of D's peculiar readings in the apparatus to the parallel Latin text, but to make occasional reference to D's readings where these were relevant. The readings cited from K in the upper registers can be taken to agree with those of D; readings peculiar to K are relegated to the lowest register.)
6.4.3. The anomalous witness of Engl

The stemmatic location of Engl is a complex problem, and my researches over the course of years by stages uncovered new data, which led to successive adjustments in my understanding of the underlying issues. A historical account of this process is perhaps the clearest and most illuminating approach.

It early became apparent that the text of 3KCol often reflected a more original reading than that preserved in CC; in other words, it was clear, pace Hm. (xii), that the English translation must have been based on a text superior to CC, one occupying an intermediate stemmatic position between the original text (represented by O) and that preserved in the inferior MSS (typically CC, though T and G, which were identified soon after, turned out to contain a very similar text). Whereas at times Engl does indeed reflect peculiar Late Group readings (confirming to this extent the judgement in Hm.), at other times, where these witnesses have a demonstrably inferior reading, the English reflects a text closer to O. In other words, Engl occupies the same general area of stemmatic middle ground as V and the other closely related witnesses; it certainly could not be identified with CC itself.

The next question was whether a more exact stemmatic location could be determined for Engl, given the identification of a growing number of relevant witnesses. An answer to this question would permit a scientific reconstruction of the readings in the translator's exemplar.
The first step was to determine the relationship between the extant Latin witnesses of our group, using the methods detailed in the preceding sections. The location of Eng\textsuperscript{1} within this pattern would emerge by comparing the readings of the English version by turns with those in the several Latin witnesses.

The stemmatic relationships of V, the earliest among these witnesses, provided the point of departure. The English text was compared with V in those instances where the Latin exemplars showed either an opposition in the readings of O ) V CC T G, i.e. where V follows the inferior reading, or of O V ) ( CC T G, i.e. where V has the more original reading. In simple terms the fundamental question becomes, "Does the English consistently reflect a more original text than V, or vice versa?". If the latter turned out to be the case, the procedure would be repeated in turn with each of the stemmatically "lower" witnesses.

Given V's closeness to O, it proved particularly valuable to be able to refer to passages whose origins could be traced to some independent source, especially if the source was in the same language. One such passage is the "Heresies Passage" at 276/n22 (cf. 24\textsuperscript{v}b2-25a8), where the author inserts from an earlier commentary by Rabanus Maurus (PL 107: col.759-60) a homiletic passage dealing with the efficacy of the Three Gifts in the refutation of heresy. In this passage we have not only an extant original to provide a control over O, but a text with a wealth of theological subtlety inherently likely to generate illuminating instances of textual corruption.
The following are some of the more significant variants in the Heresies Passage.

(a) In the original version the opening sentence reads:

In auro thure et mirra: per ista trium munerum genera in vno eodemque Christo divina magestas et regia potestas et humana mortalitas intimatur. (276/n22)

In this example V, along with M and D, preserves the original in vno eodemque Christo, whereas the Late Group omit the word in (allowing the phrase to be interpreted as dative); the English has Golde Encense and Mirre By thise iij gloriouse 3iftes is shewed to oon and be same Crist . . , suggesting that the translator's exemplar also lacked in. Inference: V preserves the better reading, Engl the inferior one.

(b) A little further on is the sentence:

In oblacione thuris confusus est Arrianus qui soli patri sacrificium offerre contendebat; in oblacione mirre confusus est Manicheus qui Christum vere mortuum pro nostra salute non credebat.

Here the original Arrianus qui . . . in oblacione mirre confusus, though preserved in V, is lost in the other witnesses and is not represented in the English. The inference is as above.

(c) Later we find in the source version the Arian described as (qui) deo vnigenito naturalem nititur dare servitutem. This difficult phrase had become confused in the tradition already by the stage of V (which reads de vnigenito naturalem (?)nititur salutem servitutem). KD emends with de vnigenito negare nititur naturalem servitutem. On the other hand in the Late Group we find the original text replaced by an altogether different and independent version (qui negat in diuinitate filium patri coequalem). The English translation indisputably follows the
later reading (And arian also the which deneyede the sone to been euene with the fader); on the other hand it is clear that V's reading (and that in K and D also) reflects the original reading. Inference: as before.

The readings in the Heresies Passage consistently show: (a) where the readings separate according to the opposition O V ) ( CC T G, that V follows the original text of this passage more closely than does Engl; (b) in regard to O ) ( V CC T G, that there are no non-trivial instances where Engl preserves a more original reading than V. This pattern of variation has been tested and confirmed from passages throughout the work. Its general validity implies that Engl occupies a lower position on the stemma than V, transmitting some of the readings preserved in the earlier MSS but at other times reflecting the more advanced stage of corruption exhibited in the readings it shares with the Late Group.

(The last example in the Heresies Passage is interesting in that it provides evidence for a measure of revision in the later stages of the tradition: the later definition of Arianism cannot be construed as having been generated by random evolution from the original version, but clearly represents a fresh and independent input (for other indications of revision in the text of the Late Group, including the notable addition of an alternative ending, see 6.4.4). On the evidence of the Heresies Passage, Engl indisputably belongs to the "post-revision" stage).
Turning to KD, we find in the Heresies Passage the following agreements for this independent subgroup: (a) in the first example K omits the *in of in vno eodemque Christo*, but D includes it, so the evidence is ambiguous in this case; (b) KD omits the passage *arianus qui* . . . (confirming its links with the later witnesses); (c) on the other hand, KD's reading *de vnigenito negare nititur naturalem seruitutem* clearly reflects the more original reading in V, not the revised version found in the Late Group and reflected in the English. We can conclude from this passage that relative to V and Engl, K and D occupy a lower position in the stemma than the former but a higher one than the latter. This is consistent with earlier findings.

(Z was collated against the other witnesses in this passage. Z turned out generally to follow the readings of V, in particular preserving the earlier definition of Arianism, but never followed the peculiar readings either of KD or the Late Group texts. This is consistent with the previous conclusions concerning the close relation of Z to V, though it offers no confirmation of the precise location of this witness -- nor indeed any direct insight into the position of Engl.)

The definition of Arianism in example (c) above, with its earlier and later versions, seems to provide an indisputable link between Engl and the Late Group, against not only V (and Z) but K and D as well. Such insights were of fundamental importance for textual establishment and interpretation in the present edition. The practical significance is that we are given a control over the parallel Latin text which we print. Our base text (transcribed from CC, which in general shares the readings of the
Late Group witnesses), contains a text more degenerate than what would have lain before the translator, so our edited text needs the inclusion of a corrective element. Accordingly, the apparatus is designed to offer relevant readings of the more original stage of the text -- V, K, and O (and occasionally M, D, and other witnesses); these in general reflect the stage of the text before Eng¹ was copied. The English version will reflect an oscillation, so to speak, between the two textual stages, at times reflecting the readings of the better Latin witnesses, at others those of the base text. (The rationale behind the apparatus to the parallel text is discussed in more detail at 6.6.)

On occasion it was found that the reading of Eng¹ reflected neither of these two classes of readings, but some peculiar variant. Such instances can be explained on the assumption that the translator's exemplar was stemmatically independent of the remaining witnesses of the group (there is nothing surprising in this; in fact all the extant witnesses of our group prove to be independent). As such Eng¹ could be expected to preserve errors generated independently of the other branches of the tradition.

Specific evidence consists in occasional peculiar omissions of text: for example at 10v16 the English fails to translate, as a result of eyeskip, a portion of text (226/n17-n28) preserved in all Latin exemplars so far examined. This is admittedly weak evidence, as eyeskip losses can occur independently, and in this case the loss could probably have occurred as easily in the prearchetypal stage of the English tradition as in the Latin.
Other evidence is furnished by some curious cases of "mistranslation". Generally speaking it can be shown that our translator is both competent and careful, and not inclined to make blunders in interpreting his exemplar. However at 14a17, where the Latin (in all exemplars) declares that Herod was etate annosus (233/n5), the English on the contrary says he was but jonge of age. Now the word annosus 'full of years' is not altogether uncommon, nor especially opaque in sense, so it is surprising to find the translator rendering it in an opposite sense if this really were the reading in his exemplar. Another example occurs at 28vb27 (293/11), where all extant Latin texts state that 'no living creature' can survive in the waters of the Dead Sea (nulla creatura vivens pre malediccione eius in ea reperitur); the English instead says ther is noon cristen man lyuyng founde in here. Perhaps the corruption of the original creatura to christianus, or something similar, produced this reading in the English version.

If one grants the independence of Engl, the practical implications are that whereas our reconstruction of the parallel Latin text will be dictated at times by the base text reading and at times by the superior readings, on occasion our interpretation of the evidence will have to be modified to take into account the fact that the translator's exemplar contained peculiar readings which no extant MS authority provides the means to anticipate or rectify. In practice it has proved possible to introduce typographic conventions to signal the presence of independent readings in the parallel text (see further at 6.6).
At this point, however, the investigation of the stemmatic location of Engl takes a new and surprising turning, and introduces an intriguing complexity into the argument. The following summary notes only the main points; detailed discussion of the evidence appears at relevant points in NOTES.

As I worked my way systematically through the Durham text, the analysis of passages late in the text (notably the Heresies Passage) seemed to provide an irrefutable argument for locating Engl in close stemmatic proximity to the Late Group witnesses. However, on returning to revise my printed texts from the start, and with data from a larger number of witnesses at my disposal, it became clear that the earlier sections of the work reflected a rather different relationship.

Specifically, a pattern of agreement could be discerned between this part of the English text and the readings of KD (two witnesses which had only recently become available for collation). This pattern included predictable instances such as 3Va27 weder, reflecting auram (O V K), rather than auroram (Late Group), and 4a7 the deuel, reflecting dyabolus (O V K), rather than dominus (Late Group); such agreements were to be expected given the evident location of Engl at an intermediate stemmatic position between KD and the Late Group. However it was also to be seen in the case of the peculiar readings of KD (examples include 3Va8 as the a rysynge of the sonne, reflecting the transposition ortus solis/prout peculiar to KD; 4Va12 to se that sterre, reflecting KD's peculiar emendment ipsam stellam videre; and 15a32 They say also in the Est, reflecting KD's peculiar conversati rather than the general conversi).
Moreover close analysis revealed a less obvious pattern of agreement specifically with the second of this pair of witnesses. The constant stylistic modifications in D went far to obscuring this underlying relationship, but the striking parallel between D's peculiar addition at 223/n9 of semper nix inuenitur and the English ther is eueremore burghoute the jere snow a boute in the countree (8vb34-36) affords clear evidence of an intimate grouping of D with Eng1. Confirmation is provided by a number of other readings, including instances where the translation retains scriptural citations in the original language (e.g. the citations at 80/36 and 90/20 reflect the peculiar form of the text in D).

Now in the light of previous conclusions such a pattern of agreement is truly anomalous. KD constitute an independent subgroup of the tradition, located in the line of descent from O on a branch complementary to that which leads to the Late Group (see Fig. 1). In such a case it is most surprising to discover the English reflecting an alternation of agreement between the peculiar readings of two independent subbranches.

In principle various explanations are possible. One that immediately suggests itself is that the pattern reflects an alternation of exemplars: in other words the translator had access to more than one Latin text and worked from either, or consulted his second exemplar in cases of difficulty in his primary one, each exemplar being of different provenance and stemmatic affiliation. Another explanation is that he used a single exemplar whose text was in itself contaminated.
However further investigation brought the pattern of alternation into sharper definition. In some passages the Durham text proves consistently to reflect peculiar readings in KD (and equally significantly, fails to reflect the peculiar readings of the Late Group), whereas other passages reflect peculiar Late Group readings, but not the peculiar readings of KD. This seemed to fit the alternation of exemplars theory, rather than the model of a thoroughly contaminated exemplar.

But most revealing of all was the next discovery: the pattern of variation has evident parallels in the composition of the Durham text itself. When the patterns are compared over the whole length of the text, it emerges that the one pattern (reflecting the KD readings) corresponds with passages common to both the unabridged and abridged traditions (henceforth, "abridged" passages); whereas the other, reflecting peculiar errors of the Late Group, normally only appears in passages peculiar to the unabridged Durham text ("unabridged" passages).

The identification of these patterns, which emerged only late in the study (and necessarily subsequent to the identification of K and D as members of a stemmatically independent subgroup), is of the greatest significance for the vexed question of the evolution of the English text. The implication of the evidence is that the alternation, far from being arbitrary, reflects the fact that the "abridged" and "unabridged" portions of the translation depend on different exemplars, in other words, that they represent two independent textual strata.
The further implication is inescapable: the passages peculiar to the Durham MS must be a secondary textual layer. Therefore, the unabridged version cannot represent the original version of the translation.

The main problem in unreservedly accepting this conclusion lies in the extent of the evidence. The pattern of readings reflecting the variation of exemplars does seem genuinely to correlate with the pattern of "abridged" and "unabridged" passages; but it must be admitted that the readings that reflect the correlation are not as "dense" as might be wished. In any particular passage the number of indisputable correspondences between the English version and the peculiar readings of the relevant form of the Latin is never great in absolute terms. While this no doubt is simply a reflection of the fact that the Latin text does not vary so very greatly overall, it makes it difficult to present a conclusive case for the postulated model. Nevertheless it was principally the evidence of the Latin exemplars that inclined me to my preferred theory of the evolution of 3KCol, namely the primacy of the abridgement. My initial working hypothesis had been the reverse; it seemed instinctively more plausible to imagine a prototypic unabridged version serving as basis for subsequent abridgements, the forms in which the work was evidently destined to win out in popularity with the contemporary readership.

At the same time, the evidence of the Latin tradition is supported by weaker evidence of other sorts: partly "formal" arguments, based on analysis of transitional passages where the "abridged" text crosses into the "unabridged" portions; and
partly linguistic considerations, such as the identification of lexical and stylistic peculiarities. As with the testimony of the Latin witnesses, discussion of this evidence (which has its own inherent problems) will be taken up at relevant points in NOTES.

(My initial assumption of a contrasting pattern of agreements between the earlier and later parts of the work turned out to be an oversimplification in part occasioned by the physical state of the Hunter MS. The earlier portion of the MS, up to the Major Lacuna, covers the first twenty-odd chapters of 3KCol, and in these early chapters both abridged and unabridged versions preserve much the same text; the differences between the versions becomes notable only later, especially after the conclusion of the narrative proper (much of which is lost in the Lacuna), when extensive passages of "unabridged" material, including the Heresies Passage, appear in the text -- hence the observation of a preponderance of Late Group agreements in the later portions of the work.)

It is worth remarking that this application of the evidence of the textual tradition of an original language to explore the evolution of a translated text has wider methodological implications. At the same time the effectiveness of such a methodology is dependent on thorough background research: without a far ranging recension of the tradition of HTR, the group of witnesses relevant to the English versions would not have been identified in the first place (who would have predicted that Latin texts of relevance were to be found in provenances as distant as Denmark and Czechoslovakia?).
Moreover, identifying the relevant group of witnesses would not have been sufficient in itself: it was essential that the witnesses prove capable of being located within a precise stemmatic framework. Even then, it is notable that the pattern of variation underlying the Durham version would most likely have gone undetected had the witness of KD not become available: it was the location of these two witnesses in an independent branch of the stemma complementary to the Late Group that established the polarity which proved decisive in revealing the pattern of variation in the English text.

Finally, it should be pointed out that as the Durham text can no longer be regarded as a uniform textual entity, strictly speaking it is inaccurate to refer to this witness by a single siglum. Consequently in subsequent discussion the use of Eng\(^1\) will be restricted to the witness of the abridged tradition of 3KCol. The location of Eng\(^1\) on the stemmatic diagram reflects this definition (no special siglum or precise stemmatic location is assigned to the exemplar underlying the "unabridged" portions of the Durham text).

6.4.4. A digression: the alternative ending

Signs of textual revision at a later stage of the tradition of our group of Latin MSS were noted in the context of the Heresies Passage. Others include interpolations such as the note on the name Egrisculla (CC Grisculla) at 228/n3, *alibi scribitur Egrisculla vel Egrosilla vel Egriscula*. 
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But the most striking example of editorial intervention is the appearance in the later witnesses of an "alternative" ending. This ending (Hm. 315/n5), a series of notes concerning the Magi (Nota quod . . .), replaces the "standard" ending, a passage in praise of Cologne (Gaude felix Colonia . . .). This ending is preserved in the Late Group witnesses, in D (anomalously, it would seem), and, as a notable example of the contamination in that witness, in C; it evidently also appeared in EngR.

However, the choice of the epithet "alternative" to characterise this ending should not be taken to imply that the ending entered the tradition by simple substitution. In fact no witness of our group preserves the standard ending, nor does any text have both endings (not even C, where it might have been expected through conflation). In the earlier witnesses (V, Z, and K) the text terminates with the verses Ab Helena . . . (310/n19), which precede the standard ending in the common text. Thus in the earliest extant stages of the tradition of our group the original ending had been lost, but the alternative ending had not yet been introduced; in other words, a further evolutionary stage (of "no ending", so to speak) intervenes between the common text stage and the introduction of the alternative ending (it is possible to argue that the "no ending" stage was in fact the original one, and that both standard and alternative ending are secondary, but the question has no direct relevance to our purposes).
The point at which the alternative ending entered the tradition cannot be determined with precision. The evidence of the (stemmatically) earliest witness for the ending, D, is ambiguous, as the ending appears in this witness (and in the stemmatically indistinguishable EngR -- see 6.4.7) but not in K: given the close relation of K and D one would have expected both to either preserve or lack the ending, and the anomaly is to be explained correspondingly as due either to omission in K (which however is not notable for such large scale omissions), or as contamination in D (for which there is otherwise no evidence).

In short, the introduction of the alternative ending may, or may not, precede the emergence of KD as a separate subgroup. It certainly precedes the emergence of the Late Group as an independent entity, and might be associated with that stage of textual revision evidenced elsewhere in the Late Group.

Evidence for M is lacking, since the text terminates at an earlier point (304/13). The readings in the "unabridged" portions of the Durham text reflect an exemplar belonging to the Late Group, which implies that the exemplar contained the alternative ending; however direct evidence is lacking (see 11.3). As for Engl the archetypal form of the abridgement shows no trace of either ending, and the evidence of the most closely related Latin witnesses (K and D) is ambiguous.
6.4.5. The Late Group: CC, T, A, G, Eng²

The later witnesses are placed in a distinct subgroup on the basis of the many common readings that have accumulated in their text through the process of textual degeneration.

Of the four witnesses CC, T, A, G, and Eng², the first to be appreciated as important for 3KCol was CC (apart from C, no other witness of this group was known to Hm.). The readings of G, the next to be identified, proved often to be identical with those of CC. However, G is conspicuous for its peculiar errors, and particularly its frequent omissions of text (e.g. at 263/n21 G omits in cruce matrem . . . lccum quo Ihesus); CC on the other hand has peculiar readings of its own (e.g. at 232/n33 CC reads aurium where the other witnesses have the more original crurium). The two witnesses are therefore stemmatically independent. (In practical terms, the identification of this independent witness brought the reconstruction of Eng¹ a step closer, since it provided a means of identifying and discounting the peculiar errors of CC, the base of the parallel text.)

The position of T is not quite so obvious; but occasional agreements between G and T (e.g. at 232/n26 G and T uniquely include the chapter reference ysaie sexagesimo capitulo after the scriptural citation), and the fact that neither agrees with CC against the other in cases where the third witness preserves an original reading, would seem to indicate that these two witnesses stand together against CC. T however has its own peculiar readings, and is thus stemmatically independent.
Owing to the tightness of the binding B.L. was not able to supply a microfilm of the full text of A; however a copy of the folios relevant to the Collation Passage was provided. Subsequent collation suggested that this witness belongs with the Late Group, being related most closely perhaps with T.

In contrast to Eng¹ it proved possible to arrive at a definition of the stemmatic position of Eng² with surprising ease and precision. The difference is due to various factors: the close relationship of the Late Group witnesses, the evolved state of their text, as well as to the greater literalness of the second prose translation.

To start with, the membership of Eng² in the Late Group cannot be a matter of doubt: it is evidenced by countless instances where the English translation reflects the peculiar -- and inferior -- readings common to the Late Group witnesses, and most notably by the preservation of the alternative ending, as well as the spelling variations at 228/n3.

Specifically, there prove to be readings in the English which can only be accounted for on the assumption that Eng² is most closely allied to G. For example, at 281/n10 all other witnesses but G read:

\[ \text{et episcopi eorum et presbiteri ab episcopis latinis} \]
\[ \text{consecrantur et ordinantur;} \]

G however reads \text{latini} for \text{latinis}, and Eng² reflects this with \text{And her bisshopes and prestis be made and halowid latynes.}
Again, at 311/n5 a sentence in the alternative ending is printed in Hm. as:

```
ordinauerunt quod eligierentur duodecim de melioribus familijs inter eos,
```

familijs being the reading of CC. T has the same reading (and D reads famulis). However G uniquely (apart from the contaminated witness C) reads astrologis. Eng² reflects G's reading with per ordeynid that ber shold be ordeynid xij wis astronomers.

Finally, in the same passage the Latin texts read:

```
secundum enim beatum Augustinum magi in caldeo idem quod philosophi (add sunt G C) in greco et sapiens (sapientes G C) in Latino;
```

here Eng² reads For by seynt Austyn Magi in Caldee is as mych to sey. as philosophi in greke. Sapientes in latyn. Wyse in Englisshe, i.e. preserving G's plural form sapientes.

These readings confirm the link between G and Eng², and imply at least one intermediate evolutionary stage on the line of descent from the common ancestor of T and G to G.

In fact, as the next section shows, we have evidence which allows an even more precise definition of the stemmatic position of Eng².

6.4.6. A late contaminated witness: C

Though C was paired with CC in Hm., C often preserves a better reading than any other witness of our group (eg. praua for plana at 229/n5). Furthermore if one scans the apparatus in Hm. one notes that while C and CC frequently agree in variant readings, there are equally numerous cases where C agrees with P, the text in one of the early printed editions. As there is every
reason to believe that CC and P belong to widely divergent branches of the tradition of HTR, this contradictory pattern of agreements can only be explained on the assumption that C is a contaminated text. Corroborative evidence is provided by conflated readings which appear in C, a predictable feature of contaminated texts: e.g. at 237/n8 O reads *tenebat*, P *leuabat*, C *tenebat et leuabat*; at 21/n2 O reads *multum*, P CC P read *communiter*, C reads *multum et communiter*. (Here as elsewhere I use the term "contamination" to refer to instances where the readings of one branch of a tradition have entered an otherwise unrelated branch, either influencing or replacing the original reading; whereas the term "conflation" will be restricted to cases where a composite reading is arrived at from the amalgamation of two readings from separate branches.)

Clearly C's practical value in the present context is marginal. At the same time it turns out to be possible to define more closely the point of connection of the relevant stratum of readings in C and the witnesses of our group. This serves to complete our stemmatic analysis, and could prove useful in other contexts.

Specifically, the source of these readings in C proves to be a text close to the subgroup comprising Eng2 and G. Evidence appears in the readings of the alternative ending. The following passage has been previously cited (here the text follows D):
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ordinauerunt vt eligerentur duodecim de melioribus famulis inter eos.

We saw previously that for *famulis* the reading *familijs* appears in CC and T, *astrologis* in G and C, and *astronomers* in Eng\textsuperscript{2} -- showing C in agreement with the subgroup consisting of G and Eng\textsuperscript{2}, against the first two witnesses.

(This effectively rules out the possibility that the alternative ending entered the tradition from C itself. If the source of the alternate ending was indeed C or a text like C, then in the above example *astrologis* would have been the consensus reading of the witnesses, not simply that of a peripheral group, as our stemmatic analysis shows the subgroup G and Eng\textsuperscript{2} to be).

Yet there are signs that we can arrive at a still more precise definition of the association. The Latin texts preserve a series of verses at the end, and in the Lambeth translation these appear in the original language. The majority of witnesses, including the MSS of our present group, reproduce these verses as seven triplets; however C and Eng\textsuperscript{2} both omit the last stanza (but not so G, which has the full seven).

Furthermore, both C and Eng\textsuperscript{2} anomalously read *nusquam* in the sixth stanza for the generally received *numquam*. Unless these agreements are coincidental, it seems that we can identify a closer grouping comprising C and Eng\textsuperscript{2}, indeed an independent subgroup, given that G preserves the regular number of verses.
It is interesting that it has proved possible to define so precisely the relationship between these two witnesses: this might not have seemed inherently likely, given the nature of the evidence (a translation on the one hand and a contaminated text on the other). On our stemmatic diagram the witness of C is bracketed, to stress the need for caution in interpreting the evidence of its readings. The identification of the further subgrouping is not without value (it confirms the mutual independence of Eng² and G), and would be worthy of further investigation in a closer study of the second English prose translation. It is of course of marginal importance to our present purposes, since we have seen that 3KCol was translated from a Latin MS considerably better than, and stemmatically quite removed from, those in the subgroup to which the exemplar used by the Lambeth translator belonged.

6.4.7. The exemplar of the R-editor

The R-text is one of three broad types in which the abridged 3KCol circulated: it corresponds to the first group in Hm., the archetypal text being preserved in witness R. In this version of the translation many modifications and additions appear, including passages omitted in the other abridged versions but reintroduced from the original Latin. Our analysis of the Latin tradition can be used to elucidate the source of this reintroduced material.
(No version of any matter cited in this section from the R-text appears in the other abridged English texts; it will be shown in 10.3.3 that all such material is secondary. It is also worth pointing out that this reintroduced material is independent of comparable matter in the Durham text, with which it shows not the least verbal similarity; indeed, separate Latin exemplars underlie both -- see below. The exemplar available to the R-editor in preparing his adaption of the English text will be termed the "R-exemplar" -- EngR for stemmatic purposes; it is of course a reconstructed witness).

The R-exemplar must have contained the alternative ending (and, by implication, must have belonged to our group of Latin witnesses), since material introduced at two separate points in the R-text (37/6-39/13 and 47/16-49/12) was taken from this ending. The R-text also preserves an independent version of the Heresies Passage, in which the "earlier" definition of Arianism appears (79/12-14: þe Arrian he forsakeþ in goddis [sone] Crist Ihesu kyndelich subieccioun). Now among the extant Latin witnesses only D preserves both the alternative ending and the earlier definition of Arianism; this suggests that D is the extant witness closest to the R-exemplar.

Collation of the Latin texts confirms this relationship. Significant examples from the alternative ending material in the R-text include the following:

a) 49/9: Magi in þe tung of Chaldee is as moche as to seye as a Philosophre in þe tunge of grewe; here D alone of the Latin witnesses has the singular philosophus in place of philosophi.
b) 37/16: þei chose among hem .xij. of þe beste seruauntes 
that were among hem;

here the word corresponding to seruauntes in the original is in C 
and G astrologis, and in CC and T familijs -- but D has the exact 
equivalent, famulis 'servants'.

c) 47/36: "Now is bore of a mayde a childe . . . and he 
schal reigne .xxxij. þere, and in token here-of I 
schal lyue .xxxliij. dayes and þan I schal deîze";

here the other witnesses read (triginta tribus annis) viuet 
'shall live (for 33 years)', whereas D alone reads regnabit 
'shall reign'.

d) 47/29: (a Rose) þe 

which about mydnyȝt spred abrode and 

out of þis rose jëde oute a faire white dove fleyng 

vppe and doun in þe eyre and in mannys vois spak and 

seide . . ;

again the version in D is the one which corresponds most closely 
with the R-text: where the other witnesses have (rosam) de qua 

guidem media nocte exiuit quedam columba, D reads que dilatabatur 

et media nocte exiuit de ea quedam columba, and where the other 

versions have nubes ascendendo et dixit, D reads nubes ascendendo 

et descendendo.

Confirmation of the close relationship between EngR and D is 
also found in the R-editor's version of the Heresies Passage 
(e.g. 79/24 in one wyse . . . and in an obir wyse, compare the 

reading unique to KD alio modo et alio -- the other texts reading 

alia et alio or alia et alia).

This close relationship implies that EngR is also closely 
related to K (as reflected in the last example). Unfortunately 
we cannot be sure of the exact interrelations of these three 
witnesses on the basis of the relatively brief passages available. 
for analysis (K lacks the alternative ending, the most
substantial source of reintroduced material in the R-text). The evidence is in fact somewhat contradictory: at 101/5 the R-text preserves (in Latin) the scriptural citation, whereas both K and D have lost these words, at first sight suggesting that the R-exemplar is more original than either K or D -- but the loss through eyeskip (*peregrinorum ... peregrinorum*) could have occurred independently; at 115/16 the R-text preserves the anonymous citation in the original language and in the form *In carne viuere preter car...* where D reads *In carne preter car...* but all other witnesses, including K, have *In carne viuere sine carne est vita angelica non humana* -- suggesting a closer link to D than to K (it is however conceivable that both scribes independently restored from memory the more original form of a well known (verse?) quotation -- I have not succeeded in tracing the source).

If this last supposition -- of more intimate connection with D -- is correct, it raises the interesting possibility that the exemplar of the R-editor and the exemplar of the original translator, i.e. *Eng¹*, were identical (we have already shown that the extant exemplar most closely related to *Eng¹* is D). But the question can never be resolved in an absolute sense: the R-editor reintroduced into the abridgement matter originally omitted, so by the very nature of the evidence *Eng³* can almost never be directly compared with *Eng¹* (using the latter in its strict sense, viz. to refer to the exemplar behind the abridged 3KCol).
However my impression is that Eng¹ is an earlier form of the D-type text. The peculiar errors of D are extremely frequent, and neither English witness reflects more than a portion of them. But Eng¹ only rarely reflects these peculiar errors; whereas the number of parallels between the R-material and D, even in the limited text available for analysis, suggests that Eng² reflects a higher portion of the peculiar mistakes which developed in this subtradition. The implication is that Eng² is more closely related to D than Eng¹ is. However as the three witnesses can never all be directly compared at once, their mutual interrelationship does not admit of precise definition; consequently on our stemmatic diagram Eng² is linked to the remaining witnesses by dotted lines, to reflect this uncertainty.

6.5. Postscript: some other witnesses

The text of HTR in Ro (B.L. Royal 8 F XII) ends with a note which appears to derive from the alternative ending (Nota quod isti magi dicuntur . . . Caldei enim stellam pro deo colunt). However textually Ro belongs to a different branch of the tradition, where we should not expect to find the alternative ending. It may be therefore that this sentence is an independent addition deriving from the sources of the alternative ending.

The catalogue entry for Ro lists several other copies of the same text in the B.L. collection, among them Royal 5 F. XIV. The description notes that Royal 8 F. XII "appears to agree generally (except in the concluding passage) with 5 F. XIV and the Cotton MS. Cleop. D. VII [i.e. our witness C]". As the latter preserves the alternative ending, whereas Royal 8 F. XII only preserves a
sentence of it, this note might be taken to imply that 5 F. XIV also had the alternative ending, and so presumably belongs to the part of the tradition with which we are directly concerned. Unfortunately no further analysis of this witness is currently possible, as disrepair of the binding prevents filming of the MS.

B.L. Add. 34276, ff. 32-33v preserves a short passage De triginta argenteis (the name "John (?)Narburn" appears in the margin). The text is clearly based on the account of the Thirty Pennies in HTR (248/n27-251/12), though the material is considerably abridged. Only tentative stemmatic analysis is possible in view of the brevity of the excerpt and the reworking of the material. However there are some common readings which might be taken as evidence that this witness belongs with our group (e.g. 248/n29,30 de terra caldeorum, whereas in our group only the contaminated M has the generally received reading de Ur Caldeorum), and indeed with the Late Group witnesses (249/22 ligatos). It might even be grouped with T and G in the light of the reading ad egyptum, for 249/n5 in egyptum, which only those two witnesses of our group share with the extract (and conceivably with T especially, in view of the reading guidem for guidam at 249/n23, unique to T and this extract).

6.6. The significance of the analysis

The Latin text which accompanies this edition has been established on principles which reflect the analysis presented in this chapter. The following notes may further assist in interpreting the parallel text.

The parallel text is designed to present nothing more and nothing less than a best approximation to the reconstruction of the Latin text available to the translator(s). In a broad sense it is defined on the one hand by the superior witnesses O and V, and on the other by the readings of the Late Group. The peculiar readings of O are of general interest in that they provide an indication of the author's original intention, but are only relevant to the English text where they corroborate the superiority of the readings of V and K. The base text (printed from CC) generally reproduces the consensus of the Late Group witnesses; but peculiar readings in CC are noted.

However our analysis suggests that the unabridged English version is not a textual unity, but contains two components. The more primitive reflects an exemplar of the KD subgroup, one particularly closely related to D; the second component, the passages peculiar to the unabridged text, reflects the readings of the Late Group (more precise definition of the underlying exemplar is problematic).
The apparatus to the Latin presents two "registers" separated typographically by a broken line. The principal register (above the line) records variants directly reflected in the English text. In general terms this register offers a corrective, or at least an alternative reading of equivalent value, to the reading in the running text. Where the Latin parallels "abridged" sections of the English text, the readings record the original form of the text (typically signalled by the sigla O V K), or the peculiar readings of K (and specifically, if relevant, the peculiar readings of D).

Where the Latin text is tracking "unabridged" portions of the English text, the running text as it stands will closely approximate the exemplar on which the translation depends. The transition from "abridged" to "unabridged" passages is indicated by the use of bold type for portions of the Latin text corresponding to English "unabridged" matter (another signal is the readings of K, which will often appear in the upper register in the "abridged" portions, whereas they move to the lower register in "unabridged" passages).

The register below the line shows the range of significant variation in the tradition. These readings may be useful to a student of the Latin tradition, or of interest to the general reader seeking to clarify the author's original meaning -- since they cite the readings of O -- but can be safely ignored by the reader who simply wants to read the English text against a Latin text approximating that on which the translation depends.
In addition the apparatus indicates points where the base has been emended to remove orthographic peculiarities; these emendations are marked with an asterisk. A separate register (tagged with an obelisk) offers notes to the reader in cases of textual, grammatical, or orthographic obscurity; these include instances where there is reason to believe a peculiar reading stood in the translator's exemplar (accompanied by "?read", "?om.", etc.). For general purposes the reader can safely ignore the former register, and refer to the latter as and when it proves helpful. These two registers appear immediately beneath the Latin text.
7 3KCOL: THE TRADITION OF THE 1ST GROUP

7.1. Introduction

The next four chapters contain a detailed examination of the textual tradition and evolution of 3KCol.

The abridged witnesses are classified into three groups in Hm. Two witnesses are placed in the 1st group; to these the sigla R and V are here assigned:

R = London, B.L., Royal 18 A X
V = London, B.L., Cotton Vespasian E XVI.

A further, albeit defective, witness can now be included in this group, to which the siglum S is assigned:

S = London, B.L., Stowe 951.

Reference was made in the previous chapter to the text in this group, the archetypal form of which was designated the R-text (it will be shown that this text is archetypally preserved in R). In a later chapter (9.6) it will be argued that the hand responsible for this version (the "R-editor") used a more original form of 3KCol as base, introducing into it numerous modifications including, as noted earlier, material independently translated from the Latin original. In other words the R-text is not a primary witness of the archetypal text of 3KCol.

Apart from minor textual parallels, general features shared by these three witnesses include peculiarities of format, e.g. the location of passage 69/32-71/8 (which in the other versions appears later, at 72/25-35) and the inclusion of passage 79/1-31 (not present in the other versions), as well as the Latin
marginal notes, the absence of chapter numeration, and the acrostic chapter initials (see Hm. vi).

Citations will follow the form in the individual MSS, with references (by page/line) to the corresponding printed version(s). Citations from R (recto pages of Hm.) have no accompanying siglum but can be recognised by the odd numbered page references. The variants of V are given in Hm. (199-205). A sample of the variants of S is included in APPARATUS under FULL VARIANTS FOR SELECT CHAPTERS. A reasonably accurate control over the pre-archetypal stage of the R-text is provided by the primary versions of 3KCol, and on occasion comparison will be made with these to confirm the archetypal reading where the 1st group witnesses differ. These traditions are accessible in Hm. (verso text); citations are recognised by even numbered page references.

7.2. V: an inferior witness

7.2.1. The three witnesses compared

Hm. prints the text of R, describing V as a "literal copy" of R; S was not identified (Hm. v). In fact both textually and dialectically S is much closer to R (N. Midland dialect, according to Hm. viii) than V (northern) is.

V introduces many peculiar errors into the text -- e.g. kepe taken and ofte for 5/32 kepe take of; callynge for 23/12 (a comune) chepyng -- and omits a whole passage (67/17-26 Thys syde . . . Iewes) preserved in R, S, and the rest of the tradition. This shows that V cannot be the "precursor" (direct ancestor) of R or S.
7.2.2. The possibility of contamination in V

Whereas the majority of V's errors are errors of omission, usually of isolated words (e.g. of 3/7 worshippe and and 9/22 of diuere), a minority are of a different type (additions, alterations, etc.) which sometimes agree with the readings of other branches of the tradition (in particular, with H, L, E, BN, and MP). Examples include byhete grete yiftes to be kepere VL for 9/2 bihetten yiftes to be kepere; many maner of men VBN for 9/23 all maner of men; and

5/22 3if hys prophecie had come þorwe þe deuelys crafte, þe deuyl wolde not have forbode hym to curse Israel þe deuelys crafte þe deuyl} þe deuyles crafte þey V, devels craft they H.

Nevertheless this hardly constitutes compelling evidence for contamination. Detailed examination of V's distinctive errors in the first 10 chapters reveals mostly trivial parallels with other strands of the tradition, such as variation of prepositions:

5/22 þorwe þe deuelys crafte þorwe} of VEMP,

or the alternation of the definite article with demonstratives (9/32 þis progenye} þe progenye VEL) -- coincidences predictable enough in late exemplars. Moreover, the proportion of such coincident readings is small compared to the numerous distinctive errors which V does not share with any other branch. At best it can be suggested that if extraneous readings are believed to have entered V, the source is to be sought in the branches of the tradition identified above.
7.3. The relationship of R and S

To return to the main argument, we have shown that:

\[ R \not\equiv V; S \equiv V \]

(the notation "B K A" meaning that stemmatically witness B does not lie in direct line of descent from witness A -- in other words, that A is not the precursor of B).

As previously noted, S is closer than V to the group archetype: S contains fewer peculiar errors -- in a 10-page sample passage, S averages fewer than three errors per page, whereas V averages over nine -- and the errors of S are less distinctive. Consequently it proves more difficult to define the precise stemmatic position of S than is the case with V.

However, it seems that S is not the precursor of R. S contains many distinctive errors in passages where R preserves the more original version, for example:

69/15 And as hit is seyd afore
   as] om. S (cf. 68/15 and as hit is seyde . . )

115/18 to lyue in body and not bodilich ne aftir be
   fleissche is an aungeles lijf [vita est angelica] and
   not manmys lyfe
   is] as S.

In particular S in two passages has an omission which R does not have. The first is:

129/14 And ḉis Cytee of Nazareth is in ḉe lond of
   Galilee, and bisyde ḉis Galilee is ḉe hille of Thabor
   of Nazareth is in ḉe lond of Galilee] om. S; And
   ḉis Cytee . . Galilee and] om. V

where the verso version (128/13 Also ḉis cite of Nazareth is in
   ḉe londe and ḉe lordschippe of galile, and bisyde ḉis galile is
   ḉe hill ḉe wich is cleped Thabor) shows that R has most closely preserved the original reading.
The second omission occurs in the following passage:

135/14 þer began a newe persecucioun of eresye
a3ens þe cristen feîp, and also a persecucioun of deep
a3ens hem þat wolde mayntene þe cristen feîp & þe
cristen lawe.

where the wording of the alternative tradition (134/14-18) is
almost exactly the same as R's.

In either case, it is impossible to imagine that the scribe
of R could have reconstructed the more original reading from S's
corrupt one, so we may conclude:

R f S.

7.4. S and V: a subgroup

The last two examples also provide evidence of a close link
between S and V: at 129/14 S preserves a corrupt form of the text
which V omits altogether, and at 135/14 almost exactly the same
omission occurs in both witnesses. More instances can be cited:
in a 10-page sample (Hm. 97-115) where S has 26 distinctive
readings, 11 of these are common to V. Examples include:

89/3 And þus þesiij. tvorschippful kyngis þei dwellid
in her londys and kyngdoms
worschippful kyngis] kynges worshippful S, kynges
worshipfully V;

97/32 þer cowde no leche hele hym
no] add man no S, add man ne V

103/26 Thys was to vs all a gret profyt (Latin: id
nobis omnibus profuit)
profyt] prophete SV.
These readings are evidence of a separate subgroup SV whose members preserve common peculiar readings distinct from those of R. The next step is to define the exact interrelationship of the two witnesses. It has been shown that S cannot descend directly from V. We must therefore accept one of two hypotheses: either V descends from S directly, or the two witnesses are mutually independent (i.e. both stem from a common precursor -- say, *SV).

Support for the second hypothesis comes from examples such as the following, where in each case V preserves the same reading as R, which in turn is closer to the other versions:

69/15 And as hit is seyd in þe gospel afore: Et intrantes domum &c., so þei 3ede and offrid to god as] om. S

83/29 þei my3t not vnneþe go after ne ryde home a3ene in .ij. 3ere a3ene] om. S

117/22 (Iohn Ewangelist) was a preest & most specialychche chose and louyd of god almi3ty of] om. S.

It is significant that in each case the reading of S makes sense in itself; thus, if V did descend directly from S, there would be no reason to expect to see a reversion to the archetypal reading.

None of these examples is conclusive in itself. The argument rests rather on accumulated evidence: in the 10 page sample there are 10 cases in which S has an inferior variant when V preserves the superior one (inherited via *SV).

Admittedly a portion of these variants may fairly be termed trivial. This is a problem we face in dealing with a text so close to the archetype: S may be a direct copy of *SV, and the product of a careful scribe at that, so its distinctive errors are all of a quite minor nature.
(In fact S's readings are often so close to R's that it is hard to imagine an intervening copy (viz. *SV). Thus S shares with R a number of quite particular lexical (e.g. 119/4 for an every [sic] lastyng memorial) and morphological (e.g. 115/10 divers exposiciouns of her jifty [sic]) irregularities -- anomalies usually normalised by the stage represented by V. However the retention of these anomalies may be simply a testimony to the conservativeness of a succession of copyists.)

Counterevidence against the model is the occasional ostensible retention of a more original reading in V. An example is (text as printed in Hm.):

63/3 doctours of þe lawe and þe scribes ... were evermore present in þat cite; so þat þe Iewes and þes [scribes] bat knewe ... scribes(2) Iom. RS.

The primary versions do not contain the omission, nor does V. At first sight this suggests an RS linkage, as opposed to the SV one. However an alternative explanation is that the word is a scribal emendation deduced from the context (to make good the awkward bes bat), and thus not an archetypal reading.

A similar case is:

79/13 in goddis Crist Ihesu RS
goddis] add sone V;

the lacuna is so transparent that at least one scribe in the line of transmission from *SV to V could have been expected to guess the correct reading and emend the text accordingly.

Based on the conclusions reached so far, viz:

\begin{align*}
R \not\in S; & \quad S \not\in V; \\
R \not\in V; & \quad V \not\in S;
\end{align*}

six (and only six) valid hypotheses can be constructed (Fig. 2).
Fig. 2. Possible stemmatic models for the 1st group witnesses.
However the following considerations allow certain models to be eliminated. In the sample passage, S and V in 11 cases share a common reading that differs from that of R. Often it is possible to show that one of the two alternatives (i.e. the reading of *SV or the reading of R) is closer to the archetypal reading; in particular, six examples are found where R's reading is probably original. Now if R in a significant number of cases preserves a more original reading than *SV, then we can eliminate those models which subordinate R within this group, viz. (a), (b), and (c) in our diagram; for in each case the inferior reading, which must have been present in the common ancestor *SV, would have been transmitted through all lower branches, and so would have appeared in R. Moreover (d) can be eliminated as the evidence implies the existence of a subgroup SV whose peculiar readings are distinguishable from the peculiar readings of R.

This reduces the valid models to two, (e) and (f), bringing us to the final and most significant question.

7.5. The evidence for the group archetype

In Hm. it is assumed that V descends from R directly. This is at first sight a plausible conclusion. Only close analysis reveals occasional agreements between V and the other traditions:

5/28 arofore pei cleped him a enchauntour and no prophete cleped] calle V (cf. 4/28 therfore be Iewes .. clepe hym a enchauntour and no prophete)

17/31 And pe cause [pat ber were .xij. men ordeyned is [bis] is] was V (cf. 16/33 was).
Even these, like the previous examples at 63/3 and 79/13, can be explained as coincidental parallels or scibal emendations. As such, they do not constitute evidence against Hm.'s model.

(Curiously, Hm. seems to allow the possibility that V all the same might occasionally transmit a more plausible reading than R; thus at 115/15 in token of dedyng of fleische V's variant reading deying (for dedyng) is recorded marginally. The practice of citing the readings of a witness in direct line of descent from another is of course inconsistent with stemmatic theory, as in a closed system such a witness cannot independently preserve a more original reading than any of its precursors.)

In fact it is not possible on the evidence of V alone to discount the second possibility, illustrated by model (f), that R is not the archetype of the group, but that both it and *SV are dependent on another earlier exemplar -- *RSV, say. (The possibility that this model is the correct one is of more than theoretical consequence, for, if it were correct, Hm.'s printed text would have to be revised to take into account the readings offered by the alternative tradition, viz. the SV branch.)

However, methodological problems arose in attempting to resolve the dilemma. The question revolves around two knowns (R's readings, and that of the other versions) and two unknowns (the readings of *SV, and the readings of the possible earlier archetype, *RSV). To complicate matters, it is not always easy to find really distinctive variants on which to base the argument. The best approach seemed to be the accumulation of many small pieces of evidence which when examined in quantity would hopefully allow reliable conclusions to be drawn.
Consequently, as a basis for analysis, the whole extant text of S was collated against R, V, and the other versions. For each peculiar variant of S an attempt was made to reconstruct a reading for *SV to set against R (where these differed). These two alternatives were then set against the hypothetical reading of the archetype *RSV (as confirmed by the verso text, or otherwise), and a count was made of the number of times R and *SV respectively seemed to preserve the archetypal reading. In each case the most probable reconstruction was accepted, in order to avoid rejecting too many examples as "not proven"; occasional mistakes would presumably level out in significance over the whole range of evidence.

Out of 115 variant readings in S, it proved possible to reconstruct a reading of *SV in 83 cases; in 54 of these cases this reconstructed reading differs from that of R (thus in 29 cases S's variant is reflected in all three witnesses; of these, five cases point to a common error -- a matter to which we shall return later); in 39 of these cases an archetypal reading can be reconstructed with reasonable certainty, and in 37 cases either R or *SV (not both) preserves this ostensible archetypal reading. Separating these 37 readings, we find R follows the archetypal reading in 26 cases, *SV in 11 cases.

7.6. Errors in the group archetype

The first point of interest to emerge from the analysis is that there are five cases where the reading of the group archetype seems to be corrupt. One case is (text of R):
93/30 be bawme is put in gret [sic] siluer pot, be
which pot is of .v.j. or .vij. galouns.
pot(1)] potes SV

where both context and the other version (92/30: be bawme is put
in to a grete potte of syluer, and pat pot is more pan .v.j.
galouns) suggest that the singular is the original reading. The
article is restored in the printed text (be bawme is put in [a]
gret siluer pot), but the evidence of the MSS suggests that it
must have been lacking in the group archetype (the reading of SV
being a rationalisation of this archetypal reading).

In another case both R and S read:

83/26 bei come hom saf and hole in to her owne londy
[sic]
londy] londe V

(the archetypal reading, preserved by R and S, most probably
stems from a misreading of the abbreviation for the plural; that
this reading has been rationalised in V is not surprising).

In a third R and S have the following text in common:

93/24 and þan be roddys be knytte after be maner as a
'vyne is kitte
knytte] kyttes V (cf. 92/23 and than be roddys be
kytte as a wyne);

this example is somewhat more difficult to interpret in view of
V's reading; but apparently both *SV and R concurred in the
erroneous reading knytte.

The two remaining cases, at 63/3 and 79/13, have been dealt
with previously (7.4).

I conclude from these readings that errors existed in the
group archetype. Unless these errors were already present in the
editor's base, they indicate that the archetypal text does not
represent the original text of this version of 3KCol.
(There are further examples in the printed text which lie outside the passage of analysis, which was necessarily limited to the common extant text of the three witnesses; at this stage these can only be termed archetypal errors on the presupposition that R is the group archetype. It is noteworthy that such readings are normally emended without explanation in Hm. (e.g. 11/8 [&]; 11/18 [of] -- the bracketed words are not in the MS).

7.7. R: the group archetype

A second deduction from the data rests on more detailed analysis of the other readings. In our exhaustive sample only 37 readings could be isolated as evidence for the independence or otherwise of *SV from R. In theory we should predict the results to show either that all the readings of R follow or are closer to the archetypal readings (implying that R was in fact the ancestor of *SV); or else (if both stem from *RSV) to find a distribution of agreements -- R preserving the reading of the common precursor in some passages, *SV in the remainder.

The figures as they stand, with 26 readings against 11, at first sight seems to accord with the second alternative. However on closer examination the evidence of these 11 readings in *SV is less convincing. For a start, six can fairly be dismissed as trivial -- *pes/pe (twice); by caswe/(-bat); her/hei (a pen slip); Tartary/(-n); and whan/and so whan. Another two occur in familiar Latin citations, where one might expect to find the original reading restored by a later scribe.
This leaves three pieces of evidence where there seems to be some real basis for preferring the reading of *SV. The first is:

93/28 *bis bawme renneþ* . . downe in to dissches of syluer (text of R)
in to] add be SV

where the alternative tradition reads (92/27) the bawme renneþ
downe in to bes vessels; but in fact, the modification of the preceding context in the R-text makes R's reading, not *SV's, the more plausible.

The second example is:

95/14 And *bis bawme is at [sic] it were thynne wyne and grene* (text of R)
at] as SV

where the left hand version reads (94/15) and *bis bawme is as bouþ it were thynne grene wyne*; but SV's reading is an obvious emendation in the context.

71/35 is a very similar example.

Thus the evidence for a pre-R archetype *RSV has melted away under detailed analysis. There seems in the final analysis little support for the notion of an independent SV branch, in other words, to challenge the accepted model that R represents the archetypal witness to this version of 3KCol. Admittedly, the opposing 26 readings could be subjected to similar analysis, and the number of convincingly superior readings might well be considerably reduced in the process. But there still exists a disparity of 26 to 11 in the preservation of alleged archetypal readings; moreover the fact remains that whereas the readings in R include indisputably superior readings (e.g. 129/14 and 135/14, examined at 7.5), there is no convincing example of an archetypal reading preserved in *SV independently of R.
(In practice, even if the alternative hypothesis had proved to be true, the conclusion would have little practical bearing on the establishment of the 1st group text; since the only readings in doubt were precisely those cited above, there would only be a handful of cases where a cautionary note would need to be introduced into the apparatus of the printed text.)

The preferred model is summarised overleaf; as previously noted, the retention of particular archetypal errors in S would suggest that no more than a single copy intervened between this witness and the archetype R.
Fig. 3. Stemma of 1st group.
8.1. Introduction

Hm. places almost all the remaining witnesses of 3KCol in the 2nd group.

These include the base text of the verso version, to which the siglum K is here assigned:

\[ K = \text{Cambridge, Univ. Libr., Ee IV 32} \]

as well as a number of other witnesses to which Hm. assigns the sigla B, D, P, and T (D and P are defective):

\[ B = \text{London, B.L., Addit. 36983 ("Bedford MS")} \]
\[ D = \text{Oxford, Bodleian Libr., Douce 301} \]
\[ P = \text{Cambridge, Univ. Libr., Add. 43 ("Patrik Papers")} \]
\[ T = \text{London, B.L., Cotton Titus A XXV.} \]

According to Hm. the printed edition, W, "follows the Cbr. MS [i.e. K] or a copy of it" (159n; v/n1):

\[ W = \text{the "1st Edition" of Wynkyn de Worde} \]

Another witness placed in this group by Hm., but not cited in the Various Readings (159-86), is here assigned the siglum Q:

\[ Q = \text{Oxford, Bodleian Libr., Ashm. 59.} \]

It should be noted that Cambr. Kk 1,3, wrongly assigned by Hm. to the 2nd group, in fact belongs in the 3rd group (see 9.4). It will be shown that the unique unabridged witness, here assigned the siglum F, was founded on a 2nd group base:

\[ F = \text{Durham, Hunter 15 pt.2.} \]

Further 2nd group witnesses unknown to Hm. will be identified later in the present chapter.
As previously, citations will be from the original MSS, with line references to the corresponding passage in the printed version. However the consensus text will normally be cited from F.

The reader may care to anticipate the conclusions of the present chapter by referring to the stemmatic diagrams (Figs. 4 and 5) at the end of 8.2.6 and 8.6.

In Hm. the 2nd group is described as the generally received text (v-vi). Apart from F, some 21 witnesses of 3KCol are now known, of which 12 belong in the 2nd group; thus the 2nd group remains numerically the most commonly preserved version. The number of previously known witnesses was insufficient to allow more than general observations concerning relationships within the group (Hm. vi-vii). However it is now possible to define these more precisely and to represent them with stemmatic models. For reasons which will be more apparent in the ensuing discussion, and in the chapter on the evolution of the 3KCol (INTRODUCTION 10), it makes sense to divide the witnesses of the 2nd group -- for the time being setting aside W, which proves somewhat anomalous -- into three subgroups, viz: (i) the "A-subgroup" (7 witnesses); (ii) the "K-subgroup" (1 witness); (iii) the "B-subgroup" (3 witnesses). In fact these subdivisions are implicitly recognised in Hm.'s analysis.
8.2. The A-subgroup

Of the witnesses of the A-subgroup, four -- T, D, P, and Q -- are discussed in Hm.; to the remaining three the sigla A, M, and E are here assigned (E lacks the final section):

A = Astor A2 (present whereabouts unknown)
M = Cambridge, Magdalen College, Pepys 2006

8.2.1. The A-additions

Of the seven the text is best preserved in A. However it will be shown that A is not the group archetype; rather, an archetypal text for the group (the "A-text") can be reconstructed on the basis of a bifurcate stemma.

Not surprisingly the features which distinguish the A-text from the other 2nd group texts are not so obvious as those which distinguish the major groupings from each other. Nevertheless the A-text is marked not only by peculiar errors but by a peculiar formal characteristic, namely short but significant passages appearing at scattered points in the text but omitted in the other 2nd group subgroups. These distinctive passages, which Hm. identifies in the text of T and D (without explicit note of their appearance in P and Q as well), are here termed the "A-additions" (it will be shown in a later chapter that the A-additions constitute significant evidence for the evolution of 3KCol; however the term "additions" is used descriptively, and in itself does not carry evolutionary presuppositions).
The A-additions, which also appear in the text of the 3rd group witnesses, are printed within square brackets in the verso text in Hm. (where they are commonly identified by the marginal note "added from Tit. [i.e. T]", e.g. at 30/n4, 42/n3, 54/n4, and 60/n2).

8.2.2. The archetypal text of the subgroup

Aside from the "additions", the A-text is characterised by peculiar errors. An analysis of the witnesses over twenty chapters reveals 42 instances where all share or reflect a common peculiar reading. Examples include:

10/28 ... of hereynge and of syghte and also of sermouns and omelyes ... FKY etc. and also of] monu [i.e. mony] faire ATDEMP

30/7 men repe corn ... moost in May after the place and the grounde is sette as in some place be ground is heyere and in some place lower. But by Bethleem be ... F etc. (... secundum locorum situacionem ...) after the place ... place lower] om. ATDEMP

32/22 The sceptre of Iuda shal nought be bore away ne the stokke of be lynage til he come that shal be sent F etc. (non aufferetur sceptrum de Iuda et dux de femore eius donec veniet qui mittendus est) ne] fro ATDEMP

52/32 Ierusafem a ryse and take light for thy lyght is come and the ioye of god is spronge vp on the F etc. (surge illuminare Ierusalem quia venit lumen tuum et gloria domini super te orta est) is come] om. ATDEMP

48/17 none ... knewe of othres purpos ne entencioun by cause of the longe weye and fer weye that was bytwixe every kyngdome F etc. the longe weye and fer] longe weye and for the ATDE, the lang wey and yet not wythstondyng the grete and long MP.
Such readings, which in many instances are demonstrably inferior, indicate that the archetypal text of this subgroup already contained errors.

Statistical analysis of the readings reveals that the next most frequent pattern of agreement is of TDE against A (30 instances). This suggests that the three witnesses belong together as a subgroup. More often the TDE reading is the inferior one; nevertheless peculiar readings in A establish the independence of this witness from TDE (see 8.2.5). In practice this means that the consensus readings of TDE must be consulted as control over A in reconstructing the text of the subgroup archetype.

We now turn to examine more closely the relations between T, D, and E.

8.2.3. T and D

The relationship between T and D and the significant features of their common text are defined thus in Hm.:

MS Tit. and Douce form a subdivision of this group: they have not the omissions of MS Cbr. and are, therefore, derived from an older MS.; but they are later and more corrupt. . . . Both MSS., closely related, are, however, independent of each other, and are copied from a third MS. of the same kind; sometimes MS. Tit., sometimes MS. Douce has the preference. (vii)

In other words T and D are a mutually independent pair of 2nd group witnesses, both preserving the A-additions. A notable feature of TD (the consensus of the pair) not shared by A is an alternative version of 140/34-150/2 (printed at Hm. 184; wanting in E).
Numerous readings confirm the mutual independence of the two witnesses. D has peculiar errors and omissions not shared by T or the other witnesses, such as the omission of 8/19 _when be citede of Acon that in this contree is cleped_ and 32/16 _and of a womman paynym on the moder side_. T on the other hand makes errors independently of D, a typical example being:

30/25 _therefore the sheperdes . . . now in oun place now in another . . . dwellede there with her sheep PD etc._

_T also omits 60/3-4 _thus it . . . Iurye which D and the other witnesses preserve._

8.2.4. The mutual independence of TD and E

Two conspicuous corruptions can be cited in support of the classification of T, D, and E as a subgroup. One is:

62/13 _filium non vidit, cui tamen imposterum multa preuidit AMP_  
_cui tamen] certamen TDE._

The other is at 18/2, where A preserves the original reading:

_Nevertheless the people loked not only after the sterre but after that man that was bytokened by this sterre the which man shuld be lorde of all folkes;_  
_here E has a significant lacuna:_

_neuer the lesse the peple lokid oonly affter the sterre but affter be man bat was betokend be the sterre the whiche man shoulde be lord ouer alle the worlde._

_The loss of not was the first step in a process of degeneration which reaches an advanced stage in TD, where the text reads:_

_Netheles be peple loked after be sterre but a sterre bat man was bitokenede by was this sterre be whiche man schulde be lorde of alle folke._
Obviously the more corrupt text in TD cannot lie behind E's text; at the same time E contains the innovation (*lord*) over *alle the worlde*, so presumably cannot be the direct ancestor of TD's text. This passage not only provides a further example of the link between the three witnesses (the loss of not), but also establishes the mutual independence of E and TD.

Peculiar readings in E are in fact numerous (further examples can be gleaned from any page of APPARATUS). Some may derive from contamination, specifically with BN in the B-subgroup, with which E seems to have a consistent link (e.g. BN end the last passage with *lorde of alle the worlde*, echoing E).

It is possible that contamination links also exist between E and MP as well as between E and various 3rd group witnesses, as we shall see later.

8.2.5. The relationship of M, P, and A

In M and P we find a very similar version of an inferior form of the text. Their common text -- here termed MP -- is full of peculiar errors; some passages are quite anomalous. For example at 24/27-36, in place of the standard version (text of A):

152
no man toke kepe of this hous bycause it was also
destroyed and no thinge left but as it is aforeseid a
litel vnthrfiti hous and a Caue vnder erthe and wallys
on every side And afore in this hous was brede solde &
tymbre and other thinges that were brought to Market
And assys and hors and other beestes that come to the
market were tied aboute this vnthrfifty hous

we find in MP the following:

no man toke kepe of this howse and no thyng left but as
it is a for seide and brede Tymbre and alle oper thyng
that com to (add the P) market weren solde ther on the
grounde sum wyth in the house summe wyth out and the
(the) om. P) bestes that brought thyng theyer (theyer)
 om. P) for to sille were tyd a boute this howse.

Again, in place of 26/31-34:

And suche a maungere was made of stone in the same
place that Crist was born and in that same maungere
oure lady seint Marie laide her sone as it is tolde
before

MP read And the maunger ber god was leide in was made of stone.

Another anomalous passage replaces 22/31-24/4.

However, M and P are mutually independent, as shown by
omissions and peculiar readings in their respective texts. An
example of a peculiar reading in M is:

10/4 And among all othere they browght a dyadem of
gold P etc.
    they browght a] the M.

Again, beginning at 10/29 of diverse bokes ... the standard
text is omitted in both M and P, but in M the lacuna extends
further: P resumes at 10/30 (Also 3e . . . ), but M does not
resume till 10/32 (Vaus bereth . . . ).

In other instances P has an omission where M preserves the
original text, for example:

12/2 as hit is aforeseide the more pat this sterre was
loked after the more the . . . fame of this sterre
encresced FM etc.
    the more pat this sterre was loked after] om. P.
In short, M & P and P & M, thus demonstrating the mutual independence of M and P; the close similarity of their texts suggests that each quite faithfully reproduces the text of a corrupt antecedent exemplar (*MP).

Within the A-subgroup, MP is more closely aligned to A than to TDE. MP shares the reading of A in 25 of the 30 instances of variation between A and TDE, and in four of the five cases of variation between AE and TD.

The text of A is patently superior to that of MP; nevertheless it remains to be established whether *MP descends directly from A or from an earlier MS of the A branch (in short, whether A and MP are mutually independent). The statistics immediately suggest the second alternative, for complementing the 25 instances of agreement between A and MP against TDE are the 5 instances where MP agree with the other witnesses against A. An example is 54/27 Precedet vos in Galileam: ibi eum videbitis, where after videbitis A uniquely adds sicut dixit. Further examples include:

40/12 It is also the manere in the Est... FKTDEMP etc.
    is] was A

58/9 Alle men shul come fro saba brynginge golde and encense and shewynge praysinge to god FMP etc. (cf. . . . et laudem domino annunciantes) and shewynge praysinge] and shewynge A, and preysyng TD, shewyng praysyng E

(in the latter example the combined evidence of the witnesses shows that the original reading may well have been found in the subgroup archetype, though it is only preserved in MP).
The only difficulty is the possibility that the data is compromised; anomalous readings common to MP and E, MP and the B-subgroup, and MP and the 3rd group witnesses may attest to contamination links across the tradition. The supporting evidence is not strong; in any case there is little reason to believe the direction of contamination is from outside into the MP subbranch, since we find no reflex of peculiar textual features of distinct parts of the tradition in MP, nor any indisputable instances of "reversion to archetype" (i.e. where MP preserves a more original reading than the other witnesses of the A-subgroup). To be sure, the effects would be harder to identify if contamination had entered MP from the closely related E.

However the evidence of one passage would seem to confirm the independence of MP:

And so it 3ede to fore hem tyl they come to Bethleem the which is but .ij. lytill myle from Ierusalem TE, lac. D [Bethleem] a place A, wher the child was MR.

TE preserve the original reading. The variant readings suggest a lacuna (in place of the proper name) stood in the exemplar the scribe of A was copying from. MP's variant is more plausibly explained as an independent emendation for this lacuna than as a direct reflex of A's reading (it can be shown in this case that contamination is an unlikely explanation of the reading of MP).

At the same time it is hard to imagine any copyist hesitating to fill such an obvious lacuna, so it is presumably the very exemplar that lay before the scribe of A, rather than an earlier precursor, from which *MP descends. At any rate the relative integrity of the text of A (as evidenced by the rarity
of peculiar deviations from the reconstructed A-text) indicates that very little stemmatic "distance" (in terms of numbers of copies) can have intervened between A and the subgroup archetype; consequently even less distance can have stood between A and *AMP, the common precursor of the three witnesses.

8.2.6. Q

A further member of this subgroup, Q, came too late to my attention to be included in the statistical analysis. However even from cursory examination it is apparent that this text is characterised by an unusual degree of independent elaboration. For example, where the standard text (represented by A) reads:

48/20 yet the sterre euenlych yede tofore every king and alle her puple And when they rested or stode stille the sterre stoode stille and when they yede or riden the sterre alwaye yede forth tofore hem in his vertue and in his strength and 3aue light to al her way and as it is wrt afore In the tyme that Cryst was bore it was pees in alle the worlde wherefore . . .

the text of Q reads:

be sterre went evenlich byfore hem and alle beire grete numbwr of people And whane in beire saide wey bey rested or stode stille pane be sterre wolde hoove and stande per stille, and whane bey departed frome place to place in beire goynge on beire saide viage, so wolde be sterre semblabully hoove and abyde hem in his fervoure his beaute and clerenesse and light bope by daye or by be be night and whane bey remoeved so godely be sterre mooved hit and was beyre lodesman conduyt and hooly goode against alle ower things bat hade might or powere to destourbe or in any wyse boo kings or any of beire people And yee should vnderstande bat in bes same tyme of be birth and nativyte of Ihesu Cryste it was pees and reste thorowe oute all be worlde wher fore. . . .

Such elaboration is by no means uncommon in Q, and suggests the text would repay further study from a lexical or stylistic point of view.
For present purposes however an analysis of variants over several chapters points to the underlying evolutionary relationships. The peculiar readings of MP are virtually always reflected in the text of Q; moreover on the rare occasions where M and P differ in their reading, Q commonly reads with the latter rather than the former.

The existence of an independent PQ grouping is confirmed by:

42/34 In that londe is also founde Gold wonderly rede in manere of thynne and smal rootys AM etc. rootys] peces PQ.

As M could hardly have restored the unpredictable rootys from the context, it can be assumed that this was the reading in the common ancestor of the three witnesses (i.e. *MP), and that the variant reading peces is an innovation of a PQ subbranch independent of the M line.

Another passage which supports this interpretation is:

32/25 and many other questions been bytwixe the cristenmen and Iewes in that contry of her unction and her kynges FK etc. been] om. AM, were PQ

where PQ agree in their emendation of the lacuna which must have stood in *MP.

A further example of a peculiar reading in PQ is:

40/2 bestes as oxen sheep and other bestes FKM etc. as] and his P, hees Q.

Nevertheless it is unlikely that Q is a reworking of P itself, since in spite of its numerous innovations Q on occasion preserves a more original reading:

32/7 he was made kynge by the Emperour FKMQ etc. made] om. P
P and Q are therefore to be regarded as mutually independent witnesses. However the common precursor, *PQ, must be very close to *MP on the stemma. The close similarity in text between M and P shows that there can be little stemmatic distance between *MP and P; therefore the distance must have been proportionally the less between *MP and *PQ.

The stemmatic relationships between the witnesses of the A-subgroup is summarised in the diagram overleaf.
Fig. 4. Stemma of the A-subgroup.
8.3. The K-text

The witness K and its textual relations are described in the following terms in Hm. (my notes in square brackets):

Of the MSS. of the 2nd group, MS. Camb. Ee [K] is the best . . . yet it is not without mistakes. . . . MS. Bedford [B] descends, though not immediately, from MS. Cbr., as it shows the same omissions [sc. of the "A-additions"] and mistakes, which, however, with many more of an intermediate MS., it supplies and corrects on its own account, and rather foolishly, so making the text worse. . . . (vi-vii)

In other words K is -- and, after reexamination of the tradition, remains -- the best single witness of the 2nd group; but it shares with B omissions (namely of the passages preserved in the A-text), as well as having peculiar readings of its own; thus it cannot be the archetypal text of the group. Rather, the formal characteristics common to K and B point to an earlier textual stage (the "K-text"), which can be reconstructed by eliminating the peculiar errors of K; this is essentially the same as the verso text in Hm., minus the bracketed A-additions.

An example of the shared omissions occurs in the following passage:

54/24 (be disciples) wer wonte alwey to come to gydir in pat town pryuely for drede of be Iewes; and in pat same litil town god almy3ty apperid to hys disciples А etc.

(pryuely . . . town] om. KW, for OBN

(all other witnesses preserve the fuller text; F has an anomalous version). Further examples will be cited in a later context.

However other errors and omissions are peculiar to K, for example:

4/14 Balaam was no prophete but an Enchauntoure thoru3 wicche-crafte and be deuellis crafte he prophecied K Enchauntoure] add and F etc.
Similarly there are minor slips at 12/27; 20/28; 46/11; and 74/8 (further examples may be gleaned from an inspection of the verso text in Hm., where peculiar readings of the base MS are noted in the margins).

The reconstructed K-text contains surprisingly few peculiar errors (as opposed to the shared omissions); in this sense it differs from the previously examined archetypal texts, viz. the A-text and the R-text, with their clearly identifiable errors. An isolated example is the reading Jerusalem in:

\[
\begin{align*}
14/6 & \text{he was nat that man that shulde aryse vp of Israel and be lorde of alle folkes} \\
& \text{Israel] Jerusalem KWBN, lac. 0.}
\end{align*}
\]

8.4. The B-subgroup

The third subgroup of the 2nd group is the B-subgroup. Three witnesses belong here, of which B alone is identified in Hm.; to the other two the sigla N and O are here assigned:

N = Cambridge, Trinity College, R.5.43

8.4.1. The B-text

In the passage quoted from Hm. in 8.3, the formal features linking B and K are noted, as well as the inferior quality of the text of B. The stemmatic relations between B and the other two witnesses of this subgroup are precisely defined (see 8.4.2), and an archetypal text of this subgroup (the "B-text") can be reconstructed accordingly; however, as all three witnesses are closely related, the B-text is not markedly more original than the text of B itself.
The state of the text in these late witnesses is no doubt in part the effect of progressive textual degeneration (a relatively late dating for this form of the text is suggested by the colophon date of 1442 in B, the only precisely dated MS of 3KCol). However other factors played a part.

In the first place, there is some evidence that the text in these witnesses is contaminated (see 8.4.3). More significantly, the B-text seems at some pre-archetypal stage to have been subjected to a superficial but thorough reworking: comparison with the other versions reveals a continuous series of minor, mainly stylistic deviations which modify the original wording and on occasion reinterpret the sense, but essentially import no new content.

In practice this corruption, modification, and possible contamination mean that the B-text can be of only minor value in the reconstruction of the archetypal text of 3KCol; indeed, on stemmatic grounds it is debatable whether this version of the text could ever transmit archetypal readings. (On the other hand, such a thoroughly reworked text, with its linguistic regularisations and modernisations of vocabulary, might in a sense be viewed as a fresh, updated edition of 3KCol, and would possibly repay further investigation from this point of view.)

A further characteristic of the B-text is the presence of a stratum of readings also found in the "abridged" portions of F; the implications of these readings will be discussed at 8.5.
8.4.2. The stemmatic relationship between B, N, and O

Peculiar readings common to the three witnesses abound. To take a random example, where the standard text reads:

60/14 and whan þei si3e þe sterre, þey were ri3t glad K etc.

the text of OBN reads:

and then they saugh (they saugh] om. N) the sterre stonde stille owyr the place ther that Cryst was borne and then they were glad.

Such passages justify the classification of these witnesses as an independent subgroup. At the same time we saw in 8.3 that K, though linked with the witnesses of the B-subgroup by formal characteristics, has peculiar readings of its own. This confirms the mutual independence of the two subbranches.

The definition of relationships within the subgroup presents no complications. Where the witnesses differ in their readings, B and N are much closer to each other than either to O, implying a split in the tradition between O on the one hand, and B and N on the other. For example, where the standard text reads:

20/12 soo whan þei were þere, þe tyme was come þat oure lady seynt Marie scholde be deliuered of her childe: and was delyuered K etc.

O reads:

and as sone as they werre come the thyer anone aftyr come the tyme that our lady seynt mary schulde be deliverid of his schilde and was delyverid

whereas BN preserves the following text:

And as sone as þey weren come thedyr anon þat (add tyme N) oure lady seynt mary þat was hys (Joseph is N) wyffe Sche was grete wythe chylde and (Sche . . . and] om. N) lokyd her tyme and as sone as þey weren come thedyr (add wythe in schort tyme after N) Sche schuld be (was N) delyuerid of her chylde oure blessyd lorde (her blessyd sone N) ihesus.
A further example of the very close relationship between B and N is the passage (text of F):

44/29 and þan afterward the mirre is wronge oute of hem. wherfore we shul vnderstonde that . . .

where O follows the standard text, but BN read:

and than they gadyr yt (it is gadryd N) of and do withalle what þei wylle and (and] om. N) ye may wele consyder and vnderstonde that. . . .

However, on occasion B and N independently preserve peculiar readings. An example in N is:

148/31 (Preester Iohn) sent his oldest sone þat was cleped dauid with a strong oost and a gret multitude of pepil in helpynge of þes Nestorynes KB etc. (O lac.) oost . . helpynge of] power to help N

N also has lacunas not present in the text of B or the other witnesses (e.g. a short lacuna at 40/29-31 and a longer one at 28/19-25). Notable peculiarities in N are the incipit (see APPARATUS), and at the beginning of ch.[33] the added words Dere bretheryn (longe tyme after the dethe . . .).

B also has independent readings, such as:

32/15 but Þit the fals Iwys forsake naȝt þat herodes com of a Iwe on þe fadir side KON etc. (pat herodes] her Errowor B;

and where the standard text reads:

154/22 and þat þei do in tokene þat þis iij kyngis sougthen god K etc. (lac. O)

N reads And þei do þis in tokyn of þese thre kynges þat soute, but B reads þat sought god.

The existence of independent variation (generally of a very minor nature) demonstrates that B and N are mutually independent witnesses, both closely reproducing the text of the same corrupt exemplar (which we will call *BN).
O shares many readings with the other two witnesses, but at times preserves a more original reading. One example (at 44/29) has already been cited. A further instance -- numerous others can be found in APPARATUS -- is the following, where O preserves the standard text, but an anomalous version appears in BN:

60/28 also bey were destourblid bycause bey were com from so ferre contrey to worschip be kyng of Iewes pat was newe bore; and bycause pat herodes was but an alyen . . . KO etc.

and bycause] of oure lady seynt Mary also a nother cause was for lone BN.

This conservativeness demonstrates that O cannot derive from *BN.

Elsewhere O preserves readings and omissions peculiar to itself:

72/33 and many ober Iwelis . . . pes kyngis brou3t with hem to offre to godd KBN etc.

to offre to godd] and Purposid to an offerid ham vnto almyghty god O

32/18 wherfore cristen men make be Iwys vtterlich confuse of pat prophecie of Iacob her patriark, pat sayde bus Non auferetur . . . KBN etc. of(1) . . bus] om. O.

This shows that O cannot be the direct ancestor of *BN.

In short, O k *BN and *BN k O, demonstrating that O and BN represent mutually independent traditions; in other words, the B-subgroup divides into two branches, with O to one side, and the mutually independent witnesses B and N to the other (see Fig. 5 at the end of the chapter).
8.4.3. Contamination in the B-subgroup

A broad collation reveals anomalous readings linking the B-subgroup with almost every other branch of the tradition. The possibility of a contamination link between the B-subgroup and MP has been previously noted; another consistent pattern of common readings exists between E and the B-subgroup. A further set might indicate links between the B-witnesses and various 3rd group witnesses. Nevertheless the coincident readings are generally minor or trivial. In any case the question is largely theoretical: the witnesses involved are all late and relatively insignificant for the reconstruction of the archetypal 3KCol.

Rather more significant is evidence for contamination between the B-text and the R-text, i.e. the archetypal text of the 1st group. Consider the following examples:

26/20 and to bat same manger was an ox of a poure man
teyde bat noman myȝt euer herborwe
myȝt euer herborwe] myȝt ne wolde herborwe R,
wold herborwe OBN

34/8 ße sterre ascendid vp in to ße firmament
vp] add a hiȝe R, add a yen OBN.

56/31 herodes kynge and al the Citee were gretliche
destourbed
herodes kynge and al the] Herodes kynge of all ße
R, kynge herod that was kynge of that OBN.

Individually unconvincing as these examples might be, such echoes of B-text readings appear consistently in R. Furthermore they are perhaps a little less arbitrary than appears at first sight: they show a certain discrimination often lacking in coincident readings.
If these readings are genuine borrowings and not just the product of convergent evolution, then we have an interesting insight into the 1st group editor's method of working. In undertaking a new edition of 3KCol he was evidently not content to trust the authority of a single witness: instead, he prepared his base text by taking one exemplar (which will be shown to belong to the 3rd group) and collating it against a second (an early B-subgroup MS). This revised base he then modified, abridged, and, with the help of a Latin base, corrected and expanded, so as to produce the original 1st group text.

8.5. The unabridged witness F

Of the recently identified witnesses of 3KCol, only F proves to contain a substantially new form of the text. It would be consistent with the classification of Hm. to define the unabridged version as a fourth group, of which the archetypal text (the "F-text") is uniquely preserved in F.

Comparison of the English versions does not offer any obvious answer to the evolutionary dilemma raised by this new witness; rather, as was shown in INTRODUCTION 6, it is the evidence of the Latin tradition that, by offering insights into the underlying Latin exemplars, indicates that the "unabridged" portions of the F-text are a distinct and later textual element.

Once separated out, the "abridged" component of the F-text can be subjected to stemmatic analysis as any other witness. From this it emerges that F has clear links with the 2nd group, and specifically with the B-subgroup.
In the first place, the formal elements characteristic of the 1st and 3rd group texts are absent in F; where comparable material is preserved, the version in F is textually independent. Moreover the A-additions are lacking, just as they are in K and the B-subgroup. However, whereas only trivial echoes of the peculiar readings of K are found in F, there is a consistent pattern of agreement with the readings of the B-text; specifically, when F was collated against Hm.'s verso text, it was found that out of 122 readings that differed in F, no fewer than 40 were paralleled in the B-text.

It is worth analysing these shared readings in some detail in view of their intrinsic interest to the present edition (they represent the stage closest to, if not identical with, the "F-base", the abridged witness underlying the F-text).

A proportion of these readings are variations of a minor nature such as:

70/12 . . . a litil childe of xiiij dayes age K etc. age] olde FOBN.

However other readings are more substantial. Some appear to be in the nature of a gloss, such as:

72/27 . . . ornamentis pat Alizandre left in ynde and in Chaldee and in perse K etc. (cf. . . . ornamenta que Alexander Phillipi Macedo in Chaldea India et Persyde reliquit)”

Alizandre] kynge Alisaundre the (add grete OBN) Conqueror (the Conqueror om. W) that conquered al the worlde FOBNW.

Others may originate as emendations, for example:

22/33 than he deschargeth hym of his hors or what beste that he hath of his berthen FOBN(W) (cf. extunc depositis suis rebus . . .)

hym of] hym K, om. YATE
(in the latter instance the reading of FOBN(W) can be explained as a rationalisation of the reading transmitted by K, even though the emendation still fails to produce coherent sense; this passage is discussed in more detail in NOTES).

The shared readings are commonly no better than, or demonstrably inferior to, the alternative reading (i.e. that preserved by K and the rest of the tradition). Thus in the following passage the Latin shows that the other witnesses preserve a more accurate version of the original:

60/18 Of þis why þes iij kyngis com first in to Jerusalem rapir þan in to bethleem, many bokys in divers maners declare and expowne K etc. (De hoc quare isti tres Reges ...) Of þis why þes iij kyngis] Of these thre kyngis why they FOBNW.

Another passage contains two readings where the original clearly indicates the superiority of the alternative text:

66/9 Therfore to þis cornerstone crist boþe þis sydes, boþe þis wallys come and made o corner of trewe byleve K etc., lac. W (ad lapidem ergo angularem vterque paries venit et verum angulum veritas fidei fecit) to] om. FOBN; corner] corner stone FOBN

In fact it proves difficult to find examples of readings shared by F and the B-subgroup which are demonstrably superior to the readings of the alternative tradition; the following three are the most plausible examples gleaned from chs.1-22:

22/4 and in be same place god cristis soone of heuene was bore of oure lady K etc. god cristis] Cryst goddes FBN, was Cryst borne godes O, crist was borne goddis W
Although favoured by the Latin, these readings are predictable enough in their context: in other words, there is no reason to view them as anything other than later emendations. Moreover such examples are very much in the minority; generally the variants common to F and the B-text are demonstrably inferior.

The overwhelming superiority of the alternative readings provides further support for the theory of the evolutionary primacy of the abridgement. In the immediate context, the most obvious implication of the shared readings is that a stemmatic link exists between the B-text and F; the evidence cited above points to the existence of an antecedent exemplar -- *FOBN -- from which both derive. That this exemplar represents an evolutionary stage subsequent to the K-text is demonstrated by the agreement of F and the B-witnesses in inferior readings relative to the consensus of K and the other witnesses. That it preceded the emergence of the B-text itself is shown by the fact that the witnesses of the B-subgroup share peculiar innovations; specifically, there is little sign in F of the multitude of characteristic B-text readings introduced by the stylistic reworking. In other words, the B-text is a stemmatically independent branch of the tradition.
In summary, *FOBN is the best recoverable witness of the text of the abridged exemplar on which the unabridged version was founded (i.e. the F-base). In addition to the omissions inherited from the K-text, this reconstructed witness is characterised by trivial variations, elaborations, "glosses", secondary emendations, and corruptions, but lacks the great mass of stylistic and other variants characteristic of the B-text.

On the other hand, there is no way to demonstrate whether the F-base represents an independent tradition in itself. It is implicit in our theory of the evolution of 3KCol that the F-text presupposes an antecedent abridged exemplar; but the very fact that F is the unique witness of the F-text means that evidence for other intermediate stages is no longer recoverable. In other words, there is no way to demonstrate that the F-base and *FOBN were physically distinct exemplars.

The argument so far demonstrates that the original version of the unabridged text was founded on an exemplar a number of stages removed from the original draft of 3KCol (of these *FOBN perhaps, and the K-text certainly are securely identified). It is the final (post-*FOBN) stage(s) that contribute the peculiar errors of F (for examples see APPARATUS, where such errors are signalled by the consensus of all abridged witnesses, i.e. KYARTDEOBN, in support of a variant reading).

Moreover examination of the "unabridged" portions of F reveals errors even in this self-evidently most recent textual stratum:
17\textsuperscript{vb8} And the same Prestre Iohn in his seles and in his armes bereth the ryght half of god blessynge in a compas (. . . et habet dexteram dei benedicentem in giro)

where the Latin suggests that half is a scribal slip for hand. This implies that F is at least one stage removed from the original version of the unabridged text.

(The general paucity of superior readings in the F-text is somewhat surprising, given that the editor had access to a Latin exemplar. Presumably the editor was concerned primarily to identify and replace passages missing in his unabridged base, and took its overall textual integrity for granted (the R-editor's modus operandi might be compared -- see 10.3.3). A rare example of a superior reading in F, the correction of 14/6 Ierusalem to Israel (see 8.3), is an analogical alteration which might just as readily have been supplied by an alert scribe as by the editor).

8.6. W, the printed text

Hm. cites the full readings of W, Wynkyn de Worde's "1st" or "1499" edition -- elsewhere, "1499(?) (date omitted)" -- at 159-61 and 186-98 (see v, 159, 186). The present analysis is based on the first 19 chapters of the reprinted version (A moost excellent treatise of the Thre Kynges of Coleyne); a sample of the readings is found in FULL VARIANTS FOR SELECT CHAPTERS in APPARATUS. Hm. mentions other editions, without specific note that all the editions preserve a virtually identical text (see INTRODUCTION 5). Hm. states -- not quite accurately, as we shall see -- that "W. de Worde follows the Cbr. MS [i.e. K] or a copy of it" (159n).
In literary and textual terms W would rank as one of the poorest witnesses of 3KCol, being full of omissions, corruptions, syntactic irregularities, and foolish readings (see INTRODUCTION 5). The question of the stemmatic position of this witness is complicated by the fact that the text of the print does not consistently reflect any particular MS, nor do any of the more distinctive readings of W appear in the text of any other witness. We find parallels for individual readings of W in a wide range of secondary MSS of the tradition:

8/20 (Akers) was enhabited richelich with worchippeful princes K etc.
enhabited] enhaunseed PW

10/7 aboue stode lettres of chalde K etc.
chalde] golde VMPW

10/15 whanne the coroune was leyde vpon hym . . .
F etc.
coroune] diademe EJLW

12/8 Whan Ezechias reigned and was kyng of be londe of be Iewes . . . K etc.
kynge] lorde & kyng R, kynge and souereyne W.

But these coincidences are hardly significant; they are such as one might expect to find in a late text, as a result of corruption, convergent development, and/or contamination.

Surprisingly, there are instances where W shares superior readings with other isolated witnesses, for example:

6/3 (Sabob) is fro damaske ix days iournay F etc.
ix] almost a R, a W (. . . distat a Damasco fere per unam dietam)

18/10 vpon this hille of Vaus in a clere weder been seye many diverse and stronge sterres F etc.
strongel] straunge TW (. . . quamplurime stelle rare discernantur)
More remarkable still is the appearance in \textit{W} of readings which reflect the original more closely than any other witness. The following are not isolated instances:

10/14 what man pat was take with the foul evel \textit{F} etc. the foul evel] the fallyngeuill \textit{W} (cuicunque epilentico . . .)

8/11 ther is not a more worshipful ne a more myghty kynrede in alle the londes . . of the Est \textit{F} etc. worshipful ne a more myghty kynrede] worshipful kynrede ne more noble and myghty \textit{W} (maior vel nobilior vel potencior progenies)

18/22 in the heuede of this piler stondeth a grete sterre wel made and gilte \textit{F} etc. wel made and gilte] gylt and wel made & fayre \textit{W} (. . . mire pulchritudinis).

The most obvious explanation of these sporadic superior but non-archetypal readings is a superficial revision of the text against a Latin exemplar. A reading such as the following must surely have come from such a source:

10/28 and so of thise bokes . . been thus writen togedre and putte into oon boke \textit{F} etc. putte into oon boke] comprsed in one libel or lytel boke \textit{W} (. . . in hoc libello in vnum conscripta et redacta).

However such readings are sporadic and secondary; to determine where the basic stemmatic relationships of this witness lie, we need to search for consistent underlying patterns.

\textit{W} follows the format of the 2nd group, and contains none of the characteristic material of the 1st or 3rd groups. Moreover \textit{W} does not preserve the omissions (e.g. at 4/14, 30/7, 52/32), "additions" (e.g. 60/16, 88/30-32, 94/35), or peculiar readings (10/28 etc.) of the \textit{A}-subgroup, but rather, shares the omissions of \textit{K} and the \textit{B}-subgroup witnesses. One instance (the passage at 54/24) was cited in 8.3. Another is:
96/1 Afterward Ioseph was solde of his brepery in to Egipt to marchauntys bat were of Ismahely for þes same xxx gylt penyes. Afterward whan Iacob was dede þan were þes xxx gylt penyes sent in to þe londe of Saba YA etc., F lac. 

Afterward(2) . . penyes(2) om. KW, that were O, and after þey were BN.

This suggests W is to be grouped with the non-A witnesses. However there is no reflection of the readings noted in 8.3 as peculiar to K (which precludes direct descent, pace Hm. v/nl); coincidences such as the following can be dismissed as trivial:

84/24 And þe Iwes that knewen þe scripturys and þe berþe of cryst and þe place of Envye and of falsnes excyted þe paynyms all aboute to calle hem wychys Y etc., lac. F 

place] places KW, place were he was borne OBN.

On the other hand, W shows clear links with the other branch of this subgroup. Many of the readings common to the B-witnesses and F appear also in W; in fact these common readings constitute the most distinctive link of W with any branch of the tradition. Examples (e.g. at 72/27, 60/18, 22/4, 62/25, 68/8) have already been cited in 8.5; others include the spelling Bona for Bena for the name of the mountain at 42/36, and 52/28 as the prophecie of ysaie for the alternative reading Of pis prophecied ysaias and.

Although such readings link W, F, and the B-text, it is more difficult to determine W's closest affinities. The following passages perhaps point to a particular link with the B-text:

134/13 After the deth of þis gloriouse kyng (þes III worscheppeful kynges KA, þis worshipfull kyng Y) Constantyn and his holy moder (seint) heleyne aforeseyde . . . ther began a new persecuciuon of heresie ægyyn þe cristene feith F etc., lac. O

And after þis be proses of tyme Constantyne Noble and his moder Seynt heleyne deyde and after that ther began . . . BN, After [this] thise thre worshipfull kynges bodis were brought vnto Constantynople kyng Constantyn & his holli moder saynt Eline deyed And aynst the fayth of crysten men began . . . W
134/26 (they) wonne with stronge batayle the londes of grece and of Armenye F etc.
     batayle] hande in gret and strong Batell B, hande be Batell N, honde & batayl W

54/27 as it is write: Precedet vos in Galileam K etc.
     write] add in the gospelle OBNW.

But none of these coincidences is very compelling; they could as easily be independent developments.

A complication is the existence of isolated readings common to W and F but not found in the B-subgroup witnesses:

20/5 and every man þede forþ in to his contrey KBN etc.
     forþ] hom FW

50/20 þe caue þere crist was bore and leyde in þe manger K etc.
     þe(2)] an olde FW, om. A, a TDEOBN.

If, as indicated in 8.5, F and the B-text are mutually independent branches of the tradition, the agreement of W with peculiar readings in both branches would be anomalous.

If the peculiar readings common to F and W are deemed the more significant, then the peculiar readings common to W and the B-text must be dismissed as coincidences (it is noteworthy that this model, presupposing a common precursor *WF, would confirm the separate identity of *FOBNT and the F-base). On the other hand, peculiar readings common to W and the B-text seem the more common pattern, in which case it may be that the peculiar readings shared by F and W were the inherited ones (via the common ancestor *FOBNT, or even via an earlier *WFOBNT), and the appearance of the more original reading in the B-text is the result of contamination from other branches of the tradition (see 8.4.3). In view of the ambiguities of the data the position of W is marked by broken lines on the stemmatic diagram.
In short, W is a corrupt 2nd group text, superficially revised against a Latin exemplar. Stematically its links lie with the non-A witnesses of the 2nd group, i.e. with the K- and B-subgroups. Specifically, the peculiar readings common to F and the B-text appear also in W, suggesting that the most immediate stemmatic relationships of W lie with these witnesses.
Fig. 5. The relationships between K, F, W, and the B-subgroup witnesses.
9.1. Introduction

Hm. distinguishes a third group within the tradition of 3KCol, although only one member, H, is identified:

\[ H = \text{London, B.L., Harley 1704} \]

(H is defective, lacking 116/31-122/10 and ending imperfectly at 148/18). However we have noted that Kk, described as "late, and very bad" and assigned to the 2nd group by Hm. (vii), in fact also belongs with the present group:

\[ Kk = \text{Cambridge, Univ. Libr., Kk 1,3 section 12.} \]

The following additional witnesses can now be assigned to the 3rd group:

\[ I = \text{Oxford, Bodleian Libr., Laud misc. 749} \]
\[ J = \text{Oxford, Bodleian Libr., Laud misc. 658} \]
\[ L = \text{London, Lambeth Palace Libr., 72} \]
\[ Y = \text{Blackburn, Lancs., Stonyhurst College, E.xxiii.} \]

Moreover it will be argued that the R-editor, in producing his reworking of 3KCol (i.e. the 1st group version), used as his base an exemplar belonging to the present group (the "R-base").

In the section of the introduction dealing with the classification of the witnesses of 3KCol, the following remarks concerning the 3rd group appear in Hm.:
MS Harl. (3rd group), late, and frequently corrupt, joins the 2nd group, but shows traces of an older text, and has, besides, not a few additions from the Latin source, some of which are found in MS. Royal [i.e. 1st group], some in no other MS., so that it stands apart from the rest. When these additions were made, it will be difficult to decide, but most likely they were taken from the oldest text. I have given these additions beside the Cbr. [i.e. verso] text. (vii)

This passage makes a number of important points (but the references to "an older text" are tendentious). The Harley MS is defined as a 3rd group, a classification confirmed by the discovery of additional MSS of the same type. It also "joins the 2nd group"; specifically, the links are with the A-subgroup, the common element being the A-additions (see 8.2.1; this is not made explicit in Hm., though marginal notes record readings shared by "Tit. & Harl.", e.g. at 40/n2, 100/n1, 140/n3, cf. 72/n1).

The 2nd and 3rd group versions agree closely enough for peculiar 3rd group readings to be printed as marginal additions or footnotes to the verso text. These additions will be termed the "Y-additions" (for reasons which will become apparent). Usually the Y-additions are quite short, but more substantial examples appear at 142/n4, 146/n1, and after 120/25 (the latter wanting in H; cf. APPARATUS and 10.3.2).

At the same time, Hm. notes a connection between the 3rd group and the 1st group: H has additions from the Latin source, some of which are found in the 1st group text. From the tone of the remarks the common matter could be taken to be limited to isolated or secondary passages. However I believe a more fundamental connection exists between the two groups, the true nature of which is intimated by marginal notes in Hm. like "Here MS. Harl. continues, with nearly the same text as MS Royal in
this Chapter" (122/n1, where the similarity between the 1st and 3rd groups is underlined by the change of convention for citing the peculiar readings of H from the margins of the verso to the margins of the recto, i.e. 1st group, text for the course of the chapter; cf. 124/n5). The deeper connexion between the two groups is explored more fully in 9.6.

9.2. The Y-text

The passage cited in 9.1 accurately reports the corrupt state of the text in H. The discovery of fresh MSS permits a better appreciation of the original 3rd group text, and presents an opportunity for revision of the printed version, and in particular for supplementing the lacunae in H.

Like certain other groups and subgroups, the 3rd group is distinguished by having one member with a markedly superior text. In this case the most original witness is Y; this is confirmed by passages where Y agrees with the version of the other groups when the remaining witnesses of the 3rd group share an innovation:

48/17 noon of hem wist of oþir ne knewe of oþhirs purpos neþer intencioun KYR etc. purpos] comyng HIKkJL

72/28 all þe ornamentys þat Quene Saba fonde in Salomons temple Y(R) Quene] kyng HIKk, kinge of J, þe king of L

124/n4 all þes places this worshippeful quene ... with grete humilite and deuocioun visited and worshipped Y, lac. R (. . . humiliter visitauit et deuotissime honorificauit) humilite and] om. HIKkJL.
It is noteworthy that these common innovations imply a textual stage distinct from Y -- say, *HIKkJL -- from which the remaining witnesses descend.

In fact the text of Y proves to contain remarkably few demonstrable errors. It is thus more difficult than in previous cases to identify peculiar readings of the group archetype. One plausible example occurs in the passage following as bei of ynde seye at 120/25 (lacking in H), in which one sentence begins:

For all maner of peple in what dyssese or infirmite tribulacioun and anger bat þey were . . . Y ( . . . quacumque infirmitate dolore vel angustia vel tribulacione detinebantur . . . );

here anger is arguably a slip for anguish -- compare angustia (the other extant witnesses of the group follow Y).

Moreover, when other passages containing peculiar readings of Y are examined, in no significant case can it be convincingly demonstrated that the other witnesses preserve a more original reading than Y. Apparent anomalies are generally trivial, as when an obvious emendation has been supplied (e.g. 62/38 as hit [is] aforeseyde). A rare non-trivial example is:

58/1 ffortitudo gencium venerit tibi, inundacio camelorum operiet te KRHJ tibi] om. YIKKL

and even here the appearance of the correct reading in H and J can be explained as the result of contamination, or the restoration of the correct wording of a familiar scriptural passage from the scribes' memories, rather than as the preservation of an inherited reading.
In short, the lack of inferior readings peculiar within this group to Y implies that there is no reason to reject the hypothesis that Y is the group archetype, from which *HIJKkL directly descends -- hence the terms "Y-additions" and (for the archetypal text of the group) "Y-text"; moreover the rarity of inferior readings in Y generally implies that the Y-text is a very close witness to the archetypal text of 3KCol. In one sense the textual tradition of the 3rd group shows a similarity with the 1st group, in that the group archetype is extant; compare the subgroups of the 2nd group, where the archetypal text must be reconstructed on the basis of a stemmatic model.

9.3. The independence of H

Of the 3rd group deteriores, H proves to be the most original in stemmatic terms. A statistical analysis of the readings of this witness over nine chapters reveals the following pattern of opposition in agreements:

HIKJL ) ( Y -- 13 cases
IKkJL ) ( YH -- 16 cases.

From this it is clear that H often preserves the archetypal reading (i.e. the reading of Y), where the other witnesses share an innovation. A notable instance is at 128/9-13, where the original text Nazareth... Nazareth is lost in IJL (lac. Kk), but preserved in Y and H.

Two conclusions can be drawn from this set of agreements. The first has already been noted, that the subordinate witnesses of the group descend not from Y directly, but from *HIKkJL (from which they inherit the 13 common errors in the sample).
On the other hand H has numerous peculiar readings of its own, such as:

2/30 aftir hirynge sight and speche of opere men ... somme thynges hire ben writen K etc. opere men] clerkes and oure fornefaders H

(further examples can be found in FULL VARIANTS FOR SELECT CHAPTERS. This shows H cannot be the direct precursor of the other witnesses. In short, H and IKkJL represent two mutually independent subbranches of the tradition, both stemming from the lost *HIKKJL which descends directly from Y.

The second conclusion to be drawn from the above data is the identification of IKkJL as an independent subgroup: the agreements where IKkJL share an innovation against an original reading preserved in H attest to the existence of an independent precursor of the four witnesses. The stemmatic relations between these four witnesses will next be examined.

9.4. The interrelationship of I, Kk, J, and L

There is some uncertainty over the precise relationship between I, Kk, J, and L.

In textual terms I is, after Y, probably the most faithful witness of the 3rd group text, in that it lapses into error much less frequently than H; but in stemmatic terms I has been shown to be subordinate to H, since it shares innovations with the subordinate witnesses of the group. It is also an independent witness, as its peculiar errors and omissions demonstrate, e.g.:

50/31 kyndely resoun scheweb hit to a man YHKkJL scheweb] om. I.
A subgroup KkJL independent of I is implied by common errors such as those in the following passages:

50/1 bei were in grete dowte what hit scholde be KYHI etc.
   be] mene KkJL

44/33 Thise iij kynges . . . of thilke londes and kyngdomes in the whiche thise giftes wexed and growede and also the whiche shulde be offred to god in the olde prophecie rather of thise smale londes they shulde be cleped kynges than of other gretter londes FYHI etc. and also] om. JL; the whiche] om. Kk; the olde prophecie] the old prophecied J, oolde tyme prophecied L; they . . . kynges] om. KkJL; gretter londes] add and kyngdoms JL.

The latter example also supplies evidence for a further subdivision JL, with common peculiar readings. Yet JL must be independent of Kk, as the latter has peculiar modifications of its own (in particular, Kk radically abbreviates the entire text); in other words, Kk and JL constitute mutually independent subbranches of the tradition. Common JL readings, usually of minor significance, are frequent (see FULL VARIANTS FOR SELECT CHAPTERS for examples); a count in one chapter alone found 14.

Nevertheless J and L are mutually independent, as each has peculiar omissions and additions. J alters and adds, as in the following passage:

56/19 euerich of hem as to her semyng spak all o maner of speche YHIKkL
   speche] add In so moche that euerich of hem vnderstode othris langage wel and fyn J.

Peculiar readings in L are likewise numerous, for example:

80/7 hit was in a moment all tobroke in to dust K etc. dust] smale pecys L.
There are problems in data available for these four witnesses (e.g. the abridged state of Kk, and the possibility of contamination in the case of J and L -- see 9.5). Nevertheless the above analysis offers the most probable description of the stemmatic relations between them. The relationship between the deteriores is of purely theoretical interest in any case; in view of the archetypal status of Y, none of them is of any relevance for textual reconstruction.

The conclusions of the present chapter are summarised on the following page.
Fig. 6. Stemma of the 3rd group.
9.5. Contamination in the inferior witnesses

Of the MSS of the 3rd group, Y, the archetype, and probably I and Kk are free of contamination, but H, J, and L may be contaminated from diverse sources.

However, we can be reasonably confident about the direction of the contamination: any common material must be crossing from other groups into the witnesses of this group. This assertion is based on examination of the text of witnesses outside the present group at points where the 3rd group text has its Y-additions. These supplementary passages amount perhaps to a thousand words in total, and are often intimately interwoven into the context; yet not a word of this material appears in any witness outside the 3rd group. As any contamination that occurred less than once in a thousand words would hardly merit the name, such contamination as exists must be passing from outside into the 3rd group, not from the 3rd group into other witnesses.

The readings of H are often shared by E; moreover, as E appears to have contamination links with the B-subgroup, common readings often link the three traditions.

As well, persistent and reasonably convincing evidence is found of a link between J and BN:

2/23 ffor pís goynng doune of þe sunne ... Y etc.
ffor pís] Right so the BNJ

10/20 where þat diademe and obir preciouse ornamentes bycome aftir, hit was never knowe 3it in to pís day YKkL etc.
obir preciouse ornamentes] many other Iewels and Ornamentys BN, many ober precious Iewellis and rich ornamentis J
Another possible source of external readings in J is MP; but as common readings appear variously in J, in L, and in both, the contamination must have entered the tradition at a stage prior to *JL (unless both J and L independently acquired these readings):

122/19 Preester John and Patriark Thomas myʒt noʒt revoke þe pepil from her heresyes K etc.
   revoke . . heresyes] make the puple to revok here fals opynions M, lac. P, make hem to revoke her Bresyes J

8/33 And whanne they seye alle thyng more wonderful than ynde and in the Est F etc.
   more] add plenteſſul and MP; wonderſſul] add and more plenteſſuous L (not J).

There are also suggestions of a link between L and the B-
subgroup:

136/8 and so þis Eustorgius sent þes iij bodyes in to Melane and leyde hem þerin yn a feyre chyrche þe wich is cleped þe frere precheours with alle solempnite and worschippe K etc.
   worschippe] add þat þey coude doo BN, lac. O, add þat þey coude doo L.

Individually any of these coincidences could be an independent innovation; it is their frequency, rather than the plausibility of any single piece of evidence that suggests contamination. We have seen that the question is purely of theoretical interest in the context of textual reconstruction; however, contamination may provide an explanation of certain anomalous instances of "reversion to archetype" such as:

Surge illuminare Ierusalem . . quia ecce tenebre operient terram YHJ
   ecce] ex te IKkL

(our stemmatic analysis indicates that ex te must have been the reading inherited by J, so that the more correct reading that actually appears in J may derive from an extraneous source).
9.6. The evolution of the R-text

In 9.1 it was suggested that a more intimate relationship exists between the 1st and 3rd groups than has hitherto been recognised. The best approach to this question might be to begin with a summary of the relationships established so far between the main textual groups (postponing a comprehensive discussion of the evolution of 3KCol until the next chapter).

3KCol is an abridged translation of the original work, and the process of abridgement was generally by excision rather than precis. The primitive literary unity of the abridgement is apparent in all its versions, but the subgroups of the 2nd group in particular have a very similar format, despite individual textual discrepancies. For want of a better designation this form might be termed the "basic" abridgement (no evolutionary presuppositions are necessarily involved).

Superficially indistinguishable from a primitive unabridged translation, the unabridged version according to the present study is in fact an expansion of a particular type of 2nd group text through the reintroduction, in the original order, of almost all the omitted matter. The source of the additions is thus single, and their order predictable. Otherwise the F-editor made few changes in his base text (for example, no attempt was made to supplement the omissions inherited via the K-text).

In the 3rd group we find essentially the same abridged text, but enlarged with passages of original material not present in the 2nd group versions; these passages are reintroduced at their original positions.
The 1st group is in some ways the most complex and evolved version of 3KCol (see further at 10.3.3). While exhibiting an overall similarity in format with the other abridged groups, this version amounts to more than a simple abridgement-by-excision. Passages preserved in the other versions are in the 1st group either omitted (cf. 3/21-26; 85/34-87/6; 125/10-12), condensed (e.g. 25/14-19, cf. 24/12-36; 41/5-13, cf. 38/28-40/24), conflated (e.g. 71/32-73/13 = 70/32-72/13 + 74/7-15), or transposed (e.g. 75/31-77/5, cf. 72/13-23); these passages include (e.g. 124/n5), but are by no means limited to, those peculiar to the 3rd group. At the same time additional material peculiar to the 1st group appears, some of which derives from the original -- e.g. 11/35-36; 37/6-39/13; 47/16-49/12; 153/19-22) -- and some from extraneous sources -- 27/28-29/2 (Gregory), 29/3-10 (Bede), and 31/23-29 (source unidentified). Along with this the 1st group contains sporadic superior readings which, it will be argued, are the result of revision of the text against the Latin.

In the passage of Hm. cited in 9.1, we find the 3rd group classed with the 2nd group, though links with the 1st group are also noted. The additions of the 3rd group were "most likely ... taken from the oldest text". There is also mention of "additions from the Latin source", some of which are common to the 1st and 3rd groups, and some peculiar to the latter.

Aspects of this description are a little puzzling (e.g. the distinction between the "traces of an older text" and the "additions from the Latin source"). Moreover a fresh entity is introduced, namely an older text, for which no independent
evidence exists. Nevertheless at face value Hm. appears to be claiming that the 1st and 3rd group versions were separately reworked with the introduction of passages from an older text/Latin source, these presumably being independently selected by the respective editors, but on occasion showing coincidental correspondence.

While agreeing with the description of the textual similarities between the two groups, my concept of the evolution of the 1st group is in certain respects fundamentally different. According to my interpretation of Hm., the 1st and 3rd groups are viewed as independent versions. However my belief is that the two versions were produced sequentially; the 3rd group was the earlier, and furnished the 1st group editor's base, into which he introduced extensive modifications in format as well as independent additions from various sources including the Latin original.

On this assumption both the parallels and the peculiarities in the two versions can be explained. The R-editor's use of a 3rd group base accounts for the common material peculiar to these two versions, these being the Y-additions which were carried over into the 1st group. The material unique to the 3rd group consists of those Y-additions which, as it happens, the R-editor chose not to retain in his version. Finally, the R-editor's independent additions constitute the material peculiar to the 1st group.
Detailed analysis shows close textual parallels between the 1st and 3rd group versions throughout. Wherever the 3rd group deviates from the "basic" abridgement, the same modifications are normally found in the text of R (occasional anomalies occur where the R-editor introduced further modifications). As far as the two versions are comparable, I can find no convincing examples at any point in the text where the primary readings in the R-text imply a source other than the Y-text (exceptions are the corrections which the R-editor introduced independently from the Latin). The conclusion that the R-editor's base text belonged to the 3rd group seems inescapable. The differences between the 1st and 3rd groups are most noticeable on a formal level (the general "shape" of the two versions); at the textual level the two versions are very close.

On this interpretation the R-editor's considerably modified version becomes the latest in evolutionary terms, the 3rd group representing an intermediate stage. The latter closely resembles the 2nd group, but is distinguished by the presence of the Y-additions, most of which were carried over into the 1st group. We can summarise the connections as follows (leaving open the question of the historical relationship between the 2nd and 3rd groups):

\[
\text{2nd group --- 3rd group ---» 1st group}
\]

This explanation of the evolution of the two versions is novel; but it has the advantage of not requiring the introduction of a further unknown, viz. the "older text" (except in so far as this older text is to be equated with the Latin original). It is
admittedly impossible to make a final pronouncement on the relationship between the two versions; it is conceivable that there did exist an older text containing fuller material than now appears in either. But in the absence of contrary evidence it seems best to accept the most economical hypothesis and assume that the R-editor's base text was little different in form and wording from the archetypal 3rd group text, i.e. Y.

A final question remains, that of the stemmatic relationship between Y and R -- a separate issue from the evolutionary relations between the 3rd and 1st groups. If one grants that the 1st group is a modified 3rd group text, then it is legitimate to inquire whether the R-base descends directly from Y; whether it forms a subgroup with the 3rd group deteriores; or whether it depends on a 3rd group exemplar antecedent to Y.

In none of the passages examined does the reading of R agree with the peculiar reading of *HIJKkL (see the examples cited in 9.2). This suggests that the R-base is not to be grouped with the inferior witnesses. By implication this means that it either descends from Y independently, or from an antecedent exemplar. Evidence for the latter model would come from readings in R which are closer to those of the other versions. However, such evidence as there is appears to be limited to trivial examples. We have seen that Y is very close to the archetypal 3KCol; it contains very few mistakes, and very few copies can have preceded it. In any case the R-editor not infrequently reworded and rearranged the text, so agreements between R and the other versions against Y can always be dismissed as coincidental and/or
secondary. In short, there is no convincing evidence to suggest that the R-text descends from a text antecedent to Y itself.

(Note that if the 1st and 3rd group texts were independent modifications of a 2nd group base, as the description in Hm. seems to imply, one might expect to find superior readings preserved independently in both versions.)

There are occasional superior readings in the R-text that are not found in Y or the other versions -- examples include 7/3 almost a dayes iorneye (fere per unam dietam) instead of ix dayes journey; 9/22 Barouns for lordys (barones); the addition 69/34 pat is to seye all be ornamentis; 103/36 lenger and bredder for more (longior lacior et maior); 143/9 in latyn (in Latino) for in his owne tonge. But these are satisfactorily explained as the result of the R-editor's revision of the text against the Latin (it is indisputable that the R-editor had access to a Latin exemplar, from which he reintroduced matter originally omitted).

Overall the present reinterpretation leaves the relationship between the 1st and 3rd groups much more unambiguously defined, and clarifies certain aspects of the evolution of 3KCol. It also simplifies the recension of the text, since the assumption that the R-base derives from Y eliminates R as an independent witness to the archetypal 3KCol. Nevertheless the question of the direction of evolution between the groups remains to be settled: the validity of the evolutionary links is indisputable, but it is possible to argue in favour of a reverse direction. This issue will be taken up in the next chapter.)
10.1. Introduction

The internal stemmatic relations of the several groups have been explored and aspects of their evolution elucidated; it now remains to formulate a comprehensive model of the development of 3KCol. The present chapter argues for a preferred model, but will also consider a contrary theory.

10.2. A review of the major textual strands

There is a clear underlying unity in the abridged versions; they agree substantially in what they preserve or omit as well as in the order in which they present the material. Their texts are directly comparable over most of the work, and the readings of the best witnesses show only minor variation. It is indisputable that all derive from the same translation.

The basic parameters regarding the classification of the versions -- the essential unity of the translation, and the division of the (known) tradition into three groups -- were established in Hm., but the evolutionary problems were never fully resolved. In Hm.'s discussion the groups seem to exist in something of an evolutionary limbo. More than once the obscurities of a "first text" are alluded to, and the hope expressed that the discovery of fresh MSS will eventually throw greater light on the history of the text (vii).
The identification of the Durham MS as the unique extant witness of an unabridged version of 3KCol at first suggested that Hm.'s "older text" had been recovered; but such hopes proved unfounded when the additions of the 1st and 3rd groups were seen to have no real textual affinities with corresponding matter in the Durham version, as the following passages demonstrate:

29a25 And whan alle the custumes and vsages be ful done at Iordan thanne al þe peple goth home with grete ioye and by the weye as the goon euery man casteth at other apples orenges for they been rype at that tyme F

142/n4 And whan þis is do þan euery man with grete ioye goþ home in to his owne contrey and þan þey pleye with applis in þe weye þe which be cleped Aranʒa And þes applis in þat tyme of þe þære be rype Y.

143/30 And whan þis is do þan euery man goþ hom aʒene pleyynge with applis in þe weye þe which be cleped aranʒa and þes applis in þat tyme be rype R.

Nevertheless the essence of the evolutionary problem, the relative merits of the abridged and unabridged versions as the primary version of the text, remained the central dilemma until analysis of the Latin MS tradition, together with supporting stylistic and formal evidence, started to shift the balance in favour of the primacy of the abridgement.

With the status of the Durham version clarified, the problem of the evolution of the abridged versions returned to the fore. The formal unity underlying the groups implies the abridgement once existed in prototype. However as Hm.'s remarks make clear, the exact form of the prototype is not easy to discern. It is best to set aside this question for the present, and to return to an examination of the relations between the several versions.
It is illuminating to set out in the following order a summary of the generic relations so far determined:

a) the unabridged version, F, reintroduces virtually all the original material excluded in the basic abridged versions: at the same time F's additions are quite independent of corresponding material in the 3rd and 1st groups. Its primitive textual links are with the non-A 2nd group witnesses, and in particular with the B-text.

b) the B-text is a much evolved 2nd group text; its textual links are in the first instance with F, with which it shares peculiar inferior readings, and at an earlier stage with K, with which it is linked by common omissions.

c) the omissions common to K and the B-subgroup link these witnesses together against the A-subgroup.

d) the A-subgroup, though very similar in overall format to K and the B-subgroup (and thus qualifying for inclusion in Hm.'s 2nd group) is distinguished by the preservation of those passages (the A-additions) omitted in the non-A witnesses.

e) the A-additions appear in the 3rd group, demonstrating its primitive links with the A-subgroup. However the 3rd group is distinguished by additional passages (the Y-additions), which correspond to matter in the Latin original.

f) the present study argues for a direct evolutionary link between the 1st and the 3rd group texts: all the primary readings of the one can be derived from the other. In addition the editor of the 1st version had access to a Latin exemplar, from which he supplemented and corrected his base.
The sequence a) to f) points to an evolutionary continuum:
unabridged version -- B-subgroup -- K -- A-subgroup
-- 3rd group -- 1st group
(the links between particular forms may be indirect). It is
noteworthy that, as set out above, no stage of the continuum
involves presuppositions as to the direction of evolution; in
other words, the sequence of links remains valid regardless of
the chosen starting point and the directions the paths are
traversed in.

10.3. Possibilities for the archetypal 3KCol

Having connected the various forms of 3KCol along this
continuum, we are in a better position to assess the "historical"
factors and to consider the merits of each version as a possible
primary form of the text.

10.3.1. The 2nd group

We can begin by eliminating the less likely candidates. The
present study has argued that the unabridged version, a priori a
plausible contender, is actually a secondary form of the text: it
originates as an expansion of a primitive version of the B-text,
and as witness to the archetypal text of 3KCol has no authority
except as a control over the latter.

The B-text is only one branch of the non-A side of the 2nd
group tradition, the complementary branch being represented by K.
Together the two branches permit the reconstruction of an earlier
"K-text" stage, the distinct feature of which is the omission of
short passages preserved in the A-subgroup (the A-additions).
Now these A-additions give every appearance of being an integral part of the archetypal text. They correspond to material present in the Latin original, and are stylistically consistent with the remainder of the text; moreover the corresponding omissions in the non-A branches of the tradition, which normally are readily explained as the result of eyeskip, often render the context incoherent. Thus the originality of the A-additions can hardly be doubted. The following examples illustrate the point (the additions are printed in square brackets, and cited from T, following Hm.); cf. 30/n4; 42/n3; 60/n2; 70/n1; 72/n1; 94/n5; 136/n4:

54/23 for þe disciplys of god allmyȝty ... were wont allwey to come togedir in þat towne [pryuely for drede of þe Iewes; and in þat same litil tooun] god allmyȝty aperid to his disciplis after his resurrecciuon K etc.

94/15 and bis bawme is [as it were thynne grene wyne, a litil troublid. and this bawme is] cleped rawe bawme [and the toper is callid soden bawme. Manye moo vertues ben of this bawme], þe wich were longe to telle here K etc.

96/1 aftirward Ioseph was solde to his breþerin in to Egipt ... for þes same .xxx. gilt penyes. [Aftirward whanne Iacob was dede, thanne were thes xxx gilt penyes] sent to þe londe of Saba. ... K etc.

The omissions in the non-A tradition effectively eliminate these versions from consideration as archetypal forms of the text; on the other hand the inclusion of the A-additions gives a convincing textual and literary unity to the 2nd group version of 3KCol. My feeling is that this -- the 2nd group text with A-additions -- is the version closest to the prototype (this is in fact what is printed in Hm. as the verso text). However this is ultimately a subjective judgement, inasmuch as it is based
largely on stylistic criteria (see below). It should be noted that the corresponding archetypal text must be reconstructed from comparison of the K-text and the A-text (with the Y-text as control), since neither is free of peculiar errors.

The alternative possibilities will now be considered.

10.3.2. The 3rd group

The distinctive feature of the 3rd group format is that, whilst preserving the A-additions, it additionally incorporates the Y-additions, which the 2nd group versions lack.

The two sets of additions bear a certain resemblance, as both correspond to matter in the Latin original, but close analysis reveals a significant difference: the A-additions constitute an organic textual element, and cannot be removed without damage to their context, whereas the Y-additions can be detached or replaced without fundamentally impairing the textual integrity. The implication of the contextual evidence is thus negative: it offers no insight into the question of whether or not the Y-additions are relics of an archetypal text, and no solution, therefore, to the question of the status of the 3rd group version.

Some of the Y-additions are quite substantial (e.g. 142/n4; 146/n1; 148/n5); the longest would be the passage following seye at 120/25 (lacking in H):
Furthermore he schul vndirstonde þat oure lord Ihesu cryst þat is glorious in his werkyng and wondirful in his seyntes, as he lovid þes iij worschippeful kynges in her lyfe, riȝt so he worschipped hem after her dethe. For all maner of peple in what dysse or infirmite tribulacioun and anger þat bey were in whether hit were in be londe or in be see, whan bey cried to þes iij. kynges for help and socoure oure lord þorw þe merites and þe preiours of þes iij. kynges sent hem helpe and grace. Wherþorwe grete multitude of peple com from ferre contrey boȝe by londe and by water to visite and to worshippe þes iij worshippeful kynges. And so bey beþ þat bey preched with seint thomas þe appostil in her lyfe here in erpþe þey conformente hit after her deth þer worching of diuers tokenys and myracles among þe pepil. And whan þey laye aIf. iij. to gedir in her toumbe with hole bodyes and incorrupt arayed with diuers ornamentys as hit [ís] aforseyde þey semed to þe pepil naȝt as dede folk but as men þat were a slepe and þey were better and feirere coloured þan þey were in her lyfe and so þey laye incorrupt many ȝerys and dayes Y.

But in general the Y-additions are shorter, and constitute minor additions (e.g. 116/n1; 126/n4; 128/n4; 132/n4), variations (e.g. blyss euerlestynge for 118/32 euerlasting Ioye), or clarifications, e.g. (Y-addition in square brackets): 116/n9 and so þes lordis and gouernours of ynde be cleped þe same namys [that is to saye patriarch Thomas and Prester Iohn] ȝit in to þis daye K etc.

Stylistic criteria afford no insights. There are no obvious discordances in style between the Y-additions and the rest of the text. The phrase þat is glorious in his werkyng and wondirful in his seyntes in the Y-addition at 120/25 recalls 84/36 (allmyȝti god) þat is euer wondirful in his werkys and glorious in his seyntys; but this may be coincidence or a case of conscious stylistic imitation, rather than a reflection of literary unity. Comparison of the Latin exemplars, which revealed textual stratification in the unabridged version, proves inconclusive in the present context, since examination of the Latin passages underlying the
Y-additions fail to reveal any significant variation which might serve to identify a corresponding change of exemplar.

In short, no means have been found to decide conclusively the evolutionary dilemma posed by the 3rd group version. My personal feeling marginally favours the primacy of the 2nd group over the 3rd, if only because the Y-additions, at least the less substantial ones, seem often a reflection of the efforts of a somewhat pedantic corrector rather than an organic part of the original translation.

A further possibility is that the Y-additions are not a unified textual stratum: the more substantial additions might have been part of the archetypal text, and the less substantial a later stratum peculiar to the Y-text -- but there is no cogent evidence to support this theory either.

10.3.3. The 1st group

In the previous chapter the comments of Hm. on the 1st group were cited in the context of the question of the relationship between the 1st and 3rd groups. The present study rejects Hm.'s notion of an "older text" as a source of the additions in the Harley and Royal MSS, and argues instead for a direct linkage between the 1st and 3rd groups.

Further remarks on the 1st group appear at other points in Hm.'s introduction. Taken together they show a correct appreciation of the peculiarities of this version, but also an ambiguity in assessing its originality and its evolutionary significance.
The first passage appears under the heading "groups of MSS". Having noted the qualities of the 2nd group text, Hm. continues:

On the other side, MS. Royal (1st group), carefully written and executed, with Latin marginal notes, is of older date (beginning of the 15th century); its readings are generally the best, its language and dialect very nearly original. But its arrangement in some parts (p. 69-78; 145, 24-152), contrary to the Latin source, and without apparent reason, is such as can hardly be deemed original. [a discussion of the acrostic chapter initials ensues] ... The text of MS. Royal has many additions ... whereas in other cases it leaves out or abridges ... For these reasons I cannot believe MS. Royal to contain the primitive text; it is rather to be regarded as a separate version, made after a first text. (vi)

Hm.'s catalogue of the formal peculiarities is valid. But the statement that the "readings are generally the best" calls for comment. The reference is presumably to R's occasional superior readings, which the present study argues stem from a revision of the text against the Latin. However the handful of readings cited in 9.6 constitutes close to an exhaustive listing of R's superior readings. The notion that the readings of R are generally superior may thus rest on a misapprehension: possibly the appearance of one or two such readings early in the R-text (e.g. at 7/3; 9/22) led to an overgeneralisation regarding the text as a whole. (My impression is that in revising his base the R-editor's attention was occupied primarily with broader matters such as the reintroduction of substantial units of omitted matter, and only incidentally focused on individual readings.)

These readings are thus no argument for the originality of the R-text; in fact the only valid argument adduced is the early date of R. Otherwise all the evidence supports Hm.'s own view that R is a separate version, made after the first text.
However this ambiguity concerning the status of R is echoed elsewhere, under the heading "history of the text":

MS. Royal is quite another version, made soon after, and from, the first text, with additions (in the homiletic part), and omissions (in the descriptive part), so that it could be given out as a new version; but the bulk of the text, where it coincides with the other MSS., is still in a better state, though sometimes difficulties are disposed of by simply skipping them (as on p. 3). (viii)

Here a fresh element is the explicit statement concerning the superior state of the bulk of the text in R. The present study endorses the general conclusions in the above passage, without placing as high an implied value on R as witness to the archetypal text. At the same time one can appreciate that, given the MSS available at the time, R could well have seemed superior: of the other witnesses only K, the base of the verso text, was as faithful a witness of one particular form of 3KCol.

Further remarks on the Royal MS appear under the heading "date and dialect of the English text". In support of the date of 3KCol, stylistic examples are cited from the recto text, implying that in this regard the "first translation" is best represented by this witness (viii/n2). On the second issue the comment is "[t]he dialect of MS. Royal, and, though less pure, of MS. Cbr. Ee [i.e. K], is South-midland; and this, most likely, was also the dialect of the first text", which accords with Hm.'s previous estimate of an early date for the Royal MS.

Taken together, these passages present two conclusions which are in some ways difficult to reconcile. The first is that R cannot be the original form of the text; the second, that R is an early witness close in language and style to the original
translation. In fact neither is contradicted by the present study; indeed, the anomaly is if anything more striking, now that there is no longer any reason for retaining Hm.'s notion of the dependence of the 1st group on an older text -- rather, the 1st group assumes the preexistence of the 3rd group, implying even further distance between R and the original 3KCo1.

In the discussion so far it has been assumed that the close links between the 1st and 3rd group versions result from the evolution of the more evolved 1st group from an antecedent 3rd group. However, the early date assigned to R could serve as starting point for a hypothetical argument in favour of a reverse model. With the notion of the primacy of the 1st version would accord the early dialect and style of R, as well as the sporadic appearance of superior readings. According to the continuum established earlier, the 3rd version would be the next stage to emerge, as a reworking of the translation into a form closer to the order and wording of the Latin. The loss of the Y-additions would have produced the next evolutionary stage, the 2nd group, from which the other versions would have progressively derived.

So stated, such an evolutionary theory must be considered improbable, but not impossible a priori. However it can be tested in various ways.

The methodology of analysis of the underlying Latin exemplars proved fruitful elsewhere; unfortunately it fails to turn up valid contrasts in the present instance, not because evidence is lacking, but because the underlying R-exemplar proves to be stemmatically indistinguishable from Eng¹ (see 6.4.7).
Another approach is the analysis of formal and stylistic features. The former offers few obvious clues (though the evidence of the acrostic chapter initials may repay closer investigation). However the stylistic peculiarities of the R-text constitute a significant body of evidence. The style of 3KCol is fairly consistent and to a degree repetitious; moreover certain passages peculiar to the R-text (e.g. 37/6-39/13) closely resemble material found elsewhere in the text. The opportunity for stylistic, and in particular lexical, comparison thus presents itself.

Words peculiar to the R-text include 79/3 mortalite; 79/12 incarnat; 83/24 lakkid, peryssched. More significantly, certain lexical items in the R-text are at variance with the usage of the rest of the work -- for example 83/25 meyne 'followers' is never found elsewhere in this sense in 3KCol (cf. 7a15 of be housholde and of be meyne of kynge Dauid: de domo et familia dauid), the standard word being oost (e.g. 40/12; 56/10,11 &c.), though company (52/25; 66/29), folk (?54/20), and peple (38/29; 48/21; 82/11; 86/25) also occur. Other examples (with the contrasting usage outside the R-text) are: 79/3 powste, cf. power (84/6); 53/21 mark, cf. tokene (152/24, 154/23 &c.); and 79/16 help 'salvation' -- MED s.v. help 4.(d) -- cf. sauacioun (18/35, 78/35). The standard translation of exspectare is loke aftir (12/3; 18/2; 32/32), also abede pp. (36/5); but in the R-text the verb is translated as awayte aftir (37/20). All these words -- powste, mark, awayte (aftir) -- occur only in the R-text.
Stylistic discrepancies can be fortuitous, and the extent of text available for analysis is not very large. Nevertheless I believe these and other examples afford convincing evidence that a different hand composed the material peculiar to the R-text. As this merely serves to confirm the secondary nature of the 1st version, the question of which extant version of 3KCol most closely approximates the prototype reduces to a choice between the 2nd group (with A-additions) and the 3rd group -- a dilemma on which I have already stated my own subjective judgement.

In theory it should be possible to go one step further and subject the three most primitive forms of the text (K-text, A-text, and Y-text) to stemmatic analysis; but in practice it has not been possible to come to any conclusion about the stemmatic interrelations of these three witnesses. The pertinent readings are few in number, their evidence is ambiguous, and, granted the primacy of the 2nd group, archetypal readings uniquely preserved in the 3rd group would be indistinguishable from superior readings introduced into it by revision. In turn these unresolved problems surrounding the stemmatic relations between the most primitive witnesses, coupled with the paucity of direct evidence, render virtually insoluble the question of the possible existence of archetypal errors, and so of the distinct existence of the archetype and the original version of the translation.

The evolution of 3KCol is summarised on the diagram following. Due to uncertainties regarding the primitive stemmatic relations, the archetype is represented as an area from which the lines of evolution descend, rather than as a point.
Fig. 7. The evolution of 3KCol (preferred model). A plus sign after a witness indicates that substantial editorial revision has preceded this textual stage.
10.4. An alternative evolutionary theory

Given that I long considered the primacy of the unabridged version as the more plausible evolutionary theory, it is worth reviewing the arguments in favour of this opposite model.

Let us assume that the evolutionary starting point was an unabridged translation. The continuum established in 10.2 remains valid, but the primary split will now be between the abridged tradition and the unabridged tradition from which F derives (and from which it acquired its peculiar inferior readings). The prototype of the abridged tradition would be the abridgement of an unabridged text which descended independently from the (unabridged) archetype. Remarkably, this model requires the prototype abridgement, and indeed the archetype, to contain the omissions common to F, the B-text, and K, which presumably leaves the corresponding additions of the A-subgroup to be explained as a later set of corrections. From the 2nd version with the A-additions would derive the 3rd group, and from the 3rd group, the 1st group, as in the standard model.

There are a number of difficulties with this model. The paucity of superior readings in F is a major problem. It has been shown that where the unabridged text and the abridged texts are directly comparable, the former rarely or never preserves demonstrably superior readings. This is hardly what would be expected if both F and the abridged tradition are independent witnesses to the archetype.
The peculiar readings common to F and the B-text are also problematic: if they were a feature of the archetypal abridgement then the K-text must represent a further stage of correction which purged these generally inferior readings from the abridged tradition; otherwise the common readings could only be the result of contamination -- a process difficult to envisage occurring between two forms of the text so different in format.

There is only one feature of the texts which is perhaps more satisfactorily explained on the reverse model. It is notable that the A-additions occur most frequently in the earlier parts of the work, one of the latest examples being at 96/n1; on the other hand the Y-additions are quite infrequent until 116, when they become very common, occurring on every page until 150. The distribution of the two sets of additions might be interpreted as representing the result of two successive and complementary stages in a revision process. On the other hand it is equally possible that the distribution is completely fortuitous.

In short, there are major problems even in its own terms with the theory of an unabridged archetype, of which perhaps the most cogent is the general inferiority of the readings of F (this underlines the lack of authority of this witness, which therefore little merits more general publication, apart from its independent additions, which are of considerable length and interest). These arguments, persuasive in themselves, are confirmed by the evidence of the Latin tradition which points to the presence of different exemplars behind the "abridged" and "unabridged" portions of F.
10.5. **Conclusion**

We can now see that 3KCol was a translation originally conceived and executed in abridged form. From the original version several further editions derive, at least two of which were executed with reference to a Latin exemplar. The many instances of modification, correction, and expansion at different stages in the tradition (which extended to printed editions) constitute an interesting textual and literary phenomenon, and shed light on literary tastes and bibliographical trends in 15thC England.
11 THE DURHAM MS

11.1. General description of the manuscript

A description of the MS (which I have not had the opportunity to inspect personally) is published in Ker 492-94, to which the reader is referred for codicological and other details, and from which citations in double inverted commas in the following paragraphs derive.

Durham MS Hunter 15 consists of two separate parts, written at different dates and in different languages.

The first, in Latin and, according to Ker, written in England in the 13thC, preserves in one hand a defective text of the Historia Scholastica of the biblical commentator and teacher Peter Comestor (1100-79). This work, a history of learning from biblical times to his own, became the standard work on the history of the Bible in the Middle Ages.

The second part, "s. xv in.", contains works of diverse content. This part was originally longer; a number of intermediate leaves are lost as well as a whole quire between ff. 16 and 17, and in addition, to judge from a 16thC list of the contents on f. 3, a "tract in French" still followed the last presently extant item at that time. Of the seven extant gatherings, presumably all originally consisting of eight leaves, only 48 leaves survive. The textual losses relevant to 3KCol are discussed in detail below.
All the extant items are in English and copied in the same hand, "a good anglicana". A similar format appears throughout. All items are written in double columns of 36 lines each, except that the columns of the extant text of the *Governayl of Helthe* are of 44 lines. Space for initials has been left, most commonly a square of two lines high, but sometimes of one line high, for example at the beginning of each chapter of the Table of Contents of *3KCol*, and a five line square is left at the beginning of the first chapter of *3KCol*. The letters to be inserted are indicated, but have not been completed, except for a few of the smallest. The latter, as well as the scriptural citations and the Latin chapter numbers, are apparently in red ink.

We have no information concerning the identity of the scribe, but a number of early owners of the MS have left their mark on its pages. The most conspicuous of these were the evidently youthful hands in Ireland in the 16th-17thC who defaced the pages with marginal scribblings (sketches of boats and handwriting practice predominate). A more serious hand added *Notas* (in English, Latin, or a mixture) and occasional comments (on f. 25, by the section on the Nubians, he notes *ecce contradiccio, guomodo essent heretici [et] primi*). Samples of the more notable marginalia and further details on the persons responsible are found in Ker.

11.2. Contents of the MS

The following four items make up the present contents of MS Durham Hunter 15, pt.2.
11.2.1. 3KCol

This is the largest single item (although in its original state the fourth item may well have been of comparable length). Though defective, it is the unique surviving witness of an unabridged version of this translation, and as far as can be judged it reproduced with considerable fidelity the order and contents of the original Latin (cf. below on the lost ending). Three portions of the text are wanting through loss of leaves (see below), and the first folio and portions of subsequent folios are blackened and largely unreadable on the film.

11.2.2. The Governayl of Helthe (GH)

This work (unidentified in Ker) is a regimen of health in eight chapters, giving practical advice on diet, lifestyle, and so on. Copies of two prints survive, one by Caxton (1489) and one by Wynkyn de Worde. Caxton's text was reprinted with introductory notes by Blades in 1858; not having had the opportunity to examine the latter, I rely instead on Blades's biography of Caxton for most of the following information.

The work is a translation. The original Latin is attributed in the MSS to John de Burdeux (latter half of 14thC) or Bartholomaeus (14th-15thC), but perhaps only because both were known as prolific authors. Blades suggests a date in the latter half of the 14thC for the original. The work is a compilation from the medical works of the Arabian and Greek physicians, and quotes largely from the Regimen Sanitatis Salernitanum.
Not a great deal appears in the literature concerning GH and its textual tradition. The name of the translator is unknown; but the appearance of the text in our early 15thC Hunter MS dispels the notion that the translation was one of those executed by Caxton himself. Blades's biography makes no note of MS copies; but IMEP 3: 47-48 cites five MSS from Blades's 1858 edition and refers to a further listing in Robbins. The two listings partially overlap, but between them bring the total to eleven, to which can be added the present witness, as well as BL Add. 29,301 (according to the catalogue entry for Egerton 1995, which includes a reference to a copy of the Latin in Sloane 1986). The extent of the manuscript tradition suggests that the work was popular and designed for lay medical practitioners, as opposed to the university specialists (Robbins 409), but it would be rash to presume from the inclusion of the work in our MS that the scribe (or his patron) was a medical practitioner.

The Durham text begins in the middle of the fifth chapter (originally entitled *How a man sholde haue hym in etynq*). The verses referred to as "medicina stomachi" in the Caxton print and formerly attributed to Lydgate (Blake 230) do not appear at the end of the MS as they do in the prints. In each of the prints the text, though very similar, contains enough peculiar mistakes to suggest that the two versions are stemmatically independent (in other words Wynkyn de Worde did not use Caxton's print as copy text when he reprinted GH, but a very similar independent text, perhaps the very exemplar which his master had used). Surprisingly (in view of its earlier date) the text in our MS is not conspicuously superior to that of the prints.
11.2.3. *Wimbledon's sermon*

The sermon bears the rubric *Redde rationem vilificacionis* [i.e. *vilificacionis*] *tue* (Luke 16:2, rendered *elde reknynge of thy bailye*). The text is edited with a valuable introduction by Knight. Preached by Thomas Wimbledon at Paul's Cross evidently about 1388, the sermon was one of the most widely copied of the period (Knight 9/n4), and 15 other texts, 13 English and two Latin, are known. The Durham text is defective: two leaves are lost, and a passage occupying nearly 40 lines in the edited text is omitted. A cursory collation does not reveal close links with any of the textual groups identified in the edition, nor would it appear that the Durham witness preserves any conspicuously superior readings.

11.2.4. A treatise on the Seven Deadly Sins

The present title is adapted from the rubric to the text; the work is simply entitled "Tract on confession" in Revell 116-17. The text in our MS ends imperfectly; there is a complete text in MS Sloane 774 according to Jolliffe, who classifies the work (C.5) under Forms of Confession and relates it to part II of a text on "be clensing of manes sawle" (E.14).


11.3. Losses in the MS

The losses relevant to 3KCol are the following: one quire between ff. 16 and 17; a single bifolium between f. 27 and f. 28; and two bifolia containing the ending of 3KCol and extending into the beginning chapters of GH. The corresponding gaps in the text will be referred to as the Major Lacuna, the Minor Lacuna and the Lost Ending.

This raises the question of the extent of text lost at the end of 3KCol (the abridgement terminates at a much earlier point, so the alternative versions offer no insight into this problem). My first approach was to attempt a calculation on the basis of the corresponding Latin: for in passages where the material in the original is faithfully reproduced, there was a general equivalence of 300 words of Latin per MS page of English. However in practice this approach was to prove unhelpful.
In the first place the equivalence is not uniformly applicable: for example, this conversion ratio would overestimate the extent of the Minor Lacuna by one leaf and the Major Lacuna by two (the translation was presumably more concise than usual within these intervals). But another problem is the assumption that the English faithfully reproduces the ending even in the broadest sense.

An alternative approach starts from an estimate of the loss of text at the beginning of the ensuing work. This estimate can be made with greater confidence: versions in the same language are available, and, although the two prints of GH do not exactly agree either with each other or with our text, all three are very close -- they derive from the same translation, and differ only in minor verbal detail.

Using these prints a conversion ratio was calculated for the extant portions of GH, on the basis of which the estimate for the lost portions came to seven MS pages (actually 7 1/3 or 7 1/2, based on Caxton and Wynkyn de Worde respectively; but our scribe regularly begins each work on a fresh page, so the MS version may have been a little more concise than the prints). As four bifolia are lost between the two works, this leaves at most a single page for the ending of 3KCol.

The first point of interest is that the initial assumption that the translation more or less exactly reproduces the original cannot be valid for the final sections of the work. The single leaf left for the ending of 3KCol indicates that the translation could hardly have extended much beyond Hm. 307, whereas the
original ending extends for several edited pages more (the entire text runs from 206-312). At least three more pages of MS would have been needed to reproduce fully the ending of the Latin.

As no relevant Latin text finishes so early, the conclusion seems inescapable: the scribe, or the editor of the F-text, deliberately curtailed the ending of the work (alternatively, the scribe's exemplar might have been defective at the end). Indeed, there is a piece of internal evidence which supports this notion and accords surprisingly neatly with our comparative estimates.

The English version of the Table of Contents (extant only in our MS) appears on ff. 1-3. However the English fails to reproduce the final two sentences of the Latin. At the same time it is perhaps significant that the end of the Table of Contents corresponds exactly with the page end, the text of ch.1 beginning at the head of f. 3V

Two explanations can be offered (though for present purposes they amount to the same thing). The scribe may have wanted the main text of the work to begin on a new page, and so, purely for cosmetic reasons, omitted the last two sentences of the Table of Contents, and abbreviated the main text accordingly. On the other hand it may be that the abbreviation of the main text occurred first (whether by the scribe's own choosing or through previous alterations or losses in his exemplar), and the correspondence of the ending of the Table of Contents with the page end is simply a coincidence.
In short, if the Table of Contents is reliable, the Durham version ended at the point indicated, viz. after the section describing the folke of ynde who dar not for colde come ouer be see (3b33-36), and presumably no later than the start of the next main section (the Workers in the Vineyard, which begins at 307/24), otherwise this conspicuous passage would surely have merited an entry in the Table of Contents. The Vineyard passage in fact begins some 300 words of Latin on from 306/n13 (approximately the point where the extant English text terminates) -- just enough to fill the page left to it according to our conversion ratio. If this correspondence seems a little too neat, the fact remains that the evidence of GH provides convincing evidence that GH occupied seven of the eight lost pages, and that the text of 3KCol must have finished more or less at the point indicated in the Table of Contents, considerably earlier than in any Latin MS belonging to the relevant part of the tradition.
12 EDITORIAL PRINCIPLES

12.1. Introduction

The previous chapters have covered the literary and codicological background to 3KCo1. This final chapter of INTRODUCTION offers an overview of the main sections of the study and explains the editorial principles employed in the parallel texts. The language of the Durham text of 3KCo1 is analysed in terms of its dialect elements, and these and other matters are examined for what they reveal about the scribe.

12.2. The parallel texts: English and Latin

The Durham 3KCo1 occupies 32 folios. The text in the present edition is diplomatic, the line by line transcription reproducing the layout of the MS as closely as possible. Each column of MS is reproduced over two consecutive pages (18 lines per page), as it proved impracticable to print the whole of a column on one page. Folio and column are indicated at the top right hand corner of a page, the marginal line numbers (inserted by the editor) indicating whether the upper or lower portion of a column is represented. At the foot of the page appear notes relating to difficulties or ambiguities in the transcription.

Uncertain readings are enclosed in square brackets; unreadable letters are represented by bracketed stops, the number of stops corresponding to the number of illegible letters, or, where individual letters are indistinguishable, by a bracketed space of appropriate length. Cancelled letters (which in the MS
are subpuncted) are represented by *striking out* the printed letters. A departure from strict diplomatic layout, introduced for the ease of reference, is the series of modern English chapter headings within square brackets. Fuller details of the transcription conventions are given below.

The decision in favour of a diplomatic transcription was made after consideration of the alternatives, the principal one being a continuous text with modern punctuation and capitalisation. Both methods have their advantages and drawbacks. The principal recommendations of the diplomatic were practical: it allows unambiguous text references, independent, indeed, of the actual transcription. The fixed format also furnishes a ready made solution to many problems of layout and typography (but also a challenge in attempting to interpret and reproduce the intentions of the scribe). The alternative method has many inherent attractions: it offers an easily assimilated text, and circumvents many of the dilemmas inherent in an attempt to reproduce exactly the scribal letter forms, punctuation, and capitalisation (though it introduces its own problems in these and other areas). In a more widely accessible edition a modernised transcription might well be more suitable.

A Latin text has been printed in parallel on facing pages. This text is included primarily as an aid to interpreting the unabridged English version. Passages omitted or transposed in the Durham MS are treated correspondingly in the parallel text, and no equivalent Latin is supplied for the lacunas, even where
the translation is recoverable from the abridged tradition (an exception is made in the case of short link passages, which are usually retained even where no obvious equivalent appears in the English).

The base for the Latin is Cambridge Corp.Christ.Coll. MS 275 (CC). Here a "quasi-diplomatic" transcription has been employed, with the punctuation, capitalisation, orthography, and word divisions of the MS; but the line divisions are not retained, and the chapter headings are transposed into a space created between the chapters. Uncertain readings are enclosed in square brackets. Erroneous or misleading spellings are normalised (such emendations are tagged with an asterisk, and the MS reading recorded below the text).

In retrospect the decision to transcribe the Latin text quasi-diplomatically has caused me some misgivings. The arguments for a diplomatic transcription of the auxiliary Latin text do not seem so compelling, and the burden imposed on the reader by the absence of modern punctuation and capitalisation may be deemed unnecessary. However, it can be argued that the problems are comparable to the ones the translator himself would have faced: medieval manuscripts do not normally contain what modern readers would deem a satisfactory system of punctuation, and none of the related Latin MSS employs a notably more acceptable system. To put it another way, a text without modern editorial intervention avoids the bias that such intervention inevitably imposes.
In the end, however, some measure of compromise was adopted. The commonest mark of punctuation, the stops, which are not confined, as in modern use, to line ends, and which do not seem to be used in accordance with any obvious or consistent system, are printed in two different ways according to their function, viz. directly after the word if the word occurs at a sentence end (corresponding to the modern use of a stop or semicolon); but elsewhere with a space on either side -- or even with no space on either side -- where the stop simply serves to separate clauses, phrases, or adjacent words. As a further aid to interpretation a second register, signalled by an obelisk, is added below the Latin text; this register aims among other things to clarify ambiguities of orthography, word division, syntax, and general irregularities which confuse the sense and which would probably be less obvious in a fully edited text.

The principles on which the Latin text is edited are explained in other parts of this study. The meaning of the various critical symbols accompanying the apparatus is summarised on the pages preceding the text proper.

12.3. Notes

The texts are accompanied by annotations. This section (NOTES) is intended primarily as a linguistic commentary, but material dealing with descriptive, literary, and historical background has been included. In addition a distillation of the data contained in APPARATUS is gathered at the head of each chapter, under the subheading SIGNIFICANT VARIANTS (see below).
However in order to avoid overburdening NOTES, much linguistic information is relegated to other parts of the edition. The glossary for example attempts to note all examples of peculiarly ME (or simply obsolete) words and senses; consequently the reader is urged to make full use of this resource, and to guard against the assumption that words in the text have their modern sense simply because no explicit notice to the contrary appears in NOTES (however where lexical items are dealt with in a note, this is signalled by a cross reference in the glossary entry in the form of an "n" added to the end of the line reference).

In the same way the parallel Latin text is taken to be an implicit commentary on the English translation, and only the more significant implications of the original version will be discussed in NOTES.

12.4. Apparatus

The apparatus to the English text appears in different form in different parts of the study. This arrangement reflects the diverse function of this element of the edition.

The purpose of an apparatus is to provide the reader with an instrument for interpreting a work in the light of its textual history, and for recovering an earlier stage of the text than that preserved in the base or any other surviving version. At the same time the information in the apparatus constitutes a data base for research into the history of the text, and implicitly, a body of evidence against which the editor's theories and conclusions can be tested and validated.
The arrangement of the apparatus in the present edition reflects this multiplicity of function. The variants appear under SIGNIFICANT VARIANTS, included at the head of each chapter of NOTES; and more comprehensively in APPARATUS (under VARIANTS FROM SELECT WITNESSES and FULL VARIANTS FOR SELECT CHAPTERS).

The justification of this arrangement is the belief that the editor's duty does not end with the recording of textual data and the presentation of a stemmatics model, but extends to the interpretation of that data in the light of the model and the presentation of the results of the analysis in a manner immediately accessible to the reader. It is the task of the editor to sift through the data and make objective decisions to the best of his ability, thus freeing the reader from the necessity of performing this onerous operation independently (while still providing the opportunity for independent verification of the results).

The apparatus has therefore been constructed according to different principles in its different parts. In order to provide a data base, it was decided that a complete set of readings of all extant MSS should be given for at least a part of the work; this appears in the final section of APPARATUS (under FULL VARIANTS FOR SELECT CHAPTERS) where the readings of all extant MSS for chs. 1-4 and ch. 21 are provided.

(The bulkiness of this part of APPARATUS shows the impracticability of presenting the readings of all MSS over the entire work, irrespective of the theoretical arguments for selecting and condensing the data. At one stage consideration
was given to the possibility of the inclusion of readings from all independent MSS — i.e. excluding those MSS which can be shown to be directly dependent from another; however even the reduced number of readings arrived at under this selection proved to be quite excessive.)

The other part, VARIANTS FROM SELECT WITNESSES, is constructed on a further set of principles which reflects the conclusions reached in the study of the MS tradition. Our preferred evolutionary model implies that in order to recover the archetypal text the evidence of all other versions must be compared with each other, and the consensus reading recorded wherever a discrepancy exists between it and F.

The major problem however is how to determine the consensus reading. While this consensus is self-evident where all the abridged versions agree among themselves, it is not always easy to identify when the witnesses disagree. The abridged tradition is transmitted in a number of lines, and the stemmatic model does not clearly reveal where the lines of descent intersect when traced back as far as possible (i.e. to the abridged archetype).

In the circumstances it seemed best to present in VARIANTS FROM SELECT WITNESSES the evidence of each of the main lines of descent of the alternative (i.e. abridged) tradition. These are essentially four: the single witness K, the B-group, the A-group, and the subarchetype Y. In practice even this selection of data is contentious. The B-group in particular is problematic, since these witnesses present a very divergent text, and one moreover which cannot conclusively be demonstrated ever to preserve original readings.
The following selection policy was therefore adopted in recording the peculiar readings of the four lines:

(a) for the B-group, the consensus reading was recorded where all three witnesses of this group were extant and where a consensus could reasonably be ascertained from the data; but where fewer than three of the witnesses were extant, only the more significant common readings were recorded (the implied element of subjectivity is not a significant problem given the demonstrably poor quality of the readings independently preserved in this subbranch).

(b) for the important witness K all readings, no matter how minor, are printed, except for simple misspellings (these are faithfully recorded in the margins of Hm., e.g. 8/n4 worschippful, 12/n3 wroindrid).

(c) for the A-group the inferior witnesses M, P, and Q are ignored, and a consensus reading is recorded, taken as the agreement of A with at least one of TD or E; peculiar readings of A or TDE are not recorded.

(d) for the important witness Y, the same policy as for K is adopted; the other witnesses of the 3rd group are ignored. The Y-text differs from K, however, in that it contains many individual readings and passages; these are arguably secondary elements in the text, but have been comprehensively included, since evidence for this group has previously been available only from Hm., and there from the inferior and defective witness H.
Peculiar readings of R are not generally recorded; but as it is possible that R has a degree of stemmatic independence, a record of its readings is on occasion desirable).

(In addition to the sample chapters where a full record of variants is preserved, the reader has access to the evidence of certain of the secondary witnesses via the "various readings" printed in Hm. (159-205). The readings of R are accessible from the edited text; the text of H has also been printed).

Thus APPARATUS overall reflects the history of the text, presents a selection of readings preserved in the main lines of transmission, and provides the reader with an insight into the archetypal stage of the text. Nevertheless even in select form the quantity of readings is dauntingly large, and unnecessarily detailed for the general reader. The main lines of the alternative tradition may well be a long way from consensus at any point, and it can be argued that it is the editor's task, not the reader's, to sort through the variant readings and to decide on their significance. In any case even in instances where a consensus reading can be determined with reasonable certainty, if this reading presents an alternative which turns out to be linguistically trivial, it is questionable whether the reader should be troubled with having to consider it at all.
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These considerations were the basis for the inclusion of a further more succinct version of the apparatus, namely the SIGNIFICANT VARIANTS which appear in NOTES. This set of variants is the editor's final distillation of the information contained in APPARATUS, and presents the readings at points where the archetypal text (as defined in 10.3.1) is deemed to show significant variation from the text of F, or else to contain material of linguistic interest (in practice this means that peculiar readings of the subgroups are normally ignored; the primary stratum of readings of the A-subgroup, as opposed to peculiar readings of this subgroup, is identified by agreement with the readings of Y). The amount of data presented in SIGNIFICANT VARIANTS represents a drastic reduction, and some of the evidence is cited in abbreviated form (e.g. the secondary readings of Y, given in full in APPARATUS, are noted simply as "anom. Y" in SIGNIFICANT VARIANTS).

A summary of the layout and conventional abbreviations is presented in the pages preceding VARIANTS FROM SELECT WITNESSES.

12.5. Glossary

The glossary attempts to record all obsolete and ME words and senses, and (in a separate sequence) all but the most common proper names. A description of the principles adopted in preparing GLOSSARY precedes that section.
12.6. Works cited

Full bibliographic details of literary works and reference tools are recorded at the point of first citation in the text, and again in alphabetic sequence in the bibliography (WORKS CITED). Subsequent references are by author and page number; multiple works by the same author are distinguished by publication date. The method of entry follows the principles of the MLA handbook, with some exceptions (e.g. titles are recorded with natural rather than conventional capitalisation). A list of bibliographic abbreviations appears in the preliminaries (STANDARD BIBLIOGRAPHIC ABBREVIATIONS).

12.7. Principles of transcription

The following section deals with the practices of the Hunter scribe and the methods adopted for representing them in transcription.

12.7.1. Transliteration and capitalisation

In transcription the following printed equivalents of the lower case series are used:

- abcdefghijklmnopqrstuvwxyz
- \( \text{\(\_\)} \) representing yogh and \( \text{\(\&\)} \) thorn. However some of the printed equivalents represent letters with more than one written variant: thus \( \text{\(s\)} \) stands for the long s (used initially and medially), the sigma-shaped s (an alternative initially), and the 8-shaped s (the final form); \( \text{\(r\)} \) includes both the short form of the letter and the 2-form used after o.
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On the other hand some of the printed forms are mere positional variants in the scribal hand (i/j, u/v, and arguably b/th and z/gh). Furthermore <z> and <ʒ> do not seem to be distinguishable; and z is used as a plural marker in the ending "mentz", where strictly speaking its phonetic equivalent is/s/ (angle brackets are used to represent the scribal concept or representation of a letter form, as opposed to its transcription, which is represented by italicisation, except after a colon; oblique slashes enclose phonetic equivalents).

In short, some letters identical in the scribal hand are transcribed differently according to their phonetic value (e.g. ʒ and z), and other forms which are clearly distinct are represented with the same printed form (e.g. the several forms of s); this indicates the practical limitations of a diplomatic transcription, which inevitably includes a range of compromises imposed by editorial decisions and typographic limitations. A further lack of correspondence between manuscript and transcription may occur in the case of letter forms composed of minims: for example <n> and <u> are not formally distinguished, and this poses occasional uncertainties in their transcription.

Lower case <i> is usually dotted, and so often is <y>. As well a faint oblique line at times appears above <i> and other minims; this mark may appear in addition to the dot over <i>.

Most letters have more or less distinct upper case forms, these being represented by:

A B C D E F G H I L M N O P Q R S T V W
though the absence of those which do not appear in this series (K X Y Z and upper case yogh and thorn) may be fortuitous, the sample of text being limited. The absence of J and U is not surprising, as by convention these letters do not appear in initial position.

With this series transcription again involves a certain measure of compromise. In some cases (notably <L> and <P>) the upper and lower case forms are sufficiently similar that a distinction is sometimes difficult to make by visual inspection of the microfilm, and the transcription has been to that extent arbitrary. In the case of <A>, whereas an unmistakable upper case form (with a tongue) is found (e.g. And at 2Vb28, 3Va18), at times it can be difficult to distinguish upper and lower case by form alone; with <H>, although a distinction seems intended (and is introduced in the transcription), the only detectable basis is a difference in size. On the same principle it may be that upper case forms for certain other letters were intended, but as it has not proved possible to make a consistent distinction, no corresponding upper case forms have been introduced in the transcription. On the other hand there are two forms of <S>, a looped form and a doubled form, respective examples of which can be seen at 4a30 and 4a32. Another ambiguous form is initial double-f; this is probably intended as an upper case form, but in some instances it seems to have a distinctive form (e.g. 17b21, 29), in which case it has been transcribed as F, whereas in other instances the form is indistinguishable from two consecutive lower case letters, in which case it is transcribed as ff.
The identification of upper case forms rests on an analysis of function. This agrees in many ways with modern use, but shows some differences. Proper names are generally spelt with initial upper case forms; common nouns usually begin with lower case forms but occasionally (and erratically) have upper case initials, e.g. Chapel (as well as chapel), Chapitre, Mirre, and so on. There are even rare examples of medial upper case forms, e.g. 9Val5 sauAcion. Upper case forms are normal at the beginnings of sentences and are occasionally found at the beginning of subordinate clauses.

12.7.2. Punctuation

Medieval punctuation is notoriously unsatisfactory, and the difficulties in making distinctions from the film compound the problem. Ultimately a decision was made to distinguish six principal marks of punctuation. These are:

(i) an extended wavy line, sometimes terminating in a more or less distinct oblique tail (transcribed by a low dash (_)) and generally corresponding in modern use to a full stop);

(ii) a more condensed version of the same, usually with a distinct tail (transcribed with a semicolon and similar to a comma or semicolon in modern use);

(iii) a punctus interruptus (resembling an inverted semicolon, and transcribed with a comma, to which it approximates in function);

(iv) a stop (transcribed by a stop, but used more generally and more loosely than a modern stop).
(v) a small mark similar in shape to a modern comma
(transcribed with an apostrophe, and marking minor text divisions);

(vi) a sign like a modern "equals" sign (so transcribed and apparently of similar function to the modern hyphen, except that the sign is written twice, being attached to the front of the second member of the hyphenated unit as well as to the end of the first; it is commonly used to link the two halves of quite short words broken over two lines, rather than longer compound words).

Another mark which appears rarely is a pair of dots similar to a modern colon. This symbol has been transcribed with a colon, but it has proved impossible to classify -- it may represent a form of (ii) or (iii) above.

There seems to be a discernible progression in specificity in marking major and minor sense divisions as we move from (i) to (v). It should be noted however that the choice of printed equivalents has been dictated by the availability of typographic symbols, so that the printed forms do not necessarily correspond to the written forms in appearance or (modern) function.

Besides it is not always easy to distinguish the marks of punctuation on the film. In particular it is not certain whether (i) and (ii) are distinct forms or the same mark in different graphic environments. Moreover (ii), when written compactly, can be difficult to distinguish from a simple stop or a simple oblique stroke (the latter being represented in transcription by an oblique dash in the rare cases where it occurs).
A further complication is that the form transcribed with an apostrophe sometimes appears over one of the other marks; this may mean that it is an element superimposed by a later reader rather than a part of the original system of punctuation.

12.7.3. Word division

This is another area where clear distinctions have not always been possible. Indeed medieval notions may not have been as clear cut as our own on such matters, and in some instances divided and undivided spellings may have been considered equally valid. In other cases word elements apparently admitted of intermediate degrees of independence: a word can appear in divided and undivided forms which are clearly distinct -- compare for example the forms aeyn (2a1) and a eyn (2a5), whereas the word agone as written at 2b25, with a lesser gap between the <a> and <g>, suggests that the first graphic element was felt to have a less than fully separate status (a further example of such semi-divided spellings is wher of at 3a17).

At first sight it might seem that the scribe's notion of a word unit could be gauged from his practice of hyphenating words broken over lines (for example sum==me, as==trommie, vn==der). These hyphenated words do conform in general to our notion of what constitutes a word unit (a complicating factor being that sometimes hyphenisation does not appear where it might be expected; on the other hand in some cases the apparent absence of a hyphen may simply reflect the lack of resolution in the microfilm copy). Nevertheless it is notable that hyphenisation seems only to be employed in instances such as the words cited
above, where their status as word units is not otherwise in doubt. It would therefore be difficult to attempt to standardise ambiguous cases on the basis of scribal usage.

In practice the word divisions in our MS are generally unambiguous, and in the circumstances it might be best to leave the matter to rest here. As we are following the principles of diplomatic transcription, the problem of defining a word unit is not one which normally arises, except in regard to filing order in the glossary. But it is worth noting some instances which may seem surprising to the modern eye: to fore==hem; sumdel==fat; al==to gedir; hab==every; bey==done; shalbe (the last is widely paralleled outside our text, and may be a reflection of incipient standardisation).

On occasion we find the second half of a broken word appearing not at the beginning of the following line but at the end of it. This is perhaps an alternative method of hyphenation. In the transcription such groups of letters are enclosed in angle brackets, but placed after the first part of the word in the previous line. Another mark (which appears, for example, at the ends of lines 3Va5,6) is a faint single stroke, only found after the first half of a divided word; this may be intended as yet another form of hyphenation.
The abbreviations found in our text are generally of standard type and unambiguous. Among them are several superscript forms: the "r-series" (a superscript <a>, transcribed as ra, and a superscript <i>, transcribed as ri); the superscript hook, transcribed re; and the macron, transcribed where appropriate either as m or n (but in some cases superscript <a> represents the letter itself -- abrahã, Thomã, eunãgelist -- in which case it is italicised in the transcription). Other abbreviations include <p> with a horizontal stroke through the downstroke (transcribed: per, par); the same letter with a rounded tail through the downstroke (transcribed: pro); a downward tailed loop to indicate the plural ending (expanded to es, according to the scribe's usual spelling); an upward loop replacing the last two letters in after (again, expanded according to the scribe's usual practice, and italicised); and the final hooked or looped r-form, transcribed as: re.

A comparatively rare form for the plural is <e> with a following raised <s> -- or hook? (e.g. 3Va21); this ending is transcribed: es. Other rare forms include the abbreviation represented by the raised <m>, as in: Eustachium (20Va36), cf.: Soldinus (25Va27); and a stroke over <p> (Erchebïshoph at 24a29, transcribed: Erchebïshope). Normally abbreviations are represented by italicisation in the transcription; however they are expanded silently in Latin chapter headings or citations, in accordance with standard practice for Latin texts.
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Abbreviations for specific words include: *wt* (transcribed: with); *Ierēm* (transcribed: *Iērusālem*, according to the scribe's full spelling practice; *Ihu* (transcribed: *Iēhesu*); and ampersand (transcribed: and; the abbreviated form of *etcetera* is transcribed: &c). Generally speaking abbreviations are used comparatively sparingly in our MS.

Otiose strokes are another contentious area. In our text such marks are rare: they appear at word ends, mainly where the word falls at the end of a line, and regularly as bars through *h* medially. There seems to be a modern trend towards ignoring otiose strokes, on the grounds that it is difficult to decide what the scribe "really" meant by such marks. On the other hand words in which they occur medially seem to be normally spelt with such a stroke in this text, and in the rare instances where a stroke is used finally, the word is spelt with a final *(e)* at other places; this suggests that they are more than mere flourishes, and it seems best to transcribe the final strokes with an italicised *(e)*. On the other hand an attempt has been made to produce a typographic approximation to the medial strokes (e.g. *Ioĥn*), though the presence of these medial strokes is ignored in other contexts (e.g. in the filing order of GLOSSARY).

In our MS we find for the *(-t/s)ion* ending two spellings, *ōn* and *ioū*; these are represented in the transcription respectively by: *ion* and *ioun*. 
12.8. Dialect

A considerable amount of information, including a linguistic profile drawn up in accordance with LALME criteria, was gathered and analysed in an attempt to determine the dialect, or dialect composition, of our MS as represented by 3KCol (since the same hand wrote the whole extant MS, an analysis of the other works might provide a useful control, but has not been attempted in the present study).

The traditional studies of ME dialects, accessible in summary form in MED (Plan and preliminaries 8-11) provided a starting point. These early studies are considered to have many limitations, but the maps of isoglosses offer a convenient summary of conventional wisdom. The general conclusion suggested by these studies is that our text comes from the south central or east Midlands. The North is excluded by 5 v. 4 (Map 1); West Midland by man v. mon; Northeast Midland by pr. 3 sg. -eth v. -es (Map 2), as well as by shal, hem v. sal, theim (Map 3); the Eastern margins of the Midland by pr. ppl. -ynge v. -and, -ende, -inde (though in this case the evidence of LALME suggests the situation is rather more complex); and the absence of voiced forms like vót v. fót (Map 3) excludes the South.

The exact position of the southern and western boundaries is not clear from examination of the maps. The evidence for pr. pl. -en/-eth (Maps 1 and 2) is ambiguous, as -eth appears as a rare variant (e.g. 3b32: frogges wexeth hoos); and although the form hille appears regularly, the definition of the boundary for hul/hil varies in different studies, Moore, Meech, and Whitehall placing it much further to the East than either Brandl or Wyld.
(Map 5). But taking a broad perspective we would be justified in locating our text within an area north of Sur/Ken, bounded in the West perhaps by the counties Wrk/Ox/Brk, extending on the East to all but the most northerly and easterly areas of Nfk/Sfk/Ex, and on the north not much further than Lei/Ru/S.Li -- an area thus embracing Pet/Nht/Ely/Hu/Cam/Bed/Bck/Htf/Mx/Lon (abbreviations as in LALME).

This conclusion was refined by making use of the more abundant material in the main sections of LALME. Although no specific methodology is detailed in the Atlas, a statistical approximation to the "fit" technique was employed (see LALME 1: 2.3.3). A list of counties was drawn up, and a number of items were selected in turn from the County dictionary volume; if the form that regularly appears in our text for any particular item was attested for a particular county, a tally was entered against that county.

The tallies for each county were cumulated. Any particular form might occur over quite a wide geographical area (though judicious choice was used to select forms with a circumscribed range). But the rationale was that as the tallies for successive items were added, a proportionately large number would accumulate in the home area(s) of the dialect of the MS.

The results of the analysis pose certain problems. In the first place the conclusions suggested by the tallies are somewhat at odds with those arrived at using the isoglosses. In particular there are some discrepancies in the outer boundaries. The more southerly counties are poorly represented (tallies in
brackets) -- Brk (6), Ox (5), Bck (5), Bed (1), which could reasonably be interpreted to mean that these counties are unlikely to have been the home area of the dialect. On the other hand the more westerly and northwesterly counties have quite high tallies -- Stf (14), Sal (13), Lei (12). However the areas with the largest number of tallies are Wrk, Nht, and Cam (22, 19, and 21 tallies respectively).

A refinement is afforded by the process of exclusion; the dot maps in LALME provide a useful tool for identifying areas which show no, or rare, evidence of particular variant forms. Thus the dot map showing the distribution of 90 'many'/91 'mony' makes it unlikely that a text like ours which consistently uses many would have originated in the more northwestern counties (Stf/Sal). This conclusion is reinforced by the distribution of EACH forms (Maps 84-89) since in these two areas 'ich' or 'uch' forms alternate (our text has eche); this also eliminates Li (characterised by 'ilk' type). The regular use of any in our text rules out Ox/Gl ('eny' type) and Bed/Hu ('ony' type), thus supporting the evidence from the tallies; the maps for MUCH and ARE confirm this (our text has principally or exclusively moche, been). Thus ultimately the two approaches seem not to be greatly in contradiction, and between them allow the definition of the home area with some degree of confidence.

A more difficult problem is that posed by the three areas most frequently represented in the tallies. Had the areas been contiguous, the evidence would have been easier to accept at face value. But whereas the first two areas (Wrk/Nht) adjoin, the third (Cam) is further to the East and separated from them by the
intervening counties Pet/Hu/Bed, which in fact are not well represented in the tallies (as might have been expected if the dialect of the MS extended over the whole area).

Furthermore, close analysis reveals anomalies in the evidence: there are forms which point predominantly or exclusively to the more western area of the range (e.g. ronne RUN pt.; honged HANG pt.; euerych(e) EACH), whereas other forms are confined to the more easterly area (e.g. hevere HIGH comp.). We seem therefore to be dealing with at least two regional focuses, where the language is in many respects similar but each contains variants distinct enough to mark them as separate dialect areas. How are we to account for this?

It is not enough to say that the western (Wrk/Nht) and eastern (Cam) areas are simply two areas with the same dialect with a wedge of different dialect separating them: the evidence of mutually exclusive local forms precludes this. Nor can the explanation be that the scribe changed his exemplar in the course of copying: if that had been the case there would be signs not of a mixture, but of a linear succession of different variant forms. Yet as far as I can tell there is no such discontinuity in the distribution of forms in the text.

A plausible explanation is that the text is a product of translation(s) from one dialect into another, one or more sets of forms being show-through from earlier stages. Granted our evolutionary model, the Durham text is several copies removed from the archetype, and a Mischsprache (partial translation) is one predictable result of successive copying (see LALME 1, Ch.3).
A complication is the possibility that we are also seeing the effects of standardisation of spelling. Even as early as the beginning of the 15thC forces were working towards the establishment of supraregional and national standards in the vernacular; this undoubtedly led to linguistic mixtures resulting from partially successful attempts to imitate the prestige form.

In particular it has been proposed that non-localised regional forms came to be favoured when scribes, aware of the growing prestige of the standard language, attempted to rid their language of what were by then felt to be the more grossly parochial forms, while not actually affecting to write Chancery Standard (see Samuels). There seems to be evidence that scribes would replace the forms of their own usage with those from outside their area known or believed to have a wider currency, though these would not necessarily be selected from any one consistent source. In the process the scribe would be creating not a pure Mischsprache of two or more genuine dialects but a somewhat artificial language. One consequence of this is that it places limits on the extent to which our data can be subjected to analysis, since any particular form we might wish to use in argument could be an imported form. Any such mixture ultimately could never be amenable to strict dialectal analysis.

In practice we do find forms that could be interpreted as neutral in instances where the item exhibits wide variation over the central midlands (e.g. the scribal sit(t)h conj.; thurgh). Even where the scribe uses more than one form, each of the forms is usually a valid one for either of the focuses we have defined (e.g. the variants heye, heigh, hye for HIGH).
Furthermore, where the postulated home areas of the dialect offer alternatives, the scribe has a preference for the more widely distributed form. Thus he commonly writes *chirche*, rarely the more restricted *cherche* (or is this to be interpreted as a compromise between more typically eastern 'cherch' and more typically western 'church'); *firste*, rarely *ferste*; and 'wor'-type (v. 'wir'-, 'wur'-) for WORSHIP. We might conclude that this is evidence for the beginnings of supralocal (regional) standardisation -- a process in which the Midlands by its central position linguistically and geographically was in the natural course of things inevitably bound to play the central role, at least until other political and cultural forces intervened to affect the rise of standard English.

Unfortunately there is really no way to prove such a theory in connection with our text, since we do not know exactly how many stages it passed through, nor can any of the stages be precisely located (all we can infer is that it is likely that F is the end result of several stages of copying). All in all the evidence allows us to say little more than that the scribal repertoire is conspicuously lacking in distinctly local forms.

Nor is there reason to believe that comparison with the other MSS of 3KCo1 would shed much light on the question. Most are late, and the process of mixture and standardisation is only likely to have been compounded over the course of the 15thC. In any case a full analysis of the witnesses is not available. Certain have been used in LALME: H seems to fit in Lei, and V in Ru, while the language of B seems to be very colourless and
standardised (private communication from Dr Margaret Laing). Of the others some have localisable elements (N has the Nfk/Sfk forms like xulde SHOULD). But most are of mixed language, with elements that would enable them to be located in an area covering most of the southern midlands. In any case this can hardly be taken as evidence for the dialect of F.

For the dialect of the original translation the surviving witnesses offer only the faintest clues. The evolutionary conclusions of the present study suggest that the stemmatically and paleographically earlier witnesses -- K, Y, R, and A, for example -- are still some stages removed from the original. More detailed analysis would be required to determine whether any are precisely locatable, or whether any affinities exist within the group.

One possible example of the influence of the original dialect is the reading at 6\textsuperscript{a}28: But specialy vpon this hille of vaus in a clere weder been seye many diverse and stronge sterres . . . (218/21 \textit{et specialiter super istum montem Vaus in aura clara quamplurime stelle raro} -- read rare? -- \textit{de nocte discernantur} . . .). All the texts have the reading \textit{stronge} except T, where we find what must be the correct reading, \textit{strange}; yet in the light of what we know of the history of the text this restoration in T can only be explained as a uniquely inspired guess on the part of the scribe.
Now among the ME variants recorded for the word (OED s.v. strange a.) is the form strang, but no record of any form strong(e). However strang does exist as a variant form of "strong" — a northern form according to OED s.v. strong a. So the archetypal reading in our texts could be explained by assuming that the translator intended the word "strange", which he may or may not have spelt differently to "strong", but spelt it as <strang(e)>; whereupon a subsequent scribe misinterpreted the spelling and copied it in the form which to him and subsequent copyists unambiguously signalled "strong".

But what does this tell us? All we can really say is that at least by the archetypal stage a copy was made by a scribe who knew that <strang(e)> was a possible spelling for the word which meant to him "strong". It would however be rash to conclude from this that the scribe had before him an exemplar written in a more northern dialect. In this particular instance the dialect situation is not clear cut. Although no specific evidence is available for the distribution of STRONG in LALME, the dot map for -ANG shows a very wide distribution for this form, principally in the north but with sporadic instances well into the midlands. Thus it may well be that the misreading has a dialect basis, but there is really very little specific in it which can be made to yield an indication of the location of the original language of the translation.

12.9. The identity of the scribe

What can we say about the scribe who wrote our text? As we have no external evidence, the question can only be judged on the basis of what he produced (and here I refer primarily to his 3KCol, the only part of his output I have examined in detail).

The items selected for inclusion in the MS (all in the one hand) might give some indication of private taste and interests, if we could be sure that the MS had been produced for the scribe's personal use. But it could equally well have been produced on commission or for speculative sale. The careful hand and the space left for initials suggests one of the latter alternatives. In that case the rather assorted collection of texts in our MS may tell us something about late medieval literary tastes and/or commercial possibilities in the book trade, but little about the scribe himself. We gain some impression of his personality from his interaction with the text he was copying. The corrections to the text would indicate that he was not a blind copyist; his emendation of the Table of Contents subsequent to his copying of the main text (see 3b7n) is very scrupulous, and the alterations at 8vb1-2, if in his own hand, indicate further that a revision was made against the Latin original, again suggesting a more than usually alert and intelligent reading of the text.
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A NOTE ON MEDIEVAL LATIN

Those more familiar with Classical Latin may find features of Medieval Latin (ML) surprising and at times confusing (though many are not specially medieval, but made their appearance in the language of Late Antiquity or even earlier).

Orthography reflects the pronunciation of Late Latin. The classical diphthongs disappear; thus (classical) coepit is not distinguished from cepit. Spellings like resurrexionem for resurrectionem appear, and the interchangeability of -c- and -t- before front vowels means that certius is not distinguishable from tercius; a further stage is the substitution of -s- for -c/-t- (e.g. ardensiores). Other examples of variability include yemps (for hiems); hijdem (idem); orto (horto); simplifications of double consonants (vberima); alternation of -ijs and -is (denaris); pellicea alternating with pellicia. Some spellings in our Latin base may reflect peculiarities of local (English) pronunciation, e.g. Caluerie for Caluarie, eligerunt for elegerunt.

There are alterations in the word-stock, new words supplementing or replacing classical forms and familiar words being used in non-classical senses, of which examples include (with the classical equivalent in brackets): ciuitas (urbs); villa (oppidum); itaque (ita). Many words reflect the influence of Christianity: pagani, reliquie, translacio. We also find new collateral forms (aera for aer).
There is a break-down in some of the distinctions maintained in classical Latin grammar and syntax (e.g. *ei* appears for *sibi*, *quiuis* for *quisque*), and in particular the formal distinction between 'motion to' and 'place in which' is blurred, so that *in egipto* appears for *in Egyptum*, *Colonie* for *Coloniam* ('to Cologne'); the form *parisius* (presumably for *parisios*) is noteworthy. Tense distinctions are not always clearly maintained, so that we find *fuerunt translata* (or even *fuerant translata*) for the standard perfect *sunt translata*. In syntax a conspicuous innovation is the use of *quod*-clauses to introduce indirect speech; such clauses may also begin with *quia*, and the verb can be indicative or subjunctive. The distinction between indicative and subjunctive use in subordinate clauses is generally weakened. A notable innovation is the use of *dum + subj.* for *cum* 'when', 'as soon as'.

Other instances of ML usage which could confuse are noted in the apparatus to the parallel Latin text (signalled by an obelisk).
## CORRESPONDENCES BETWEEN THE UNABRIDGED AND ABRIDGED VERSIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>F</th>
<th>Hm.</th>
<th>Theme (&quot;unabridged&quot; passages)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>la1-3va1</td>
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26a24-b30#  152/18-28  Indi
26b31-26Va23#  152/29-154/11  Greeks
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TRANSLATION DOUBLETS

1a3. holy and worshipful: sanctorum
1a9. from her Cu[ntr]e and her londe: de terra sua
3va11. in sprynginge and arisyngge of the sonne: ipso solis ortu
3va23. shewed and halwed: dedicauerunt
3va32. shewed and expressed: ?ornauerunt/approbauerunt
3va36. ofte . . and openliche: cf. prescripta
3vb9. sette and putte in oone: in vnum redacta
4b6. declare and telle: enarrare
4b18. the warde and the kepynge of hem of ynde was ordeyned and keped: Indorum custodie observabantur
4vb15. the name and the loos: nomen; (4vb24) fama
5a17. helede and sauede: infirmitates depulit
5b26. the loos and the fame (transposed in variant): fama
5va5. tolde and sayde: dixit
5va32. were in purpos and wille: proposuerunt
6a13. in captiuite and in prisone: in captiuitate
7va6. a grete chepynge or a feyre: commune forum
7va15. made and shapen: formatam
9a4. to grewe and wexe: crescere
9a9. after the place and the grounde is sette: secundum locorum situacionem
9b5. made and ordeyned (=9b19 made): constitutus (=20a28 facta)
9vb9,14. strakes and bemes: radios
9vb10. more brennynge and more lighter: ardenciores
9vb16. a forme and a liknesse: formam
11a3. a water and a grete flood of paradys: fluuium paradysi
11a22. thynne and smale rootes: tenuissimmarum radicum
11a30. kept besilyche and strongliche: diligenter custoditur
11v11. wexed and growede: crescebant
12b26. to lede and to brynge: ducere
12v15. lowede and m[e]kede him self: exinaniret semetipsum
14v32. her falsness and her trecherye: perfidiam
15b12. ij walles ij sydes: duo parietes
15b13,18. one feth and one byleue: uniatem fidei
15v14. false goddes and maumettes: ydolis
16b25. leest of stature and of persone: minor in persona
16v27. the more and the grettere: maiora
17a25. warnede and conseillede: hortabantur
17a33. able and discrete: ydoneum
17a34. loue & desyr: voluntatem
17v5. chosen and ordeined: elegerunt (=17b22 chose and toke)
17v9. wolde aryse or attempte a3eyns: rebellarent seu a fide apostatarent
18vb24. stood and was in prosperitee: floreret
18vb28. goodnesses and vertues: bonorum
19b18. with the Iewes lawe and with her byleue: iudaica perfidia
19v14. a ryal and a worshipful chirche (transposed 19v20):
   pulcherimam ecclesiam
19vb26. with al reuerence and solempnete: reuerenter
20a36. is arayed and made gay: ditissime est ornata
20b6. to make and to shape: facere
20b33. dighte and smoked: fumatas
21a7. ostryes and houses: hospicia
22a35. in worshippe and honour: in honore
22vb10. wyse and witty: prudens
23a7. telle and seye: publice vaticinantur et dicunt
23a19. be translated and bore: transferri
23b34. for (to) socoure and helpe: auxilium
24b20. his loue and his lordeshipe: graciam (=24b26 grace and loue)
26a36. translated and bore: translatata
26b3. ordeyne and make: ordinant (transposed 26vb24).
26vb21. encrese and turne: accrescunt
26vb30. lyke and in the same forme and manere: in modum et formam
26vb32. come and soughte: quesierunt
27a4. the Custume and the vsage: ritum
27b33. entrede or come in to: intraret
28a36. in minde and tokene: in signum
29va12. many tales and fables: multa fabulosa
30va3. to hoolde and to haue: ad optinendam (terram)
30va20. were kynges and regneden: regnabant
30va23. fauorebh and socoureþ: fauet
31b12. (no) helpe ne succour: auxilium
31b15. her malice and here wikkednesse: eorum nequiciam
31b26. dremes ne . . . avisions: sompnia
31vb6. in mynde and worshippe (of): in memoriam
32a27. any worshipe or reuerence: reuerencia
32a31. 3eueth and ministreth: tradat
32b5. were seyen and knowen: veraciter videbantur
32b27. formed and shape: formata
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SUMMARY OF THE MAJOR LACUNA

CHAPTER 22

(The Kings brought many precious gifts from the East to offer Jesus, including the treasures of Alexander the Great and the vessels plundered from the Temple at Jerusalem.)

(72/35) But so awed were the Kings by the brilliant light in the manger that what they actually offered from their treasure chests were the first things that came to hand: Melchior found a golden apple and thirty golden pennies, Balthazar offered incense, while Jaspar with tears offered myrrh. All they recalled Mary saying as they offered their devotions were the words "Deo gracias".

(74/24) Melchior's first gift was one of the treasures Alexander had left behind in Inde when he returned from Paradise Terrestre -- the Golden Apple which he had had fashioned from particles of gold from every land he conquered, and which he carried in his hand wherever he went.

[239/n17-n19] As something round is without beginning or end, the roundness of the Apple symbolised the all-encompassing . . . and also the repentance of sinners, which is why kings and emperors still bear such objects in their hands today on special occasions.

[239/n20] Various explanations are given of the three gifts; one is that the gift of gold was an offering of material assistance to Mary and her child.
Moreover it is a custom in the East that when a royal procession passes the streets, the people burn myrrh and incense before their doors as a gesture of loyalty and true submission. Similarly in olden times martyrs were ordered to worship pagan idols with incense and fire; and even today the Saracens demand similar offerings of their Christian prisoners.

CHAPTER 23

But of course God Almighty who created the world from nothing had no need of material gifts; being born into the world without sin, he took the Golden Apple that represented the world and crushed it to dust in his hands, just as the "stone cut from the hill without human hands" broke to pieces the fearsome idol that King Nebuchadrezzar saw in his dream.

CHAPTER 24

Their devotions completed, the Kings and their entourages once more experienced hunger, thirst, and tiredness, and spent the rest of the day in Bethlehem refreshing themselves and recounting to the people the story of their wonderful journey.

But in their sleep a warning came to them not to return to Herod, so they chose another path for their journey home.
The Kings travelled together through the lands where Holofernes had passed in former days, and the inhabitants, thinking the general's armies had returned, treated the Kings with great respect, especially when they heard the account of their visit to Bethlehem. Throughout those lands the story of the Kings and their miraculous journey was never after forgotten. But they returned without the Star's guidance, and their journey lasted not thirteen days but two whole years — a demonstration of the gulf that separates divine and human action.

Furious at their secret departure, Herod and the scribes pursued the Kings, burning the ships of the people of Tarshish and Cecile for having ferried the Kings across the water.

The name commonly applied to the Kings, Magi, arose out of a misapprehension. The peoples through whose lands the Kings had so miraculously passed on their way to Bethlehem failed to appreciate the role played by divine providence, and attributed the speed of their passage to supernatural power, spreading the notion that they were magi, witches; the Jews knew the truth of the matter from their scriptures, but maliciously fostered this misapprehension. The true explanation of the name is detailed elsewhere; it suffices here to affirm that in reality they were of course not witches, but great and glorious kings.
CHAPTER 25

(84/33) This miraculous journey of the Kings was ordained by God Almighty so that knowledge of his birth, hitherto confined to the Jews, should be revealed to all peoples, and his name be praised from one world's end to the other.

CHAPTER 26

(86/7) At Mt. Vaus the Kings consecrated a chapel in honour of the Child, and agreed to meet there once a year; they also chose this chapel as their last resting place. Returning with great honour to their separate lands, they told their subjects the story of their journey, and had a representation of the Star displayed in all their temples.

CHAPTER 27

(88/8) Meanwhile as news of Jesus's birth and the visit of the Magi spread, fear of the Jews forced Mary to abandon the manger and seek the shelter of another cave. In later days a chapel in honour of St. Nicholas and the Three Kings was consecrated in this second cave, and pilgrims today are shown a flecked stone on which drops of milk fell as Mary suckled her child.

(88/28) However on leaving the manger Mary left behind her dress [and Jesus's swaddling clothes], which were discovered later by St. Helena.
(90/6) The fame of Mary and her child was further increased by the prophecies of Simeon and Anna, so Joseph took his family and fled for safety to Egypt. (90/31) The path they travelled is marked by the Roses of Jericho; these roses grow nowhere else but along this way. [246/n27-247/2] The place where the Holy Family sojourned for seven years in Egypt is near the great cities of New Babylon and Cairo, the residence of the Sultan. (92/4) A garden of balm now grows there, in which there are seven fountains; there Mary washed her son and his clothes, and to this is attributed the peculiar therapeutic properties of the sap of the balm bush. The balm is harvested each year in March under the personal supervision of the Sultan, but the bushes will grow only if tended by Christians.

CHAPTER 28

(94/24) As for Melchior's other gift, the Thirty Golden Pennies, they had a long history. They were originally made by Terah, the father of Abraham, in the name of Ninus King of Mesopotamia. Abraham took them with him from the land of the Chaldees, and used them to purchase a burial ground for himself and his family in Hebron. The same coins subsequently changed hands several times, passing to Egypt with Joseph and his brethren, to the land of Sheba, and to Solomon's Temple; finally they found their way to the treasure chests of the kingdom of Arabia, from which Melchior took them when he set out on his journey to Bethlehem.
(96/24) Mary lost the Three Gifts on her flight to Egypt, but they were found by a shepherd, who brought them to Jerusalem, and gave them to the Temple after Jesus had cured him of a mortal disease.

The incense was burnt on the Temple altar. [250/11-14] Part of the myrrh was mixed with vinegar and offered to Christ on the cross, while the rest was given to Nicodemus for Our Lord's burial. (98/24) The Thirty Pennies became the thirty "pieces of silver" -- a generic term in the Gospel, since they were actually of gold -- which were given to Judas for betraying his master. However, after Christ's betrayal and passion the Pennies were divided and dispersed for the first time, fifteen being given to the knights who guarded the Sepulchre, and fifteen being used to buy a field for the burial of strangers -- [250/n20-n28] the Potter's Field is not far outside Jerusalem; in Crusader times it was converted into an underground burial vault. But coins with a similar imprint are still minted in the East today, one side bearing the image of a king's head, and the other Chaldean letters which no one today can read; each of them is worth three florins.

[251/n16] The soldiers who stood guard at the Cross and who kept the Sepulchre belonged to a class of feudal knights who maintain their traditions to this day.
CHAPTER 30

(100/31) After their seven year sojourn in Egypt, the Angel commanded Joseph and Mary to return and settle in Nazareth; thus the prophecy was fulfilled that "He shall be called a Nazarene". The full story of Christ's earthly ministry is to be found in the gospel narrative.

(102/5) After his resurrection Jesus sent Thomas to Inde to preach the gospel. Although Thomas went unwillingly, it was appropriate that the apostle who had with his own hands proved the truth of the resurrection should be the one charged with carrying the story of God's passion, ascension, and resurrection to the same Kings who had seen and worshipped him in his childhood — a matter which St. Gregory discusses.

(102/31) Other disciples as well, Sts. Bartholomew, Simon, and Jude, were also sent to preach in this part of the world. This should surprise no one: there are many parts of Inde, any one of them larger than the whole of the world on this side of the Sea — in the East they reckon Christendom here as no more than a hundred days' journey.
(104/6) As St. Thomas journeyed through the kingdoms of Inde on his ministry, he noticed in all the temples an image of a star containing a cross with a child above it. When he inquired about this, the priests of the temples told him of the Star that had appeared long ago above Mt. Vaus and the journey of the Three Kings. When Thomas heard this, he gave thanks to God and joyfully explained to the priests the significance of the these symbols, and converted them and their people to the Faith. The temples were cleared of their idols and consecrated afresh in worship of the Child. People from far and near were healed by St. Thomas of all manner of sickness, and these people in turn carried the Faith to more distant parts.

(106/20) At length St. Thomas reached the kingdoms of the Three Kings, and learnt that they were still alive -- greatly advanced in years, but still whole in body, and living, like Simeon the Just, in expectation of receiving the Holy Ghost and the sacrament of baptism. In spite of their age, when they heard that a man called Thomas had arrived in their kingdoms preaching of Christ and baptism, they assembled their retinues and set out to meet him.
(108/5) Thomas received the Three Kings with great joy and reverence. He told them of Christ's teaching, passion, and resurrection, and in particular explained the importance of baptism. He baptised the Kings and their followers, and as he did so, the Kings were filled with the Holy Ghost, and joined in Thomas's preaching, confirming his story with their own. Then they took him to Mt. Vaus and had him consecrate the chapel there. At the foot of the mountain they began the construction of a magnificent city which they named Sewill, a city that remains to this day the greatest and richest in Inde, and the residence of Prester John and the Patriarch Thomas.

CHAPTER 32

(110/15) St. Thomas then ordained the Three Kings as priests and subsequently as archbishops; they in turn appointed bishops, priests, and clerks, bestowing material possessions on the clergy for the maintenance and propagation of the Faith. Thomas instructed the clergy concerning the form of the mass, the Lord's Prayer, and the rite of baptism, laying particular stress on the importance of the latter.

(112/4) Thomas subsequently suffered martyrdom, the details of which are contained in the book of his Passion; it is noteworthy that the land where Thomas was martyred is inhabited by a people whose faces are dog like, though devoid of hair.
(112/14) After the death of St. Thomas, the Three Kings completed the organisation of the church in their lands, and then retired from the world to their city of Sewill, having transferred to certain of their subordinates the spiritual and temporal administration of their realms.

(112/27) Then two years before their death, the Three Kings called a great convocation of their people.

[257/n17-12] They were now very old; but they had no heirs, for, contrary to the usual practice in the Orient, they had neither married nor kept concubines.

(In fact it is generally held in the East that they remained virgins all their lives, and were thus not only the first converts to the Faith but the first to dedicate themselves to chastity -- which some authorities say provides an alternative interpretation of the Three Gifts, gold representing virginal dignity and chastity, incense virginal prayer, and myrrh the mortification of the flesh.

So The Kings summoned all their people, great and small, to a convocation. After first admonishing them to remain steadfast in the Christian faith, they urged them to elect leaders to assume spiritual and temporal leadership of their realms. On the man chosen to be their spiritual leader the people bestowed the hereditary title of Patriarch Thomas, while the temporal leader was honoured with the hereditary title of Prester John.)
(Chapter 40)

(The next sect are the Maronici.)

(154/27) They hold masses only at Christmas and at Easter, and then in honour of St. Thomas the Apostle and the Three Kings.

[284/5] Among their errors is the notion that churches can be desecrated by the most trivial incidents, such as the entry of a spider or a sunbeam; in addition, they allow unilateral divorce.

[284/11] The Cepti are another dispersed heretical sect. An apocryphal book known as "The Secrets of St. Peter" is used in their churches, as well as the Gospel of Nicodemus. Their bishops wear hoods resembling those of the Dominicans, and their masses always include a collect in honour of the Three Kings.

[284/n11] The Ismini, a heretical sect found mostly in Egypt, brand a cross on the forehead of their children at baptism.

[284/25] In 1341 in Egypt and Damascus the Muslims endeavoured to instigate a persecution against these Christians (similar to the anti-Jewish pogroms in our own country at the time of the Plague) and denounced them to the Sultan on the pretext of certain extravagant boasts the Ismini made about the potential growth of their population; but a wise answer on the part of the Sultan prevented bloodshed.
At the end of the mass, the priests of the Ismini bless the congregation and call on God to guide and rule them as he guided the Three Kings by the light of the Star to Bethlehem.

The Maromini are another scattered sect of heretics; they adhere to the Nestorian rite, but do not practice circumcision.

When beginning or saying anything their first words are always, "In the name of God and the Three Kings".

The Nicholaite are among the world's earliest heretics, being mentioned in the Book of Revelation. Libertine views on relations between the sexes are one of their principal errors, for they believe that God shows indulgence in these matters; they also believe that through God's mercy even the demons will find salvation.

Together with other heretics the Nicholaites contrived to compromise the authority of the great doctor Origen by inserting statements reflecting their own errors into copies of his works. Many unsuspecting Christians were deceived by this subterfuge, and Origen's works were condemned at subsequent Councils. Nevertheless the oldest copies of his works are free of heresy and are held in the highest respect among churchmen in the East. Origen was in fact a man of truly saintly life, and his concern to counter and combat heresy is evident in his many homilies on the subject.

Yet for all their heresy even the most impoverished of the Nicholaites gives alms to the poor three times a day in honour of (God and) the Three Kings.
The Mandopoli are a peculiar sect, who follow no special rite and have no priests.

They move about with their families and livestock, adhering to an itinerant lifestyle all year round under the harshest conditions. They do not practise agriculture or live in houses, for if they stopped for more than three days in one place they would die; instead, they earn their livelihood as tinkers. Their language is unintelligible to others, though they themselves are acquainted with many tongues, and they never engage in open disputes. Wherever they find themselves, they participate in every aspect of communal life; lacking their own clergy, they follow whatever practice obtains locally in regard to baptism, communion, and burial.

But once a year, on a Sunday, they fast and go in procession to church, to the sound of pipes and music, and celebrate mass in honour of God and the Three Kings, praying God to lead them through desert, field, and mountain safe from all perilous beasts.

Space precludes further discussion of these sects, save to note that the peoples of the East hold the Kings (who were once their kings) in particular esteem, exhibiting a devotion far greater than that shown to them in our own country.
[289/7] A final note: there was once a sect of heretics called Arriani, but they had no reverence for the Three Kings; the whole world was infected with their heresy, but now they have been exterminated completely.

CHAPTER 41

(140/3) Now each of the above named sects are divided by doctrinal differences.

[289/n23-n31] They live in the same towns, but each sect has its own priest and church, and the priest obeys the bishop of the diocese in which he or his parents were born, no matter how far away he now lives. In the secular sphere these people are generally highly skilled, excelling as doctors and merchants.

(140/7) But for all their sectarian differences these Christians are united in their reverence for the Three Kings and against the Saracens.

(140/10) Thus at Christmas tide all the sects follow the same ritual. They fast till dusk on Christmas Eve, when each householder sets up a table with lighted candles and sufficient food and drink to last till the Twelfth Night. On Epiphany eve everyone goes with a candle in hand to visit the houses of friends, and the greeting delivered at the door is, "Good day to you" -- never "Good evening" or "Good night", which would be regarded as a grave offence, and legally actionable.
After the evening of festivities the whole body of Christians goes on the morning of Epiphany to the Jordan to perform their rites.

A monastery stands near the Jordan where Jesus was baptised. The river rises in the mountains, flows through the Sea of Galilee, and enters the Dead Sea, on the banks of which the cities of Sodom and Gomorrah once stood.)
(Many travellers come from this side of the Sea to Jerusalem bearing merchandise.)

[306/n14] In particular they bring with them mementos of Cologne, including earth from the cemetery of the Eleven Thousand Virgins; this earth is sought by the men of Inde, who say it has the power to silence the croaking of frogs which plague their homeland. The reputation of the relics at Cologne draws people from Inde over the sea on pilgrimage, but they find the cold in our regions extremely difficult to tolerate: even in the month of August they wear ankle length fur coats of russet hue, and many die of cold on the way or turn back -- for men are smaller and weaker the nearer the East they are born, although they are skilled archers and generally most astute. In Jerusalem the men of Inde discover all they can about conditions in Europe, especially about Cologne and the relics of the Three Kings, and bear back official letters to show to Prester John and Patriarch Thomas.

[307/17] For throughout the East the Kings are held in the highest regard -- and rightly, for the Kings were the Firstfruits of the Gentiles, the First of Virgins, the Labourers sent into the Vineyard by the Heavenly Householder at the start of the New Testament in the last age of the world, to labour faithfully the full course of the day and to receive without murmur the same eternal reward.
For at daybreak in Jerusalem and Bethlehem the Kings cleared the Vineyard of the harsh and inexcusable stones of Jewish perfidy and malice.

At the first hour and in the company of the blessed Thomas, the Kings purged from the Vineyard the brambles and weeds of error and idolatry, and planted it afresh with the palms and vines of the Catholic Faith.

At the third hour the Three Kings were gathered after their death by St. Helena. They restored the Vineyard which had suffered decay and damage from heresy and idolatry, and irrigated its trees with miracles so that they again began to bear the fruits of the true Faith.

At the sixth hour, translated to Constantinople in Greece, at the centre of the world, the Kings husbanded the Vineyard with further miracles to increase its fruitfulness and to send new shoots of the Faith into every corner of the world, until every race and people, drunk on the juice of the Vine, should praise the name of the Lord, which till then had remained concealed in the country of the Jews.

At the ninth hour the Kings, translated to Milan to glorify the Vineyard of the Lord of Sabaoth in the West, by means of the interpretation and exposition of the three Gifts expelled the foxes who spread error and heresy.

At the eleventh hour, at sunset, these glorious labourers were translated to Cologne, which they chose as their final resting place, after receiving their eternal reward from the Heavenly Householder.
Yet there they continued to tend the Vineyard with miracles and wonders. For nowhere in the whole world, from the sunrise to the sunset, have any such glorious saints graced so noble a city and cathedral. For though God bestowed favour and honour on many cities and places and hallowed them with miracles and relics, yet no church or city is endowed with so noble a college of canons and ministers of God or so honourable a populace — an evident token that God has specially singled out this noble college and this honourable people as worthy to receive these most noble Kings in their final resting place.

[309/32] Rejoice, noble college, that God has so singly favoured you with his love and honour and with natural bounties, and bestowed upon you his most special treasure, the Firstfruits of the Gentiles and the First of Virgins. Wherefore you must never tire of offering thanks for such blessings and performing services in his honour and in honour of the Three Kings, lest you, like the despised Nestorians, be visited by the Lord's wrath and deprived of the blessings you enjoy, and find yourselves set on God's left hand at the Final Judgement. But rather be counted with the Nubians, beloved and honoured by men and singularly honoured by God, placed at the Judgement in glory on the right hand with the Kings themselves. For it was not by chance that the ancient city titled Agrippina has now received the name Cologne from the cult of God — as the following verses explain, telling in Latin the story of the Kings whose praises the churches, chapels, and oratories of the East celebrate in many different tongues:
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The Holy Cross by Helen found

The Kings to gather further bound
   In kingdoms near.

Of Constantine the city fair
Eastern Kings with relics rare
   By grace adorn.

In the town of bless'd Ambrose
The glorious relics next repose
   A precious gift.

Thrice discovered, thrice translate
By God's will Cologne of late
   Adores the Kings.

From East to West the glory passed,
Cologne the resting place at last
   Of thrice found Kings.

Never now to journey on
Nor as once to venture home
   A different way.

But worshipped for the high King's sake,
Whose laws Cologne will never break,
   The Kings find rest.
[Standard ending]

[311/n5] Rejoice, blessed Cologne, by special grace and divine providence favoured with the Three Kings and the noble college that ministers to them, the most glorious of all your treasures and the joy of all other peoples, the goal of pilgrimage for princes and potentates, nations and tongues from the farthest ends of the earth! For this singular honour you are the more strictly bound to show due thanks to God and reverence to the Kings and their servants, that in the final Judgement you may be secure in rendering your accounts. Amen!

[Alternative ending]

[311/n5/2] Note: the names of the Magi are as follows, as recorded by the Master in the Historia Scholastica: in Hebrew -- Appellius, Amerus, Damascus; in Greek -- Galgalat, Magalat, Serathim; in Latin -- Jaspar, Balthasar, Melchior. Note: the title "magi" derives not from the practice of magic but from the pursuit of wisdom; for according to St. Augustine the term "magi" in Chaldean has the same meaning as the Greek word "philosopher" or the Latin "wise men". Again, according to St. Remigius, there are different opinions about the Magi: some say they were Chaldeans, for the Chaldeans worship the star as god; some say they were Persians; some say they came from the farthest regions; and some say they were the descendants of Balaam, which is the most probable explanation, since Balaam among his other prophecies uttered the words, "A star shall arise of Jacob".
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Whence Chrysostom tells he found the following account in certain books.

There was a race of men in the East of great wisdom and nobility. Discovering in the books of Balaam -- for they happened to be descendants of Balaam -- that Balaam had prophesied, "There shall arise a star from Jacob . . .", they interpreted this literally to mean that such a Star should appear at the precise moment of Christ's birth, and set about to observe the rise of the Star and the hour when Christ would be born.

To aid their observations they chose twelve of the best [astronomers] from among them -- this number, so that if one died a replacement would always be found, and there would still be twelve of them to maintain a watch for the Star -- and they built a beautiful palace for them on the top of the highest mountain in the East, where the air was always clear, and stocked the palace with all necessary provisions. There the twelve remained in silent prayer and abstinence, in solemn exspectation of the rising of the Star.

At last the hour of the Nativity arrived. The astronomers were [at prayer] at the very hour of midnight, when there appeared in the air above them a most beautiful and brightly shining star, in the top of which was the image of a child bearing a cross. At the appearance of the Star the astronomers were filled with joy that this sight had been granted to them in their own lifetimes.
The astronomers told the news to the wise men of their country, and these chose three of the noblest and wisest of their company to journey with gifts to the new born Child and pay him homage as king and lord. The three at once set out, and with the Star's guidance, as the Gospel tells, they arrived on the thirteenth day, to worship the Child and offer gifts.

[311/n2/33] Note: Germanus, a historian of the era of Our Lord, and Theophilus, who wrote of Christ's deeds, record three miracles that led the three Magi to set out in search of the new born Child. Jaspar had a tree in his yard in which ostriches had built a nest, with two eggs from which at midnight on Christmas night a lion and a lamb came forth. Balthazar had a herb garden planted with balm, and from the stock [a shoot] emerged with a beautiful round rosebud at the top; from the rosebud at the hour of midnight a white dove appeared which spoke with a human voice as it flew up to the clouds, saying, "God is born of a virgin, Creator and Saviour of the world". Melchior had a wife who gave birth at that time to a boy child, who immediately stood on his feet and cried, "A child is born of a virgin, the Saviour of all mankind; he shall live thirty three years . . . (and so on), in token of which I shall live thirty three days and then die". And so it came about.

[311/n2/46] The last miracle contradicts the statement in ch.33 that the Kings had no queens or concubines but remained virgins.
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f. 11Va

1 drawel] throwe ATDE, bynde OBN; hem] om. ATDE; eres] eerebes YR. 3 the] bes KYARTD; pan] so YR. 7 of(1)] add be Y; of(2)] add be KYAOBN. 10 thilke] this seide OBN. 13 god] add oute of these londes OBN; in] aftry O, be BN. 14 of thisel
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2 After ward] And aftyrwarde OBN. 5 and(1) om. KYARTDEOBN.
7 and] add were YARTDEO, pey B, lac. N; passed] add forb
KYATDEOBN. 8 none] add of hem KYATDEOBN. 11 the] om. ATDE;
fer] for the ATDE; weye] om. OBN. 12 kyngdom] add and OBN.
15 stode stille or rested] rested or stode stille ATDE; or] and
OBN. 17 3eden or ridden] yedyn and Ridyn forthe O, redyn forthe
BN. 20 to] add hem in (be BN) alle the EOBN; wey] add that
they went OBN. 21 wryte a fore in thel schowid aforãe OBN.
22 in] throug OBN. 24 that] as OBN. 29 worthy kynges 3ede]
31 mervaylede] add in ther wittys OBN.

3 and(1)] om. OBN; and in] than So aftyrwarde O, so B, also N.
4 wher of] wherfore OBN. 5 Omelye] add thus KATD, add on this
wyse E, add that he made of the wyche he declaryth and sayth thus

CHAPTER 13


f. 12vA


CHAPTER 14


f. 12vb

12 Also... (13b6)ther aboutel] the abridged versions have a different text for this passage (Hm. 54/17-32; see 13a12n). The following are the variants of the abridged tradition (base MS K, line-references to Hm.); none significantly affect the text in Hm.:

17 thus] om. OBN. 18 be] om. DOB, lac R. 19 be wochel] pat ATDE. 21 is cleped/pere] trs. OBN. 23 bi] the AE, pat TD; towne] add the wyche ys callid galile OBN. 24 were] they wher OB, he was N. 25 in] into EOB, to N; pat] this OBN; prayuel... toun] om. K, For OBN. 26 aperid] add ther OBN. 27 his] this OB, be N. 28 That] this OBN. 29 he] ye OBN; 3el] he K. 30 cleped... is] cut away in Y.

f. 13b

CHAPTER 15


f. 13va


298
f. 13vb

1 folk] folkis KA, the folke D. 3 and be] and KYRBN, the A, om. TDE. 5 Alle men] And alle that (that) om. BN OBN. 6 brynging] and brynge TDEOBN; and] om. OBN. 7 and shewyng] Mirre and schewe OBN; Also . . (14a10)strone] om. KYATDEOBN, anom. R.

f. 14a

CHAPTER 16

10 Capm xvjm] Capitulum xvijm KYATD. 12 to] in (in) om. E) to be cite of KYATDEOBN; as it is sayde byfore] om. KYATDEOBN. 13 was] add kyng OBN. 14 in the same tyme] om. OBN; in the] pat KYATDEOBN. 15 the citee of Jerusalem And] Jerusalem OBN; And] add as it is sayde tofore KYATDEOBN, lac. R. 20 in] om. OBN. 23 gospelle] add and sayth thus OBN. 24 ihesus] add in Bethlehem YO, add in Bedlem Iude B, add in Bedelem Iude in dIebus herodis N; The which is this] that (thys BN) is to say OBN; which] add gospell YARTDE. 25 cryst ihesus] cryst TDE, Ihesu cryst OBN; a] in the ATDEOBN. 28 londe] add be KYATDE, add than this OBN; kynges] add that OBN. 29 and] om. OBN. 31 his] the OBN. 32 done hym worship] worship hym ROBN. 33 to done hym worshepe] om. KYARTDEOBN; whan] add kyng ROBN. 34 was] add gretly OBN; destourbed] destourbed KYRN, destroubled ATDEB, trowbelyd O. 35 Jerusalem with hym] his cite of Jerusalem OBN. 36 to gidre] om. ATDE, to hym OBN.

f. 14b


lac. D.

6 Iurye] Iewis OBN. 8 ban] add kyn (ie. kyng) OBN. 11 that apperede] whan hit apperid cryst OBN. 12 so sente hem] then they went OBN. 13 sayde Goth and enquere] he preyed hem that they wolde goo and enquere OBN. 16 cometh] add a3en and R, add agayn by (by) to N) me and OBN. 19 kyng they 3ede] wyll of the kyng they tokyn her lewe and went forthe OBN. 22 the chylde was And whanne] as (as) bat BN this blissid child was borne and then OBN. 23 they . . tresources] stonde stille owyr the place ther that Cryst was borne and than they were glad and (add ban bey BN) opened her treswris and 3eden into the hous OBN. 25 and] add bere bey founden be childe with Mary his modir and YARTE, lac. D.
Chapter 17


f. 14Va


f. 14Vb


Chapter 18

f. 15a


f. 15b


f. 15Va

1 stone] om. KYATE, lac. D. 2 that(1)] the KYARTEOBN, lac. D; that(2)] and O, and be BN. 6 Aungelis] a aungell R, the angîll OBN. 8 byleuade] leved KYARTE, lac. D. 9 Crist] add bes scheperdys ware be first of Iwys pat leved (belevid EOBN) on (in OBN) Crist KYREOBN; This syde the wall] one side and (add thys BN) one OBN; the] pis KYARTEBN, lac. D. 10 This side this] and that othyr side and (add the BN) othyr OBN. 12 thise] add kynges YR. 13 contree] om. KYARTEOBN, lac. D. 14 goddes

CHAPTER 19


f. 15vb


D resumes.

21 were] was OBN. 22 And] add þan KYARTEDE; a3ein] om. ROBN; sterre] add hit KYA. 25 right] but KYARTD, lac. E; Is] add aforseyde þe li3t abode in þe place þere cryst was and oure lady And as hit is YA(R)(T)(D)(E). 27 That} This OBN; for] to KYARTEDEOBN; 3eden] enterid OBN. 28 founde] add ther OBN. 30 hym] hem KY. 31 Mirre Encense] mirre and encense KYATDE, lac. R, Encense And Myre And OBN. 33 vse} vsage OBN; that] om. ARTDEOBN. 34 Est] add that OBN; to] add the ATDEOBN. 36 golde] add in hys hande OBN.

f. 16a

1 his] om. ATDE. 2 to} wyth OBN. 3 kynges] kyngis K. 4 in] om. KYARTEOBN. 7 the] om. KYOB. 9 hem} hym YARTDEOBN. 10 touche no] not touche OBN.

CHAPTER 20

15 fVlgencius .. (33)xxj] om. KYARTEOBN.
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CHAPTER 21

34 The] that KYATDE, and [bat OBN; thisel the OBN. 36 3ifte] giftes KYATDE(E)OBN.

f. 16b

1 Cristl om. YR. 3 olde] age KYA, of age TDE; he] om. TDEOBN. 4 he] om. EOBN; by wrapped] wrapped KYATDEOBN. 5 and] om. OBN; his moder lappe] heye in & (a R) manger vppe to be armes Also (And R) our lady seint Mary his modyr YARTDE; moder] moderes OBN. 6 bokes] add and Synth Sayth that O, add and BN. 7 in] add hyr OBN; fleshly] fleshy KYREO. 8 the(2)] om. K, pes YARTDEOBN. 9 and a] om. OBN. 16 god almyghtys] hyr Sonnys O, our lorde god he sone his BN; almyghtys] almynty KYR. 17 So] and OBN; that] when DEO, om. BN. 19 hondes] honde KYATD. 21 was] where OBN. 22 afterwardes] add Capitulum xxjm KYATD. 25 go] om. KYATDEON; god] add he KYATDEON. 27 and] add of KYATDEBN. 28 god] add he KYA(R)TDEBN; of] add a KYARTD. 32 to god] he KY(RE), add he ATDOBN; moost . . . was] om. OBN; of stature] of persone KATD, in persone YR. 33 and] add he KYARTDE. 34 wher of it is] wyth owtyn OBN; it] om. KYATDE.

f. 16va

3 pedum tuorum] etcetera KATEBN, eius etcetera O. 4 falle] add doune KYATDEBN, om. O. 6 erthe] add and OBN. 7 detrahed] shall betray OBN. 11 of] at AB, add at TDEN, add in C. 12 ryght] om. OBN; of persone] personys OBN. 13 manere] add of KYARDEBN. 15 that(1)] they OBN. 16 were] om. ATDEBN. 19 been . . . and] ther of bene the lasse of Statvre that bene borne there and also O, pere be the leste of (be ber lasse of ber N) persone pat be borne there and BN. 21 tendre] add of complexion OBN. 22 herbys] add also there O, add [bere B; hotterel] add and better and all maner of (of) om. R spyces be better YR, add and better ATDE. 25 manere] add of KYADEO.

page torn D.


f. 16vb

CHAPTER 22


29 of] add be KAROBN. 31 londes] add and OBn. 33 bobes] of TOBN.

CHAPTER 33

f. 17a


f. 17b

6 the patriark] a patriarke and Namyd BN; for] add a KYATDE. 7 memorial] memory ATDEN, add as long as he levyd BN. 9 to gidre .. anoper] and chese a nother in a certeyn place assygnyd BN. 12 And .. (15) thanne] Than (thus D) when bis matiere was (was] om. E) bus [bus] in this wyse D, om. N) spoke amonge be pepil (add pat B, add and N) bei assentyd (add and accordet D) perto and of one (of one) om. E) acorde and of on will KYATDEBN. 15 alle] om. BN. 16 and(2)] add all YATDBN, lac. E. 20 folwed] add be techynge and levyng of BN. 24 name] man KYATDE, same name BN. 26 in .. (29)day] made after Seynt Thomas And so yt was presentyd vtto the pope of Room BN; in] add all Y. 30 3aue] add and assigned Y. 32 tythes] tithe AE; alle] om. BN. 33 And] than KYARTDE.

f. 17va

3 by cause .. heyres] KYARTDEB, lac. N. 4 by] of KYARTDEB, lac. N. 6 worshipful] add and a my3ty YR. 7 and .. temperaltee] a boue be pepyll And chosyn hym (add a N) guernowre of all be pepyll temporall BN. 8 this cause] these causys pat BN. 11 Thomas] add or be bysshopes or preestys (or preestys] om. R) YR. 12 and it so were] om. BN. 13 Thomas] om. YR. 16 this] the AE. 22 preesthode] add ffor alle be worlde owep
to obeye to holy chirche and to preesthode KYARTDE; in spiritualtee om. BN; For .. (b12)xxxiiij om. KYARTDEBN.

CHAPTER 34

13 Ferthermore .. shulde be) Also (And also BN) he is KATD(E)BN, Also (Also om. R) an obir cawse is bat be lorde of ynde is YR. 16 Iohn] add be wich is Y; for .. for] in be (for R) worschippe of KYARTDEBN. 17 Iohn] add be KYARTDEBN. 18 the which] bat KYARTDEB(N); of god to fore alle othere best byloued and chose moost (in most ATDE) specially (special YATDE) chose and loved (bylouye TD) of god allemy3ty KYARTDE, moost belouyd and specially choysyn of (cosyn to N) god almyghty BN.

f. 18a

CHAPTER 35

f. 18b


f. 18va

2 also] offryd vppe to þe fader of heuene þe holy (blessed R) sacrament on þe autere and YR, om. BN; g..d] all KYARDE(B)(N). 3 seyde] perfourned Y; Crist] oure lord god BN. 4 to(1)] from BN; to(2)] in to KATDE, to dwelle with hym in YR. 5 ioye] add and blisse (and blisse om. R) And so to fore þe all þe peple ðe passed oue of þis worlde (he deyed R) YR. 6 the] his YARTDEBN. 8 that] om. ARE; thise] om. KY, þe A(T)(D)E. 9 were] layen KYARDEBN; And] as AE; this . . there] and pannes oure lorde god schewyd there a wonydrfulle myracul BN. 11 the body . . leyd] þe peple had brouȝt þe prid kyng and wolde haue leyde hym Y, þe pepil wolde haue leyde hym R. 12 the thridde kynge] this Jaspar BN. 13 beryd] om. KATD(E). 14 the iij] þe iij obir KR, þat obir iij YTD, the ober A, þe bodyes of þe ober R, þes iij other BN. 15 the iij other] euerych of þe (þes BN) iij KATDEBN, þe iij YR. 16 asonder] euerych from obir YR. 17 receyued] hym to ligge] he was receyvyd to be leyde BN. 24 etcetera] om. YARTE. 25 glorious kynges and Erchebisschoppes] iij kynges BN. 27 lyues] lyfe KYARDE(B). 28 were] louyd and BN. 31 stille] add ouer þe citee after her der Y, lac. R. 33 ynde] add and of þat parte of the Est BN; Aftur .. (18vb22) heyly] om. KATDEBN, Furthermore þe schul vnirdostone þat oure lord þese crist þat is glorious in his werkyng and wondryful in his seyntes as he lovid þes iij worshippeful kynges of her lyfe ryt so he worchipped hem after her deythe For all maner of peple in what dyssese or infirme tribulacioun and anger þat þey were in whepper hit were in þe londe or in þe see when þey cryed to þes iij kynges for help and
socoure oure lord þorw þe merites and þe preiours of þese iiȝ peple com from ferre contrey bope by londe and by water to visite to and to worshippe þese iiȝ worchippeful kynges And so þe feip þat þey þroched with seint Thomas þe apostil in her lyfe here in erpe þey connexted hit after her þe þorw þirching of diuers tokens and myracles among þe peple And þan þey laye all iiȝ to gedir in her toumbe with hole bodyses and incorrupt arayed with diuers ornamentys as hit is aforseyde þey semed to þe peple naȝt as dende folk but as men þat were a slepe and þey were better and feirere coloured þan þey þere were in her lyfe and so þey þay laye incorrupt many ðerës and dayes Y (reworked in R).

f. 18vb


f. 19a

7 wher fore . . . (17)rested Inne] insomochil þat þe kyngdoms and þe londes þere þese iiȝ blessyd kynges were lorde and kynges of and also (also) all R) þe peple of þe Cite of Sewyll where þese iiȝ kynges restyd in for þe moost þartay were dyuyed among hemself and heeldyn divers oppynynos of eresy ægens þe feyp of holy chirche YR; wher fore . . . (15)afore sayde] om. KATDEBN. 16 that] ther KATD, anom. YR, þer as E. 17 Inne] om. KATDEBN. 18 ne] and KVARTDEBN; the] om. KY. 20 her] om. AT. by] add no KVARTDEBN. 21 correctioun] add ne temporel correctioun KVARTD; And so . . . lawe of god] in pis persecucioun þat was bus brouȝt vppe among þe peple ægens þe cristen feip (þat . . . feip) of this eresy R) þe þe þey left her ryȝt byleue and toke hem to her olde lawe þat is to seye to worshippe (toke . . . worshippe) worshiped R) fals goddyys and mawmettyys YR. 22 lawes] lawe K(Y)A(R)TEBN. 25 that] as AT. 27 of] add al TDBN; peple] add (for þe þe þey þat hem at no reuerence neþer at no reputacioun R) And as þese iiȝ (add worbi R) kynges (add and Erchebisschopes R) laye in her toumbe incorrupt to fore (IN to þe tyme of R) þes eresy riȝt so þan þese eresy and duiuision was so gretlich encresid in her kyngdoms þere as þey were kynges þan as nature of mankynde (man R) askþþ þe bodyses of þese iiȝ kynges (add weded corrupt and R) were dissoluyd and turned in to erpe and dust (powdret and in to erpe R) YR. 28 And . . . peple] om. BN.
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29 that] om. AE. 31 the(2)] om. KYARDBN, lac. TE. 32 kynges] add and BN. 36 bare] caried ATDE.

f. 19b

1 grete] add solemnly and YR. 3 his] her ARTDE.

CHAPTER 36

4 Capmxxxvij] Capitulum xxxiiiijm KYATD. 5 And .. CC xxxiiiij] om. KYARTDEBN. 6 whan] Thanne B(N). 7 Constantyn] add de Noble BN. 8 god] add and divers miraclys KYART(D)EBN. 9 Siluestre] add the pope BN. 10 his] add owne ATDE. 11 in(1)] add his KYATDE, lac. R; in(2)] add his KYARTDE?, lac. R; maneres] manere ADE. 13 the(1)] om. K; lawe] lif ATDE; In] And BN. 16 was] add conuersaunt and Y. 19 with .. of] om. ATDE; blyeue] fals Beleve And thus queene to fore her conversacion to Cryst was a grete enemy to be lawe of Cryst and (add to be N) feybe BN. 20 wonderfully] wondirlich YR, add a noon BN. 27 the] her KYARTDEBN. 29 the] bat KYARTDE. 30 the] add holy KYARTDEBN. 31 that sure lordre ihesu] pis holy quene A, that T, whiche D, be holy qwene bat E. 32 manhe] add had KYARTDE. 33 thurgh his] whan he was BN; vpon erthe here] her in (on B) erbe KYARTDBN, lac. E. 34 places] place BN. 35 holyl] om. BN; fals] om. KYATD, be EBN. 36 false] om. BN.

f. 19Va

1 cursede and odious places] for a Cursyd place and for an odous place BN; As] all pes places pis worshippeful quene to be worship of god and of his blessed modir Marye with grete humilite and deuocioun visited and worshipped After pis pes holy places pat is to seye Y, and also BN. 2 Caluariel] add in be same wyse BN. 3 cross] add and dyde for mankynde Y. 4 his] be KYATDN, om. E, lac. N; sepulcre] add and be place běre be iij Maryes stoden and ijen be stone removed fro be toume Y, sepulture ADEBN. 5 bat] per KYRDB, be N. 7 John] add be YARTE?BN. 9 Crist] add after his vpperysing fro deth to lyfe in be bridda day Y; apperede] add after hys Resureccioun R. 10 Alle these places] om. BN. 11 places that were holyl] holy places KYATDB, anon. R, places full holy E, holy placys be which aforne her conversacion sche hatyd purgh be counsell of be Iewys and after her conversacion BN. 13 in to] within KYA, with TDE, in BN. 14 chirche] om. BN. 15 alle] add pes KYAR(T)D, add ober BN; places] add aforseyde Also in ober divers places sche made many chirches and ordeye Archebysshoppes bysshoppes preestes and clerkes and ober mynstres of holy chirche to serve god and sche 3af to hem many grete possessiouns to maynten and encrese goddis seruyse Y. 16 the] pis KATEBN, pis holy Y, this worthi D. 17 the place] all be placys BN; that] per KYARTE,

f. 19vb


f. 20a


ff. 20Va,b & 21a,b

CHAPTER 37

7 Also vpon .. (21Va15)Capm.xxxviiijl] om. KATDEBN, Furthermore (Also R) seint Elene dyd make a feyre [add and a strong R) chirche aboue þe same place þere crist was bore (add in Bethleem R) And in þat same place þere crist was bore (þere .. bore om.
R) bysyde þe manger lyep (be beried R) seint Ierom Paula and 
Eustochium Romayns þe wich of grete deuocioun come þeþir 
(Eustochium þe which were Romayns and com þieder of greet 
deuocioun R) with seint Ierom YR.

f. 21v

CHAPTER 38

16 Furthermore] om. Y, anom. R. 18 to] add þe cite of KY(R)B, 
into þe citee of ATDEN. 20 also] om. RBN. 21 bisshoppes] a 
Bysshop BN. 22 clerkes] add and many obir mynstrys of holy 
chirche and 3af hem many grete possessions Y, lac. R. 
23 In .. (21vb36And] and in þis cite of Nazareth our lady was 
gret of þe (an D) aungell KYATDBN, anom. R.

f. 22a

1 Nazareth] Galile KAE; londe and] om. A; and] add þe K, add in 
þe Y, lac. R. 3 hilleþþ} add þe KYA, anom. R. 7 Iohn and 
Iames] Iames and andrewes BN. 8 mencIouþþ} mynde KYATE. 9 it] 
om. K; is] om. Y. 11 iournees] Iourney KYARTDBN. 
15 taughteþþ} add hem BN. 16 diceþþ} add many BN; he þedel] trs. 
KYARTDBN. 19 hem] add in þat contrey BN; And .. . (22b29)day} 
om. KYARTDBN.

f. 22b

CHAPTER 39

29 Capmxxxix] Capitulum xxxvm KYATD. 34 doþþ} to K, to do 
YATDBN, anom. R.

f. 22va

2 to thenke/gretlyþþ} trs. ATDBN, to thenk E. 6 certeynþþ] add of 
ATDEN. 7 toþþ} in to KYARTDEN; þe] om. K, þes R. 8 wasþþ} add 
entryd and BN; toþþ} in to KYATDBN, lac. R. 9 the(2)] om. 
KATDE, anom. R. 10 falseþþ} add goddys and Y, anom. R, om. BN. 
14 amonge .. . feithþþ} om. ATDE. 15 the] add techyng and 
prechyng of þe ffeyth þat seynt Thomas prechyþþ þe pepyll BN. 
17 the whichþþ] had prechyþþ þem and taught hem all (at N) þat tyme 
BN. 18 was(1)] were ATE, was than D; destroyedþþ} add and panne 
BN; renewedþþ} add and encresed Y, anom. R. 20 whan they herdeþþ 
þat herde and sawe BN. 22 seint Eleyneþþ} om. KAEBN, and Y, lac. 
R, that is D. 23 the(2)] add holy TDBN. 25 of(1)] om.
KYARTDE, lac. R; of(2) om. KYATDEBN, lac. R. 27 they] the pepyll BN. 30 god] cryst YTD, lac. R.

f. 22Vb


f. 23a


CHAPTER 40

f. 23b

1 Thanne] And þan KYATDE, anom. R, and þis BN. 3 a] one KYTEDEBN; it] hem BN. 4 richesses] richesse KYATDEBN, riches R. 5 it] hem KYARTEBN; in to] add þe cite of Y, to BN; alle] repeated Y. 6 reuerence] add þat she coude BN; leyde hem] and þere þey were putte Y, putte hem R. 7 that] þe wic h YR. 10 with] add help of god and of Y, lac. R. 12 And .. (25)hede] om. KYATDEBN. 26 also was] was þat tyme K, was in þat tyme Y, was sometyme ARTDEBN; þe] a BN. 29 and] add be

f. 23Va

1 partie] parties KY, anom. R. 6 grekes .. and] om. BN. 10 the morwe . . day] om. KYATDEBN, lac. R. 11 in to) vnto YTN, lac. R; Parys] add in fraunce BN. 12 And .. (27)arayed] and þe schulde (shulle YAEBN, shall also TD) vnderstonde þat Constantynnopol is þe chefe cite of (add all EN, in all B) þe londe of (of om. T) grece (Grek TD) and whan þes iij kyngis (þis iij kynges Y, thise iij kinges bodies ATDE) were brouȝt in to (vnto N) þe (þis BN) Cite (add and þe chirche Y) aforseyde (aforseyde om. BN) KYATDEBN, lac. R. 28 the] þat AE. 29 and/with grete deuocioun] tras. EBN. 31 alonge] long Y(R)BN. 32 tyme] add And oure lorde ihesu crist of his grete mercy (oure .. mercy] god almyȝty R) wrouȝte þere many myracles (add to be pepil R) borwe þe merites of þes iij holy (holy om. R) kynges Y(R); After the deth of þis glor[iouse Constantyn] and aþer þys þe (in N) processe of tyme constantyne noble .. deyde BN. 33 glorieus] iij worshippeful kyngis KA', worshipped full kyng Y, noble kinge D, kyng RE. 34 holyl] om. ARTDEBN; moder] add seynt KYARTDEBN. 35 what tyme that Tulian Apostata regnedel om. KYARTDEBN. 36 ther] om. ATDE; bygan] add aȝene KYARTDEBN.

f. 23Vb


f. 24a

18 thrugh] add þe KYATDE, R anom. 20 Thanne] Whan KA.
22 to] add be KYADE. 24 this] the ATDE. 27 of .. (30)they] And þan (þan om. R) þis Erchebysship of Coleyne þorwe help (helpes D) of divers lordys of þe londe of (þe londe of om. R) Melane YARTDE, of dyuers lordys for þes Rebelles of Millan (add And þis Erchebyschoppe came to þe Emperoure with a grete pusaunce N) and this (þe N) Emperour and þe Erchebysship of Coleyn went and werryd on þes Rebellys and BN. 28 and .. (30)they] om. K. 34 the(2)] þes KYARTEBN, anom. D.

f. 24b

33 forth] for K, om. BN; by his] with a BN. 36 eft] om. KYARD(E)BN.

f. 24va,b


E ends.

24 Furthermore .. (25a14)knowe that] om. KYARTDEBN.
f. 25a


f. 25b


f. 25va


f. 25vb

12 masses] masse KYARBN, lac. TD. 13 hondes] hande KYA, lac. TD. 14 subdeke] southdecone KYR, sodekene A, lac. TD. 16 That the iij kynges] of be's iij kynges which BN. 17 in Bethleem] om. KYARBN, lac. TD. 22 Ethiope .. (27)Nestorius] om. KABN (cf. 29vb25ff), for be toke be name of a eretike pat
was cleped Nestorius Y, lac. RTD. 27 And .. (26a5) reverence
But] om. KABN, And þes eretikes oute of all resoun were and be
apostates from þe feip of holy chirche for þey forsoke all þe
feip and þe lawe of holy chirche as þe schulle here afterward
And þes Nestoryns do no reverence ne worschippe to þe iij
worshippeful kynges Y, lac. RTD.

f. 26a

5 whan .. masse to) and her preestis whan þei go to masse
(seruye BN) þei KABN (cf. 29vb26-28), whan her bysshoppes
ordeyne preestys þan (whan þei make preestis among hem R) þey
make hem swere þat þey schulle in her masse YR, lac. TD.
11 And .. (26a23) and for þe moost party þey be blak
Ethiops and alle men of oþer sectys hate hem gretelich KABN,
but þes Nestorynes be odious and had in grete despite to all oþir
sectys. And for þe moost party þey be blak Ethiops And þey peynte
god and oure lady and þe iij kynges and seint Thomas in her
chirches all blak and þe deuelys all whyte And þis þey do in
despite of all oþir cristen men and also of seintes Y, anomal. R,
lac. TD. 25 been] is ATDBN. 27 And .. (b17) shauen] om.
KYATDBN, anomal. R.

f. 26b

17 whan thise preestes] þe preestis of þis (that BN) londe
(Contrey N) whan þei KYATDBN, whan þei R. 18 seye] add a AT,
go to BN. 19 or ouer gyltel] om. KYATDBN. 20 thanne .. hym
self] þe preest (preestes D, add þat seyeþe messe N) and (add he
þat ys B) þe (and þe] om. TD) dekene and þe (þe] om. TDN)
southdeke ne þei (þei] om. R) mete togeder on (in BN) þre partyes
(add of the chirche N) and so þei (þei] om. Y) go (add to gedyrs
BN) to þe (add hygh BN) autere KYATDBN. 24 that] of KBN.
25 that] om. KYARD. 29 þede] add to gedyr BN. 31 Also/ther
is] trs. KYAT, lac. R. 32 is] þe KY, lac. R. 33 and ..
heer] om. KYATDBN. 36 þat that] om. KYADB, þat RT.

f. 26va

2 þan] om. ATDBN. 4 foure] in B, thre N. 9 at] aftir
KYARTE. 10 the(1)] þis Kyr. 15 And] om. KYATD.
16 falleth] fallen ATDBN; to] in to K, anoon in to YR.
17 done] dop KRYBN. 18 þat] of BN. 19 kynges] add þe whych
BN; grete] iij BN. 24 manere of secte] secte þe KYA, secte
T(D)BN. 25 is] þe KY; Syriani] Symani KYTD, Suirani A, Sunani
R, Symyany BN. 26 been] add men KYABN. 27 the which] om.
BN; of olde tyme/was] trs. Y, lac. R. 28 ynde is now] and now
yt ys BN. 29 Syrie] Smyys KYA, lac. R, Smyys TB, S five minim s
D, Symyany N; and .. Syrians] om. KYATDBN, lac. R. 30 thise]
f. 26b & 27a, b & 27va

3 the] a RBN.  6 this] pat KYARTD.  7 these] be YARTD.
8 the iiij kynges] god allmy3ti KYARTD, god B, om. N; londe]
longe K.  9 the] om. KYARTDBN.  10 Also . . (27vb28)3iftes] om. KYARTDBN.

f. 27vb


CHAPTER 41

f. 28a

1 nyght] add anoon KATD, add or gode euen be to 3ou anoon YR, add Thanne BN.  2 as] add bow KYARTD.  7 candeles] add li3t KYTD, candell light A, a candell lyght BN; tokene . . (13)hem] token and mynde pat be breuning sterre which (that D) apperide fro be Natiuite of oure lorde Ihesu crist (Ihesu crist om. D) vnto be xijth daye And by (in D) all pat tyme ladde and (Tadde and om. D) wente byfore be bree kyngis and alle (om. D) her companye vn to Betheleem to whom was no ny3t but allwey daye was seen to hem with (add a D) grete brightnes TD.  8 of thatl] pat be KYAR, anom. TD, of be BN.  9 and] om. KYAR, anom. TD, that BN; be] bes KYAB, anom. TD.  10 hostes] oost KYABN, anom. TD.
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herodis Regis ecce magis (magi N) venerunt ab oriente etcetera BN. 31 this] pe K. 34 offreth .. power] and ban offryth every man to hys power B. And ban every man offeryth After his owne degre N. 36 and] add in KYABN, lac. RTD.

f. 28b


f. 28½a, b

2 Ihesu] ihesus KYA, lac. RTD, Ihesu Cryst BN. 3 the] in þat KYA, lac. RTD, in the BN. 5 and(2) .. (29a25) purpos] om. KYABN, lac. TD.

f. 29a

25 And .. (31) CapÝxlij] om. KABN, Also all þes cristen eretykes and divers sectes þat dwelle so ferre þat þey mowe nat come to þis water of Iordan þey go on þe xij day to þe next water with her bysshoppes and preestys and clerkys and oþr peple and whan þey be come to þe water þey stonde all in a certein place and offre deoultich iij giftes to þe cros in token of þe iij kynges And þan þey rede þis godspell in latyn Cum natus esset ihesus etcetera And when þis godspell is redde þan þey bysshoppes and the preestys blesse þe water and wasshe þe cros in þe same water and þan many syke men gone in to þe water naked and wasshe hem and þowe þe grace of god þe be hole And whan þis is do þan every man with grete Ioye goþ home in to his owne contrey and þan þey pleye with applis in þe weye þe wich þey cleped Aranʒa And þes applis in þat tyme of þe Þere þe rype Y, anom. R, lac. TD.

CHAPTER 42

33 and otherel] Abbottys and Y, and R; and] add alle KYB. 34 secte] add þat YBN. 36 ihesus] add in Bethlehem iude etcetera YN, add et cetera A, lac. TD, add in Bedelem B.
f. 29b


f. 29\(\text{vb}\)

2 defoulyngel] add of any manere dispyte BN; Also .. (29\(\text{vb}20\))xliij] om. KYARB\(\text{N}\), lac. TD.

f. 29\(\text{vb}\)

CHAPTER 43

21 Also .. (23)they] om. KYABN (cf. 25\(\text{vb}19-23\), lac. TD. 27 Nestorinil] Nostrynys B, Nostrynye N; And .. they been] Ferthermore þe schul vndirstonde pat þes Nestorynes aforseyde were Y(R); wo.ste] worst K(Y)A(R)BN, lac. TD. 28 f. of her .. circumcided] om. KABBN, for þorwe her eresye þere were xl kyngdoms in þe eest corupt and enfect Y, lac. RTD. 33 Ferthermore .. þat] And Y, lac. R.

f. 30a

1 a\(\text{3}e\)yne\(\text{s}(2)]\) add her lawys and a\(\text{3}e\)ns Y, lac. R. 2 lawe] laews YR, lac. RTD; chirche] add a longe tyme In so mcchell pat þey wolde nat be reuoked from her wikkidnesse for no prechinge ne techyng of doctours of holy chirche Y, lac. R. 4 they] per KYARB, lac. TD; londe] add of þes Nestorynes KYAR, lac. TD. 8 whiche] add pepil KYAR, lac. TD; clepe] clepyth BN. 9 And they] om. K, And þes Tartarynes YAR, lac. TD. 13 the(2)] þes YA, lac. TD. 14 destroyedenl] kelde YR; peple] add bobo olde
and longe Y, add anom. R. 16 took] ban þes tartaryns toke all Y, lac. R. 17 her... (31a33)Tartarye] grete Citees and
dwellid in hem and it do vnfo þis daye And also þey toke among
ôbir grete Citees iij Citees pe wich be chefe in all þat contrey
one Cite is cleped Cambalech þat opir is cleped Thauris and þe
thrid is cleped Baldach þe wich Baldach is þe Cite þe wich of
olde tyme was cleped Babylwayne and per is þe grete towre of
Babilwayne Y, lac. R; her] om. KA, lac. TD; d] and KABN, lac.
TD; townes] toures BN. 18 And... (31a33)Tartarye] om.
KA(R)BN, lac. TD.

f. 31a

CHAPTER 44

34 And furthermore. (31b34)Nestorines] anom. TD (see Hm.
p.184); And furthermore] and KABN, Than Y, anom. TD.
36 londes and the kyngdoms] londe and þe kyngdome BN.

f. 31b

1 Nestorines] add as hit is aforseyde Y, Nostrynes BN; the] þes
YR. 2 Ioon] Iohn KYAR, anom. TD, Iohn a noon ryght BN.
and socoure hem Y, lac R. 7 wille] and in ful purpos Y.
8 vpon a nght] affftyrwarde BN. 10 hym] add ferefully Y.
12 done] add no KYABN, anom. TD; socour] coumfort YR. 13 is]
wass YR. 14 shulle] schoîde YRBN; ytterly om. BN. 15 for]
add god wolde no lenger suffre Y; and] add for KABN, neber Y,
anom. TD. 18 avision] a visyoun KY(RET, anom. TD.
19 kynges] add ban BN. 21 Iohn] add and of his counsell Y(R).
22 lorde] add for hem BN. 26 heede] kepe KYARB, anom. TD.
27 avision] visions KYAR, anom. TD; that] om. KYA, anom. TD.
28 holde... and] om. BN; first] add wylle and his first YR;
purpos] add þat he was in Y. 29 thanne] om. BN. 32 with]
add a KYABN, lac. R, anom. TD. 33 and] add a KYAB, anom. TD,
[34] Nestorines] add ægens þe Tartarynyss Y.

TD resume standard text.

35 peples] peple ATDB. 36 thanne] om. KYARTDBN.

f. 31va

1 the bettre and] om. KYARTBN; an d] add þer þei BN. 2 dauid]
add þat was prester Iohn sone Y, add Prester Iohn sone R.
3 that] om. KYA; ascapede] skaped KYARDBN. 4 neuere oon] nat
one YR, add on lyue BN; destroyeden] add and conquerid Y.
8 was he] trs. KYARTDBN. 9 hadde done] did AD.

f. 31vb
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f. 3va

CHAPTER 1

lac. KSDO (the first folio recto of K is unreadable).

1 Incipit . . (3Vb10) in one] Prologus Here begynneth the lyf of the three kynges of Coleyne fro that tyme they sought our lorde god almyghty and came to Bedleem and worshipped hym and offered to hym vnto the tyme of their deeth As it is drawn out of dyuer bokes and put in one And how they were translate fro place to place W; Incipit primum Capitulum] om. YMP, De tribus regibus Colonie proporagus A, Miçtfull god þat euermore is wondrful yt hys seyntis and glorious in his werkes many wondrful þingis wrouȝt and schewed to all his holy seyntis and specialiche to þe iij worchippeful kynges þe which with all worchippe and (worchippe and) om. V) deuocioun souȝte oure lord ihesu cryst in Bethleem in his childehode RV, Here foloweth the manere and fourme of sekyng and offeryng and also of þe beryng and translacion of þree holy and worchipful kyngis of Coleyne Iaspar Melchyor and Balthaser T, Here begynneth the Story of the three holy and worshipful kynges of Coleyne E, Hereth of these iij worchipful and glorious kynges H, Hic incipit uita trium Regum (vita trium Regum) unreadable I) colonie (I)KkJ, Thus begynneth the lyfffe of thre kyngys of Coleyne B, Plesyth it to alle Cristen pepil to here this lyttelle trGtk Of þe þre worchipful kynges N, Here begynneth þe lyves of þe ij Kyngis of Coleyne conteyned in xvij chapiturs L, Capitulum primum The vertue and þe might of almyghty god of heven þe fader þe sone and þe holy gooste þre persone in Trinite and oon god of his deytee wolde þat frome þe begynnynge of þe worlde into þe ending oure feyþe were putte in to Remembranþe for þencresce and ferme bylyve of alle cristen peple bought and saved by oure lorde Crist Ihesus passion at Therusalem in þe mount of Caluarie þere passionde cruþefied and putte to deþ þe wicked Iuves by þe spirit of enspiration of holly and solemple clerkes putte hem in contynuell pryer and byesinesse for þe compylacion of þis saide chronicle þat þus begynneþe Q.

2 Itthe . . kynges] of the whiche E, in H, Of whom N; Itthe] seth YATIPJ, And for as moche as RV, om. B, With hit is so (or lo) that Kk, Sith þat Q; thise] add three YARVTMPKKJL, the thre B, add three saide Q; worchipful kynges] kynges worshipful and glorious Kk; worchipful] added later V, add and glorious YRVJL, add and holly Q. 3 kynges] add and glorious kynges I.


f. 3Vb


CHAPTER 2


I unreadable.


I resumes.

s.ynl seie RV, sayn and alle allegen T, leggen and seye BN, alleged and saye W; and s.ynl om. L. 35 a] add prophet HIKk, no BN, add prophete and a JL; and was the firste prophete] repeated R; and] add he L; was] om. W. 36 firste] add man B; prophete] add <a> man N; that was] and W; that] or than H, add euer MPQ; was] add and ATEMPQ, add ony H.

f. 4a

1 and] add he W. 2 were] was Q; no] om. BN; right gloriouslylich prophecey] he propheceyd ryght gloriously W; right] om. ATEMPQ, so he BN; gloriouslylich] add he JL. 3 propheceyen] add to hem that were no Iewes KK; of] om. E. 4 Ihesu cristi] om. W; cristi] om. RV; and] add also J; of(2)] om. V. 5 comynge] add and I; iij] add holy KK, add glorious J, add worshipful L; kynges] binges T, add and also of be sterre J. 6 his] om. V; come pburgh] ben by W; pburgh] of VEMPQ. 7 the(1)] om. H; deyeles] devylle MP;

K becomes readable.

I unreadable.


D begins.

that is now] om. ATDEMPQ; is now] trs. W; now cleped there] clepid now H; now] om. BNKK. 32 [there] om. ATDEHMPWQ, pe L; Sobab] Sabob KYARVTDEHBN?MKkJLW, Salos P, Sabous Q; that] the whiche toun J. 33 ix] almost a R, a VW; where] and ther J. 34 sepulcre] sepulture HW; is] add they E, add yitte Q; seye] om. BN, add yit MPJ, yit L; to] into TDEINMPKKJLQ; this] his H. 35 that] the TDEHBNKk; same] om. VMPQ; toun] tombe TD, add Sabob J. 36 felde] add with a lightnynge that come fro hevin J.

f. 4b

6 Capitulum terciu] Capitulum Secundum KYA(D)(I)(M)PKk, Capitulo secundo Jl, om. RVTHBNW. 7 Whan] Thenne H, Aftir pe tyme (add pat V) RV. 8 of] add the londe of L; hadde .. hem] whan pey voided out of pe cite of L; hadde] om. V. 9 wonne .. (11)was] largely unreadable I; wonne .. hem] made and wonnen Q; and .. hem] om. MPW. 10 alle the londe] om. P; londe] landys BN, cuntry L; liggynge] om. RVQ, beyng P, Longyng BN, add all KK. 11 a boute] therabowte TDEBMPWQ, therto al N; and .. of hem] om. RVQ; and] that BN; was] add so ATDEBNNJLQ, so KK. 12 that] thee ATDEHBNM?PKkJLW; contree] add for P, add fore to te stere ne M, add for to stir or for Q; sette] stere P. 13 for .. hem] om. MPQ; for] from T; fere and] om. KYATEHIKKJLW, the gret BN, ?the D; pat they had] om. KK. 14 Thanne was ther] Also ther was Jl, That tyme in Inde was W. 15 that] in the Est cuntry wic J; pe .. was] and also they

f. 4Va

9 stella ex Iacob] om. YAEHMPQ; ex ... a forsayde] vt Supra Kk, &c W; ex Iacob] om. KTDDBN; &c ... a forsayde] om. J; &c exurgit homo de ISrael et dominabitur omnium genicium L.

CHAPTER 4


[. 5a

were labured with that horrible seeknes called morbo caduco Q; that om. IBNJW; was take with hadde MP; was] om. H, were J. 20 the] om. H; foul euel] fallyngeuyll W. 21 the] that MLQ; coroune] dyademe EJLWQ; was] add with devocion was Q; leyde] put RV. 22 anone] sodeinly by miracle Q; he] the creature P; was] add al J, add made al Q; hool] add of pat sikeness L; Wherefore] And MPLQ, ther fore W. 23 afterward] om. V; maister] maisters ATDEMPQ; and] of RTDEBNJLQ, of er of Kk. 24 ordre] ordres ATDEMP; of] the EHBMPKkLWQ; templers] tempes AKk, add afterward V; same] om. W, saide vertuous relique of be Q. 25 dyademe] crowne RV; of golde with] gold wip R, of gold and wip V, and MP; of golde] om. WQ; with] of Kk. 26 otherwise precious] ?Inmíneuval ryche reliques Q; othere] om. KkW; precious] riche L, add cancelled stones Kk; jewels] ornamentis RV, add and ornamentes HL, add and many riche ornamentis J; of .. offrynges] and kept it for a worschipful Iewel RV; of the which] that borw be wiche BN; of] by Q; the] om. TKKJW. 27 coroune] dyademe JL, om. Q; hadde] om. N; late] gote BN, late 3eris J, om. LW, longe tyme Q; profite of] om. WQ; profite] Rychesesse BN. 28 of] and Ikk, as be B, be N; offrynges] offeryng KkW; But] ATDEMPQ; after tyme that] afterwarde whan L; after] add be RVBNQ, add that E; tyme] om. W. 29 that] om. EN; ordre .. (35)after] heben people hade wonne and goten that solemnpe Temple and Citee of Iherusalem and despoyled it of pat saide diaedeeme and alle be ober reliques Iouailles be ye hade ber never sith that tyme hider came it to be knolege or witting where any cristen creature wist redeyly or herdtelle where alle that richesses with ober many ober hornamentz of be churche of cristen fethy be came which is gret sorowe to alle cristen nacion Q; of] add be NMPKkW, add these B; templers] tempes Kk. 30 was] were VTDEBNKkLW; there] om. HBNMPJW, ?<And> Kk, men cowde nougt knowe L; where] whider R, were I, than H; that] add bis RV, add the D, the Hkk. 31 and] add the H, add many BNJW, add alle the MP; other] add ryght W; precious] add jewelles and H, Iewellos and BN, add Jewellis and rich J; ornamentes] Iueles MP. 32 bycome after] were bicomen neither L; after] om. KkW; it was neuere knowe] can no man telle BN; was] is KK; neuere knowe] trs. D, vnknown Kk. 33 knowe] add hit KYARVTDEHMPJL; in to] vnto BNW; Wher fore .. (5b11)boke] om. RV. 34 ther .. sorwe] grete sorowe and lamentoon was thenne W; was] add a E; sorwe] serche L; made] add perfore E. 35 al] om. D; that] be KYATDEHBNMPKkL; longe .. same] aboute Moreover the forsayde W; tyme] om. P; after] add And J. 36 the same Princes] ?a prince Kk; the] these J; same] om. EKK?JL.

f. 5b

1 broughte] add also W; oute .. (4)whiche] bokes writen of the thre kynges be whiche were Ebrewe and be same (difficult to read) Kk; oute of ynde bokes] oute Inde bokes T, bokes out of ynde D. 2 boke] add which were W; in .. caldeel] of Caldee and Ebrewe Q; hebrew] Grew M; caldeel] told L, add langege berynge
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witnes W. 3 lyf] lives L; and .. dedes[ om. Q; of(2)] om. IM?P; dedes[ add blessed KIAEHITBNMPQ; add hooly TD; add worshipful L; glorious and worshipful J; add remenom W; bokes] om. E.
5 were afterward] trs. KK; afterward translated] trs. BN; in to] in KK. 6 freshe] add tunge J; so] thus L; of] in H; be BN, þorough J; theſe] the KK, those W, poo Q; and] om. E; add also J. 7 of(1)J; add be Q; of(2) ... that] reeding of hem Q; of(2)] om. EHBKJKJ; syghet] sightis L; and also of] mony faire ATDEMP; and(2) om. H; also] om. W. 8 of] borough J; sermons and omelyes] trs. D; and omelyes] om. KK; and] add of LW; that] om. BNMP. 9 been] were BN; of .. (13)progenie] &c M; of .. (1)boke] om. P, many hoolly sermons and omelyes Q. 10 been .. to gedere] is this boke written and gadered H; been] and BN, this presente treatise is W; to gedere/and putte] trs. TD; and] add so L; putte .. that] composed in one libel or lytel boke Also W. 11 boke] add And KkJ; shul] shulde J. 12 the] this E; kynder of this progenie] ?progenie and kenred Kk; of this] and be Q. 13 this] the VEHIIJL; bere] bere ARTDEMPLOQ; alwey] om. HQ; alle wyth M. 14 in her banere] om. KK; banere] baners W, armes and bannyers yitte Q; in to this day/a sterrel] trs. BN; in to this day] om. RV; in to] vnto W; sterre] in their Baner Kk. 15 with a] which is made in be Æ. a] pe AVTEBNKK; the] a ATDEMPWO, add hooly RV; made after] on W. 16 after] in BN; maner and the same] om. ATDEIMPKKJLQ; and] add in BN; the same(2)] in lyke W. 17 forme] add bat E; iij] add blessid KIAEHIBNW, add blesfulle MPO, add glorious] J. 18 the tyme of] om. EMPO; the(1)] om. W; the(2)] add Incarnacioun and J. 19 oure] add blesfulle W, blyssed P; lorde] ihesu cryst] sauyoure Cryste Thesu W; lorde] add blessed Q; And .. (30)it] And þis banere was bore in every bataillie þat was do bitwix cristen men and sarsyns RV; so .. alwey] om. H; it was that] thus L, om. W. 20 that alwey after] alwey þat a Sterre BN; that(1)] om. IKkJ; alwey] all day PQ; that(2)] om. H, add the prophete W. 21 of] add of be sayd BN; this] that W; sterre] add cancelled and that KK; and .. (30)it] the more the fame and desyng of the sterre encreased and the more gretli it was had in remembrance thurgh out alle the londe of Inde and of Caldee and also the more þe people desyred to see it in thier lyue days W; and] om. HMPO, add that Kk, annoon L. 23 ther after .. a fore seide] after þe sterre Kk; ther after] þere HBN; this] þe YATDEHIMPKJQ; Vaus] add many þeris J. 24 a fore seide] add and BNMLQ; the .. after] om. P; þat þis] þe Q. 25 this .. more] they loke KK; this] þe YHI; after] add upon the hille of Vaus IJL; the more] om. N. 26 the loos and the fame] trs. KYATDEIBNMPKJL, fame and loos H, fame and þe loos Q; of this sterre] om. EH; this] þe sayd Kk. 27 encreesed] add of the sterre E; and .. of] om. J; and] om. Q; spoken] made I. 28 thurgh] add alle TDBNMLP, þorowewalt JL; of(2)] om. HBPKKJQ. 29 and] wherefor L; aliom. BN; þe] om. E; þeþe] add gretely BN; desirede to se it] of þoo landes and cuntreys reioysed inwardey for to see it so were þey were reioysed in body and sole for to here þer offe Q; desirede] add for DMP, add at all tymes BN, desireth KK, add gretely for J, add sore L. 30 it] that sterre J.
CHAPTER 21

Iac. P.

34 The . . bethleem] And 3e schul vndirstonde bat RSV; The] that KYATDEIIL, and bat HOBNMWOQ, And in that J; same] om. W; day] tyme LW; thise] the OBNKK; thire] add noble D, add worshipful JL. 35 soughten . . (16bl) tyme] wirshippe our se lord he was KK, offred thus to Criste he was W; soughten . . bethleem] worshipped and soughte god in Betheim with gifftis E; god] our se lord Ihesu Crist J, add all myghty L. 36 worshipede] worship M; with] add her MQ; 3ifte] 3iftes KYATD(E)HIOBNMQLQ.

f. 16b

1 Crist] om. YRSVHI; was that tyme] worshiped him Q; tyme] add as RSV, same E. 2 of] add be age of Q. 3 olde] age KYAIRKk, of age TDEMJLWQ; and . . sumdelfat] om. W; he] om. TDEOBNNKk; sumdelfat] add and rownde L, feyryst of all members of mankynde Q. 4 he] om. EOBNQ; by wrapped] wrapped KYARSVTDEIOBNMKKJLW, om. H, bere W; pore clothes] clothes of lytyll valewe W. 5 and] om. OBNWOQ; his moder lappe] hey3e (om. KK) in (in to M, om. KK) be (a RSVMJQ) manger (add of be bestes Q) vppe (of M) to be armes Also (And RSVMLQ), And also J) oure (add Blissid JL) lady seint Mary his (add blessed Q) modyr (his modyr] om. E) YARSVTDEHMKKJL; moder] moderes OBNW; as . . She] om. KK. 6 writen] repeated by writing Q; bokes] add and Syth Sayth that Q, add and EN; She] om. MQ, the W; was] add bere L, add a fere creature Q. 7 in persone] some what E, a little M, add sumwhat J; in] a H, add hyr OBN; flesshly] flessy KyrSEO, conveniently flessed Q; and somdel broun] but a browne woman KK; somdel] som what WQ; broun] browiiiiiiier(?)she Q. 8 the(1)] om. VHWQ; the(2)] om. K, be YARSVTDEHIOBNNMKJLWOQ; iiij] add worshipful JL. 9 with] and J; whyte and a pore mantel] mantill of white full poure E, cloth in be maner of a mantill Kk, poore whyte mantell W, symple cleene mantell of white Q; and a porel] om. RSVL; and a] om. HOBNM.

lac. Kk.

10 and that mantel] be whiche Q; that] the E; mantel] om. W; she] add kepte and O. 11 helde] add all Q; hir(1)] add Childe J; hir(2)] the A. 12 Andl] add also J; hir] the E; was . . face] sauf his face was hiled al to gedir nay but hir hede al sauff hir face Q; heled] covered W; alto gedir] also all RSV. 13 the] here MJL; face] visage RSV; a] om. RSV. 16 helde] lift RSV; vp] om. J; god almyghtys] our se lord Crist Ihesu is H, hyr Sonnys O, oure lord god her sone his BN; almyghtys] almy3ty KYRSEI; heued] add Crist Ihesu O, add verri god and man J.
Kk resumes

17 So . . (32)god] rewritten with the inclusion of material from
ch.[22] RSV; So afterwarde that] And þan J, And so whan L; So]
om. H, and OBNKQ, and so M; afterwarde that] after W; that]whanne þat T, whan DEO, om. BN; iij] add worshipful JL; kynges]
add So O, add with ȝiftis J, oure lord Ihesu Crist L; and] om.
E.

P resumes.

19 his . . and] unreadable I; hondes] honde KYATDH, om. N, add
ryght W; and] add þan J. 20 leyde] lefte E; ȝiftes] add
dovne O; þe childes] Crystes W. 21 heued] add Ihesus O, add
and DNY; was] where OBN; with] of Kk; þise] the D, her N, add
riches Q. 22 þe shul heren/afterwarde] trs. PQ; heren
afterwarde] trs. Kk; heren] have knowleche OM; afterwarde]
add Capitalum xxjM KYATDIP, om. H; her afterwarde Of the Stature
of thes thre wyrchypphull kynges as folowyth here O, her aþter
Capitalum xxjM M, add Capitalum xxj Also furthermore 3e shul
vnirstonde that J, add more pleynly CapM 21L, add &c
<Capitalum xxj> Now þis storie shall beo more openly declared to
yowe of Q. 23 that was] om. W; that] the wiche J. 24 and]
or Q; of] om. EOBP, repeated M; Arabie] add was he Kk, add
KYATDEHIONKKW, almighty JL; god] add he KYATDEHIONL, add And he
Kk; leest] om. O, the leest man MPJLQ, lesse Kk; and . .
(29)stature] om. O. 26 ofj om. E; persone] add and BNMPJWO,
add And of þis thre kynges Kk. 27 Godolie] Godoby MP, sodolie
Kk; and] add of KYARSVTDEHBNMKKJLWQ; that] om. Kk. 28 to
god] he W; to] add almighty JL; god] add he KY(RSV)TDEHBNJL,
and he Kk; of mene] a fadome of length and of L; of] add a
KYARSVTDMKJWQ; mene] om. BN. 29 in his persone] om. W; in
his] and of PQ; in] of VMK; persone] add moche O, add of the
myndell assyd BN. 30 Thaars and of the yle of] om. E.
31 and] add kyng L; the yle of] om. THN; þat . . god] om. E.
32 to god] he KY(RSVE)IL, add he ATDHOBNMPQO, om. KkW; to] add
almighti J; moost . . was] om. OBN; moost of stature] be mooste
persono in stature of alle þeos Q; moost] of moost stature and
T, be most man MKL, the moost persoone P; of stature] of
persono KAVTD, in persoone YRSII, add the whiche oþeryd myre to
god E, of persoone in stature M, in stature P, add and personne
Kk, in his persone J, of persoone and of stature L. 33 and]
add he KYARSVTDEHMPKKJLWQ; a] om. RSV. 34 wher of it is no]
wyþht owtyn OBNW, be whiche is not for to Q; wher of it] And þat
MP; wher of] þat V; it . . for] om. Kk; it] om. KYARSVTDEHIJL;
for amonge alle othere] wherof RSV; for W. 35 othere] add
thynges MPJ, om. Kk, add as L, add kynges Q; prophete] prophecie
KkJL; sayth] add thus OJ, seyde BNMPWQ, said thus Kk; Coram
illo procedent] om. E. 36 procedent] procedent O, procedens B,
procedent M, procedent KkW, procedet Q.
lac. Kk.

9 ffertheremore .. (28)been] displaced RSV; ffertheremore .. (12)persone] But hauynge regarde to the persones bat were that tymes they were but lytill persones thoos thre kynges W; ffertheremore] Also 3e schul vndirstonde bat RSV; iij] add worshipful JL. 10 and] with BN, add alle M, shal worship and alle Q; her hoste] all her men RSVL; hoste] oostes HBNMP, add of pepil J; hoostes Q; hauynge .. they] om. L. 11 that men] of men that MPO; of] at ABMPQ, add at TDEN, therof JJ, add in O. 12 tymes] add pat N; theyl om. B; were} add but L; ryght] om. OBN; of persone] personys OBN, of stature And of persone L; persone] persouns VDP. 13 In so moche/that] trs. O; In so moche] repeated Q; manere] add of KYARSVDEHNPLWQ, om. M, the J. 14 peple] men M, add of pat cuntre J; mervayled moche of hem] had moche merueyle therof W; moche/of hem] trs. T; moche] om. JL. 15 that(1)] om. V, they OBN; shewede] sayled W; wel] om. H. 16 were] om. ATDEBNMPL; fro] of RSVM, of straunge and Q; cuntree .. Est] countrees W; outt] om. T. 17 Est] add parte of be worlde L; ffor .. Est] om. DB; the nerer toward be Est and the nerer the vprisinge of the sonne] trs. H; nerer toward be[ ] fyorthre E; nerer] ner TO; toward)(] om. W; be .. nerer] om. L. 18 and] om. O, is MPO; the nerer the)] om. J; the nerer] om. W; the(1)] repeated Q; nerer] add ys O, add to MP; the(2)] om. P; vprisyngye] Rysynge EJ, Spryning H. 19 that men been bore] and the hete maketh hem (add fore Q) to be (add the Q) MPQ; that men] the men that E; that] om. N; been .. and] ther of bene the lasse of Statvre that bene borne there and also O, bere be the lestes of (be per lasse of per N) persone bat be borne there and BN. 20 the] om. P; they been] om. MPO; stature] add of body RV, add body S. 21 the(1)] add more J; feblere and the more] more feble and W; feblere] add in wittis H; the more tendre] tendreer E, add of complection OBN. 22 But] and EW, add the O, add here MPO; herbys] add also there O, add bere B, add and frutis J; been] add be RSV, add in that cuntre more J, add more L; hottere] add and better (hottere and better trs. H) and (add also JL) all (all om. S) maner of (of om. RS) spyces be better (add ther þan in oper cuntreis J) YRSHIJL, add and better ATDE, add ther BN, beter and hoter of (and P) more of vertu then in oper countrieys MP, add and more tendre þane
herbes of other countries Q; and add the O, add also J.
23 suche othere al oher suche J; suche] om. RSV; othere]
wormes and W; perilouse] wylde RSV. 24 been] add more L, add
the W; grettere and more venemous] more venomous and more
strenger and gretter RSV, more venomous and more greter þant
(grette (gretter Q) and moore venemous than PQ) oher ben MPQ;
and] add the W. 25 And . . (28)been] om. RSV; And] add also
JL; alle] add other L; manere] add of KYADEIOMPO, other W.
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26 and] add of Q; the(1) . . (28)been] ben there more grete than
here W; nerer] Ner O; sonne] that O, add þat L. 27 they . .
and] om. Q; they been] om. TEHMP; more and the] om. O; and the
grettere they been] gretter N. 28 fferthermore . .
(16Vb16)Capitulum xxij] om. KYATEHIOBNMP(KK)JLWQ, anom. RSV.
GLOSSARY
The glossary is divided into two sections, a main section and a section of PROPER NAMES (PN); the two are linked by cross references.

A list of ABBREVIATIONS precedes the main section.

1 Plan (main section)

Layout has been modelled on Norman Davis's glossary to Bennett and Smithers's *Early Middle English verse and prose*, with some modifications; it also generally conforms to the guidelines in EETS's *Notes for editors*. The etymologies are taken with minor adaptations from MED, and checked against those in OED (at the time of printing fascicules of MED to S.16 were available; OED supplied the remaining entries).

Within an entry no attempt has been made to present the senses in historical order.


2 Method of entry

Choice of headword: In general MED practice has been followed in defining word units. Variant spellings of headwords are recorded, but forms with unreadable letters are not normally entered.

Generally a noun (or verb) phrase is entered under the noun (or verb), with select cross reference(s).
**Variant spellings:** A final or quasi-final silent e is bracketed in headwords with such variant spellings, e.g. anon(e);

**apostata(e)s.** A variant double letter is likewise bracketed, e.g. sit(t)he, Tha(a)rs, as is variant final -n in verb forms (infin., pr. pl., pa. t. pl., pp.), e.g. bere(n), bore(n), except that no record of such variation is made for pa. t. forms of a wk. v. Variation between i and y or th and p is not noted.

**Senses entered:** The glossary aims to include all words and senses no longer current. Though record is made of ME senses only, this does not mean that modern sense(s) may not apply in other contexts to the item entered, or even be present as a possible alternative sense in the same context.

**Punctuation:** In definitions commas separate closely related senses, semicolons mark off more distinct senses and spellings as well as phrasal usages. Where a word or sense occurs only in a phrase, the phrase is preceded by a colon, which is thus equivalent to the words "(only) in the phr.". Stops mark off major grammatical subdivisions. (However, as in Bennett and Smithers, these conventions may be simplified in shorter entries.)

Boldface type is used for headwords and their secondary forms, and for references to headwords. Grammatical designations immediately following head forms are italicised, as are unentered ME words and citations. ModE sense equivalents appear within single inverted commas.
Entry of secondary forms:

a) Nouns: Regularly formed plurals, i.e. in -(e)s, -ys, etc., are noted only where a special sense attaches. No special note is made of irregular or undifferentiated plurals (eyen, place, hors, thynge, myle).

b) Verbs: Infin. form(s) are entered first, followed by any relevant pr. t. forms, then pa. t. forms, then pp. Forms are entered only if irregular, or if a special meaning attaches; otherwise the meanings gathered under the headword are assumed to apply to all secondary forms. The forms of strong verbs are normally recorded; if merely the grammatical designation appears at the head of a subdivision, it is to be assumed that the form for that subdivision is identical to the headword form (see e.g. wasshe pr. pl.).

Unless otherwise indicated, a weak verb is assumed to have regularly derived secondary forms; only where a special meaning attaches do subdivisions appear in the entry, under the bare grammatical designation (e.g. pl. or pa. t.) without record of the form itself.

In the pa. t., sg. and pl. are distinguished in strong verbs only, pa. t. sg. implying pa. t. 3 sg., and the simple designation pa. t. implying that sg. and pl. are not formally distinguished.
Etymologies: These follow the main body of the entry in square brackets.

The source form is not cited where its spelling agrees substantially with the headword.

In the case of a strong verb the ME infinitive is cited at the beginning of the etymology where this form (or the pr. pl. if equivalent) is not already the headword of the entry, the infinitive being spelt according to the most appropriate form cited in MED; in the etymology of a wk. v., the ME infin. form is cited only exceptionally.

The ME infin. is followed by the OE infin. and the applicable principal parts, grouped in up to three subdivisions separated by semicolons, and distinguished by punctuation according to the following format (angle brackets enclose generic terms):

<infin.> (<pr. t. forms>); <pa. t. sg.>/<pl.>; <pp.>

Variant forms are separated by commas.

"&c." after a cited form implies that other spellings exist, the most appropriate having been chosen for illustration.

Order of entry: Bracketed letters are disregarded in the filing order. Headwords written as two words are filed as one. Initial ff counts as a single letter. Yogh immediately follows g in the alphabetic sequence (rather than occupying the alphabetic position of "y"; this is done in order to avoid separating entries containing yogh internally or finally, where it is a less common variant for gh). Thorn is treated as equivalent to th. Otherwise alphabetic order is followed, except that "i" and "j"
are separated according to their phonetic value; similarly /v/ follows /u/. Words spelt alike but of different grammatical categories are separated accordingly, the order of entry being: n., pron., art., adj., adv., prep., conj., v. Where such words are of the same grammatical category, the entries are distinguished by superscript numerals.

The tag 8 indicates that among a number of possible meanings, the Latin favours the meaning so tagged.

A question mark before a headword indicates uncertainty over the manuscript reading; before a line reference it signals a possible instance of that meaning; before a sense it warns that the sense may not be possible in ME. A bracketed question mark marks a possible alternative sense or category.

Whereas "cf." has elsewhere the sense "contrast", in GLOSSARY it is used in the weaker sense "compare".

3 Proper Names

These form a separate sequence; cross references to entries in this section are preceded by the tag PN. Standard modern equivalents (as found in AV, Peake, ODCC, etc.), often supplemented with an epithet or concise explanatory phrase, are given where the identity of the entry is not obvious or the modern spelling differs appreciably. Personal dates are given where ascertainable, preceded by "b." or "d." where only date of birth or death is known; for rulers regnal years (preceded by "r." ) are cited by preference. Unless otherwise indicated, all entries are assumed to be nouns and to have regular plurals.
# ABBREVIATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Anglian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adj.</td>
<td>adjective, -al</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adv.</td>
<td>adverb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AF</td>
<td>Anglo-French</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CF</td>
<td>Central (Old) French</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>coll.</td>
<td>collective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>comp.</td>
<td>comparative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>conj.</td>
<td>conjunction, -ive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dat.</td>
<td>dative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dem.</td>
<td>demonstrative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gen.</td>
<td>genitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gk.</td>
<td>Greek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gmc.</td>
<td>Germanic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>indef.</td>
<td>indefinite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>infin.</td>
<td>infinitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>intens.</td>
<td>with intensive force</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>intr.</td>
<td>intransitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>Latin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LL</td>
<td>late Latin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOE</td>
<td>late Old English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ML</td>
<td>Medieval Latin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ModE</td>
<td>Modern English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ModF</td>
<td>Modern French</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>note</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n.</td>
<td>noun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OE</td>
<td>Old English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OF</td>
<td>Old French</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OI</td>
<td>Old Icelandic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ON</td>
<td>Old Norse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pa. t.</td>
<td>past tense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>phr.</td>
<td>phrase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pl.</td>
<td>plural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PN</td>
<td>PROPER NAMES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pop. L</td>
<td>Popular Latin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pp.</td>
<td>past participle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ppl.</td>
<td>participle, -ial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ppl. adj.</td>
<td>participial adjective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pr.</td>
<td>present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prep.</td>
<td>preposition, -al</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pron.</td>
<td>pronoun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pr. ppl.</td>
<td>present participle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>refl.</td>
<td>reflexive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rel.</td>
<td>relative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rom.</td>
<td>Romance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sb.</td>
<td>somebody</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sg.</td>
<td>singular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sth.</td>
<td>something</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>subj.</td>
<td>subjunctive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>superl.</td>
<td>superlative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tr.</td>
<td>transitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ult.</td>
<td>ultimately</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v.</td>
<td>verb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>var(s).</td>
<td>variant form(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vbl. n.</td>
<td>verbal noun (gerund)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wk. v.</td>
<td>weak verb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WS</td>
<td>West Saxon</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
a indef. article. (referring to a specified number of units regarded as a set or as a whole): ~ xI kyngdomes 29vb30; a iiii or v myle brood 10vb32n. [OE ҈n. For this usage, cf. ModE 'a few', 'a hundred', &c.]
a prep.: ~ processioun in procession 28b3n; ~ this half see half n. [Unstressed form of on prep.]
a conj. and 27a36. [Weak form of and conj.]
a. See also a draid ppl. adj., a fore adv., afore prep.,
a a frayed pp., a twynne adv., away.
abyde v. stay, stop 7vb5; abydeth pr. 3 sq. remains, continues to exist 27b20, 32b22; abidyenge pr. ppl. dwelling, resident 14Va24n. abode pa. t. sq. 9Va30, 12vb10 &c.; halted 13a22; abood 32b15; came to rest 27b11n. abyde(n) pa. t. pl. 4Vb32, 12vb22; (?were caused to) wait 1Va17. abide(n) pp. 13b10; awaited, looked forward to 9V9a,21 &c. [OE ҈b'dan; ҈b'd/abidon; abiden.]
able adj. trained, competent 30vb20; ҈suited 17a33, 20b9. [OF, & L habil-is.]
abode, abood. See abyde v.
aboute prep. (place) (?).around 11b35n; (time) at, by the time of 8a2. [From aboute adv. OE onbutan.]
abrode, abrood adv. spread or stretched out 20b17,26; streyned ~ 23b17. [From on brōd(e) (cf. a prep.).]
accordynge ppl.: ~ in to oon corresponding, in agreement 13Va9. [From accorde(n) v. & cf. accordaunt adj.]
a draid, adraid ppl. adj. afraid 7a31,33. [infin. adrēde(n).
LOE  kad, besides earlier ondrēdan & ofdrēdan.]
af. See afspoke pp.

afferme v. give weight to, corroborate 9vb30n. [OF afermer & L affirmare.]

a fore adv. previously 10a29, 15vb13 &c. [OE on foran.]

afore prep. (place) in front of 15vb14; (time) before 13a27.
[From a fore adv.]

aforgeins prep. in front of, facing 32b31n. [afore prep. + geins
(OE gegen, with gen. ending –es after the kindred to–eanes).]

a frayd pp. frightened, alarmed, terrified 20vb10. [OF esfraer, effraer &c.]

afspoke pp. spoken about 17b13. [infin. ofspeken(n). From speken(n) v. See spak pa. t. sg.]

after(e) prep. (of congruence) in accordance with 3vb3, 6b8 &c.;
in keeping with 8vb13n; made lyke – made in the likeness of 5a8; made – the same maner as 5b15; on the authority of 3vb3;
see also after conj. (of an object sought &c.) for: see loken v., studyinge pr. ppl. [OE æfter.]

after conj. (of congruence) according as 9a9n; as 8vb14; that 20b2, 25bl. (of time) (tyme) that after 5a28, 25b20 &c. [Short for after that. From after(e) prep.]

after thanne adv. after that (was done), subsequently 12vb28.
[OE æfter bað, baðm.]

afterwarde that conj. after 16b17. [OE æfterweard + that conj.]

agast pp., ppl. adj. frightened, terrified, awed 10a16,
11vb30 &c. [infin. agaste(n). Cf. OE geæstan (rare); for prefix a–, cf. afæred, afright.]
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agone pp., ppl. adj. passed away, dead 2b25. [infin. agð(n).
OE āgān; āgān.]

ageyn(e) adv. back (to the place one came from) 2a5, 26a15 &c.
[OE ongeg(e)n.] See also turrneth pr. 3 sg.
a ʒeyn prep. in reply to, in contradiction to 29a26.
[Cf. aʒeyn(e) adv.]

aʒeyns prep. in response to 3b33, contrary to 5a22; facing, opposite 28a7; in the direction of 29b4. [From aʒeyn(e) adv.
& a ʒeyn prep.] See also aryse v., attempte v., do(ne) v.,
sette v.

aʒeynstonde v. offer resistance, defend oneself 4a3n. [Modelled on L re-sistere, ob-stàre &c.]
al(le) adv. entirely, totally 16b10, 25b5 &c.; (intens.) 26a21.
[From al adj. OE eall &c.]
alchen n. (kind of) inn 7a26n, bl &c. [Through L from Arabic al
'the' and khan 'inn'.]

alegggen pr. pl. claim, assert 3b34. [OF alegier 'justify', & aleguer 'present (reason)'; L allegâre.]

Alien n. a foreigner, outsider; one of a different kindred or religion 9b17n. [From alien adj. OF, & L alienus.]

alle thyng pron. all things, everything 4b29. [From the phrases alle thing (pl.) 'all things' & all thing (sg.) 'everything'.]

allone adj.?, adv.? exclusively 17b24n. [From the phr. al one (cf. al(le) adv.).]

also adv. and so, then 4b1n, 8b33. [al(le) adv. + so adv.;
OE eal swa.]

altercacioun n. controversy, debate, dispute 3b24, 12a6.
[L & OF]
alto gedir adv. completely 16b12. [al(le) adv. + togider adv.]

alwey. See 3it.

amonestynge vbl. n. urging, warning, admonition 3b12. [From amonesten v. OF amonester & ML admonestare.]

an conj. and 6vb15. [Weakened form of and conj.] See also an heigh(e) adv.

and conj. and yet, but 3va17, 11a34 &c.; ~ elles see elles conj. [OE]

angwissh n. distress, anxiety; hardship; torment, suffering, pain 18vb2. [OF anguisse.]

an heigh(e) adv. above 26valln; on high 6vb6; in heaven 7b9. [OE an, on prep. + heigh adj.]

anoynte pp. anointed 7b26. [infin. anointe(n). From OF enoint, pp. of enoindre.]

an(e) adv. at once 4b26, 4va21 &c.; soon, shortly after @15vb22; also ano(o)n right 13b35n, 31b6. [OE on an(e): + ryght adv.]

anoon as conj. as soon as 15va30. [ano(e) adv. + as conj.]

apostata(e)s n. pl.: bee(n) ~ renounce the Faith, apostatise 30vb9,25. [ML apostata (sg.).] See also PN Iulian Apostata.

apparaylle n. fittings, (sails and) rigging 23b16n. [OF]

apples n. pl. (fruits resembling) apples 29a30; the Dead Sea fruit or Apples of Sodom 29al1-18n,14. [OE æppel (sg.).]

aray n. dress 8b18n, 15va35n &c.; apparel, equipment, magnificence 10b13. [AF]
araye(n) wk. v. pr. pl. decorate 22b13; bake clothe, adorn themselves 25a21 &c. pa. t. clothed, adorned 18b17; prepared, provided 23b3. pp. 5a4, 15vbl &c.; made, built 20vbl4.

[AF ar(ra)ai-, tonic stem of ar(ra)er.]

arblast n. crossbow 27b36, 28v9a7. [OF arbaleste &c. & AF alblastre (from L arcu-ballista).]

aryse v.: a3ens rise in rebellion, rebel against 17v9a7; aryseth pr. 3 sg. rises, overflows its banks 28v9a7. arisen pa. t. pl.
30a4. [OE ārisan; ārās/ārison.]

arst adv. previously 14v9b34. [OE ecrast.]

as conj. as if 10v9a4, 28a2. [OE ealswā.]

askynge vbl. n. request, petition 24v9a8. [OE āscung.]

aspies n. pl. observation; scouts, spies 4v9b20; espyes 4v9b27.

[AF aspie & CF espie (sg.).]

assent n.: of on ~ of one accord 18a33. [OF]

assented pp. agreed to, approved of 17b14. [OF assenter, assentir.]

assigneke pa. t. nominated, appointed (to an office) 17v9b26; allotted, transferred (territories) 17v9b35. [OF assignier, L assignāre, & OF assener.]

assoylep pp. explained, solved 29v9b19. [OF assoiler &c.]

at prep. in response to: ~ her prayeres 18v9b5. [OE æt.] See also falle v.

attempte v.: a3eysns challenge, transgress against, violate 17v9a10,11. [OF attempter & L attemptāre.]

a twynne adv. asunder: departed ~ see departed pa. t. [From on twinne (cf. a prep.); LOE twinn, & ON.]

Augustines. See PN f(f)rere(s).
auysement n. (time for) deliberation: with oute any - all of a sudden 14v20n. [OF]
avisio(u)n n. prophetic dream, warning sent in a dream 31bl8,27. [OF]
away, a way. See do(ne) v.
axede pa. t. asked, begged 18vb4. [OE Æcsian.]

bar(e), baren. See bere(n) v.
batayle n. warfare, military forces: with stronge - 23vb20. [OF]
batelde. See y bateled ppl. adj.
Bawme n. (tree producing) balsam, balm: gardyne of - 2al8. [OF]
be, beey. See be(e)n pr. pl.
bemes n. pl. shafts (of light), rays, beams: strakes and - 9vb9n,13. [OE bëam (sg.).]
be(e)n pr. pl. are 1Va29, 14a4 &c.; beey (misspelling?) 27b3n; be 17b28; beth 15b10; subj. 25a7. [infin. bë(n). OE bëon (pr. pl. bëop).]
bere(n) v. carry 8vb25, 21Va36 &c.; support 20vb4; bear (a child) 5Va2. bereth pr. 3 sg. (heraldic emblem) has, displays 17vb10. pr. pl.: heer have or produce fleece 13vb35. bar(e) pa. t. 6a4, 18b19 &c.; baren pl. 23Va8. bore(n) pp. 5vb10,13 &c.; (fame) spread abroad 4Va16,25. [OE beran; bær/bær(on); boren.] besily adv. carefully, zealously, constantly, readily 5vb27;
besilyche 11a30; bysylche 14bl4. [From bisi, (early) besi &c. adj. OE bisig.] beth. See be(e)n pr. pl.
by prep. (of place) by way of, via, through 10 vb18, 20a6n &c.;
~ the weye see weye n.; ~ hym, hem self of its, their own
8 va20, 22 vb12 &c. (of reference) concerning 18 va20, 26b22.
(of agency) via, through the agency or help of 2 va15, 6b27 &c.;
?with the permission of 31 vb30n. [OE] See also by comen pr.
pl., by halfe n., by wrapped pp.
bycause of prep. for the purpose of 4 vb31, 6 va22. [by prep. +
cause n. 'purpose' + of prep.]
by comen pr. pl. (progeny) come, descend 13 vb32. bycome
pa. t. pl.: where (they) ~ what became of (them) 5a32.
[OE becuman. See com(e) pa. t.]
bigge v. buy 32a1. [OE bycgan.]
bygynnynge vbl. n.: toke ~ of arose from, originated in (cf. of
prep.) 3 vb12. [From biginne(n) v. See bygonne pa. t. pl.]
bygonne pa. t. pl. began 19 va27, 20 vb23. [infin. biginne(n).
OE beginnan; -gan, -gon/-gunnon.]
by halfe n.: on the Sowdones ~ on the authority of, as
representative of the Sultan 28 b30. [From the prep. phr.
*bi halve.]
byheste n. promise, pledge, covenant 5 va11; the londe of ~ PN
see londe of byheste. [OE behës.]
byhyghte pa. t. promised 24 b17, 31b2 &c. byhote pp. held out
hope of 6b33. [infin. bihôte(n), (late) -hête(n), -highte(n).
OE behátan; behást, *biheht; behåten.]
byleue n. faith (as opposed to reason) 3Va26, 12b13 &c.;
a religion, religious belief 18Vb10; with ote { and lawe
29Va14n (cf. lawe n.); esp. the Christian faith or religion:
the holy ~ 16a25, 24Vb11; preuy ~ (cf. priue adj.) 15b30n.
[Cf. OE gelæafa.]
bylt pp. built 1b4; bult(e) 1Va18, 2Vb1. [infin. bilde(n),
bulde(n) &c. OE *byldan; byld.]  
[infin. bisette(n). OE besettan.]
byside adv. in addition: with ~ together with 5a11.
[From OE bit sidan, be sidan.]
bysyliche. See besily adv.  
bisshop n. high-priest (of the Romans &c.) 7a6n; pl. pontiffs
?23Vb8n. [OE bisc(e)op.]  
bytwixe prep. ?in the sum of 12b20n. [OE betwix.]  
by wrapped pp. wrapped up, swathed 16b4n. [infin. biwrappe(n).
From wrappe(n) v. Origin uncertain.]  
blame n. sin, offence 24Vb26n. [OF bla(s)me.]
bord n. (dining) table 8Vb26. [OE bord; cf. also OI bord,
OF bord 'side', 'edge'.]  
bore(n). See bere v.
bre(e)de n. breadth, width 6Va36, 13Vb25 &c. [OE bræd(u).]  
brekynde vbl. n. breaking sound, boom 16Vb2n. [From breke(n) v.
OE brecan.]  
brennynge vbl. n. searing heat 7Va1, 10Va22. [From brenne(n) v.
See breve pa. t.]  
brennynge ppl. adj. burning, fiery 9Vb10n. [From brenne(n) v.
See breve pa. t.]  
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brente pa. t. burnt 12b36. pp. 11b31n. [infin. brenne(n).]

OE biernan &c.; but chiefly from ON, cf. OE brenna.

broddest adj. superl. broadest, widest 10vb33n. [From brŏd adj. OE brŏd.]

brought pp.: in induced, persuaded 31a12n. [infin. bringe(n). OE bringan; brŏht.]

bulles n. pl. bulls, seals (of lead) 22a27. [OF bulle & L bulla (sg.).]

bult(e). See bylt pp.

but conj. (after negative v. of preventing) 27va6; (with subj.) unless 15vb36; except 31vb30; otherwise than that, without (as a result) 28vb14; if 8vb31, 31vb29; that except that 725vb5n. [OE butan.]

caaS; cam; Capitre. See par caas adv.; com(e) pa. t.:

Chapitre n.

cariage n. supplies, vehicles, baggage 13b28; esp. animals (?for food) 10b25. [AF; cf. CF chariage.]

Castel n. small town 7b19n; fortified camp 28vb25, ?30a16. [OE & AF castel, L castellum.]

cause n. reason 1va30, 29va28; purpose 13va7,8; matter of legal controversy 26vb4n. [OF, & L causa.]

certeyn(e) adj. a certain 3a25n; particular 8a13, 11b18 &c.; a definite but unspecified number of (cf. certeine n.) 22va6n. [OF]

certeine n. a fixed amount or portion (as payment &c.) 8a17. [From certeyn(e) adj.]
Chamayles n. pl. camels 10b10,34 &c. [L camēlus & AF cameil, CF chamoil (sg.).]

Chano(u)ns n. pl. canons (clergymen living under canon rule)
19V26, 20Vb17. [AF canun & CF chanoine (sg.).]

Chapitre n. chapter lb6, lVal &c.; ?Capitre 1a1. [OF chapitre (from chapite) & L capitulum.]

charged pp. laden 10b11; ppl. adj. 28V4a28. [OF charg(i)er.]

chepynge vbl. n. buying and selling, market 7V4a6n.
[OE (A cęping; WS cęping, cyeping). From cęapian v.]

chere n. state of feeling, humour: with good ~ joyfully 15a20.
[OF]

cheese v. choose, elect 17a31,b10. [OE cęosan.]

chirge n. church: holy ~ 25Vb3l; ?pl. 25Va7n. [OE cęri(ce)
(pl. cęri(cean) & ON kirkja (from OE).]

chirchehawes n. pl. churchyards (i.e. cemeteries) 25Va8.
[chirche n. (cf. chirge n.) + haue n. (OE haga 'hedge', 'enclosure').]

chothyynge (misspelling?) clothing 26Vb29n.

clene adj. chaste: a ~ mayde a virgin 12V4a9. [OE cęæne.]

clepe wk. v. call 1Vb3l, 2b31 &c. ppl. adj. so called, aforesaid
25b34n. [OE cęeopian.]

clepyng vbl. n. call, summoning 6b22. [From clepe wk. v.]

clere adj. no longer dark or overcast 13b14. [OF cler, (later)
clair.]

clerenesse n. a bright light, brightness 15a11. [From clere
adj.]

clereth pr. 3 sq. shines forth, shines brightly 3V4a9. [From
clore adj.]
Clerkes n. pl. scholars, masters, learned persons. Lower clergymen. [OE cler, clær & OF cler, L clæricus (sg.)]
cleueth pr. 3 sg.: upon sticks on, adheres to. [OE cleofian.]
cloos adj. closed, drawn together. [From OF clos(e), pp. of clôre.] Cf. closede pa. t.
closede pa. t. engulfed, covered. [27Va31. pp. 27b27; joined 30b22; enclosed, set. [From cloos adj.]
clothes n. pl. swaddling-clothes. [OE clôp (sg.).] See also weryng clopes n. pl.
ccoude, clowde n. mist, fog. [OE , &c. pieces of cloth, awning. [OE clôd ‘rock’, ‘hill’.]
coloured ppl. adj.: better of fairer or healthier complexion. [OE coulo(u)rer &c. & L coloräre.]
com(e) pa. t. came. cam sg. came pp. 14a19, 14Va10 &c.; out of born in. [infin. come(n). OE cuman; côm/cûmon; cumen. ME cam is an analogical reformation.]
comauondentz n. ?pl. (error?) injunctions.
commendeth pr. 3 sg. praises, extols. [L commendâre & OF comender.]
commune adj. widely spread. [OF, & L commûn-is.]
comounlyche adv. as a general rule. [From commune adj.]
company(e) n. retinue, army. [OF compa(i)gnie.]
compas n. circle: in a ~ all round 17vb11. [OF]
[L, & OF comprendre.]
confermede pa. t. corroborated, provided proof for 18vb12.
[OF confermer (& L confirmäre).]
confuse adj.: make ~ defeat in argument, refute 9b36;
cf. confused pp. [L confus-um pp. of confundere.]
confused pp. (of a person) confounded; (of an opinion) refuted
24va36,b16 &c. [From confuse adj.]
conseille n. plan, scheme 4a12. [OF conseil, L consilium.
Cf. counceilgynge vbl. n.]
consideracioun n.: tooke good ~ of took into account, paid
careful attention to 15a20. [L & OF]
consumed pp. eaten away, destroyed 25b33. [L & OF]
contre(e) n. any geographic area, whatever its size: place,
district, region 4b12, 4va2 &c.; one's native district or @town
7a8; the people of a region: al the ~ all the inhabitants,
everybody 9b15n. [OF contræ (from *contrata).]
cordes n. pl. cords, ropes 11b36, 11va3. [OF]
correct(e) pp., ppl. adj. corrupted 19a4, 29vb30 &c.; (of water)
turned impure 28b22. [From L corrupt-us pp. of corrumpere.]
costys n. pl.: at hir ~ at their (own) expense, @at great expense
2a1n,7. [OF]
?counselgynge vbl. n. counselling 25vb36n. [From counseile(n),
councelle(n) &c. v. AF conseiller, CF conseillier; also
L consulere, LL consiliære. Cf. conseille n.]
cours n., n. @pl. movement(s), path(s) 5v25. [OF cours &
L cursus.]
cracche n. manger 20V a26. [OF]
craft n. power, @science: the deuelys ~ sorcery 3V b30, 4a7; art, skill 11a29. [OE crafte,]
craftily adv. skilfully, ingeniously 21V a8. [OE craf(i)tlie, crafetlifte; cf. crafteig adj.]
cristene n. pl. Christians 20a3; adj. ~ men 2V b35. [OE Cristens; cf. OF Crestien & L Christiānus (sq.).]
cros n. crozier 22a26n. [OE & ON; both from Old Irish; ult. L crux, crucis. Cf. OF croce; ML croccia.]
cunynge; Cintree. See kunynge vbl. n.; contre(e) n.
curse v. excommunicate, anathematise 26a8. [OE cursian (from curs n., probably L cursus).]
custome, costume n. traditional practice, esp. @religious practice, ritual 3a26, 25V a28n &c. [OF]
custumable adj. habitual, usual 16V b4. [OF]
custume. See custome n.
debates n. pl. quarrels, brawling 28b31. [OF]
declaracioun n. explanation, interpretation 24V a33. [OF & L]
declare v. show, explain, relate (of about) 4b6, 14b31.
[L declarāre & OF declarer &c.]
dede. See do(ne) v.
dedye v. dedicate 12V b35n. [OF ded(i)ier.]
defouled pa. t. treated with contempt, damaged, destroyed, desecrated, @made ugly, defaced 29b33. pp. trampled upon 12a3; corrupted 25b35. [Blend of OE folian (cf. foul(e) adj.) & OF defoler 'trample'.]
defoulynge vb. n. injury, disfigurement 29a2. [From defoule(n) v. See defouled pa. t.]
degrees n. pl. ways: in alle ~ 30b31. [OF]
deye wk. v. die 5a7, 26a36 &c. pa. t. 2Va5; dyede 2b21.
[ON; cf. OE deya.]
delitable adj. delightful 29a10. [OF]
deliuerede pa. t. rescued, released 19b35. [OF delivrer.]
deneyeth pr. 3 sg. rejects, refuses to acknowledge 17a15n.
[OP deneier, atonic stem form from L dênegâre.]
denne n. cave, cavern, pit 7b17, 7Va15. [OE den(n), daen(n).]
departed pa. t.: ~ hym self ?spread, dissolved 15b19n; intr.
separated, moved apart: ~ asonder 18a15. departed pp., ppl.
adj. distant, removed, separate 10Va35, 18Va28; split,
separated, divided 25a3, 26b27 &c.; separated from each other
22vbl9; ~ a twynne 15b21. [OF departir.]
depeynted pp. emblazoned 27a13, 27b6. [From OF depeint pp. of depeindre.]
deschargeth pr. 3 sg. rids, (?)unloads 7vb6n. [OF deschargier.]
descriue v. record in writing, enumerate, as by way of a census
7a3n; descry 10vb26n. [OF descri(v)-re (from L descrìb-ere).]
descrivynges vbl. n. census 7a4n. [From descriue v.]
despyte n.: in the ~ of in order to spite, out of contempt or
illwill towards 26a20; for ~ 29b35. [OF]
desporte n. pleasure, relaxation 4vb32, 6Va23. [AF; CF deport;
cf. Anglo-Latin disportum, -us.]
destourbed ppl. adj. troubled, frightened, alarmed (of, for at)
14b36, 14Va9 &c.; distourbed 14a34. [OF desto(u)rber & L disturbâre.]
destroyed pa. t. devastated, ravaged, sacked 23b30, 23v22 &c.; 
killed, slaughtered 30a14, 31v4. pp. 2v925; ruined, 
overthrown 29b32; (faith) 22v18n; (heresy) suppressed, put an 
end to 24v1, destroyed out 2v30; (religious order) dissolved 
5a30. [OF destrui-re & L destru-ere.]
deth n. mortality 16a21, 24v7; mortification: of flessh 17a14n. 
[OE dēab.]
detrahed pa. t. belittled, abused 16v7. [OF destraire.]
deuided ppl. adj. removed, separated 10v35. [L dīvidere.]
deuocioun n. piety, devoutness, earnestness 17a13, 18b20 &c.; 
feeling of reverence 29b16n; desire (of for) 17a10n. [L & OP]
dyede. See deye wk. v. 
dighte ppl. adj. prepared, adorned, anointed, treated 20b33. 
[infin. dighte(n). OE dihtan; diht. From L dictāre.]
dignite(e) n. rank, position of honour 2b35; estimable state 
17a7; of excellent, honorable 17a11n. [OF]
discordes n. pl. quarrels, differences of opinion 28b32. 
[OF descorde & L discordia (sg.).]
disease n. bodily discomfort, suffering, pain, hardship 8b33, 
12a12 &c. [OF desaise, disease.]
diseded ppl. adj: by afflicted by, suffering from 18v2. 
[OF desaisier.]
disparpled pp. dispersed, scattered abroad 27v34. 
[OF desparpaillier &c.]
disposede pa. t. ordained 10a3. [OF disposer.]
disposynge vbl. n. disposition, temperament, constitution 1vb14n. 
[From dispose(n) v. See disposede pa. t.]
disposition n. nature 3a14. [L & OF]

dissimulacion n. evasion 5v35n. [L & OF]

distourbed. See destourbed ppl. adj.

diverse adj. various different 2a24, 16v32n &c.; separate, individual 19a34, 31v15; numerous, several 4b20, 4v32 &c. [L dìuersus & OF duivers(e).]

diversely(che) adv. in different ways 3a23, 29b5. [From diverse adj.]

do(ne) v. (periphrastically): ~ helpe, socour to 31b12; (ritual) perform, partake in 25b17, 20 &c.; (with infin.) cause (to be done): ~ make, wryte &c. have (sth.) built, written @2v15, 23 &c.; ~ a wey dispose of, condone the removal of 26a10; (smell) banish, disguise 25v3, 29a6. dede pa. t. 1v15, 2a6 &c. done pp. acted, proceeded: ~ a3veys disobeyed 31v9; ~ (vp)on the cros crucified 12v3, 12 &c.; ~ away (faith) extinguished 25v9, 30v26; doon 19v3. See also obeysaunce n., oblacion n. pl., reverence n., solempnete n., worship e. [OE ðōn; dyde/dydon, dēdun; ðōn.]

donate n. an introductory Latin grammar by Aelius Donatus: lerne her ~ learn the elements of Latin grammar 30v19n. [OF donet, donnat, from L Dōnātus.]

done, doon. See do(ne) v.

doute n. doubt, uncertainty 12a29, 15a25; it is no ~ it is certain 16b34; anxiety, fright, awe 12a5n. [OF]

drad. See a drad ppl. adj.

draught n.: be ~ of an arblast the distance an arrow can be shot with a crossbow 28v9. [Prob. OE *dreahht, *дреэт (cf. OE dragan v., and Gmc. cognates).]
**drowe** pr. pl.: ~ forth raise, bring up 30vb4n.  
**drowe** pa. t. sg. 
15b25. **drawyng** intr. pr. ppl. moving, travelling 21va9. 
[OE dragan; drəg, drəh/drəgon.]

**dreynte** pp. drowned llal. [infin. *drenche(n)*. OE *drencan; drenct.*]

**drenken** pa. t. pl. drank 12a20. [infin. *drinke(n)*. OE *drincan; dranc, dronc/druncon.*]

**droppeth** pr. 3 sq. drips, exudes 11b17n. [OE *drop(p)ian.*]

**dryue** pa. t. pl. drove, pursued 27va22. [OE *drifan; dræf/ drifon.*]

**drowe.** See **drowe** pr. pl.

**duke** n. leader, ruler, sovereign, governor 14b7. [OF *duc & L dux.*]

**dust** n. ash ?29a17. [OE *düst.*]

**dwelle** wk. v. to linger in telling: it were *longe to ~ 21va12.* 
15b25. 
**pa. t.** remained 9a35; ?came to rest 32b21. [OE *dwellan.*]

**eere** v. to come into ear 9a17. [From *ǝr(e)* n. OE *ǝr, eher.*]

**eyr(e)** n. air 4va19n, 9va30n &c. [OF *air(e)*, *ǝr* (from L *aer*, ult. Gk.).] 

**eft** adv. a second time, once more 24b36. [OE]

**eke** adv. also: both with *Inne* and ~ with *oute* 20vb12. 
[OE *胙(a)c.*]

**elles** conj.: and ~ otherwise 28vb35. [OE] See also *somwhat* n.

**elnes** n. pl. ells (an ell being a measure of varying length) 20a33. [OE *eln* (sg.).]
empyre n. imperial power or rule 7a1; helde the ~ of ruled, had control over 6vb35n. [OF: L imperium.]

encense n. incense 14b27, 16a21 &c.; ensense 1V.a6. [OF encens; ML incensum.]

encresse pr. pl. ~grow closer to 26vb2ln. [AF encres(i)ss~, CF encroiss~; L incrëscere.]

endes n. pl. confines, shores 28vb15, 29vb13. [OE ende (sg.).]

enfect(e) pp., ppl. adj. infected, contaminated, corrupted 19b18, 24Va33 &c.; ?enfeite 29vb31. [From L infectus pp. of inficere, & OF enfait, infait pp. of infaire.]

enformed pp. instructed; told, informed 10a27n. [OF enformer; L informare.]

enformyngge vbl. n. teaching, instruction, training 3b4. [From enformen v. See enformed pp.]

ensence. See encense n.

enuye n. ill will, spite 19vb2, 21vb2 &c. [OF; cf. L invidia.]

erroures n. pl. erroneous or unorthodox beliefs 30vb14, 31all &c. [OF, & L errör-em (sg.).]

erthe n. @clay 8Va16. [OE eorbe.]

erthely adj. having material and transitory existence on this earth, mortal: ~ mannes deth human mortality 16a20. [From erthe n.; OE eorblfc.]

esy adj. kind, peaceful, @ienient 27a31n. [OF aaisié aise pp. of aaisier.]

espyes. See aspies n. pl.

esterne n.: ~ een the day or the night before Easter Sunday 26vb15. [OE ðastre, ðaster, & ðaster-(tíd &.); more freq. in pl. ðastran, -on.]
eten pa. t. pl. ate 12a20. [infin. ðe(n). OE etan;
Æt &c./Æton.]
euel n.: the foul euel ?epilepsy 5a20n. [OE yfel (Old Kentish *efel).]
euene adj. equal 24Vb25. [OE efen]
euene adv.: ~ to right to, all the way to 7Vb24. [OE efen]
euene blyche adv. equally 11Vb13n. [OE efrn].
euerych(e) pron. each 1Va8, 26Va35 &c. [OE efre &c.]
expowane(n) pr. pl. set forth, explain, interpret, comment on,
expound 14b31, 29all &c.; explain the significance of 17a8.
[AF espound-re, 3 pl. espouenent; L expôn-ere.]
expressed pa. t. symbolized 3Vb23n. [ML express-äre (cf.
classical L pressâre), OF espress-er.]
fader n. sg. gen. father’s 9b32. [OE ðæder.]
fadme n. fathom (a measure of length, six feet or thereabouts)
8Vb2. [OE faem.]
fayle v. remain un realised, prove unfounded 5Vb14n. [OF faillir,
fallir.]
fayre adj. clean, fresh 19Vb20. [OE fæger.]
falle v.: ~ to befall 14Vb11, 32Vb3 &c.; pr. subj. sg. arise
28b31. fel pa. t. sq.: ~ at (error?) 1Vb23n. fille pl.
26Vb23. [OE feallan; fæll/fællon.]
fals(e) adj. faithless, wicked, in error (as non-Christian) 9b30:
her ~ lawe 22Vb29; ~ mawmettes 22Vb10. [L fals-um, OF fals.]
falsnesse n. mendacity, erroneous opinion, treachery 9b26.
[From fals(e) adj.]
**fame** n. report (cf. commune adj.) 4Va23n. [OF]

**fane** n. weather vane 6Vb17. [OE fana.]

**faste** adv.: ~ by near(by) 7a26, 12Vb6n &c. [OE faeste.]

**fatte** adj. rich, fertile 9a15n. [OE fæt.]

**fel.** See **falle** v.

**fedde** pa. t. sq. pastured 8V31n. [infin. fēda(n). OE fōdan; fēde.]

**felten** pa. t. smelt, detected by smell 23a34. felt pp. 20V2a2; felyd 25Vb6. [infin. fēle(n). OE fēlan; fēde; fēld.]

**feruent** adj. eager, excited 13V11. [OF, & L fervent-em.]

**feste** n. festival, feast day 2Vb2, 18b2 &c. [OF, & L festum.]

**fille.** See **falle** v.

**final** adj. conclusive, lasting: a ~ pees (i.e. putting an end to hostilities) 31V20,31. [OF, & L fīnal-is.]

**fyr(e)** n. (a) fire 9Vb11, 12b35 &c.; (as a beacon): they made grete ~ 4b31; of ~ fire-, fiery: a bronde of ~ firebrand, torch 9Vb11; the furneyss of ~ 12V2; a pyler of ~ 15a35. [OE fyr.]

**firmament** n. sky, heavens 4V19n. [L & OF]

**firste** adj. original, former, previous 31b4,28. [OE fyrist.]

**flavour** n. fragrance 23a31. [OF flaur; ME flavour has v from savour.]

**flessh** n. meat 26Vb16. [OE flœsc.]

**flesshly** adj. flesshy, plump 16b7n. [OE flæsclīc.]

**flesshly** adv. in body, in the flesh 24Vb22. [OE flæsclīce.]

**flex** n. flax (from which linen is made) 20a20. [OE fleax.]

**flode, flood(e)** n. moving water, stream, river 8Vb34, 11a3 &c.; ?course, @flow 28V14n. [OE flōd.]
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florisshede pa. t. prospered, was famous 4vb8. [OF floriss-, extended stem of florir; cf. L flôrîscere.]

flum n. river: ~ Iordan see PN Iordan. [OF; cf. L flûmen.]

folk n. people, peoples, @the Nations 9vb25, 13vb1; attendants, retinue 12va12; @army 13b20. pl. 5vb17, 6va20 &c. [OE folc.]

foorthe n. ford 28va17. [OE ford; the final consonant in ME may be due to Norse influence.]

foot womman n. female foot attendant 20b25n. [foot + woman; OE]

for prep. because of @4b21, 6bl1 &c.; ?fit for 4vb34; in recompense for: ~ his trauayle (cf. trauaille n.) 23va3; (with infin.) to 15vb27. [OE] See also destourbed ppl. adj., kepynge vbl. n.

for conj. because 5va10,33 &c. [From for prep.] See also for late ppl. adj., for that conj., for to prep, ffor why conj.

fore. See a fore adv., afore prep., to fore adv., tofore prep.

forbode pp. forbidden 4a8. [infin. forbede(n). OE forbêodan; forboden.]

for3ete(n) pp., ppl. adj. forgotten, disregarded 6a18, 19a27; discarded inadvertently 19vb17. [infin. for3ete(n) &c.

OE (A forge(o)tan, WS forgitan); -geten, -giten.]

forheued n. forehead 26b9. [OE for(e)-hêafod, foran-hêafod.]

for late ppl. adj. deserted, abandoned 8b28. [infin. forlêste(n).

OE forlêtan, -lêten; forlêten, -lêten.]

form(e) n. likeness, representation 2a7n; @manner 9Va27.

[L forma, OF fourme.]

formacion. See in formacion n.

formere comp. adj. front, upper 20b22. [From forme ‘first’; formed as comp. to go with formest adj. superl.]
forsayde, forseyde adj. previously mentioned 2a35, 2Va2 &c.

[Modelled on L praefatum, -dictum. OE fore-secgan v.]

forth adv. thenceforth, onward 1la9,11 &c.; away, (on) ahead:

sente ~ 24b33. [OE forb.]

for that conj. because, in as much as 24vb28, ?12b16n &c.

[OE for Þet.]

for to prep. for the purpose of 23b33n. [for prep. + to prep.]

ffor why conj. (in a clause that explains and amplifies) for,

since 26vb14, 27a7 &c. [OE for-hwî.]

foul(e) adj.: the - euel see euel n.; poor, low, miserable,

@abject 21b23n. [OE ful.]

foules n. pl. birds 16Va26. [OE fugol/pl. fuglas.]

fowcheth sauf pr. 3 sq. grants 31a21. [vouche(n) v. (AF, OF voucher &c.) + sauf adj. (cf. saue quasi-prep.).]

frayed. See a frayed pp.

freeltee n. infirmity, state of being subject to change or decay,

mortal nature 12Va18. [OF fraileté (from L fragilitas).]

frendes n. pl. kinsmen, foster parents 29Va17n. [OE frëond (sg.).]

frendshipen n. accord, alliance 23a16. [OE frëondscipe.]

f(f)rere(s) (menoures &c.). See PN f(f)rere(s).

fro prep. from 1Va34, 2vb24 &c. [ON frä.] See also thenne adv.

fulfilled pp. filled, replete 23a36. [OE ful-fyllan.]

fundacioun n. the ground upon which a city is built 7bl5n
(cf. 7bl4n). [L, OF]
gadre pr. pl. (v. refl. pron.) gather 21a6. pa. t. 14a36. pp. 8vb20, 28va36n &c.; harvested 14a5 &c. [OE gad(e)rian.]
gay adj. brightly coloured, ornate 20a36,b18. [OF, from Gmc.]
gan pa. t. sg. (w. infin.) a weak auxiliary denoting past actions as occurring, rather than as beginning to occur 13b14; (w. to + infin.) began (to) 22va2. [infin. ginne(n). OE onginnan (pa. t. sg. –gan) & beginnan.]
gat(en). See geten v.
gates n. pl. doors, doorway 13a10. [OE (WS) geat/pl. gatu.]
gedir, gedre. See togider adv., alto gedir adv.
geyt n. pl. goats 13vb36. [OE gat/pl. gat, & ON (cf. OI geit).]
gentiles n. pl. nobles 22b28n. [From gentil(e) adj. OF gentil & L gentil-is.]
gerdeles n. pl. bands, ?swathes of cloth 11b36, 11va3. [OE gyrdei(s) (sg.).]
geten v. acquire, obtain, get 24b19. gat pa. t. sg. 22vb23, 24b26; pl. gaten 5a24. [ON (cf. OI geta; gat/gatum).]
gidre. See togider adv.
go v.: – oute come out, emerge 14b7; pr. pl. go(ne), goon travel, move about 13vb36, 27a8 &c.; walk: – or (and) ryde 10va13n, 10va21 &c.; – to masse celebrate mass 26a8. [OE gan (gap).] Cf. ge(e)de(n) pa. t.
good. See good wille n.
goodnesses n. pl. good qualities, good deeds 18vb28. [OE gōdnes (sg.).]
good wille n.: was in – was willing, consented 31b7. [good adj. + wille n. OE.]
goon. See go v.
goostly adj. spiritual 3$\frac{1}{2}a7, 17b3 &c. [OE gæstlīc.]
gouernance n. control: hadde . . in ∼ 21$\frac{1}{2}b27. [OP]
grace n. goodwill, good graces, favour 24$b19n; ∼ and loue 24b26
(cf. loue n.). pl. grace (at meal time) 3$\frac{1}{2}a24n. [OP]
grau e v. cut, hollow out 12$b32. grauen pp. 13a11. [OE grafan;
grafen.]
grees n. pl. steps 6$b5; a measure of length (?yards) 12$b13.
[OP gré (sg.).]
grete adj. broad, thick 10$v33; ?general: a ∼ chepynge 7$v6n.
[OE græt.] See also PN grete see.
gretyly adv. seriously, earnestly, often: thenke ∼ 2$\frac{1}{2}a2;
gretylyche: ∼ to enqueren 2$\frac{1}{2}a32. [From grete adj.]
grette pa. t. sg. greeted, gave honour to 2$v33, 2$\frac{1}{2}a27. pp.
21$b25. [infin. grete(n). OE grætan; grëtte; grëted.]
greuance n. pain 18$b26. [OP]
greuede pa. t. offended, displeased, made angry 4a11.
[OP grever.]
grounde n. the ground on which a city is built 7$b16n; site, area
8a10; piece of land 8a16; (sea) bottom 10$v19; (river) bed
28$v16; in to the ∼ completely, utterly 24$v1n. [OE grund.]
grove v. (seeds, plants) sprout, germinate, appear 9a6,?4.
[OE gro\footnote{wan.}
gumme n. gum 1$\frac{1}{2}b18. [OP gom(m)e & L gummi.]

3af, 3aue, 3ave. See 3ewe v.
ge pron. 2 pl. you 7$\frac{1}{2}l, 13$b1 &c. 3ow acc.-dat. 7$a33, b1 &c.
[OE ge, ge; sow.]
3e(e)de(n) pa. t. went 15vb2; walked, travelled 7a7, 10vb34 &c.;
her way 14b19; or riden 11vb17n. [OE sode(n).] Cf. go v.
3eer; 3eyn. See 3ere n.; a 3eyn prep.
3elde v. tr. pa. t.: vp gave up, surrendered 18b12. 3olde pp.
returned, restored 23a17. [infin. 3elde(n) &c. OE g(i)eldan;
geald; golden.]
3ere n. year 4vb5, 6vb36 &c. pl. 18a25; 3eer 5va18; 3eres 19b5n.
[OE (WS) gfar (n).]
3eue v. give 20vb33, ?10a8n &c.; cause (to be) 10a8n. 3eueath
pr. 3 sg. 7vb15, 11b2 &c.; reflects 6vb21. 3eue(n) pr. pl.
5vb30, 30vb6 &c.; (w. refl. pron.) they hem (ther) to they
pursue, devote themselves to (this science) 5vb27. 3af pa. t.
10a5n, 15va29n &c.; pl. 3aue(n) 17b30, 17vb35 &c.; 3ave 31b21.
3eue(n) pp. 1vb17, 30vb21. [OE giefan; gæaf/gfæfon; giefen.]
3if conj. if 4vb23, 4va4 &c. [OE gif.] See also but conj.
3iftes n. pl. gifts 1vb9,14 &c.; fees for services 4va13;
inducements, bribes 31b22; 3ifte (error?) 16a36n. [OE gift
(sg.); cf. 3eue v.]
3it still 23va12n, 31vb17; (intens. phr.) alwey 5vb26n, 7va4.
[OE giet.]
3olde; 3ow. See 3elde v. tr. pa. t.; 3e pron. 2 pl.
3ow. See 3e pron. 2 pl.
3oure possessive adj. your (pl.) 6a32. [OE eower.]

hadde. See wonder n., worshipe n.
half n. (error?) hand 17vb10n; a this on this side of 29a8.
[OE (A half, WS healf).]
halfe. See by halfe n.
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halwe wk. v. consecrate 12v34, 20all &c. pa. t. honour as holy 

`dedicate or set apart sb. or sth. to God and his 
service 16a31; sanctify, hallow 19b32. pp. (festival) keep, 
observe, celebrate 21v14. [OE halgian.] 
hardy adj.: was - - to dared to 4b11. [OF (h)ardi (from 
Gmc.).] 
hate n.: hath - - in - hates 3a8. [Prob. from OE hatian v.; also 
 cf. OE hete, OI hatr.] 
haue pr. pl. (custom) follow, adhere to 27a3. [OE (ge)habban.] 

See also worship n. 
hede n.: take - - of care about, show interest in 23b25. [From 
 hēden v. OE hēdan.] 

heeled; hear; heye. See hele wk. v., helede pa. t.; herre n.; 

heigh adj. 
heyer adj. comp. higher 9a12, 27a2. [OE] 
heyste adj. superl. highest 5a6. [OE] See also PN Inde. 

heigh adj. high 9v33, 22a10; heye 21b10, 28v17; hye: - weye see 

weye(n). [OE (A hēh, WS hēh)] See also an heigh(e) adv. 

heigher. See an heigh(e) adv. 

heygthe n. height: in - up(wards) 228v26n; heythe 29v1b; 

heigth the 29v18. [OE hē(a)hīpu &c.] 

heyly adv. greatly, very much: they thanked god - 18v22. [From 

heigh adj. & OE hēalīce.] 

heyre n. heir 5vall. [AP heir, aire & L hēres.] 

heythe. See heyghte n. 

hele wk. v. cover 12v28,b2 &c. heeled pp. 26v7. [OE helian.]
helede pa. t. cured 5a17. heeled pp. 21vb2, 32vb32. [OE heilan; ?also cf. OE heila 'to make whole']. See also hele wk. v.

helynge vbl. n. roof; roofing 20vb4. [From hele wk. v.]

hem pron. 3 pl. acc.-dat. them 1Vall, 35 &c.; - of (Ynde) the people of (Ynde) 4b19, 6b7 &c. (see also they pron. 3 pl. nom.); - Perse (error?) 29Va27n. refl. 4Va3, 9a23 &c.; hem self 20vb35; by hem self see by prep. [OE heom, him, hym.]

henge v. intr. pa. t. sq. hung 19va7. [infin. honge(n) &c. OE hön; hêng/hêngon. See also honged pa. t.]

her possessive adj. their 1Va9,b35 &c.; here 9Val, 25vb10 &c.; hir 18a30. [OE heora, heara possessive pron. 3 pl.]

herbergh n. shelter (for a traveller), lodgings: they toke .. none - 12a16. [OE (WS here-beorg, A *here-berg).]

herberwe v. tr. shelter, stable 8Va5n. [From herbergh n. Also cf. late WS herebeorgian.]

herbes n. pl. non-woody plants 6vb10, 9a3 &c. [OF erbe & L herba (sg.).]

here pron. 3 sg. acc.-dat. it 28vb29n,30; hir 2Vz35n. [OE hire.]

See also her possessive adj.

hereynge vbl. n. (information gained by) hearing, listening 5b7. [From here(n) v. OE (A hêran, WS hêran &c.).]

herytage n. hereditary possession 18a2. [OF]

herre n. (a single) hair 12b18; heer coll. 26b34n; hair, fleece 13vb36. [OE (WS hêr, A hêr) & ON (cf. Ol hêr).]

hertly adv. willingly, faithfully, earnestly 17a34n.

[Cf. herte n. & OE geheortlice.]

heued(e) n. head 16b12,16 &c.; (pillar) top, capital 6vb14; (river) source 28Vz30. [OE hêafod.]
heuy adj. weary, sorry &c. 8b23n. [OE hefig.]
hye. See heigh adj.
hille n. (high) mountain 4b32, 27b15 &c. [OE hyll(l).]
hym pron. 3 sq. acc. refl. himself 5va8, 7vb5; itself 5va22; by ~
  self see by prep. [OE him.]
hyn (mistake) him, it 7vb20.
hinder(e) adj. ?comp. rear 13vb23, 20b25 &c. [Prob. from
  OE hinder adv.]
hir. See her possessive adj., here pron. 3 sq. acc.-dat.
hyre n. wages, reward 6va3. [OE hyr.]
hyred pa. t. paid, rewarded 4va15. [OE hyrian.]
hyrynge vb1. n.: of ~ of from (other people’s) hiring 7vb34.
  [From hire(n) v. See hyred pa. t.]
his possessive adj. its 2a19, 3va6 &c. [OE]
holde(n). See hoolde v.
hom adv. home(ward) 7a7. [OE hám.]
honde n. military strength: with, thurgh stronge ~ by force 4b24,
  9b14 &c.; with a stronge ~ 23b35n. [OE hond &c. & ON.]
honeste adj. befitting one’s status 10va17n; beautiful, seemly,
  magnificent 32b25. [OF]
honestliche adv. fittingly 19a35; (w. aray v.) richly,
  beautifully 10b19, 17vb11 &c. [From honeste adj.]
honged v. intr. pa. t. hung 21vb31. [infin. hunge(n) &c.
  OE hangian; hangode. See also henge intr. pa. t. sg.]
hool adj. cured 5a22; al ~ (of) cured (of), free (from) 28b18, 24;
  intact, undamaged: al ~ 32vb5. [OE hal.]
hool adv.:  the group, together 27vb27; undividedly:  

all  in its entirety 11a33. [From hool adj.]

hoolde v. obtain, possess, retain: to and to have 30va3.

holde(n) pp. considered, regarded 30va9; in reverence, 
worship see reverence n., worship n. [OE (A halden; halden).]

hoos adj. hoarse 3b32. [OE hās.]

hoost(e) n. army 10va5, 3lb32 &c.; hoste 12va25. pl. @retinues 28a10. [OF, & ML hostis 'army'.]

hoot adj. warm (having a warm climate) 9a14. [OE hāt.]

hoste. See hoost(e) n.

hostryes n. pl. inns 7va27, 8va15; ostryes 10va9, 21a7. [OF, & ML hosteria (sg.)]

houses n. pl. inns, lodging houses 21a8. [OE hūs (sg. & pl.).]

housholde n. @family 7a14, housekeeping 7va21n. [house n.  
(cf. houses n. pl.) + hold n. (OE (A) gehold n. or hoolde v.).]

y. See also y flawe pp., y lyche adv., y slawe pp.

y bateled ppl. adj. furnished with indented parapets or 
fortifications, fortified 20va17n; batelde 22a24. [i- (OE ge-) 
prefix + OF bataillie, (later) ba(s)tilié + ppl. ending.]

y flawe pp. skinned 13vb29. [infin. flēn &c. OE flēan; 
be-flagen, *(ge)flagen.]

y lyche adv. alike 29a12. [OE gelīce.]

ymage n. representation, picture, painting 27a13, 27vb7; statue, 
effigy 23va17, 29b32 &c. [OF, & L imāgo.]
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in prep. (place) on, upon 2\(^b\)1, 26\(^b\)26 &c.; towards, facing: ~ the Est 21\(^a\)30. (time) at (the time of) 12\(^a\)28; ~ any tyme 4\(^b\)24; ~ bat tyme 4\(^a\)5, 5\(^b\)20; ~ the tyme of, that 5\(^b\)18, 10\(^b\)11 &c.; ~ tyme of 12\(^a\)4; in the process of 1\(^v\)28, 36 &c. (respect) in the person of, along with 5\(^a\)15; with respect to, in regard to 5\(^a\)26(1), 28\(^b\)7 &c.; (after full) 3\(^a\)7; for the purpose of 2\(^v\)7. [OE] See also in to prep., in formacion n.
in formacion n. teaching, explanation, @allegation 19\(^b\)36n.

[L & OF]
innocence n. @foolishness, fatuity 5\(^a\)34n. [OF, & L innocencia.] in to prep. (place) as far as 9\(^b\)13; (time) until, unto 4\(^a\)30, 5\(^a\)33 &c.; (with implied negative) (not) before 20\(^b\)12; (respect, purpose) for, as: ~ euere lastynge memorie 13\(^a\)1; (with numeral) as many as, ?@approximately 29\(^v\)29n. [OE]
y slawe pp. slain 3\(^b\)9. [infin. s\(l\)\(e\)(n). OE s\(l\)\(e\)\(a\)n; s\(l\)\(a\)\(g\)en, s\(l\)\(a\)\(g\)en, LOE s\(l\)\(a\)\(g\)en.]

Iewel(e)s n. pl. precious objects, treasures 5\(^a\)3, 16\(^v\)33 &c. [OF joel, jeuwiel &c. (sg.).]
ioye n. praise (to God) 7\(^b\)9n; glory 12\(^a\)36, ?4\(^v\)9n. [OF joi.]
iourneyes n. pl.: an C ~ (distance of) a hundred days' travel 12\(^b\)20. [OF jo(u)rnee (sg.)]
kepe n.: take ~ of pay attention to 4a22, look after 8b28. [From kepe v. tr.]

kepe v. tr. care (about): ~ nought of 4b2; hold, guard, tend, watch over (sb. or ath.) 7a27, 8Âu35n &c.; remain in 6Âu4,13. kepte pa. t. protected (from) 8Âu31n; kepede forced (sb.) to remain in one place 22b20. kept pp. 11a30. [LOE cæpan; cæpte; pp. unrecorded.]

kepers n. pl. guards 2b7; watchmen 4b29, 4Âu14; warders 24b11. [From kepe v. tr.]

kepynge vbl. n. the guarding or defence of a place; or, the act of keeping watch; or, those who keep watch, a garrison (for against) 4b18n; (concrete sense) 628b29. [From kepe v. tr.]

kynde n. family, lineage 2Âu2, 18a15 &c.; natural course or motion: 4âeyns his ~ (cf. 4âeyns prep.) 5Âu23; species 13Âu20,32. [OE (gel)cynd.]

kyndely adj. natural: ~ resoun human reason (as opposed to faith or revelation) 12b14. [OE cyndelic.]

kyngdome n. kingship 7b27. [OE cyningdõm.]

kynger (error) king's, kings' 24b6n.

kynrede n. nation, people, family 4Âu28, 5b12n&c. [LOE cynrâe.]

knowe v.: it is to ~ 25a12 (cf. wyte v.); recognise, identify, distinguish 8Âu10, 26b14 &c. knewe pa. t. pl. 1Âu22; were informed about 14Âu29; acknowledged 14Âu15, 15b19. knowe(n) pp. 25a12n, 32b5n &c. [OE cnâwan; cnâow/-on; cnâwen.]

knoweleche v. acknowledge, accept 5Âu36. [knowe v. + -leche(n) (OE *-læcan) suffix.]
konne **pr. pl.** know: ~ by herte 2lb16. [OE cunnan.]
kunnynge **vbl. n.** knowledge 14vb22; cunnynge branch of knowledge 5vb31. [From conne(n) v. See konne **pr. pl.**]

ladde. See lede **v.**
lady(e) **n. gen. sg.** lady's 2val4, 19vb16 &c.; ladyes 2a14. [OE hlæfdige, gen. sg. hlæfdigan.]
lay. See ligge **v.**
large **adj.** @wide 23b15; ~ and wyde 20a26. [OF]
largeliche **adv.** liberally, bountifully, generously 30vb2. [From large **adj.**]
laste **adj.** superl. ?lowest 29vb4n. [Prob. from last(e) adv. OE latost, *læståt &c.]
lasteth **pr. 3 sg.** continues, extends 28vb3. [OE læstan.]
late **adv.** until recently 5a27n. [OE] See also for late **ppl.**
adj.
lawe **n.** religion, religious practice or belief 19b19, 30vb2ln, 3lb4n &c.; with cute byleue and ~ 29va14n; the ~ of god, Crist &c. @the (Christian) Faith 17val1, 19b21 &c.; the ~ of holy chirche (the practices, beliefs of) the true (Roman) church @23vb10, @30al; Machometes ~ Mohammedanism (cf. PN Machomete) 29b27. [LOE lagu; cf. OE læg/pl. lاغu.]

lede **v.** bring, convey, transport (miraculously) 12b26. ladde pa. **t.** led 1va10,35; ledde 8b27, 12b17. [OE lædan; lædde.]
left(e) **v. intr. pa.** t. was left, remained 7val4, 8a26; ?passed by inheritance 8a20n. tr. pp. left off from, discontinued, given up 26vb14. [infin. læve(n). OE læfan; læfde; læfed.]
leye. See ligge **v.**
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lengere adj. comp. longer 5\textsuperscript{Va}17, 20a32. [OE lengra.]

lepre n. leprosy 19b10n. [OF, & L lepra; ult. Gk.]

lernede pa. t. learnt 14b10. [OE leornian.]

letteth pr. 3 sg. obstructs, disturbs, interferes with 21a33. [OE lettan.]

lettynge vbl. n. injury; delay, pause; @impediment 12a13,b3l &c. [From lette(n) v. See letteth pr. 3 sg.]

lettres n. pl. script(s) 25\textsuperscript{Va}30, ?31a14; narratives, (passages of) scripture, learning 29\textsuperscript{Va}7n (cf. 21a30n). [OF, & L littera (sg.).]

leue v.: to ~ to be believed 28\textsuperscript{Vb}2ln. [OE (WS lifefan, A lëfan), shortened forms of gellëfan, gelëfan.]

lyche adj. similar: ~ to like 9\textsuperscript{Vb}6; ~ ther to to equal it 4\textsuperscript{Vb}22. [OE geli & ON (cf. OI likr.).] See also y lyche adv.

ligge v. repose, lie 18\textsuperscript{Va}18. liggynge pr. ppl.: ~ a boute close by (a place) 4b10. lay pa. t. sg. lodged, resided 24b8. leye pp. been (in confinement): ~ in prisoun 20a4. [OE licgan; læg/lægon; legen.]

lyght n.: take ~ shine 12\textsuperscript{Va}35n; heavenly body that gives light 4\textsuperscript{Va}18; zeueth ~ see jue n. [OE (A lëht, WS lëoht); for the vowel cf. lif(e)htan v.]

light adj. bright, filled with light 32b32. lighter comp. 9\textsuperscript{Vb}10n. [OE (A læht, WS lëoht); for the vowel cf. lyght n.]

lighte pa. t.: ~ doun dismounted 15\textsuperscript{Va}33. [infin. lighte(n).OE lihtan 'lighten'.]

lightliche adv. easily 10\textsuperscript{Vb}14. [From light adj. (OE lë(o)ht) & OE lëohtliche.]
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lyke adv. in like manner: ~ after see after(e) prep.
  conj: ~ as in the same way as 26vb30. [OE gelaice.]
lyketh pr. 3 sg.: that hym ~ that he wishes, chooses 7vb2.
  [OE litanian.]
lynage n. lineage; one of the twelve tribes of Israel 9va7n.
  [OF]
lytel n.: but ~ of only a few 26va30n. [Cf. lytel adj.]
lytel adj: i j ~ myle a mere two miles 7bl8n. [OE lytel adj., n.]
lyuynge vbl. n. sustenance, maintenance of life 10b27. [From
  liven v. OE (A lifgan, WS libban (pr. stem lif-); also cf.
  lif n.).]
lodesmen n. pl. pilots 29vb10. [Also lodman (sg.). OE lâdman
  (sg.).]
loken v.: ~ after look in order to find, keep watch for, await
  (cf. after(e) prep.) 5b22, 25 &c. [OE lêcian.]
longe adj. tedious, time-consuming: it were ~ to (telle, dwelle
  &c.) 4b5, 6vb24 &c. [OE lang, long; cf. OI langr & OF lonc.]
longen wk. v. (w. to prep.) belong (to) 11a31, 33 &c.; pertain
  (to), be needed (for) 10b27, 7va20n &c.; (cf. perteyneth
  pr. 3 sg.) be used (in), @be associated with) 16a23. longynge
  pr. ppl. appropriate (to), fit (for), in use (with) 10b8.
  [Cf. long adj. 'belonging'. OE gelang.]
loos n. (coupled w. fame) fame, report 4va24, 5b26; (w. name)
  renown 4vb15; (she) hadde such a ~ 22vb7. [OF, &
  L laus/pl. laudes.]
lorde n. owner 7vb32, 8a15. [OE hlaford.]
Lord(e)shipe n. territory belonging to a ruler 30vb3,
principality 22a2; protection, patronage: his loue and his ~ (cf. loue n.) 24b20n. [OE hlafordscipe.]
loue n.: hath ~ to feels attachment or love towards 30vb3;
devotion: ~ and desyr 17a34; peace (with sb.), friendship: his ~ and his lorde[ship] (cf. Lord(e)shipe n.) 24b20n, grace and ~ (cf. grace n.) 24b26. [OE lufu.]
lovynges n. pl. praises 21b26. [OE lofung (sg.). From lofian v.]
lowede pa. t.: ~ hym self lowered or humbled himself 12va16.
[From lowe adj. ON.]
lucre n. profit 21a10n. [L lucrum; also cf. OF (15thC) lucre.]
lustes n. pl. ?motives 16va33n. [OE lust (sg.).]

made(n). See make(n) pr. pl.
maydenes n. pl. @maidservants 17vb3. [LOE mægden (sg.).]
mayster n. lessee, person in charge: ~ of the hous 7vb13n.
[OF maistre & OE maqister, mæqester, from L.]
make(n) pr. pl. invest 2b5; are ordaining 26b8; @found, establish 30vb1. made(n) pa. t. built 4vb33; ~ to ?fastened to 15b26n; maked (corruption?): ~ hym self 12va15n. maked pp. 3a18, 20a22; made 20a28, 26va4 &c. [OE macian.]
malice n. hostility, hatred, wickedness 9b26, 31b15. [OF]
manassynge pr. ppl. threatening, making a threatening gesture (to sb.) 23va2ln. [OF manacier &c.]

maner(e) n. kind (of): such a ~ smok a dress of this sort 20va2; alle ~ of all kinds of 4vb13, 9a3 &c.; alle suche ~ necessaries 10va18; othere ~ thynges 27va15; manye othere ~ of 16vb12; (little more than intens.) one ~ speche 13va4; al ~ of cristene men 28a14; no ~ of 25vb33, 26a4 &c.; a nother ~ of 26va24, 27b2; likeness 9va26; in ~ as 32b27; in ~ of in the same way or form as 11b18, 20va16 &c.; in the same forme and ~ as 26vb31; (in) what ~ by what means, under what circumstances 3b15, 23a6; in no ~ 31b11; in many, diverse maneres 3va31, 14b31; practice, custom 7va22, 8va14 &c.; nations, races, tribes: al ~ of men 8va4a. pl. a morals 19b1ln. [AF]

manhede n. human form, humanity (of Christ after his incarnation) 16b2, 19b32 &c. [From OE man n.]

manyfolde adv. many times, in many ways 23b22. [From manifold adj. OE manig-feald, monig-fald &c. Also cf. LOE manigfealde adv.]

mankynde n. human nature: toke vp on hym ~ became incarnate 12va18. [OE man n. + kynde n.]

mantel n. a sleeveless overgarment 16b10n. [OF, & L mantellum & OE mentel (from L).]

marchaundise n. trading, commerce 6va22. pl. articles of trade 4vb21. [AF]

margery n.: ~ perlees pearls 20b1. [OF]

mater(e) n. subject, source material, study 3vb11; event, circumstances 9vb31. [L materia & OF.]

maumettes, mawmettes n. pl. idols, pagan deities 15va14, 3la6; false ~ 22va10. [OF mahomet, mahumet (sg.)]
maundement n. command, edict 7a2. [OF mandement &
LL mandament-um.]

mawmettes. See maumettes n. pl.

mede n. wages: hyred with ~ engaged for a salary 4v1a5; (just)
reward, ?efficacy 12v14. [OE mēd.]

medled pp. mixed, mingled 25b3. [OF medler, var. of mesler.]

medlynges vbl. n. pl. admixtures 25b34n. [From medle(n) v.
Cf. medled pp.]

meyne n. linear descendants, family, clan 7a15; household,
retainers: priue ~ 24b33. [AP]

meke adj. @humble 30vb36. [ON; cf. OE mjúkr.]

makenesse n. humility 25a34; simplicity, sincerity, good nature,
graciousness, courtesy 16a14. [From meke adj.]

memorial n. remembrance: for everelastynge ~ 17b6. [LL memoriāle
& OF.]

memorie n. memorial, commemoration 13a1, 18a4. [OF, &
L memoria.]

men pron. indef. a man, one 27b36. [Phonetically reduced form of
OE man pron.]

mencioun n.: maketh ~ recounts, records 22a8. [OF & L]

mene adj. intervening, midway (between) 15b24; al this ~ time
28b28. [OF me(e)n, var. of moien.]

menes n. pl. petition: made grete ~ 22vb20. [From mēnen v.
'complain'. OE mǣnan.]

menour(e)s. See PN f(f)rere(s).

mercy n. εpity 5va16. [OF]

meridie n.: vn to the ~ in the south 29vb14n. [L meridiās.]
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merite n. excellence, esp. the virtue of holy persons
instrumental in working miracles, obtaining God’s grace &c.
3Va7, 5a15 &c. merites pl. 3Va10. [L merit-um & OF.]
mervayles, mervailles n. pl. things that cause astonishment,
wonders 4vb25, 6vb23. [OF]
merveyllouslyche adv. in a miraculous and awe inspiring way
12Va19. [From merveilous adj. OF merveillois.]
mescreantz. See myscre(u)ntes n. pl.
message n. mission, official business, embassy: on a certeyn ~
24a3. [OF]
mete n. food 1vb35, 7vb15 &c.; the first main meal of the day,
breakfast or lunch @3la15, @24 &c. [OE]
metten pa. t. pl.: ~ to gidre (armies) joined battle, clashed
31b35. [irfin. mēten. OE mētan; mētte/-n.]
meueth pr. pl. (w. refl. pron.) move 14a8. [OF moevre &c.; also
cf. AF move(i)r & L movēre.]
meuynge vbl. n. moving, motion 9va31. [From mēven v. See meueth
pr. pl.]
mydde n. middle (part): in be ~ of 12a36. [OE (late & rare), &
ME mid adj.]
myghte See mow(e) pr. pl.
myghty adj. able, competent: was ~ to had the power to 6b34,
12b26. [OE mihtig.]
myle. See lytel adj.
mynde n. memory, commemoration: in ~ and tokene of 28a36; in ~
and worshipe of (cf. worshipe n.) 31vb6. [OE gemynd.]
mynstre n. monastery 22a22, b17 &c. [OE mynster, from
L monasterium (pop. L *monisterium), from Gk.]
Mir(r)e n. myrrh 1Va5, 11b25 &c.; ?Mirra 2a33. [OE myrra, myrrre
(from L, from Gr.) & L myrrha, murra & OF; ult. Semitic.]

mysbyleuynge ppl. adj. unbelieving, pagan 3Va24. [Por
bileve(n) v. From leue v.]

myscrea(u)ntes n. pl. pagans, infidels, non-Christians 3Va19,21;
mescreantz gentiles 15Va8. [Por miscreaunt adj. OF mescreant
pr. ppl. of mescroire, or pop. L *minuscrēdent-em.]
misterie n. hidden significance, mystical truth 2Vb31.
[L mystērium (from Gr.) & OF mîstere 'secret'.]
mo adj. more (in number) 9a13, 11b13. [OE mā.]
moche adv. much, greatly 5Vb21, 13a24; (w. adj.) very 11a16.
[Shortened form of muchel. OE micel & ON (cf. OI mikill).]
moder n. gen. sg. mother's 9b34, 16b5. [OE mōdor, gen. mōdor.]
moost adj. superl. greatest: the ~ partie see partie n.; ~ of
stature (the) tallest 16b32. [Por mō adj. & superl. suffix;
also cf. Northumbrian māst, superl. of micel.]
moost adv. superl. principally, most often, most continually 9a9,
14Va24. [Por mō adv. comp. & OE māst adv.]
more adj. comp. larger 16Va27; for the ~ partie 6Va24 see
partie n. [OE māra, comp. of micel adj.]
morwe tyde n. dawn, early morning 3Va27. [OE morwe n. + tīd n.;
cf. OE morgen-tīd.
moste pa. t. was obliged to 20Vb33; muste: nedes ~ had
necessarily to, ought to 15Va12. [infin. mote(n). OE *mótan;
mōste.]
mountaunce n. distance, extent 30b12. [OF montance.]
mow(e) pr. pl. may, are able to 6va27, 10vb26 &c. myghte pa. t.
26al, 27va26; subj. — and wolde 24b19. [infin. move(n) &c.
OE *mugan, *magan (pr. pl. magon, maegon); mihte.]
multitude n. a large number of people, retinue. [OF & L]
muste. See moste pa. t.

name n. (coupled w. loos) renown for excellence, (wide spread)
reputation ?4vb15,24; (error) man 17b24n. [OE nama.]
namely adv. specifically 20a20. [From name n.]
ne adv. (redundant negative w. nocht) 26a2. [OE & OF & L]
ne conj. nor 9b8,18 &c. [OE]
necessaries n. pl. household goods 10b29; esp. ?foodstuffs
7va20n. [L necessarius & OF necessaire (sg.).]
nede. See nedeth pr. 3 sq.
nedes adv.: ~ muste see moste pa. t. [From OE nède &c. adv.; cf.
OE nèð &c. n.]
nedeth pr. 3 sq.: al that hem ~ all that they require 30vb2; nede
(?)subj.: aif . . hym nede if he needs, wants 7va33.
[LOE (ge)nëedian.]
neyther conj. neither 11vb25, nor 7b13. [OE nëwber (see nother
conj.) with the vowel altered on the analogy of nöper.]
neuer(e) adv. (as an emphatic negative): ~ oon not a single one
(person or thing), none at all 31va4, 32a18. [OE nëfre.]
next adv. superl. directly: ~ aboute 8vb21. [OE ne(a)hst &c.]
next prep. nearest to, adjacent to 29va25. [OE ne(a)hst &c.]
no conj. nor 4b3. [OE nã, nð adv.]
nobleye n. high rank or birth 18a13; greatness, power 2va1;
grandeur, splendour 4vb23. [OF noblei &c.]
nobleseyes n. ?coll., pl. noblemen 2v4. [Perhaps either var. of nobleis (blend of nobleye n. & OF noblesse n.) or pl. of OF noble adj., n.]

noght. See nought adv.

noghte pron. nothing: sette at ~ see sette v. [OE nā(wi)ht, nō(wi)ht n., adv.] Cf. nought adv.

none pron. neither 13b18. [OE nān.]

none adj. no 5v11, 7a25 &c. [OE nān.]

noon adv. not: or ~ 24v8. [From none adj.]


nought, nouȝt adv. not 4a24, 6v27 &c.; right ~ not at all (cf. ryght adv.) 4b2, 6v32; right ~ or lytel little or not at all 4a22; ~ on(e)liche see on(e)liche adv.; noght 17v13, (redundant) 26a2. [From noghte pron.]

obeye pr. pl. kneel down, do obeisance, pay homage (to sb.) 17v27. [OF obeir.]

obeyssant adj. obedient 17b27. [Pr. ppl. of OF obeir.]

obeyssounce n.: done (hem) ~ obey (them) 30b36. [OF obeissance.]

oblaciones n. pl.: done ~ present offerings 25a33. [OF & L]

occupied pp. (accommodation) full, filled 8b15. [OF ocuper & L occupāre; the final y in English is unexplained.]

odour n. fragrance 20v1. [OF, & L odor.]

of adv. (error?) out 19v35(1)n; putte ~ see putte pr. pl. [OE]
of prep. (time) since, from 8Val. (source, origin) from 8a26, 14b10 &c.; out of 3vb8, 5vb16 &c.; in return for 8a13. (separation) from 19vb35(2)n, from off 15va33. (partitive) some of 28b19. (cause) from 3bl2,32 &c.; ~ reverence 32va6; destourbed ~ see destourbed ppl. adj. (agency) by 8vb20, 10a22 &c. (reference) concerning 3vb24, 5b34 &c.; in respect of 4vb33, 4vb23 &c.; in accordance with 6b18; on the basis of 5b6,7 &c.; (in phr. ~ special priuylege) by 19va26, 20vb19. (equivalent to an objective gen.): byheste ~ (i.e. made to) 5val2, helpe ~ (i.e. for, given to) 14vb25; (after mercy) on 5val6, 6vb28. (after mervayled) at 16va14; (after prayed) for 18vb5, 27va29; ~ fote on foot 20b17. [OE] See also ther(e) of adv.: wher of rel.

officers n. pl. ecclesiastical officials, servants 20vb18. [OF officier (sg.).]

offre wk. v. make (a) sacrifice, offering (to) 16a28, 28a34. [L offerre & OF of(f)rir & OE of(f)rian, from L.]
oynementz n. pl. (sweet smelling) unguents 32va13. [OF oignement/pl. oignemenz &c.]
on(e)liche, oonlyche adv. only: nought ~ not only 5va10, 14vb19; exclusively, in particular 13a2,5; but ~ 24vb36n. [From onli(che) adj. OE ënliċ & ënliċ; also cf. OE ënliċe 'splendidly'.]

openly, openliche adv. to people in general, so as to be readily accessible or understood 3vb1n; manifestly, so as to be readily appreciated 27vb11. [OE openliċe.]

upyniones n. pl. views, doctrines: ~ of heresyes heretical beliefs 25b4. [L & OF]
or conj. (w. pr. subj.) before 16a2; ~ that (w. pa. subj.)

before, lest 4a11. [OE æþr adv. & ON æþr adv.]

orde n. (religious) order: the ~ of seynt Benet see PN Benet.

[OP]

ordeyne wk. v. (coupled w. make) 26a6, 26vb24. pa. t. procured,
commanded, stationed, ɐchose 6b36; (w. made) issued (a decree)
3la2; ~ ther Inne appointed to it 20vb16, 21Va21 &c.;
(w. purposede) made ready, resolved 10b5n; arranged to have,
obtained 10b35; organised 18a21. pp. (w. chosen) 17Va5;
(w. sette) formed 8vb6; made, constructed, established 22b33n,
?32Va25n; (w. made) made, fashioned, ɐdesigned 20a28; appointed
14a15, (w. made) installed 9b5n; ɐalloted, assigned 13a6.

[OP ordener w. stem ordeyn- & L ordinäre.]

ordinaunce n. decree (cf. ordeyne wk. v.) 31a2. [OP]

ornamentz n. pl. jewels, treasures, trappings, apparel 16vb20,
18b18 &c.; esp. the sacred utensils, furnishings, or
ornamentation of the Jewish temple at Jerusalem ?16vb24;

ornamentes 6a5. [OP ornament/pl. ornemenz &c. & L ornament-um
(sg.).]

ostryes. See hostryes n. pl.

other(e) pron. the other(s) 10b1, 11vb9 &c.; other persons 7Va18,
17vb19. oth(e)res gen. 7vb29, 11vb9 &c. [OE òper.]

oper conj. or 7va9, 12a13. [OE]

oth(e)res. See other(e) pron.

out(t)ake prep. except (in the case of) 10Va7, 25b13 &c. [From
pp. of outtäke(n) v. From täke(n) v. See toke(n)
p. t. (?)pl.]
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ouercomen pp. (heretical belief) prevailed over, refuted 24\^a36.  
[infin. overcome(n). OE ofercuman; ofercumen.]

ouergilte, ouer gilte ppl. adj. gilded, gilt 25\^a13, 26b19;  
?ouergilt 23\^a18.  [infin. ouergilde(n). OE ofergyldan.]

ouerturnede pa. t. overthrew, destroyed 28\^b26.  [From  
turne(n) v. OE tyrnan, turnian, from L, & OF to(u)rner.]

paynym n. a non-Jew, gentile 3\^b35, 4a23 &c.; a non-Christian,  
pagan 31\^a28.  [OF paieni(s)me 'heathendom'.]

paysibleche adv. peaceably, without dispute 11b1.  [From paisable  
adj. OF.]

pans n. pl. (of peni, a silver coin; = L denarius) 2a23n,b2 &c.;  
cf. penyes 32\^b25.  [OE pening, (later) penig (sg.).]

par caas adv. perhaps 3\^b2.  [OF phr. par cas.]

party(e), partie n. part 13\^b23, 23b22 &c.; in ~ partly, somewhat  
25\^a25; a grete ~ of 23\^b22; the moste ~ of 23\^a1; for the  
more, moste ~ in most instances 6\^a24, 8\^b8 &c.; group (of  
people) 19a32, 28a23 &c. pl. regions 16\^v6,14 &c.  [OF]

passeth intr. pr. 3 sg. advances, rises 28\^a26n; tr. surpasses,  
exceeds 4b33, 29\^a36n &c. pr. ppl. 20b32.  [OF passer.]

passynge ppl. adj. exceeding, extreme 20a29.  [Cf. passeth intr.  
pr. 3 sg.] See also passeth intr. pr. 3 sg.

passynge adv. exceedingly, unusually, marvellously 20a26.  [From  
passynge ppl. adj.] See also passeth intr. pr. 3 sg.

passyngely adv. exceedingly, extremely 30b20.  [From passynge  
ppl. adj.]

pees n. peace 3b10, 11\^b22.  [OF pais, pes &c.]
pensioun n. charge, payment (regular or otherwise) 21a1. [L & OF]

peple n. mankind 7a34: alle the ~; military force, army, soldiers 4b23, 31b33 &c.; retinue 11v14,33 &c.; group or company of people 76v16n; the ~ ?the gentiles 6b25n. [AF]

performe wk. v. put into effect 6b35. performed pa. t.
@completed, fulfilled 6b26. pp. (arrangements) carried out 22b36; performed (construction) completed 20v14. [AF perfo(u)rmer; cf. OF parfournir.]

persecucioun n.: ~ of heresy (period of) tyrannous imposition of pagan beliefs 18v33n, 23v1; ~ of death persecution involving the sentence of death 23v2. [OF & L]

perseuerant adj. steadfast 17a27. [OF]

persone n. an individual's physical appearance 13b33, 16b26n &c. [OF, & L persona.]

perteyneth pr. 3 sg. (w. to) belongs, is allotted or assigned (to) 13a2; is associated (with) 16a21,22 &c. [OF pertenir & L pertinère.]

pyler n. pillar: a ~ of fyr (cf. fyr n.) 15a35. [OF, & ML pillere, LL pilâre.]

pilgrym(e) n. traveller 8b16, 32a3 &c. [OF peligrin &c.]

pynnacles n. pl. spires or pointed turrets surmounting a building 22a23. [OF, & LL pinnâculum (sg.).]

plente adj., ?adv. in abundance, in great quantity (cf. thikke adv.) 11b28. [From plente n. OF plente & L plènitâtêm.]

plentiououse adj. abundant, & fertile 27v4. [OF]

postcomyn n. the part of the Mass following Communion 25a30. [ML postcommùnio, -iônis & OF postcommunion.]
poudre, powdred a. dust 3b32; (of crushed remains) 19b23; (of decomposition) 19a7; ash 29a17n. [OF]

power n.: of ~ having authority, status, or financial resources, able to pay 20a31, 28a35n &c.; strength, force: thurgh stronge ~ 30a11. [OF (CF poer &c. & AF pueir).]

prayed(e) pa. t. begged, requested 24val; ~ for entreated, begged for mercy on behalf of 24b25. [OF preier &c.]

prayerses n. pl. entreaties, intercession 18vb6n; made ..., grete ~ 22vb20. [OF preiere (sg.).]

preched pa. t. declared, exhorted, &proclaimed 10b17.
[OF preechier.]

prechour(e)s. See PN f(f)rere(s) pl.

preciously adv. richly, finely, splendidly 20b30. [From OF preciouse adj.]

preestys n. pl. Church officeholders (of any rank) 29a33.
[OE preost (sg.), from L; ult. Gk.]

preface n. ?pl. preface(s) i.e. the introduction to the canon of the Mass 26vb26. [OF, & L praefatio.]

prerogatyfe n. privilege, status, superiority 25va2. [OF, & ML prerogatîva.]

preuy. See priue adj.

princes n. pl. leaders, rulers, foremost persons 14b6; ~ of the prestes chief priests 14a36. [OF]

principaltee n. principality, kingdom, country 13b5; dominance: have the ~ vpon have precedence over 25bl1. [AF & OF principalitë & L principalitas.]
priue adj. personal, special, private: ~ meyne (cf. meyne n.)
24b33; preuy secret, esoteric, occult 29V a4; ~ byleue
(cf. byleue n.) 15b30n. [OF]

priuylyche adv. secretly, in secret 24a35, b11 &c.; priuelyche
14b9; priuely 13a29. [From priue adj.]

processioun n. pomp, celebration, festivity, processions 24V a11.
[OP & L]

procurynge vbl. n. bringing about, connivance, pleading 2V b26.
[From procuren v. OF procurer & L procurare.]

profitable adj. beneficial, useful 10V a16n. [OF, & Anglo-L
profitabilis; cf. profite n.]

profite n.: hadde ~ of received income from (cf. of prep.) 5a27.
[OF profit & L profectus.]

propetuel adj. (error?) perpetual 18a4.

prophecie n. ability to foretell the future 4a6. [OF, &
LL prophétia; ult. Sk.]

propre adj. (languages) separate, distinct: pey have a ~ speche
(or langage) by hem self 25V a31, 27a19. [OF, & L proprius.]

prosperitee n. a flourishing or thriving condition 18V b25.
[OF, & L prosperitæs.]

purpos n. intention, plan, decision 31b28; were in ~ and wille
intended, resolved 5V a32; central theme or subject matter of a
narrative (as opposed to a digression) 29a25. [AF]

purposed(e) pa. t. planned, determined 20V b8; subj. 4b24, 10b5n.
[AF purposer, parallel form of OF proposer.]

pursued pa. t. attacked, harried, hunted down 14V a6. [AF pursure
& CP po(u)rsuir &c.]
putte pr. pl.: ~ to add (sth.) to 26vb20n. pp.: ~ of driven off 30va2, ~ out of driven out of, expelled from 31vb13; (in a scale of values): ~ at no reverence see reverence n. [OE (cf. pytan & putung 'putting'; akin to potian 'place', 'put').]

quakynge vbl. n. rumbling 16vb2n. [From quake(n) v. OE cwacian.]

quantitee n. size, magnitude 7bl4. [OF, & L quantitas.]

queer n. choir 20va2o, 24 &c. [OF quer &c.]

questio(u)n n. a problematic matter 28vb7, 29va34; (a) ~ of (a) dispute about 4a19, 9va10. [OF & L]

quod pa. t. sq. said 5Val. [infin. quethe(n). OE (WS) cweban: cwæb/cwædon.]

rad(de). See rede(n) pr. pl.

rebelle adj. refusing due obedience, rebellious (aæyys) 30al. [OF, & L rebellis.]

receyu(e)de pa. t. welcomed 19b2n, 24va17. [OF receivre &c.]

rede(n) pr. pl. find written 32b24n, 34 &c. rad(de) pp. read (out) 3a23, 28a3l &c.; available to be read, written 18va21, 22lb25n &c. [OE (WS rædan, A rædan); ræden, (wk.) ræd(e)d.]

redy adj. at hand and willing to help, accessible (to) 9va17, 22va36; (things) available 10va12. [OE (ge)ræde + ME -i suffix.]

redynge vbl. n. chanting 25b21n, 22la34n. [OE ræding; cf. rede(n) pr. pl.]

reheresed pp. related, described 3bl7n. [OF reherci(er).]
religioun n. a religious order or community 27a26. pl. systems of belief or ritual 3a2. [OF & L] See also Religious(e) adj.

Religious(e) adj.: a ~ man a member of a religious order 24a1, 27a34 (cf. men of Religioun 4v12); devout, holy 24a8. [OF, & L religiosus.]

repe pp. reaped, harvested, gathered 11b33n. [infin. repe(n). OE repan, (ge)rîpan; ripen.]

reputacioun n.: was of ~ was held in esteem 7b13. [L]

reteyne v. (error?) ?accommodate 13v28n. [OF retien-, AF retegn-, pr. stems of retenir.]

reuerence n.: done but litel ~ to (cf. do(ne) v.) 23a24:
respectful attitude or manner, courtesy 16a14; the state of being respected, dignity, status 25va6, 32a27; had, putte, holden at; in (no) ~ held in (no) respect, esteem or honour (cf. putte pr. pl., hoolde v.) 19a26, 25va32 &c. [OF, & L reverentia.]

reuerente adj. admirable, deserving to be revered, conferring honour 20vb25. [L reverens, -entis & reverendus & OF reverent, reverend.]

reuoke v. call back, rescue, restrain 19a19. [OF revoguer & L revocäre.]

rewarde n.: hauynge ~ to in comparison with 16va10. [AF reward (var. of OF regard) & ML rewardum.]

rewle v. restrain, control (sb.) 17v13. [OF reuler &c.]

ryal adj. royal, befitting a king 18vb15; magnificent, sumptuous 19va14. [OF (CF rial, var. of roial & AF reial).]

Ryal, ryalliche adv. (w. arayed) magnificently, in a manner befitting a king 20va15,b14. [From ryal adj.]
ryche adj. splendid, noble 20va15. [OE rɪce & OF (from Gmc.) & ON (cf. OI rɪkr).]

rychely, richeliche adv. with possession of riches; sumptuously, splendidly 4vb10, 20vb13. [OE rɪclɪce; cf. ryme adj.]

richesses n. pl. opulence, rich trappings 23b4n. [OF rɪchese &c. (sg.); for form ?cf. nobleyes n.?coll., ?pl.]

ride(n) pa. t. pl. rode 11vb17, 12a10 &c. [infin. rɪde(n). OE rɪdan; rɑd/ridon.]

ryght adv. most, very 4a2, 8vb11 &c.; - nought see nought adv.; - as just as 1va15, 15vb25 &c.; - so in just the same way 9vb13, 12vb4 &c. [OE rɪhте &c.] See also anon(e) adv.

Rightful adj. pl. as n. coll. dat. (to) the righteous 17va24. [From right n.; cf. LOE (un)rihtfull.]

rightwisnesse n. righteousness 22vb2. [OE (WS, Kentish)

rihtwisness, from rihtwis adj.]

roche n. rock, a rocky height 12vb13,32. [OF; cf. ML roch(e)a.]

rolles n. pl. scrolls 17va32. [OF; cf. ML rollus, -a (sg.).]

ronge pa. t. pl. rang 21vb30. [infin. rɪnge(n). OE hringan (wk.); strong forms are by analogy with forms of clingen v., singen v. (cf. songe pa. t. pl.), sprynge v. &c.]

ronne pa. t. pl. ran 15a9n. [infin. renne(n) &c. OE rɪnnan; ränn/runnon & ON (cf. OI rinna, renna; rann/runnum).]

saaf. See sauf prep.

sacre wk. v. (mass) celebrate 26vb19n. pp. (clergy) consecrated 26vb24. [OF sacrer & L sacrãre.]
sacrifice n. sacrificial offering, host 26Va17. [OF, & L sacrificium.]
saf conj. but on the other hand 20V17. [From sauf prep.]
say; sayden. See saye pa. t. sg., seye v.; seye v.
saye pa. t. sg. saw 14Vb9,10. seye(n) pl. 4Vb29, 10a13 &c.;
  seye(n) 8b21, 14a31; ?say 24Vb35n. seye(n) pp. 4a34, ?27b32n
  &c.; seen 29Va21, 32b1. [infin. se(n). OE ægon; seah/æwon, ægon; seven.] Cf. seye v.
sayn; sauacioun. See seye v.; sauacioun n.
sank v. tr. pa. t. sg. destroyed by submerging (cf. ouerturnede
  pa. t.) 28Vb26n. [infin. sinke(n) &c. OE (ge)sincan;
  sanc &c./suncon.]
sauf prep. but for, except, save 19Vb24; (intens. phr.) ~ only
  29b4; saue 16Vb13; (w. almost) saaf 12Va26. [From the use of
  safe adj. (AF sauf, L salvus) 'preserving', 'being preserved'
  in absolute construction.] See also fowcheth sauf pr. 3 sq.
sauacioun n. salvation 6Vb33, 8b34 &c.; sauacioun 14Vb26.
  [OF sauvacion &c. & LL salvatiō(nis).]
saue. See sauf prep.
sauede pa. t. (w. heledde) cured, healed, restored to health 5a17.
  [OF sauver &c. & LL salväre.]
sauour n. smell 12Va3. [OF]
scantlyche adv. hardly, barely 20b11. [From scant adj.
  ON (cf. OI skammr, n skammt 'short', 'brief.]
science n. branch of knowledge 5Vb29. [OF, & L sciencia.]
see; seen. See PN grete see; saye pa. t. sg.
seye v. say 24vb20; say 2a24, 3va13. pr. pl. 26b18, 36; opine, assert 26b36; sey(e)n read aloud 29a35,b1 &c.; seyn 5a14, 15a27 &c.; sey 29va18; say(n) 15a32, 24vb35n &c. pr. ppl. seyinge 26vb16, 29va27. sayden pa. t. 15a10; seyden 28va12n. [OE secgan; segede/-n.] See also saye pa. t. sq.

seyen. See saye pa. t. sq., seye v.

seyinge. See seye v.

semeth pr. 3 sq. appears, is seen, is visible 27b17. [ON (cf. OI sæma `honour', `conform'.]

semynge vbl. n.: as to others ~ as it seemed to the others (cf. other(e) pron.) 13va3n. [From seme(n) v. See semeth pr. 3 sq.]

sendale n. a kind of costly fabric, sendale 32valln. [OF cendar &c.; of obscure origin.]

sente v. intr. pa. t. sent word, gave notice, told (to sb.) 5vb5. [infin. sende(n), OE sendan; send(d)e.]

sepulture n. interment, burial 16a23n, 18a35 &c. [OF, & L sepultura.]

seruage n. servitude 30vb27. [OF, & ML servagium.]

sette v.: ~ aseyns make an attack on 4b12n; ~ at no(u)ght disregard, scorn 4b4, 23vb18. pp. set down (in writing) 3vb9, placed, added 2vb35; (land) situated 9a10, (w. ordeyned) disposed, formed 8vb7. [OE settan; set(t).]

shap n. appearance 2b22. [OE gesceap.]

shape v. (w. make) cut out, design, fashion (clothes). pp. shape(n) (w. made) formed, fashioned 7va15, (w. formed) 32b27. [OE scieppan &c.; sc(e)apen. The ME v. is refashioned from the OE pp.]
sheetes n. pl. pieces of cloth (esp. linen), linen garments 20b8. [OE sciête &c. & sceat, sceata (sg.).]
s hete v. shoot (arrows) 27b36. [OE sceotan.]
shette pp. shut 11vb25. [infin. shette(n) &c. OE acyttn, perhaps w. analogical influence of shete v.]
shewe wk. v. communicate, make known, reveal, announce, declare to (sb.) 4b28, 4a22 &c.; ~ praysinge 13vb7n. pr. 3 sq. proves, validates 12b14. pr. l. 3vb32n; (miracle) performed, manifested 5vb14, 18va10; revealed the whereabouts of 22vb2,5; made a demonstration (to sb.) 4a9n. pp. told, made clear 4vb35; was ~ appeared 9vb6n. [OE scawian.]
shymynge vbl. n. @brightness, radiance 9vb34n. [From shInen v. OE scInan.]
shyer n. slice 26vb3. [Gmc. root (analogies in Old High & Middle Low German); cf. ME schive (OE *scife).]
shrewede adj. depraved, @pverse 29va10. [From shreue n. 'rogue'. Prob. from OE scréawa 'shrew(mouse)'; cf. Middle High German shrewel 'devil'. Also cf. ME shreue(n) v. 'deprave'.]
signe n. mark, imprint 21vb22,29. [OE seg(e)n &c. & OF sei(g)n &c. & L signum.]
syker adj. having certain knowledge, certain, assured 10a26n. [OE sicor, ult. L sicurus.]
Sinagoges n. pl. (pagan) temples 22va9n. [OE sinagoga, -um, from LL synagōga (sg.), & OF & L; ult. Gk.]
sit(t)he conj. seeing that 3va2, 4a23 &c.; @since the time that 29va18. [Reduced form of sitthen adv.; cf. OE sip conj.] See also sittthe adv.
sithen adv. subsequently, since then 30Va21. [OE sippon, sippan,
(earlier) sip ban 'after that' (cf. after thanne adv.); ?also
cf. ON sittan.]
sitthe adv. since: neuere ~ 30a34. [Reduced form of sithen adv.;
cf. OE sip adv.] See also sit(t)he conj.
skile n. grounds 14Va32. [ON (cf. OE skil 'difference').] 
slawe. See y slawe pp.
smale adj. @thin, slender, narrow 11a22. [OE smael, smala.]
Smaragdus n. a precious stone (emerald) 11a27. [L; ?ult. of
oriental origin.]
smellynge vbl. n. (sweet) odour, scent, smell 23a34. [From
smelle(n) v. ?OE (WS *smiellan &c., A *smellan &c.); also
cf. LOE smelle n.]
smok n. female (under)garment, shift 2Va14, 20a31 &c. [OE smoc.]
smoked pp. treated with the smoke of an aromatic substance
20b33n. [OE smocian.]
so adv. thereupon 11a9, 14b12 &c. [OE swa, swā.] See also so
that conj.
sogettes ?adj. pl. subject 9b11n. [OF sog(i)et &c. &
L sbiect-us (sg.).]
solempnely adv. with due reverence or propriety, grandly, with
special ceremonies 25b19, ?18b4 &c. [From solempne adj. OF, &
L sol(l)em(p)n-is.] 
solempnete, solempnite(e), solepnite n. (in phr. with al,
grete ~) ceremony, formality: (coupled w. reverence) 19Vb26,
(w. worshipe) 24a16, (w. processioun) 24Va10; @festivity,
celebration (of a saint’s day): don grete ~ to (cf. do(ne) v.)
26Va32. [OF, & L sol(l)em(p)nitas.]
somdel adv. somewhat 5Vb4, 16b7; sumdel 16b3. [From somdel n. OE sum adj. + del n. Also cf. instrumental form sume delte.]
somtyme adv. previously, in former times 19b35, 32a16n &c.; sometimes 8Vb17, 28Va22 &c. [some adj. (OE sum) + tyme n.]
somewhat n. something: - elles some other thing 16a1. [some adj. (OE sum) + what pron. (OE hwæt).]
songe pa. t. pl. sang, used to sing 20Vb21. songen pp. 22a33. [infin. singe(n). OE singan; sang, song/sungon; sungen.]
soote adj. sweet 20Val. [OE swōt, var. of swēte, influenced by soote adv.]
soote adv. sweet(ly): - smellynge herbes 20b34. [OE swōte, the adv. corresponding to the adj. swēte; cf. soote adj.]
sory adj. distressed 8b23n. [OE sārig.]
sorwe n. (coupled w. disease) pain, suffering 8b34; - of herte regret, & repentance 31Val2n; lamentation: made grete, moche - 5a34, 23Va5. [OE sorh, sorg.]
so that conj. provided that, on condition that 31b5, ?31a5n. [From so adv.]
soun n. sound 16Vb3,8 &c. [OE sōn, ON sōnn (from L or early OF) & AF (OF son) & L son-us.]
spak pa. t. sq. spoke 6a23, ?13Va4. spake(n) pl. 1Va26, 15a8 &c. spoke pp. made known (by speech) 4Va24. [infin. speke(n).
(L)OE sp(r)ecan; sp(r)æc/ sp(r)æcon; sp(r)ecen.]
speche n. (oral) account 3Vb4n; language 13Va4. pl. phrases, utterances, recitations 21a30n. [OE sp(r)æc, sp(r)æc.]
spiritualte(e) n. spiritual, ecclesiastical matters 17b1,36 &c. [OF]
spoke. See spak pa. t. sg. See also afspoke pp.

sprynge v.: ~ of arise from (cf. of prep.) 3vB20. sprong
pa. t. sg.: ~ vp burst forth, flowed out (of the ground) 21vB5.
spronge pp.: is ~ has arisen, begun to appear 12vB1.
[OE springan; sprang, sprung/sprungon; sprungen.]

spryngynge vbl. n. (river) source; (peoples) origin, ?rise, ?bursting forth 3a35; dawning or first appearance 16v35, (w. arisesynge) ?place of dawning 3vall. [From sprynge v.]

sprong(e). See sprynge v.

stant pr. 3 sg. stands 23vA15,17. ?pl. stondeth 28a24.

stode pa. t. sg. was, existed, remained (firm): florisschede and ~ 4v8n; stood: ~ and was in prosperitee 18vB24. [infin.
stande(n), stonde(n). OE standan, stondan (pr. 3 sg. stent, stond &c.); stød/-on.] See also stille adv.

stede n.: in the ~ of (Thomas), in (Thomas) ~ as successor to (Thomas) 2b28, 17b1 &c.; as replacement for 6vA11. pl. places 2a25. [OE]

steppes n. pl. footprints: the ~ of thy feet 16vA8. [OE stæpe, stepe &c. (sg.),]

stille adv. at rest, motionless (cf. abyde v.) 18vA31n; without change 20vB12n, 32b15; stonde ~ 29vA1n, 31vA24. [OE]

stode. See stant pr. 3 sg.

stokke n. founder, progenitor 9vA7n. [OE stoc(c).]

stondeth, stood. See stant pr. 3 sg.

stoppede v. tr. pa. t. blocked up 21vB3,4. pp. 13a9.
[OE *stoppian, forstoppian; ult. pop. l or Rom. stup(p)are 'stuff with oakum'.]
strakes n. pl. streaks (of light), rays: and bemes 9vb9n,13.
[Prob. OE *straca (cf. streccan).]

strede pa. t. (w. refl. pron.) moved to and fro 9vb15n.
[OE styrian.]

streyned pp. stretched, extended: ~ abrode (cf. abrode adv.)
23b17. [OF estreindre (stem estre(i)n-).]

streyte adj. narrow, difficult of passage 27va34n. [AP e)streit &c.]

streytly adv. (confinement) strictly, securely (without the possibility of escape) 30vb26. [From streyte adj.]

strengthynge vbl. n. strengthening: to ~ of (true faith) in order to confirm, reinforce 6b19, 9vb29. [From strength(n) v. From strength n. (OE strengbu); cf. *strengan, æt-strengan v.]

stronge (error?) 6va31n.

strongliche adv. firmly, with a strong military force: kept besilyche and ~ securely guarded (cf. besily adv., kepe v. tr.) 11a31. [OE stranglice, strongltce.]

studyinge pr. ppl.: ~ after giving attention to (cf. after(e) prep.) 6b15. [OF estudier & L studere (+ dat.).]

subtil adj. (cloth) of fine texture 20a23. [OF soutil &c. & L subtil-is.]

suffrance n.: thurgh the ~ of god by divine permission (cf. suffre wk. v.) 14vA5. [AF]
suffre wk. v. allow 5va23, 29va1. [AP suffrir &c. & L sufferre.]
somdel. See somdel adv.
supposen pr. pl. are of opinion, hold as a belief 17a1. pr. ppl. guessing, @suspecting 13va19. [OF supposer.]
swiche adj. such 4b36. [OE swilc &c.]

swotenesse n. sweet smell 32v15. [OE swōtnes; cf. soote adj.]

take. See lyght n., toke(n) pa. t. (?)pl.

tau3te pa. t. revealed or made known to 722v30. [infin.

teche(n). OE tæc(e)an: tehtes.]

teyde pa. t. tied, fastened 8v7. teyed pp. 8b2, 8v5. [infin.

teye(n). OE (prob. non-WS *tēgan, for WS tēgan).]

telle v. reveal openly 24v5. pr. 1 sq. announce 7a33. telleth
3 sq. it is told 1v21,26 &c. tolde pp. told of, detailed,
recounted 32b7. [OE tellan: teald, Anglian getald.]

temperaltee n. temporal matters, worldly business 17v8,b29.
pl. 16vb11. [AF *temprelité, for OF temporelité, &
L temporālitas.]

temple n. ?pl. place(s) of worship, church(es) 25a25.
[OE temp(e)l (from L) & OF temple & L templum (sg.).]

[OE temprian (from L) & OF temprer, tempère rer & L temperère.]

that rel. pron. the one that 9v9. [From that dem. pron.
OE þæt.]

that conj. (cause) because 10b20; (result) @to the extent that,
so that 28vb13; (corruption?) 25b2n. [From the conjunctive use
of that rel. pron. or that dem. pron.] See also after(e)
prep., after conj., afterwarde that conj., for that conj., so
that conj., ther(e) rel. or conj. adv.

the. See they pron. 3 pl. nom.

theder. See thider adv.
they pron. 3 pl. nom.: ~ of (ynde) the people of (Inde) 6b14, 18v33 &c. (cf. hem pron. 3 pl. acc.-dat.); (error?) 29a2n, 30a4n. the unstressed form 12a2, 16v9 &c. theyben see be(e)n pr. pl. [ON bei-r.]

thenne adv. (preceded by redundant fro) thence (cf. fro prep.) 26a36, 27v14 &c. [OE panone &c.]

ther(e) rel. or conj. adv. to the place where 1v15, 14b22; (w. antecedent n.) where, in which 8a1, b9 &c.; ~ that 15vb15, 18v8; ~ as 7vb4, 13b22 &c. [OE þær &c.]

ther after adv. (after loken v.) for it (cf. after(e) prep.) 5b23. [OE þær after.]

ther(e) of adv. concerning it: (redundant) as ðe swul heren more ~ her after 26a23; (after wondred, mervayled) at it 5v27, 11vb31 &c.; (after thanke) for it 5vb2, 31a20; (after make) out of it 10v33. [OE þær of.] Cf. of prep.

ther to adv. to it 4vb23; þeue hem ~ see þeue v. [OE þær to, þærto.]

thider adv. thither 4vb18, 20; theder 9a19. [OE pider.]

thikke adj., adv. thick(ly), in quantity 11b32. [OE pícce.]

thilke dem. adj. that or those (previously mentioned) 8va36, 9b2 &c. [Prob. OE þe article + ilce adj.]

thise dem. pron. pl. these people 25vb29; ðe the former 15va12n. [Apparently from this + adj. pl. ending -e.]

tho dem. adj. pl. those 16vb6, 23vb23 &c. [OE þa dem. pron. & article.]

thridde adj. third 11b20, 18va17. [OE pridda, bird(d)a.]

thurgh oute adv. to the end (of a journey), all the way 10vb34. [From thurgh (OE þurh) + oute (OE ðt).]
tilyinge vbl. n. tending (a plant), raising (a crop), cultivation
2a19. [From till(i)e(n) &c. v. OE tilian 'strive', 'labour
(after)'.]

tyme n.: longe ~ over the centuries 4Va23; season 8Vb13n
(cf. after(e) prep.), 9a24 &c. [OE tīma; cf. ON tīmi.]

Tyry n. pl. a type of snake 29a2ln. [L; see note.]

to prep. towards, against: manassynge ~ 23Va2ln. (purpose)
for: ~ her weddnyge 20b9, ~ diuine seruice 22b34 (cf. for to
prep.). (possession): to hymself in his own possession 31Va24.
[OE] See also for to prep., in to prep., loue n., putte
pr. pl., ther to adv., to fore adv., tofore prep., togider adv.

to brast pa. t. sg. broke to pieces 1Vb30. [infin. tobreste(n),
from to- prefix & brestan v. OE berstan; bærst/burston &
ON (cf. OI bresta; brast/brustum).]

to fore adv. (place) ahead 14Vb35. (time) before, previously
6a9, 7b25 &c.; in advance 14Va29. [OE tôforan.]

tofore, to fore prep. (place) in front of 7Va14, 8a8 &c.; ahead
of 13a36, 14b21 &c. (time) earlier than, previous to 4a26,
4Va20. (precedence) in precedence to, over 17a36; above, more
than 17Vb19 &c. [OE tôforan, from to prep. + foran adv.]

togider, to gidre, togidre adv. together 1Va23, 17a22 &c.;
to gedre 5b10; each other: louede ~ 18Va27n, 2la16n.
[OE tôgædere, tôgadore.]

toke(n) pa. t. (?)pl. picked out, selected 17b22; ~ wyues 18a15.
take pp. seized, apprehended 24b9; stricken 5a20. [infin.
take(n).] LOE tacan; tôc/-on; *tacen, from ON (taka; tôk;
tekinn.) See also bygynynnge vbl. n.
tokene n. signal 4b28,36; sign of or act demonstrating divine power or authority 2V6a, 5V19 &c. [OE tæc(e)n.]
tokenyne vbl. n.: in ~ that as a symbol that 27Vb26.
[OE tæcnung; cf. tok(e)ne(n) v.]
tolle n. share of the profit, rent 7Vb33. [OE toll, apparently a Gmc. adaption of pop. L. tolōneum (cf. ML theolonium), for L telōnium 'toll house', from Gk.; but cf. tale n., telle v.]
tonge n. people or nation having a language of their own 21a24, 29a34. pl. tunges: alle ~ people of every tongue 4vb18.
[OE tunge.]
toures n. pl. towers 22a23. [OE torr (from L turr-is) & OE tur (from OF tor, tur, (later) tour).] See also PN Babel.
translated pp. removed, shifted 28Va29, 30b10; (of relics) 29Va19, 32b17 &c. [From translate adj. (L translāt-us pp.) or directly from OF translater, ML translātāre.]
trauaille, trauayle n. toil, trouble: with grete ~ 11a28, 22Va34; for his ~ (cf. for prep.) 23V3. [OF]
trauailleth pr. 3 sg. travels 7V31. [OF travaill(i)er &c. 'trouble (oneself)'; cf. travaile n. The sense development is peculiar to English.]
tree n. wood, timber 7Va9. pl. beams 20Va19. [OE trēow; cf. ON tré.]
tresoures n. pl. treasure chests 14b26. [OF tresor (sg.).]
trewe adj. faithful, uncorrupt 25b30. [OE trēowe &c.]
trewely(che) adv. with steadfast devotion 21b34, 25Va36.
[OE trēowlīce; cf. trewe adj.]
triacle n. theriac (an antidote to poison, esp. that of a venomous serpent) 3a17, 29a24n. [OF, from Pop. L *triaca, for LL thēriaca, from Gk.]

tribulacio(u)n n. distress, trouble 18v2b, 32Va18. [OF & L]

trouthe n. sincerity, faith 9Va18, 22vb1. [Perhaps from OE *treōb, var. of trēob.]

tunges. See tongue n.

turneth pr. 3 sg., pl.: aȝeyn return(s) 21b9. [OE tyran & turnian (from L tornäre); cf. OF t(o)urner &c.]

vnctioun n. anointing (in legitimation of kingship) 9b28n, 9Va12n. [L; cf. OF oncioun.]

vnder prep. @during the time, reign, or office of 6a20, 7a5. [OE]

vnrightrful adj. pl. as n. coll. dat. the unrighteous 17Va25. [Cf. LOE rihtful.]

vnthrifty adj. (dwelling) @poor, run down 8a7n,27 &c. [From thrift n., itself from thrive(n) v. (ON brīfa-sk refl.) + -t suffix (cf. gift, rift &c.); cf. ON brīf(t) n.]

vn to conj. until 30V2a2. [From unto prep. Formed on the analogy of until prep., with to prep. in place of the northern equivalent til.]

vntrowthe n. unfaithfulness, lack of faith 24vb27n. [From trouthe n.]

vpon prep. over, above 32b12n,15. [From up adv. (OE up, upp) + on prep. (OE on, an); cf. ON upp á & OE upp(e) on.]
vsage n.: *it is* - it is customary 8a10; (coupled w. *costume*)
[AF; cf. *vse* n., *vse wk. v.*]

vse n. custom, *practice* 15vb33. [AF & OP *us, use &c.* & L ûs-us.]
vse wk. v. (religion) *practise* 31a4. pr. 3 sg. (w. infin.) is
accustomed (to) 31a23n. pr. pl. 32vb15; *this, the same*
follow this, the same practice 19va31n, 27vb11; go frequently
or regularly (in to) 30vb33; (clothing) adopt, wear 26vb28.
pp., ppl. adj. (customs) practised, customary 21vb11; *(it) is,*
*was* - 7va4, 30b24 &c. [OF *user &c.*; cf. *vse* n. & L ûs-us ppl.
of ût.]

veyl n. *coll.* sail, *sails* 23b17n. [AF & Old Norman French *veile*
& *veil* (cf. OF *voile* & *voil*), L *vèla* (pl. as sg.) & *vèlum.*]

venysians adj. pl. *Venetian* 20vb34. [OF, & ML *Venetián-us.*]
verray adj. very: - *god and man* 3va15, 12vb7 &c.; true (truly
entitled to the name) 3va23; genuine, real 9b34; rightful
30b31; *verrey* 16a27; (intens.) pure, sheer, *mere* 5vb34n; of ~
vse 2lb17n. [AP]

verrealy adv. truly 24vb17; *verreily:* - *byleuen* as a matter of
truth 17a1. [From *verray* adj.]

verrey. See *verray.*

vertue n. excellence, distinction, strength 4vb9; (coupled w.
*strength*) 11vb19n. pl. healing properties 2a20; acts of
superhuman power, ‘mighty works’, miracles 18vb13, 32vb11.
[AF & OF, & L *virtus, virtùt-is.*]
vesselle n. *coll.* (ritual) vessels, utensils 6a5. [AF & OF]
vynes n. pl. *vineyards* 17vb4. [OF, & L *vīnea* (sg.).]
vitaille n. supplies, provisions 10Va11. [AF & OF]

vowted ppl. adj. vaulted 20Va18. [OF vouter &c.; cf. vout(e) n.]

way(e). See wey(e) n.

wake(n) wk. v. stay awake (in celebrating a vigil) 26Va33, 28a4 &c. [OE wæcian & wæcnan.]

wan pa. t. sq. seized, took possession of, captured 24b6.

wonne(n) pl. 30a26,36. wonne pp. 31Va23, @subjugated 4b9. [infin. (ge)winne(n). OE winnan; wann/wunnon; wunnen.]

warde n. (coupled w. kepynge) act of guarding, keeping control; or, those who guard, guards (for against) 4b18n. [OE weard.]

warnede pa. t. cautioned, @advised 17a25. [OE war(e)nian, wearnian.]

wasshe pr. pl. @baptise 28b15. pp. sprinkled, moistened ?20b35. [OE wæscan, wascan; wæscen &c.]

wasteth pr. 3 sq.: away dwindles away, disappears 8Vb29n. [AP waster (cf. OF g(u)aster); cf. OE wæstan 'lay waste'.]

waxeth. See wexe v.

weddynge vbl. n. marriage 20b9. [From wed v. OE weddian.]

weder n. weather 3Va28, 11b32. [OE]
w(e)ye(n) n. road, street 20va2, 26b27; by the ~ along or down the road (i.e. in public) 20b36, along (i.e. beside) the road 11b35, by road or by that road 7va32; in the same ~ beside, along the same road 2a17; highway 7vb22; hye ~ (cf. heigh adj.) 26b26; (river) course, channel 28va15n; path (of travel) 27va35n; euyerych in his weye 12va24n; journey: by (al) the weye in the course of (throughout) the journey 10va1, 12a17 &c.; travelling: wery of the ~ 8b24; distance 11vb11, 22a13, 79a31n &c.; way(e) 13va8, 24b34. [OE weg.]

wel adv. in detail 6b32; fully 10va1; not ~ not easily 6vb7, 8vb9; viste ~ were not deceived 9b16, were in no doubt 10a18; knewe ~ 10b20; shewed ~ 16va15. [OE wel(1).]

welle n. spring (of water) 2va34, 21vb4 &c. [OE wielle &c.]

wente pa. t.: ~ hym self betook himself 2b20n. [infin. wende(n). OE wenden.]

weryng clothes n. pl. articles of clothing (suitable or intended for actual use) 20a24. [From were(n) v. (OE werian) + clothes n. pl.]

werketh pr. 3 sg. (miracles) brings about, performs 32vb11.

werken pl. do things, @work 16vb9. wroughte pa. t. sq. 31a18; wroug3t 22va21. wroughten pl. did 3va34. [OE wyrcan, wircan, (later) we(o)rcan; wrohte/-n. Cf. ON verkja & werk n.]

werkynge vbl. n. arranging, @action 2vb22. [From werke(n) v. See werketh pr. 3 sg.]

weten. See wyte v.

wether n. @ram 1va24, 13vb29 &c. [OE weper.]
wexe v. ~ (clere &c.) become, grow (clear) 13b14. wexeth
pr. 3 sg. 25b32; (plant) grows 11b32; (river) swells 28vb12,
waxeth (coupled w. arysteth) springs, has its source 28va22;
wexit 11b30. wexeth pl. 3b32n. [OE weaxan.]
what adj. indef.: ~ (man) bat any (person) that 5a19, 7vb2 &c.;
(without bat) 20vb31. [OE hwæt.]
wher of rel. for which: ~ they banked god (cf. of prep.) 18vb21.
[OE hwær + of prep.]
why. See ffor why conj.
white. See PN f(f)re(re)s pl.
wille n.; were in purpos and ~ intended (cf. purpos n.) 5vb32.
[OE willa; ?also OE wil(l) & gewil(e).] See also good wille n.
wynnynge vbl. n.: haue ~ ~ of get wealth, profit from
7vb33. [From winne(n) v. See wan pa. t. sg.]
wyte, weten v. know: it is to ~ it is to be noted 13vb14, 20a18.
wiste pa. t. 11vb9; ~ wel see wel adv. [OE witan; wise.]
witty adj. wise, capable: wyse and ~ 23a10. [OE (ge)wit(t)ig.]
wole pr. 3 sg. wills, is willing to 2lall; whan god ~ 23a8;
(?sq) purposes or sets to 29a14. pl. 8vb24, 31vb26. wolde
pa. t. 22vb18, 24va4 &c.; wished, intended 23vb3; (of God’s
will) 6vb28, 10a7. subj. 24va7; myghte and ~ 24b19. [infin.
wille(n). OE *willan (pr. 3 sg. wille, pl. willaþ); wolde.]

wonder n.; hadde gret ~ ther of marvelled greatly at it
(cf. ther(e) of adv.) 10a17; miracle 18va9. wondres pl.
marvellous things 18a10. [OE wundor.]

wonder adj. marvellous, wondrous 6vb13. [From OE wundor n.
(cf. wonder n.) in compounds.]
wonder adv. exceedingly 15a19, 29a18. [Partly OE wundor n.
(cf. wonder n.) in compounds, partly OE wundrum dat. pl. used adverbially.]

wonderfully adv. in a marvellous way, miraculously 19b20. [From wonderful adj. LOE wunderfull; cf. wonder n.]

wonderliche adv. exceedingly 11b30, 20a27 &c.; in a marvellous manner, to a marvellous degree ?1a21. [OE wunderliche.]

wondres. See wonder n.

wonen pp. accustomed (to + infin.) 26b15. [OE gewunod, pp. of gewunian.]

wonne(n). See wan pa. t. sq.

worchepeful; worchepefullche; worchipe; worshiped. See

worchepeful adj.; worshipfully adv.; worchipe n.; worshipede pa. t.

worde n. saying, maxim 17a16. [OE word.]

wormes n. pl. noxious animals, esp. serpents and reptiles 30b13n.
[OE wyrm (sg.).]

worshipe; worshipeful. See worship n.; worshipful adj.

worship n. respect, honour 2b32, 24a17; to, in (the) of in honour of 3b5, 31b6 &c.; hadde, holde in . . . held in honour (cf. hoolde v.) 25a9, 31b32 &c.; done to pay homage, worship to (cf. do(n)e v.) 26a17; worchipe 9b27; ?worshipe 14a33. [OE werpscipe, (later) wurp-, wyrp-]

worshipede pa. t. paid honour to, regarded with veneration 22a28; worshiped 23a30; worshipede (misspelling?) 19a23n.

pp. (feast day) venerated and honoured with ceremonies, celebrated 21a14, 32a14. [From worship n.]
worshipful adj. honourable, revered 3\textsuperscript{a}a2, 4\textsuperscript{a}a27 &c.; worchepeful 10a24,36; worshepeful 11\textsuperscript{b}a3. [From worship n.]

worshipfully, worshipfulliche adv. with due reverence and honour 24\textsuperscript{a}a14; in such a way as to confer honour, make a good appearance, set off suitably 18\textsuperscript{a}a7; (w. arayed) 23\textsuperscript{a}a26, 32b36.

worchepefulliche 10b19. [From worshipful adj.]

worsipede. See worshipede pa. t.

worthy adj. appropriate, fit: as it is - 20\textsuperscript{b}b26. [From worth n. (OE weorp &c.) + -\textit{y}, replacing OE wierpe adj. & OE weorp adj.]

worthier adj. comp. of higher rank, more entitled to honour 10b21. [From worthy adj.]

wosy adj. oozy, consisting of ooze or fine mud 28\textsuperscript{a}a16. [From wose n. (OE wēse); influenced by OE wōsig, from wōs 'juice'.]

wounden pp. wrapped 19\textsuperscript{b}b15, 22\textsuperscript{a}a26. [infin. winde(n) &c. OE windan; wunden.]

wrapped. See by wrapped pp.

writen pp. set down in writing, narrated, enumerated 3\textsuperscript{a}a36n, 14b32; - to gedre composed 5b10; writen 19b21. [infin. write(n). OE writan; writen.]

wronge pp. wrung 11\textsuperscript{a}a4. [infin. wringe(n). OE wringan; wrungen.]

wrou3t, wroughte(n). See werketh pr. 3 sg.
PROPER NAMES

Abacuk Habakkuk 1Va15, 12b17n &c.
Aboas a kingdom in Georgia, Abkhaziya 27b6n.
Abraham the patriarch 5Va12.
Acon¹ (= Acres 4Vb8) Acre 4Vb7n, 18a10 &c.; Acoun 4Vb28,34.
Acon². See PN Akne.
Acres. See PN Acon¹.
Adama Admah 28Vb24n.
Agapiti St. Agapetus (d.258) 22a31n.
Akne (the church at) Aachen 2Va17, 25Va10; Acon 20a13, 20Va4.
kynge Alisaundre¹ Alexander the Great (r.336-23) 16Vb21n
(cf. 239/n17-n19n). Alexandes gen. 1Vb20.
Alisaundre² Alexandria 11a10.
Antioche Antioch 17b19.
seynt Antonye St. Antony of Egypt (251?-356) 27a27n.
Apuley Apulia 24Va32n; Apulie 29Vb8.
Arabie a kingdom of the East, Arabia 10Vb12n, 11a14 &c.
Arian the heresiarch Arius 24Vb20n,23 (cf. 24Vb14ffn).
Armenye Armenia 23Vb22; Ermonye 3a4: - the more 27b9n. Armeni
pl. the Armenians 25b6, 26Vb1ln; Armenyes 26Vb28.
Arphaxat Arphaxad, a ruler of the Medes 30Va19n.
Asso Asso della Torre, a Milanese nobleman 24b2n,3 &c.
Assuerus¹ Ahasuerus, i.e. Xerxes I (r.485-65) 30b16n.
Assuerus² Ahasuerus, father of PN Darie (?c6thC BC) 30Va19n.
Augustines. See PN f(f)rere(s) pl.
the grete tour of Babel the tower of Babel (cf. toures n. pl.) 30b9.

Babiloyne Babylon (in Mesopotamia) 5vb10, 12b19n, 30b8n &c. (cf. 5vb32ffn).

Babiloyne Babylon (in Egypt) 11a10n.

Balaam 3vb13n, 34n &c.; (mistake) Barlaam 3b28, 32vb20n.

Baldach Baghdad 30b6n; Baldak 3a36; Balauch 30a25n.

Balt(h)azar Balthazar the second King 11b7, 8 &c.

Baltazar Belshazzr (d.539 BC) 30a18n.

Baltazar a son of the Tartar emperor 31a28.

séinte Barbre St. Barbara 26vb32n.

the orde of seynt Benet the Benedictines (cf. orde n.) 22a25.

Bethleem 1vb34, 7b18n &c. (cf. 8a9n, 8vb3ffn).

byheste. See PN londe of byheste.

Blansagarde a castle in the Holy Land, Blanche Garde 22b24n;

Blansengard the gentiles of ~ (cf. gentiles n. pl.) 22b28n.

Bona a fictitious mountain 11a25n.

Calabre Calabria 29vb7.

Calamut the Talmud 29va5n; Calmith 3a27n.

caldee. See PN Chalde(e).

the Caliphe the Caliph 3b1, 30a27; Calipha 30a33, 35.

Calmith. See PN Calamut.

(the hille, mount of) Caluarye Calvary 1va19, 2va10 &c.

Cambaleth Peking 30a23n, b5; Tambeleth 3a36.

the grete Cane the Great Khan 30va7n.

Cartage Cathay 30va8n.
Cedar Kedar, a desert tribe descended from Kedar son of Ishmael 13\textsuperscript{vb}11.

Cepti \textit{pl.} a heretical group, the Copts 25\textsuperscript{b}8 (cf. MINOR LACUNA 284/11n).

Cesar Augustus (= Octauian 6\textsuperscript{vb}34, 8b5) emperor of Rome (r.31 or 27 BC-AD 14) 9b3,9 (cf. 6\textsuperscript{vb}36n).

Chaldee Chaldea 5b29, 16\textsuperscript{vb}32n &c.; Chalde(e) (language) Chaldean 5a7, 6a36 &c.; caldee 5b2n, 25\textsuperscript{a}30. \textit{pl.} the Chaldeans 6a3,67 &c.; Chaldeis 6a34,6b14 (cf. 5\textsuperscript{vb}32ffn).

(Charles) Charlys Charlemagne king of the Franks (r.768-814) 2\textsuperscript{va}17; Charles 19\textsuperscript{vb}32n.

Chore (mistake?) an unidentified prophet 6b2n.

Cyrinus 'bishop' of Syria 7a6n.

Cyrus king of Persia (r.559-29) and (from 539) ruler of Babylon 6a20,33 (cf. 5\textsuperscript{vb}32ffn, 6a20n).

Coleyne Cologne 1a4, 2\textsuperscript{vb}27 &c.; Coloyne 3b16, 23a4 &c. (the Emperour) Constantyn Constantine the Great (r.306-37) 19b7n,15 &c.

Constantinople 2\textsuperscript{va}15,b24 &c.; (in a broader sense) 23b30n; Constantinople 2\textsuperscript{vb}16.

the cursed, cursyde see. See PN the dede see.

damaske Damascus 3\textsuperscript{vb}32.

Daniel 1\textsuperscript{vb}25, 6a20n &c. (cf. 5\textsuperscript{vb}32ffn, 6a20n, MAJOR LACUNA 78/34n); (different person?) 1\textsuperscript{va}16, 12b21.

Darie Darius the Mede 30\textsuperscript{va}18n.
David\(^1\) king of Israel (c1000-970) 5\(v\)a12, 8\(a\)18 &c. (cf. 7\(b\)23n, 8\(v\)a30n); ~ the prophet 11\(v\)a17n. (undifferentiated) gen. 24\(v\)b23.

David\(^2\) a son of the Tartar emperor 31a29.

David\(^3\) the eldest son of Prester John 3b7, 31b32.

the (dede see or 3a16, 28\(v\)b22) cursed, cursyde see the Dead Sea 28\(v\)b5.

effa Ephah (the descendents of Ephah son of Midian son of Abraham; their country) 13\(v\)b4.

Egypt(e) 2b11, 4b8 &c.

(the yle of) Egriswille 11b27n, 31\(v\)b18n &c.

seinte (h)Eleyne Empress Helen(a) (c255-c330) 12\(v\)b24n, 19b14 &c.

(cf. 19b22n); helene 2\(v\)b6,15 &c.

Emanuel. See PN Manuel.

Eraclie Emperor Heraclius (r.610-41) 27\(v\)a18n.

Ermonye. See PN Armenye.

Ethiope (country) Ethiopia 30b29. (people) an Ethiopean, any dark skinned African 16b33n, 25\(v\)b22n (cf. 25\(v\)b23ffn) &c.

Eustochie St. Julia Eustochium (370-c419) 2\(v\)a25; Eustachium 20\(v\)a36n.

Eustorgius St. Eustorgius (bishop of Milan 315-31) 24\(a\)2n,12. (kynge) Ezechias Hezekiah king of Judah (r.716/15-687/6) 5\(b\)31n, 5\(v\)b32n &c.

the firste ynde 10\(v\)b8 (cf. 10\(v\)a25n).

F[..]licissimi St. Pelicissimus 22a30n.

ffrerdericus Emperor Frederick I (1152-90) 24\(a\)24n.
f(fo)re(e)s pl. friars: ~ Menour(e)s Franciscans 16a6n,
30V30n &c.; (~) Prechour(e)s Dominicans (Friars
Preachers) 24a15n, 30V30n; (~) Augustines Augustinians
30V30n; white ~ Carmelites 30V31n.
fffulgencius Fulgentius bishop of Ruspe (?468-?533) 15b7n, 16a15.

Galile 7a9n, 13a21n &c.; the see of ~ 28V35.
seynt George 27a13.

Georgie Georgia: ~ the lowere 25a17, 27b5n; ~ the heyere
   (cf. heyere adj., comp.) 27a2. Georgiani pl. the Georgians
   25b7, 27a1n; georgiens 27a7; Georgienses: ~ the lowere 27vb2
   (cf. 27b2ffn).
Godolie 11b6n, 11V27 &c.
Gomore Gomorrah 28vb23n.

Greci pl. the Greek Orthodox Christians 25b7, 26b32n; Greekys
   25V29; grekes 27a5.
seynt Gregory Gregory the Great (c540-604) 12b5n.
grekes. See PN Greci pl.
the grete see the Mediterranean 32vb34; the see 2b4, 2V31n &c.
   See also PN Ocean(e).

hele(y)ne. See PN seinte (h)Eleyne
herodes Herod the Great (r.37-4) 1V26, 9b7n &c.
honissen the 'dark land' 27b22n.
hungaries pl. Hungarians 27a11.
Inde a region of the East, the distant East, "Inde" 2b12, 3b7n, 5b1n, 10vb16n, 22va7n, 26va26n &c. (cf. 102/31n); (error?) 26va26n,28; the heyest ~ (cf. heyeste adj. superl.) 2b20; men of ~ 25b11n, 32b23n. pl.: iiij ~ 10va25n (cf. PN firste, secounde, thridde ynde); (people) the inhabitants of Inde 25b15, 26a15n (cf. 25vb23ffn) &c.; Indi 25b6, 26a25n.

ysaac Isaac 14vb5.

Iaay Jesse 7b23n, 7va13 &c.

ysaie Isaiah 5b33n, 5va3 &c.; ysaias 13va30.

ysmini a heretical sect, ?Abyssinians 25b8 (cf. MINOR LACUNA 284/n11n).

Israel 3vb21, 4a9 &c.; pe children of ~ 10vb33, 15a34 &c.

Iacob Jacob the patriarch 3vb20, 9va1 &c.

Iacob Jacob or James (of Antioch, the first PN patriark Thomas) 3vb20; 17b18,21; James of Antioche 2b29.

Iacob Jacob Baradaeus 27vb18n.

Iacobite pl. a heretical sect, the Jacobites 25b7, 27vb13n.

Iames of Antioche. See PN Iacob.

Iaspar Jasper (Caspar) the third King 2vb12, 11b23 &c.

Iaspar a son of the Tartar emperor 31a29.

Ieremie Jeremiah 5vb36, 6a1n &c.

Ierico Jericho 28va21, 29a9.

seynt Ierome St. Jerome (347-420) 20va35n, 21b28 &c.

Ierusalem Jerusalem 1vb11, 1vb3n &c.; (error) 1vb3n.

Iewrye. See PN Iurye.

Ioachim Jehoiakim king of Judah (r.608-597) 6a1n.

Iob Job 4a19n.
seint Iohn Baptist St. John the Baptist 17vb21, 28b4 &c. seynt Iohannes gen. 26va34n.

seint Iohn2 Evangelist St. John the Evangelist 17vb17n, 19va7n.

Iohn3. See PN prestre Iohn.

(flum, the water, flood of) Iordan the River Jordan

(cf. flode n., flum n.) 3all, 28va22n,b2n,l2n,l7n &c.

Iosaphat(he) Josaphat (Joasaph) 3b28, 32vb20n.

Iosias Josiah king of Judah (r.640/39-608) 5vb35.

Iuda Judah 9va6.

Iudas Judas Iscariot 2a32.

Iulian Apostata Julian the Apostate (r.332-63) 23va35n.

(the londe of) Iurye Judea 7all, 9bl2 &c.; Juda 14b5,8a26 &c.; Iewrye 12b30.

seint katerine St. Catherine of Alexandria (d.early 4thC) 27a23.

latini pl. a Christian sect 25b6; latynes 25bl6n, 26vb25.

the mount, hille of liban ?Mt. Hermon 28va25n,32.

lombardie. See PN lumbardie.

the londe of byheste the Promised Land 8vb4.

seynt, kynge lowys Louis IX of France (r.1226-70) 23b32n,35.

lumbardie Lombardy 24va3ln, lumbardie 30va32n.

seynt Macharie St. Macarius bishop of Jerusalem (d.c334) 3a12,

27a27n &c.

Machomete the prophet Mohammed (c570-629) 3b2, 27va20 &c.
Madian Midian (the descendents of Midian son of Abraham; their country) 3vb14n, 13vb4.

Mandopoli pl. a heretical sect (?Mandaens) 25b9 (cf. MINOR LACUNA 156/8n).

Manesses Manasseh king of Judah (r.687/6-642/1) 5vb32,33-34n &c.
Maniche(e) the heresiarch Manicheus or Manes (c216-276)

24vb19,21. pl. (?adj. his adherents, the Manicheans 24vb15n.
Manuel Emperor Manuel (r.1143-80) 2vb22; Emanuel 23vb36n.

Magdalen Mary Magdalene 19va9.

Mar a heresiarch 27vb32n.

Maromini pl. a heretical sect 25b8 (cf. MINOR LACUNA 285/nl6n).

Maronici pl. the Maronite Christians 27vb30n.

Marrokk Morocco 29vb15n.

Mauritius, Mauricius Emperor Mauritius or Maurice (r.582-603)

23vb25n,26.

Mechior. See PN Melchior1.

Melane Milan 2vb24,25 &c.

Melchior1 the first King 2a23, 4vb2 &c.; Mechiom 24va22.

Melchiores gen. 5a12n.

Melchior2 a son of the Tartar emperor 31a27.

Melchiores. See PN Melchior1.

Menour(e)s. See PN f(f)rere(s).

Messye the Messiah 3a27n.

messopotanye Mesopotamia 4a27.

Micee Mecca 27a16n.

Michee the prophet Micah 6b3.

doyses gen. of Moses: ~ lawe 3vb26.

Montost 28b35n.
Nabaioth Nebaioth (the Nabateans, descendents of Nebaioth son of Ishmael) 13vb12,19; Nabaoth 1Va24.

Nabugodonosor Nebuchadrezzar king of Babylon (r.605-561) 6a2, 30Va18 (cf. 5Vb32ffn, 6a1n,20n, 16Vb31n, 82/11n).

Nazareth 7a10n, 21Va18n &c.

Nestorynes pl. a heretical sect, the Nestorians 3a29, 22Vb15n, 31bln &c.; Nestorini 25b6, 29Vb27.

Nestorius the heresiarch (d.c451) 25Vb27 (cf. 25Vb19ffn).

Nicholaite pl. a heretical sect, the Nicholaites or Nicholaitans 25b8 (cf. MINOR LACUNA 285/n19n). (the flood, water) Nylus the river Nile (cf. flode n.) 11a4n,9.

Noes gen.: ~ ship Noah's ark 27b11,19.

Nubyre a kingdom of the East, Nubia 5a13n, 10Vb9n, 12Vb30n &c.

Nubyanes pl. its inhabitants, ?Ethiopians 13a4,8 &c.; Nubiani 25b5,26n &c.

the (grete see) Occean(e) 10Vb31n, 29Vb2 (cf. 29Vb33ffn); the Occean see 3a30, 729Vb16n.

Octauian. See PN Cesar Augustus.

the mount of Oliuete the mount of Olives 13a20n.

Origenes Origen (c185-c254) 3a6 (cf. MINOR LACUNA 285/n28n).

paradys (terrestrial) Paradise 11a3n.

Paula St. Paula (347-404) 2Va25, 20Va36n.

Peers Persia 6a21,b8 &c.; pers 6a33; Persee 16Vb32n; Perse 29Va13,25 &c. Perses pl. the Persians 3a28 (cf. 5Vb32ffn).

pharao Pharaoh 10vb35.
Poule St. Paul 4a36.

Prechour(e)s. See PN f(f)eree(s) pl.

prestre Iohn Prester John 2b34, 3b11, 11a34n &c. (cf. 17vb2n);
?prestre Icon 31b2.

be rede see the Red Sea 10vb14n, 28n &c.

Reynald Rainald of Dassel (1115-67) 24a27 (cf. 24a20n); ?Reignold 2vb26.

the Romayn(e)s pl. the Romans 4b23, 30va20 &c.

Saba (the kingdom of) Sheba 11b11n, 13vb6n &c. (cf. 11va17n).

Quene Saba 16vb25n.

Sabaim Zeboi(i)m 28vb24n.

Salamons gen. of King Solomon (r.c970-31) 16vb26.

Samuel the prophet 7b28.

sarazin(e)s pl. Saracens, Muslims, infidels 3a24, 29b26n &c.;

Sarasynes 27a19.

the secounde ynde 11b5 (cf. 10va25n).

the see. See PN the grete see.

Sewille 3b24, 32vb6n &c. (cf. MAJOR LACUNA 108/5n)

seint Siluestre St. Sylvester (bishop of Rome 314-335) 19b9.

the hille, mount of Synay Mt. Sinai 10vb13, 27a22 &c.


Sixti St. Sixtus (d.258) 22a30n.

Sobab 4a32n (cf. 4a28ffn).
Soldini pl. a heretical sect (?Soldains) 25b5, 25va20n &c.;
Soldynes 25vb7.
Soldinus a heresiarch 25va27.
the chirche of seint Sophie St. Sophia’s (Hagia Sophia) 2vb17,
19vb29 &c.
the Sowdan, soudan the Sultan 1la32, 16a13 &c.; Sowdones gen.
28b30.
Suriani See PN Syrie.
Susis Susa 30b15n.

Tambeleth. See PN Cambaleth.
Tartares. See Tartaryn(e)s pl.
Tartarie the land of the Ta(r)tars 3b11, 23a14 &c.
Tartaryn(e)s pl. the Ta(r)tars or Mongols 3oa8n, 3la35n; Tartares
3a35; Tartres 30b18, 30va6.
the ordre of templers the Knights Templars 5a23n.
Thaars. See PN Tha(a)rs.
(Mount of, hille) Thabor Mt. Tabor 2va36, 22a4 &c.
Tha(a)rs Tarshish 1lb22n, 11va21 &c. (cf. 82/34n); Tharse 1vb30.
Thauris Tabriz 30b1n,14 &c.; Thauryse 3b3.
seint Thomas¹ (Apostle, the apostil) 1va4, 32a29 &c.
(cf. 102/5n).
(the patriark) Thomas² a title 2b31, 17b6 &c.
the thridde ynde (cf. thridde adj.) 1lb20 (cf. 10va25n).
Turkes pl. 29b28n; ?Persians 23vb19n.
Tuskane Tuscany 24va31n.
Vs Uz 4a30n.

the mount **Vaus** 4b15n, 32b11 &c. (**the princes, progenye &c.**) of **vaus** 2\textsuperscript{va}2, 4\textsuperscript{va}30 &c.

**zacharie the patriark** (identity uncertain) 19\textsuperscript{vb}36n.