

SOME EXTRA-LINGUISTIC EVIDENCE FOR THE  
IRISH PROVENANCE OF LONGLEAT HOUSE,  
MARQUESS OF BATH, MS 29 AND OXFORD,  
BODLEIAN LIBRARY, MS E MUS 232<sup>1</sup>

**Abstract:** An Irish connection for Longleat House, Marquess of Bath, MS 29 and Oxford, Bodleian Library MS e Mus 232 has long been supposed, primarily on linguistic grounds. However, in Ogilvie-Thomson's E.E.T.S edition of the Rollean prose and verse in MS Longleat 29 (1988)—the most extensive discussion of this material yet published—this assumed Irish provenance was challenged. This article presents some extra-linguistic evidence in support of the Irish provenance of both manuscripts, which has been suggested on linguistic grounds, and appends a transcription of a previously unpublished devotional item from MS Longleat 29. **Keywords:** Medieval Ireland; Richard Rolle; Longleat House Marquess of Bath, MS 29; Oxford, Bodleian Library MS e Mus 232; Devotional Literature; Irish Hagiography; Medieval Hiberno-English.

**Resumen:** En razón de criterios principalmente lingüísticos, se ha asumido desde hace tiempo una conexión entre Longleat House, Marquess of Bath, MS 29 y Oxford, Bodleian Library MS e Mus 232 con Irlanda. Sin embargo, este origen irlandés se cuestionó en la edición de Ogilvie-Thomson para la E.E.T.S. (1988) de la prosa y verso de Richard Rolle en Longleat 29—el análisis más extenso de este material publicado hasta la fecha. Este artículo presenta material extralingüístico que apoya un origen irlandés para ambos manuscritos, tal y como sugiere la evidencia lingüística, y añade en un apéndice la transcripción de un texto devocional inédito de MS Longleat 29. **Palabras clave:** Irlanda medieval; Richard Rolle; Longleat House Marquess of Bath, MS 29; Oxford, Bodleian Library MS e Mus 232; Literatura devocional; Hagiografía irlandesa; Anglo-irlandés medieval.



THE TWO MANUSCRIPTS DISCUSSED HERE ARE LINKED NOT only in their transmission of Rollean material in Medieval Hiberno-English (hereafter MHE) and in their shared preservation of two other devotional vernacular texts, but also, and

---

<sup>1</sup> Research for this article was made possible by the award of a travel bursary from the Society for the Study of Medieval Languages and Literature, here gratefully acknowledged. My thanks also to Dr Kate Harris, Longleat House and to the librarians in the Bodleian Library for facilitating access to the manuscripts considered. I would like to record my gratitude to Dr Stephen Kelly, Dr Ryan Perry and to the two anonymous readers at SELIM for their comments on draft versions of this article and to thank Charles Roe for his kindness in checking a number of references for material held in the Bodleian.

rather more pertinently, in that the main scribal hand of Longleat 29 is that of Bodleian e Mus 232.<sup>2</sup> There are, as will be shown below, good reasons for thinking that both these manuscripts are Anglo-Irish productions; and in light of the importance of Longleat 29 as a “major anthology” of Rollean material (Hanna 2010: xx), the Irish provenance of these manuscripts is worthy of more consideration in terms of Anglophone literary culture in late medieval Ireland than it has received hitherto.<sup>3</sup>

Longleat 29 is a miscellaneous compilation in 169 folios,<sup>4</sup> containing theological and devotional material in Latin and English, prose and verse.<sup>5</sup> Dating from the second quarter of the fifteenth century—a *terminus a quo* provided by the reference, in the final text of the manuscript, to St. Lawrence’s night, 1422; and a *terminus ad quem* of “not later than the middle of the century” indicated on palaeographic grounds (Ogilvie-Thomson 1988: xxi)—the manuscript measures c. 220 × c.165mm (155–167 × 100–115) and is written throughout (except for some filler items and additions)<sup>6</sup> in a

---

<sup>2</sup> These manuscripts have received some published attention elsewhere, focused almost exclusively on their Rollean contents. See Ogilvie-Thomson 1980; 1988. See also Allen 1927, *passim*; and, on some of the problems in Ogilvie-Thomson’s E.E.T.S. edition, Hanna 2010. Longleat 29, on account of its copy of the “Parson’s Tale,” is also discussed by Manly & Rickert 1940.

<sup>3</sup> The implications of the Anglo-Irish provenance of these (and several other manuscripts containing Middle English texts in circulation in late medieval Ireland) are discussed in Stevenson 2011.

<sup>4</sup> Fols iii+i63+iii, numbered 1–169.

<sup>5</sup> A full description of the manuscript and its contents can be found in Ogilvie-Thomson 1988: xvii–xxi and in Hanna 2010: 208–212.

<sup>6</sup> Of the subsidiary hands, hand 2, a “contemporary textura” is responsible for the macaronic lyric on f. 3r, the Pentecostal Hymn “Veni creator spiritus” on f. 16v and the Latin list of seven points to consider for the avoidance of sin on f. 57r. Hand 3, an “informal anglicana with secretary a,” dated by Hanna to s.xv<sup>2/2</sup> (2010: 208) has added the English lyrics (*IMEV* 3743 and *Suppl.* 2169) found on ff. 143v, 145r, 144r and 145v–146v.

single, slightly rounded, anglicana hand. The second booklet of the manuscript contains—in addition to a copy of the shorter version of Walter Hilton’s *Mixed Life*, an English version of William Flete’s *De Remediis contra Temptaciones*, a copy of Chaucer’s “Parson’s Tale” (opening simply under the heading “Prima pars penitencie”), and various other forms of confession and prayers—a substantial collection of Rollean material in English. The Rollean work consists of *The Form of Living*, *Ego Dormio*, *The Commandment*, *Desire and Delight*, *Ghostly Gladness*, an excerpt from *Meditation on the Passion A*, and various lyrics by Rolle, including *Love is Life*, *Jesus God’s Son*, *Thy joy be every deal*, and *All sins shall thou hate*.<sup>7</sup> As such, Longleat 29 witnesses a substantial and important collection of vernacular work by Rolle, which is, in its range, comparable to the extensive Rollean material found in Lincoln, Cathedral Library, MS 91 (the “Thornton manuscript”) and Cambridge, Cambridge University Library MS Dd. v 64.<sup>8</sup>

Oxford, Bodleian Library MS e Mus 232, extant in its (presumably original) fifteenth century binding of whittawed leather over wooden boards, is, at 66 folios<sup>9</sup> and c. 160 × 115mm (125 × 80mm) a somewhat smaller volume than Longleat 29, and its contents number only five items, all in the same anglicana hand of the main scribe of Longleat 29. The first of these items is Rolle’s *Meditation on the Passion B*, followed by a treatise on humility and

---

<sup>7</sup> Ogilvie-Thomson argues that the lyric following “All sins shall thou hate” in the Longleat MS, which begins “Ihesu swet nowe wil I syng” (*IMEV* 3238) should also be attributed to Rolle (1988: lxxxix–xci). For some reservations as to this argument, see Hanna (2010: xxiii).

<sup>8</sup> Longleat 29 contains, in full or in part, seven of the sixteen vernacular Rolle works that Hanna, following Allen, outlines as the canon of his vernacular material. (2010: xviii–xix) This compares to six for CUL MS Dd.v.64, and seven for Lincoln, Cathedral Library, MS 91.

<sup>9</sup> The collation of the manuscript is vii+66+iv.

meekness, ascribed to St. Gregory and St. Bernard,<sup>10</sup> an English translation, by “Nicholas Bellew,” of Edmund Rich’s (Edmund of Abington) *Speculum ecclesie*, and, concluding the volume, two meditations on the passion, in verse and prose respectively. The verse meditation on the passion (incipit: “[I]hesu þat hast me dere j boght;” *IMEV* 1761) is accompanied by marginal crosses, and introduced with a rubric “prescribing it as a devotional exercise” (Woolf 1968: 164) which instructs the reader that they should:

[I]n seiynge of þis orisone stynteth and bydeth at euery cros  
and þynketh what ye haue seide ffor a more deuout prayere  
fond I neuer of the passioun who would so devoutly say hitte.

A “short popularisation” of the original vernacular translation of John of Howden’s *Philomena* (Woolf 1968: 163) this meditative poem survives in a number of manuscripts.<sup>11</sup> A copy of the same text, complete with the same prescriptive rubric, is found in Longleat 29, and it is followed, in both manuscripts, by an English prose meditation and prayers, (incipit: “[O] myghtful ihesu grete was þe payne þat 3e suffred”) witnessed only in Longleat 29 and e Mus 232, and seemingly “inspired by the cult of the Five Wounds” (Ogilvie-Thomson 1988: xxviii). There is little by way of internal evidence for the date of e Mus 232, but given that the same scribe is responsible for both manuscripts, it is reasonable to assume that its date is roughly commensurate with that of Longleat 29, or possibly, as the respective dates given in Hanna’s catalogue suggest, slightly earlier.<sup>12</sup>

---

<sup>10</sup> Hanna suggests that this item might, in fact, be comprised of two separate texts, but, following Jolliffe G.19, treats them together in his list of the manuscript’s contents (Hanna 2010: 170).

<sup>11</sup> It is discussed further in Kelly & Thompson 2005 and Boffey 2005.

<sup>12</sup> Ogilvie-Thomson suggests a date of c. 1430–1450 for both manuscripts. (1988: xxi, xxxiii) Hanna dates Longleat MS to “s.xv<sup>2/4</sup> or med” and Bodleian, eMus 232 to “s.xv in” (2010: 170, 208).

In terms of the wider patterns of dissemination of manuscripts containing Rolle's works, the early to mid-fifteenth-century date of both Longleat 29 and e Mus 232 is entirely typical, and would seem to support Sargent's elegantly formulated observation that "the fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries were the great age of thirteenth- and fourteenth-century spirituality"<sup>13</sup> (Sargent, cited Barratt 2008: 361). Certainly, as Barratt notes, there are very few extant Rollean manuscripts from pre-1400 (2008: 361), and when the focus is further refined to manuscripts which contain copies of Rolle's vernacular works, the date of the two manuscripts in question fits neatly with the increased circulation of Rollean works in the first half of the fifteenth century.

A brief mention might be made here of the likely audience for these vernacular Rollean materials. Whilst Rolle's Latin works—the works which established his national and international reputation—were likely to have been intended for, and certainly reached, a literate and educated clerical audience (Doyle 1953: 190; Barratt 2008: 361–362), his vernacular writings were aimed rather at a predominantly female audience and "for other unlettered Christians" (Hartung, cited Barratt 2008: 362). And as Gillespie suggests (Gillespie 1989: 321):

The interests and abilities of the female religious for whom Rolle was writing in the fourteenth century are in some ways paradigmatic of those of the wider lay audience in the fifteenth. Moreover, there is ample evidence that clerical readers also came to value and exploit the resources of this vernacular tradition of spiritual guidance.<sup>14</sup>

There is, in addition to the readers identified by Gillespie, further evidence that "early Rolle manuscripts (both Latin and English)

---

<sup>13</sup> Longleat 29's copy of Hilton's *Mixed Life* might also be noted in this context.

<sup>14</sup> For this evidence, see Gillespie, 1989, and further references there cited. An "interesting example of transfer from lay to clerical ownership" is found in the 1391 will of Sir William de Thorpe of Northamptonshire, in which he bequeathed to his chaplain, Henry Hammond, "that book which Richard Heremit composed" (Barratt 2008: 363; Allen 1927: 413)

belonged to various monastic orders, in England and on the Continent” (Barratt 2008: 363). However, despite this, Manly and Rickert’s early suggestion that Longleat 29 was “almost certainly made in a monastery” (1940: 346) is perhaps open to challenge. The provenance of the Longleat MS is discussed further below, but both the date of Longleat 29 and its other contents are more likely to suggest ownership by the laity, and Ogilvie-Thomson’s argument that the manuscript probably belonged to a “devout lay family” is here accepted (1988: xxxi). The likely original readership of Bodleian e Mus 232 is perhaps similar, although the inscriptions of the names of female readers—“Annes hemperby,” “Annes helperby” (twice) and “Elyzabethe Stoughton”—led Ogilvie-Thomson to speculate on the possible later presence of the manuscript “in a community of women” (1988: xxxii).<sup>15</sup> However, again the date of the manuscript in question may perhaps make lay ownership more likely.

As for the origin of these manuscripts, the primary evidence for their provenance that has been discussed in previous scholarship is linguistic. Both Longleat 29 and e Mus 232 are listed by McIntosh and Samuels in the fourth category (“D”) of their seminal survey of MHE, placed under the heading, “Unlocalized texts for which the evidence of Irish provenance is wholly or mainly linguistic” (1968: 2).<sup>16</sup> That both manuscripts evidence texts which are in MHE was

---

<sup>15</sup> A similar suggestion—“possibly nuns”—is recorded in the relevant entry in the *LALME* index of sources (1986: i.272).

<sup>16</sup> The manuscripts in question are items 38 and 44 in their discussion. They comment, “Some of the longest texts are the unlocalized ones of D: eight of them include copies of works which originated in England and which, according to common later ME practice, were ‘translated’ by their copyist. Yet the list of features that can be compiled from the evidence of A, [“[L]ocalized documents”], B [“[T]exts for which there is some evidence of localization”] and C [“Unlocalized texts dealing with Irish matters or having other Irish associations, the language of which confirms that provenance”] is so distinctive that the provenance of these longer texts is left in no doubt” (McIntosh & Samuels 1968: 4). The linguistic features they identify as characteristic of MHE are here reproduced in Appendix B.

accepted in *LALME*, where, in the case of Bodleian e Mus 232, the dialect was further localised to Dublin, on the basis of a detailed linguistic analysis of the entire manuscript (*LALME*, I: 272, 274). The dialectal analysis of the texts of both manuscripts offered by McIntosh and Samuels and in *LALME* is here accepted, as it is by Hanna, in his descriptive catalogue of the English manuscripts of Richard Rolle, where both books in question were noted by him as “central exhibits in the formulation of Middle Hiberno English” (Hanna 2010: 171) and by Thompson, “[b]oth [manuscripts] were largely copied by the same main scribe writing in a Hiberno-English dialect that (similarly to that of the much earlier copyist of BL, MS Harley 913) preserves underlying South-East Midland forms” (2011: 272).<sup>17</sup>

By contrast, however, the extent to which the dialect of the vernacular texts in Longleat 29 and e Mus 232 should be seen as representing MHE was questioned by Ogilvie-Thomson, who summarised her linguistic analysis of the dialect as follows (Ogilvie-Thomson 1988: xxxiv–xxxv):

On linguistic evidence Professors McIntosh and Samuels classify the dialect of Lt [Longleat 29] and Mu [e Mus 232] as Anglo-Irish. They list thirty distinguishing features of this dialect, any of which can and does appear in other dialects, but which cumulatively argue Anglo-Irish provenance. In Lt five of these features never occur; ten, predominantly of a phonological nature, occur regularly; in the rest, predominantly morphological, the scribe shows such marked inconsistency

---

<sup>17</sup> BL, Harley 913 is listed in the second category of McIntosh and Samuels’s survey, “B: Texts for which there is some evidence of localization” (1968: 2). The Irish provenance of this manuscript has been accepted since the appearance of Heuser’s edition in 1904. The cumulative import of the MHE features identified by McIntosh and Samuels in the vernacular items in Longleat 29 and in e Mus 232 seems, to me, convincing.

that it appears he was prepared to adopt whatever forms he found in his copy. [...]<sup>18</sup>

The sum of these features points to the standard fifteenth-century literary language<sup>19</sup> based on the East Midland dialect(s), with a sprinkling of South-Eastern forms, The scribe's flexibility in all but a few of the Anglo-Irish criteria

---

<sup>18</sup> Ogilvie-Thomson identifies the following as the most significant characteristics of the language of Lt's main scribe:

The reflex of OE *ā* normally appears as *o*, but *a* is found occasionally in texts of Northern origin, as Rolle: *baly*, and, particularly in rhyme, *lare*, *mare*, *sare*.

OE *ā* before a simple nasal is regularly *a*; before a lengthening group both *a* and *o* are found.

OE *y* normally appears as *y* or *i*, but *u* is found occasionally in *bury*, *thurst-*, *lust v.*, *þurleden*, *cusset*, *cluster*, and *e* in *iberiet*, *mery*, *euel*, *besy*.

The preferred vowel in unstressed inflexional syllables is *e*; *i/y* is frequent in the gen. sg., especially *Goddis*, *Cristis*, but very rare in the p.p.

The normal pr.2 sg.ind, ending is *-est*, but there are eleven occurrences of *-s* in the Rolle texts. Normal pr. 3 sg.ind, is *-eth*, occasionally reduced to *-et*, with two occurrences of *-s* in Rolle texts.

Pr.pl.ind. shows both *-eth*, *-en*, and no ending, the preference varying from text to text although *-eth* predominates in the Rolle texts. Similar variation is seen in the use of *-n* in the strong p.p., it is preferred in the Rolle texts. Infinitives in *-n* are relatively infrequent.

Pr.p. is regularly *-ynge*, even when rhyming on *-and*.

The 3<sup>rd</sup> pl.nom.pron. is regularly *þay* (variously spelt); acc./dat. *ham*, less frequently *hem*, with only one occurrence of *thaym*; gen. *bar(e)*, less frequently *ber(e)*, and three occurrences of *þar*.

Initial *sb-* is always spelt as such. Medially it varies between *sb* and *ssh*, very rarely *sch*. Occasionally *s(s)b* is found for *ss*, as in *myssbe*, "miss" n. and v. rhyming on *isse*.

The initial consonant in "give" and related forms is predominantly *y*, but *g* occurs sporadically throughout.

Earlier *ht* is spelt both *ght* and *zt*, and initial [j] both *y* and *z*; in both cases Mu prefers the *z* forms.

[...] It is clear [the scribe] was prepared to interchange medial *i* and *y*, unstressed *e* and *y*, final *d* and *t*, and initial and final *þ* and *th*, and that final *-e* had no inflexional significance.

<sup>19</sup> The extent to which there was a "standard fifteenth-century literary language" might, perhaps, be challenged.



suggests that he had left his native country some time before, retaining only traces of his original linguistic habits.<sup>20</sup>

However, the grounds on which Ogilvie-Thomson reached her conclusions as to the scribal dialect of Longleat 29 and e Mus 232 are perhaps open to question.

The manner in which Ogilvie-Thomson applies the criteria identified by McIntosh and Samuels—criteria whose validity she does not question (1980: 85)—to her analysis of the scribe’s dialect seems unnecessarily rigid. The typical features of MHE

---

<sup>20</sup> The analysis offered by Ogilvie-Thomson in her edition of the Rollean works in Longleat 29 and e Mus 232 (the base manuscripts for her E.E.T.S. edition) stems from the edition of the English works in Longleat 29 that constituted her doctoral thesis, and a fuller discussion of the dialect of the main scribe of Longleat 29 is to be found there (1980: 84–87). The accuracy of the data collected by Ogilvie-Thomson is, it should be stressed, not being disputed, but there are perhaps, problems with her application of this data. In her thesis, Ogilvie-Thomson initially focuses her analysis of the applicability of the criteria noted by McIntosh and Samuels for the identification of MHE to the dialect of Longleat 29 by examining the second text found in the manuscript (an anonymous prose treatise) where she thought it likely that the scribe was translating as he wrote. In her analysis of this text, she argued that fewer than half the common features of MHE were present. However, at c. 350 lines in length, the text selected for the detailed examination, whilst not negligible, is not particularly extensive, as the lack of examples for a quarter or more of the main criteria identified by McIntosh and Samuels suggests. The assumption that the anonymous prose treatise (unknown elsewhere) was being directly translated, rather than simply copied, by the scribe, and thus is an especially accurate reflection of his own dialect is also problematic. So to, perhaps, is the location of the item chosen for this detailed analysis, close to the beginning of the first booklet, as the dialectal anomalies outlined by Ogilvie-Thomson might simply attest to a period of scribal “working-in”—a reasonably common phenomenon in copying practice (Benskin & Laing 1981). Perhaps most disconcerting for her argument is the fact that, on the basis of her own analysis, and by her own admission, the dialect of Ogilvie-Thomson’s “Text II” is not particularly representative of that of the rest of the manuscript, in which a much greater ratio of MHE features are found: “linguistically, the ratio of Anglo-Irish features is somewhat improved in the rest of the manuscript, some of them appearing some of the time in all of the texts” (1980: 86).

identified by McIntosh and Samuels were drawn from texts that ranged quite widely in date, and represented the dialect of various parts of Anglophone late medieval Ireland. Not every single item they cite will be witnessed in any given MHE text, as can be readily demonstrated by analysis of the texts for which an Irish provenance is not in doubt. Rather, it is the cumulative import of these features that enables a dialectal identification to be made. In this light, it should be noted that in relation to the dialect of the vernacular texts in Longleat 29 as a whole, according to Ogilvie-Thomson's own analysis (1980: 84–87), of the twenty criteria identified by McIntosh and Samuels as “the more important” in identifying MHE (1968: 4–5; reproduced in Appendix B): nine of the twenty are always present: (3), (4), (5), (6), (7), (9), (10), (16) and (17);<sup>21</sup> a further two are the predominant forms: (1), (2); four are frequently, but not consistently found: (8), (14), (15), and (20); two occur sometimes: (11), (12); two rarely: (13), (19); and only one: (18) never occurs. Of the eleven further features they identify as “frequent but not universal.”<sup>22</sup> one: (7) is always present; two: (1) and (8) occur sometimes; a further three: (4a), (5) and (6) are found rarely; and five: (2), (3), (4b), (9), (10) never occur. Nineteen of the twenty more important dialectal features, therefore, *are* found in the vernacular contents of Longleat 29. Obviously, the dialectal features of a text need bear no necessary relation to the provenance of the manuscript where it is found: linguistic profiles cannot, and should not, be conflated with manuscript provenance, but McIntosh and Samuels's identification of the scribal dialect as MHE seems, to the writer, more convincing than Ogilvie-Thomson's hypothesis of a “native” dialect diluted by considerable time in England.

---

<sup>21</sup> With regard to (17): “Final *-e* has no morphological significance,” I would accept Ogilvie-Thomson's observation that this is not particularly significant in light of the late date of the manuscript.

<sup>22</sup> I here treat the features they number as (4a) and (4b) separately.

Allen, considering the Rollean works in Longleat 29 in her 1927 study, offered no speculation as to the manuscript's provenance, focusing rather on textual issues in the works by Rolle it transmitted. Longleat 29 was studied further by Manly and Rickert in the descriptions of the manuscripts that formed the first of their eight-volume study of the text of the *Canterbury Tales* (although it is by no means clear if Longleat's copy of the "Parson's Tale" was recognised as such by either the scribe or the early readers of the manuscript). As their interest was in the Chaucerian text, Manly and Rickert, in accordance with the procedure explicated in their preface, mentioned only what they felt were the more notable items in the manuscript, but they offered the first suggestion as to the manuscript's origin (Manly & Rickert 1940: 346):

The compilation almost certainly was made in a monastery—perhaps Christchurch, Canterbury [...]—by a number of monks, one beginning the principal book, others adding the smaller books that precede and follow, and still others filling in blank spaces with short pieces, quotations and so on.

In positing Longleat 29 as a monastic production, Manly and Rickert were influenced by their belief that the main texts of manuscript were the work of multiple hands—an assessment that has not been borne out by subsequent examinations of the manuscript by, amongst others, expert palaeographers such as Neil Ker (Ogilvie-Thomson 1988: xv, xxx). In total, only three hands are to be identified in the manuscript. The slightly rounded anglicana of the main scribe is responsible for the overwhelming majority of the manuscript's contents, with two subsidiary scribes responsible only for two lyrics on fol 143<sup>v</sup>–146<sup>v</sup> (Hand 3) and three Latin filler items on fols 3<sup>v</sup>, 16<sup>v</sup>, and 57<sup>r</sup> (Hand 2). The appearance of the main scribal hand does undergo slight changes in the course of his copying, becoming rather more "relaxed" towards the end of the manuscript, but it is still recognisable both as the same hand of the earlier sections of Longleat 29, and as that of Bodleian e Mus 232.

Given their assumption that the manuscript was likely to be a monastic production, and following the lead provided by the addition of the name “Goldwell” on f. 168<sup>r</sup> in a fifteenth-century hand, Manly and Rickert postulated that Longleat 29 might have been produced at Christchurch Cathedral, Canterbury (Manly & Rickert 1940: 347):

On f. 168 is the name “Joh[s] Goldew[e?]ll (15 C), written as an owner might write; and cf. “...d.wel” on f.4. The family name [Goldwell] is closely linked with Canterbury—Goldwells held lands in the 15 C at Fawkham and Bethersden—and with Christchurch particularly: J. Goldwell was third prior in 1435 [...]; a John Goldwell was monk and sacristan [...]; and others were there in the early 16 C. The succession of names, together with the obvious continuation of the of the MS from time to time by different writers, suggests that it may all have been the work of different members of the same family.

Which John wrote his name in the MS it is impossible to say; he may have been not any of the Canterbury monks but a layman of the same family. James Goldwell, who died in 1498 as Bishop of Norwich, is identified by wills and property transactions as a member of the Kentish family [...] and was nephew, brother, uncle, and great uncle of men named John Goldwell.

In this assessment, Manly and Rickert are, perhaps, at risk of conflating the origin of the manuscript with a suggestion as to its early provenance, a conflation made all the more tempting in terms of the larger project in which they were engaged. As Ogilvie-Thomson observes (1988: xxx–xxxii):

[Manly and Rickert’s] collation showed the [Longleat 29] text of the *Parson’s Tale* to be from an immediate common ancestor with the Ellesmere MS, but without the latter’s editing, and so of high textual value, and it was for this reason they were anxious to place the manuscript in the environs of Canterbury, and correctly identified members of the Goldwell family who held office in the priory there. However the manuscript shows none of the palaeographic characteristics of a Canterbury text,

and although the link with the Goldwells remains valid, this is an indication of ownership rather than origin.

Ogilvie-Thomson, although rejecting an Irish provenance on the dialectal grounds discussed above, offered no alternative suggestion as to the place of the manuscript's origin. Her research into the later ownership of Longleat 29 showed that the manuscript was in the possession of Sir John Thynne, "first knight of the name, and builder of Longleat house" by 1577 at the latest. Not only does Thynne's name occur, in his own hand, on ff. 2<sup>r</sup> and 166<sup>r</sup>, but she was able to identify Longleat 29 with an entry in the 1577 manuscript list of the contents of his library; and to suggest a possible (if necessarily speculative) scenario for the transmission of the manuscript from John Goldwell, a mercer and citizen of London (d. 1466) into the possession of John Thynne (1988: xx).

As Hanna notes, the dialect of the third scribal hand, placed by *LALME* in northeast Somerset, and dated by him to the latter half of the fifteenth century, would support the supposition that the manuscript was in the Longleat area in this period (*LALME* I: 137, 237; Hanna 2010: 211–212). However, even if the dialect of the third scribal hand is accepted as indicative of the whereabouts of the manuscript in the later fifteenth-century, the manuscript's relatively early presence in south west England need not preclude the Irish origin suggested dialectally by the work of the main scribe: an Irish origin accepted by Hanna (2010: xxix).

There is, however, extra-linguistic evidence to support the Irish provenance suggested dialectally. The textual affiliations of a number of the items in Longleat 29 are potentially of interest in this respect, but constraints of space prevent their discussion here. Instead, the suggestive contents of a single item from the compilation will be examined, and its implications for the likely provenance of the volume considered. The item in question, an anonymous exposition on the Lord's Prayer, incorporating a litany that names a number of Irish saints, and a concluding prayer in

English,<sup>23</sup> has never (to the writer's knowledge) been published; a semi-diplomatic transcription, from this, the only manuscript in which it appears, can be found in Appendix A.<sup>24</sup> The item is, of course, of intrinsic interest, but in the context of the present study, the evidence suggesting localisation to an Irish audience is of primary importance.

As can be seen from the transcription, the item is structured around the Latin text of the Lord's Prayer, and proceeds through it, phrase by phrase, offering a translation of the Latin and devout, first person expositions of each. Following on from this (and judging from the layout of the manuscript, intended to be incorporated into it) is a final prayer, invoking the sign of the cross, and addressed, in accordance with the structure of the Sarum Use, to the three persons of the Trinity, the Virgin, and to the holy prophets, patriarchs, apostles, evangelists, martyrs, confessors, and virgins. The text of the latter section is punctuated in the manuscript by the regular insertion of crosses, presumably serving as a prompt for a reader to perform the sign of the cross.<sup>25</sup>

Three aspects of this text might be seen to support the idea that the manuscript was produced for an Irish audience. Firstly,

---

<sup>23</sup> My interpretation of the materials that constitute this text is at odds with that offered by Hanna, who describes it "an English tract on the Pater noster (ends. fol. 21) [...] with two English prayers naming several Irish saints (fols. 21<sup>v</sup>-22)" (2010: 209) However, the list of Irish saints is, as I read it, incorporated into the body of the tract, which I suggest to end on fol. 21<sup>v</sup>; and to be followed by a single prayer invoking the sign of the cross. The item is immediately followed by a Latin version of the same (fols. 22<sup>r</sup>-24<sup>v</sup>) which is "similar, but not identical" (Ogilvie-Thomson 1989: xxiii) and which Hanna characterises as "the Latin source" (2010: 209).

<sup>24</sup> The item was edited by Ogilvie-Thomson for her doctoral thesis (1980: 208-229). The transcription and discussion offered here are independent of Ogilvie-Thomson's work.

<sup>25</sup> Cf. the copy of *IMEV* 1761, mentioned above, and found in both Longleat 29 and e Mus 232, which have crosses, identical to those of the current item, inserted in the margins alongside the text.

and perhaps least significantly, there is, in the exposition of the second petition of the Lord's Prayer, a shift from the heavenly to the temporal realm, in which Ireland is explicitly mentioned:

[fol 19<sup>v</sup>] ¶ To these prayers  
the state & prosperitee of al holy chirche our holy  
fadre the pope hys Cardynals. his Consaill. our  
bisshop our curates withal degrees in holy church  
[fol 20<sup>r</sup>]  
our kynge the quene the Gouvernour of this land with al  
har trewe consaill. The estate & prosperite of the roialmes  
of England Irland & Fraunce Al tho that pee3 maynteneth  
& trewe peple defendeth. my Fadre my modre sowles  
my bretheren my sustres my kyn alliaunces al my good  
frendes and in especial I. b. I. I. A. K ¶

The grouping of “England, Ireland and France”<sup>26</sup> here might well be formulaic, although the phrase does not seem particularly well attested in other texts of the period, but it is interesting that it follows the reference to “our king, the queen, the governor of *this* land,” which is strongly suggestive of an Irish context. The role of Chief Governor was, at this date, an administrative post unique to Ireland, modelled on the role of Justiciar established in twelfth-century England, although no longer operative there by the reign of Edward I. In Ireland however, the need to have a permanent head of the administration, governing on behalf of an absent king remained; and whilst the title came to be more commonly known as “Lieutenant,” or “Chief Lieutenant” rather than “Justiciar” by the late fourteenth / early fifteenth century, the role was essentially the same.<sup>27</sup> Given the very personal nature of the section of the prayer that follows, it seems that the references to “Ireland” and to the “Gouvernour” might have more than a formulaic resonance

---

<sup>26</sup> The same petition occurs in the Latin version of the text immediately following in the manuscript.

<sup>27</sup> For details of the role, and its development from the model of English administration, see Otway-Ruthven 1965.

with the author of this item and, one assumes, to the scribe who copied it (if the two are not one and the same). If the scribe was simply copying the piece from an exemplar, it seems unlikely that details such as the initials of individuals would be thoughtlessly transcribed, when they could so readily be substituted with details more relevant to the owner or users of the volume.

More suggestive still of an Irish provenance are the details of the exposition of the third, fourth and fifth phrases of the Pater noster, which incorporates a litany of saints.<sup>28</sup> The majority of the saints occurring in this litany are widely known (most, in fact, appear in the Sarum Use), but following the fifth Latin phrase, there occurs a cluster of saints with very specific local associations.

[f. 20<sup>v</sup>]

**Et dimitte nobis debita nostra sicut & nos dimittimus  
debitoribus nostris** ¶ O lord god of pitte mercy & of grace  
foryeve vs our dettes our synnes & our trespasses:  
as we foryeven to oure dettors. lord of amendes þ<sup>u</sup> graunt  
vs space. Of charite þ<sup>u</sup> let vs nat mysshe of thy blisse þ<sup>u</sup>  
graunt vs solace throgħ þe swet callynge & bisy besechyng  
of thi clere & holy confessours. Syluestre leo. hiller Nicholas  
Martyn. Ambrose. Ierom Gregorie & Austeyn dunston  
swythyn Cuthbert & Birryn German dompnic Fran  
ceys & leonard Benet Esmond & Bernard Patrike Fyn  
nyan Columbe Canik & Brandane Molyng Synok  
Keuyn & Lasriane Machot Abbane Euyn & Colman And  
al other Confessours of Cristes Courte in perfite Charite  
stalle vs of holy conscience sharpe compunccioun verray  
contricioun hool confessioun ful satisfaccioun & of al oure  
synnes ful pardoun þrogħ al yo<sup>r</sup> holy intercessioun let vs nat  
mysshe: bot vs al bryng to þy heuynly habitacioun. Amen

---

<sup>28</sup> The details of the saints included vary between the English and Latin versions, and even when the same saint is mentioned in both, the placing in the text can differ. SS. “Cithe” and David occur only in the Latin text; SS. Bernard, Canice, Esmund [sic] (twice), Helen, “Machot” and Otilli, only in the English.



Of the thirteen final saints named in the litany, the identity of “Machot” is uncertain, but the rest of the saints in this cluster have distinctly Irish connections, predominantly, but not exclusively, to Leinster. Patrick and Columba are, of course, as two of the three patron saints of Ireland, neither obscure, nor peculiar to Leinster, but a notable proportion of the other saints mentioned, if the identifications suggested below are correct, do have a very local resonance with the province in which it is here argued that Longleat 29 was written.

St Finnian was the founder of the famous Abbey at Clonard, historically in the province of Meath, but by the post-Norman period incorporated into Leinster,<sup>29</sup> and as Farmer notes, his Leinster connections are emphasised in his tenth-century life (1987: 161). Reputed to be the tutor of “The Twelve Apostles of Ireland” Finnian is counted one of the principal saints of Ireland, and is, in tradition, ascribed (along with St Patrick) the role of judge of the Irish on Doomsday (Ó Riain 2011: 319).<sup>30</sup> Legend has it that as a youth St Senach first came to Clonard as part of a raiding party but thanks to Finnian’s “shrewd and prompt action in tonsuring [him]” he later succeeded Finnian as abbot (Hughes 1954: 23).

SS. Abban (Abán), Kevin (Coemgen, Caoimhghin) and Moling are, according to the biographer of the former, the three sons of Leinster “of eternal life” whose birth was prophesied by Patrick. Abban’s primary associations are with Adamstown, Co. Wexford and with Killabban, Co. Laois; the sites of his two main foundations (Ó Riain 2011: 51–52). Kevin, descended in tradition from a noble Leinster family, was the founder and abbot of Glendalough, Co. Wickow, whose tomb became one of the chief places of pilgrimage

---

<sup>29</sup> See Hughes 1954.

<sup>30</sup> It is possible that the reference here is to Finnian of Movilla, rather than to Finnian of Clonard, although given the Leinster connections of many of the saints in this cluster, reference to the latter seems more probable. The associations of Finnian of Movilla are primarily with Ulster (Ó Riain 2011: 323).

in Ireland, deemed “important enough to be regarded as one of four Irish equals of Rome” (Ó Riain 2011: 148–150; Farmer 1987: 123). St Moling spent time as a monk in Kevin’s foundation of Glendalough before establishing his own monastery, St Mullin’s, in Carlow. Fittingly, as one of Leinster’s chief saints, he was popularly believed to have been buried with Patrick, Columba and Brigid in Downpatrick. Clyn’s *Annals* record how, when the Black Death first appeared in Ireland in the autumn of 1348, thousands gathered at his foundation “to wade in the water” in an effort to gain protection from the plague (Williams 2007: 246–247; Stokes 1906).

A protégé of St Abban, St Evin (Éimhín) is, despite his purported Munster heritage, also particularly venerated in Leinster; his primary association being with Monasterevin, Co. Kildare. According to the Life of Abban, he was buried in New Ross, Co. Wexford (Ó Riain 2011: 291–292).

SS Canice, Laserian and Brendan are three of the “Twelve Apostles of Ireland” reputed to have studied under Finnian at Clonard. Born in Derry, St Canice (in Scotland, “St Kenneth”) was an Irish abbot, whose principal foundation was the monastery of Aghaboe, Co. Laois “became the most important church of Ossory” (Farmer 1987: 72). Laserian (Laisren, Molaise) is, like Canice, venerated in both Ireland and Scotland. Abbot of Leighlin, Co. Carlow, his church gained diocesan status at the synod of Rathbreasial “which led to the founding there of a house of canons regular of St Augustine and, ultimately, to the composition of the Life of St Molaise preserved in fragmentary form in the Salamancan codex” (Ó Riain 2011: 486). His present-day cult is centred on his foundation of Inishmurray, Co. Sligo (Farmer 1987: 256).

The reference to St Brendan is perhaps likely to be to Brendan (Brandon) the Navigator (i.e. Brendan of Clonfert), although it could also be to Brendan of Birr. Due in no small part to the influence of the *Navigatio Brendani*, Brendan’s cult was strong throughout Ireland and, indeed, beyond, being particularly venerated in regions of Scotland, Wales and Brittany.

Finally, it is by no means certain as to which of the hundreds of homonymous saints mentioned in the Irish martyrologies the Longleat St Colman refers, but given the predominance of saints with Leinster associations in this section of the text, the reference is possibly to St Colman of Clonard; like Senach, a successor of Finnian as abbot (Ó Riain 2011: 184; Hughes 1954: 21, n. 43).

Just as the initials and details of the previous quotation were identified as features of the text that were easily adaptable to a new copying context, so too could the local saints listed in this item (if it is not a scribal composition) have been readily changed to better suit the locality in which (or for which) the text was copied. The wording of the text would not be marred in any way by the substitution of one saint for another in the process of local adaptation suggested, and its devotional efficacy might even be thought enhanced by “personalization” of this kind. As such, the inclusion or retention of the local saints listed in the text supports the Irish origin for the manuscript indicated on linguistic grounds.<sup>31</sup>

There was, in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, as André Vauchez has demonstrated in his magisterial study of sainthood in the later Middle Ages,<sup>32</sup> a marked shift towards the veneration of local saints in lay devotion, irrespective of whether or not the subjects of their petitions had been officially canonised by the

---

<sup>31</sup> The saints listed in the corresponding section of the Latin version of this text are “Siluestri, Leonis, Hillarii, Martini, Patricii, Nicholasi, Ambrosii, Ieronimi, Gregorii, Augustini, Leonardi, Germani, Swythini, Cuthberti, Daud, Columbe, Dominici, Fyniani, Francisci, Molingi, Brandani, Cinoci, Dunstani, Keuni, Euini, Colmani, Abbani, Lasriani” [f. 23<sup>v</sup>]. Of interest also is the inclusion of St “Cithe” in the Latin version (other than Brigit, the only female Irish saint mentioned. Patent Roll 36 Henry VI, dated Dublin, 3<sup>rd</sup> February 1458, records a warrant to a “John Chevir” “giving him licence to found a chantry of one or two chaplains in honour of St Cithe the Virgin at the altar of St Cithe in the church of St Michan in the town of Oxmantown in the suburbs of Dublin.” (<http://chancery.tcd.ie/document/patent/36-henry-vi/4>).

<sup>32</sup> The period which “marked the apogee of the diffusion and popularity of the cult of saints in the west” (Vauchez 1997: 1).

Church.<sup>33</sup> It is perhaps worth noting that over half of the Irish saints named in this item from Longleat are also to be found in the Latin Kalender of the composite C13–C14 manuscript belonging to the brethren of St. John of Jerusalem, Waterford; and further examples of these saints appearing in devotional material from Ireland could doubtless be cited.<sup>34</sup> Admittedly, it is possible, as Ogilvie-Thomson’s argument would imply, that the inclusion of these Irish saints reflects merely the patriotic devotional preferences of an Anglo-Irish scribe working in England. However, given the performative aspect of the text,<sup>35</sup> it seems more plausible to assume that the wording is applicable also to the wider audience for whose use the manuscript was intended: perhaps the “devout lay family” suggested by Ogilvie-Thomson (1988: xxxi).

One further detail from the text, found in the exposition of “Et ne nos inducas in temptationem” might be mentioned in support of a Irish provenance for the manuscript:

[f. 21<sup>r</sup>] O holy fader Patrike oure  
patroun with Columb & bride whose bones resten in doune  
And al seyntes suyng your trace pray þe the pierles prince  
of paradise that of al wiked wormes this lond wedet:  
that he endeigne for his dignite & his mercy which his  
werkes passeth. þe destruers of his trewe peple may  
approwe in þi pees perfitly to þi plesaunce amen

The phrasing of “oure patroun” and “this lond” in relation to St. Patrick, again hints at an assumption of an Irish audience. Whether

---

<sup>33</sup> Vauchez 1997. See especially chapter 10, “Local Sainthood,” 157–249.

<sup>34</sup> For details of this manuscript, see James 1912: ii.277. The relevant saints are: *Patricii*, *Brendini*, *Columbe*, *Moling*, *Colmani*, *Finneani*, *Senani*, and possibly, if it equates to Longleat’s “Machot,” *Machin*.

<sup>35</sup> The insertion of crosses in this section of the text is reminiscent of the instructional rubric appended to the copy of *IMEV* 1761 in both the Longleat and the e Mus manuscripts which urges the reader to “stynteth and bydeth at euery cros and þynketh what ye haue seide.” See Kelly & Thompson 2005: 2–5.

or not the details of the translations of SS. Columba and Bridget to Downpatrick need imply a particularly local knowledge, the specific naming of the country's three patron saints are certainly indicative of an identification with Ireland.<sup>36</sup>

Given then, both the MHE dialect of the vernacular texts of Longleat 29, and the details of localisation or adaptation to an Irish audience outlined in the item discussed above, the obvious conclusion to draw would be that the manuscript is an Anglo-Irish production. The scenario postulated by Ogilvie-Thomson (explicitly in relation to the dialect; implicitly in relation to the exposition on the Lord's Prayer)—that the manuscript is the work of a scribe trained in Anglo-Ireland, but resident in England for a considerable period of time, yet maintaining a patriotic affection for the country of his birth, as manifested in his petitioning of local Irish saints—seems perhaps unnecessarily complex, especially as there is no evidence whatsoever to preclude the original composition and circulation of Longleat 29 in Ireland.

In e Mus 232, the other manuscript known to have been copied by the main scribe of Longleat 29, there is no evidence of the sort of localisation discussed above. As noted previously, little is known about the origin or early provenance of this manuscript, and its attribution to Ireland has been on dialectal grounds only. If, however, the argument made here for the Irish origin of Longleat 29 is accepted, then it seems almost certain that e Mus 232 is also an example of the literary culture of Anglophone late medieval Ireland, and there are two further, although tantalizingly nebulous hints that might possibly offer further support for this attribution.

On f. 62<sup>r</sup>, at the conclusion of the copy of St. Edmund's *Mirror*, the English translation of which is, in this manuscript, attributed to "Nicholas Bellow whose noun konnygne haue ye excused," is the

---

<sup>36</sup> Cf. the marginal additions on f. 72<sup>v</sup> of Oxford, Bodleian MS Rawlinson B 490, among which are "In vno brigida patricius atque columba ?primus" (cited *LALME*, i: 279).

signature “Jon Flemmyn,” in red ink and in a contemporary hand. The same name, “Johannes Fleming” occurs twice in the opening folios of the copy of the *Prick of Conscience* found in Dublin, TCD MS 156: “Johannes Fleming hunc librum composuit” (f. 1<sup>v</sup>, repeated f. 4<sup>v</sup>). In the Dublin manuscript, the name is written in a seventeenth-century hand, and Lewis and McIntosh, in their descriptive catalogue of the *Prick of Conscience* manuscripts, take this to refer to the copyist who, in the same later hand, transcribed the incipit and first 22 1/2 lines of the medieval text from f. 2<sup>r</sup>, which is obliterated almost entirely by gall stain (1982: 51–52). However, it is not entirely clear, as Ogilvie-Thomson points out, that “Johannes Fleming” is to be identified as the person responsible for the C17 copying—“a page and a half of text scarcely seems to justify the description ‘hunc librum’” (1988: xxxii, n. 5), and it is possible that the attribution in the seventeenth-century hand might record an earlier, now illegible, name from the manuscript.

Although accepted as such by both Allen (1927: 382) and Hanna (2010: 170), the hand of the signature in e Mus 232 was not judged by Neil Ker to be that of the scribe. Nor was the hand of the e Mus 232 signature deemed by R. E. Alton (on the grounds of differences in minim formation) to be that of the scribe of TCD 156 (Ogilvie-Thomson 1988: xxxii). However, the name is the only text in the entire manuscript to be written in red, and Ogilvie-Thomson suggests, in light of the fact that the point in the manuscript at which the signature appears is the same point at which the rubrication ends, that “Jon Flemmyn” may have been the rubricator of e Mus 232 (1988: xxxii). If the seventeenth-century ascription in TCD 156 is to someone involved in the original copying of the manuscript, then the same name appears in two manuscripts of the same date, both written in a form of MHE localised in *LALME* to Dublin. The extra-linguistic reasons for accepting TCD 156 as an Irish production include evidence of its presence in Dublin by the

sixteenth century at the latest<sup>37</sup> and a slight, but noteworthy, lexical substitution in Book VI of the poem, in which the “Rome” of Morris’s edition of the *Prick of Conscience* (VI, 6614) is replaced with “deuelyn,” i. e. Dublin (f. 99<sup>v</sup>, line 10).<sup>38</sup> Whilst there is no hard evidence to confirm the suggestion, it is tempting to consider the presence of the name “Jon Fleming” in two early fifteenth-century Anglophone Irish manuscripts as more than merely coincidental.

The second piece of extra-linguistic evidence supporting the Irish provenance of e Mus 232 also pertains to the manuscript’s copy of St. Edmund’s *Mirror*, specifically to what seems to be its attribution to a named translator: Nicholas Bellew. A search of TCD’s “A Calendar of Irish Chancery Letters c. 1244–1509”<sup>39</sup> produces a single record for the name Nicholas Bellew, dated 10<sup>th</sup> October 1423, from Close Roll 2 of Henry VI, and the following summary of the Chancery letter in which his name appears:

To the constable of Trim castle  
James Younge has pleaded to the K. that—as he has been held in irons in great duress [in ferris in magna duricia] for three quarters of a year in the castle [of Trim] and has not been brought forth to answer contrary to law and reason, and he is still detained—he might be brought by sufficient surety to Dublin castle, to be judged according to common law. ORDER to deliver James without delay to Nicholas Bellew to be brought to Dublin castle, by mainprize of John More

---

<sup>37</sup> That the manuscript was definitely in Ireland by the sixteenth century is demonstrated by the presence in the margin of f. 78<sup>r</sup> of a sixteenth-century copy of a Latin writ, from the reign of Henry VIII, addressed to the Sheriff of Dublin, and requiring attendance at the court of Irish Exchequer at Dublin. A later note, on f. 1<sup>r-v</sup>, referring to the year 1618, is a deed, made in Dublin, referencing James Ware and Matthew Tirrel; and witnessed by a “White,” a “Criffe” (?) and one “William Blauer” (LALME, i: 77; Lewis & McIntosh 1982: 51–52).

<sup>38</sup> The substitution is noted in *LALME*, i: 77 and discussed more fully in Benskin 1997: 94.

<sup>39</sup> <http://chancery.tcd.ie/document/close/2-henry-vi/40>.

merchant, William Sprot, John Pakerell and John Taath of Dublin, for his safe conduct.

Intriguingly, then, at roughly the same time in which the attribution of the translation of Edmund Rich's work to Nicholas Bellew in e Mus 232 is written, a Nicholas Bellew is recorded as an eminent citizen of Dublin, entrusted to take charge of James Yonge, the self-styled "notary imperial, and the least of the writers and citizens of Dublin" (cited Seymour 1970: 135) who, in 1422, and at the request of his patron, James Butler, Earl of Ormond and Viceroy in Ireland, made a translation of the *Secreta Secretorum*. If the Nicholas Bellew named as the translator in e Mus 232 is accepted as likely to be the same Nicholas Bellew referred to in the Chancery letter, then there is evidence for locating him in Dublin in the first quarter of the fifteenth-century. This is, in itself, enough to support the Irish provenance of e Mus 232 suggested on linguistic grounds; independent of the extra-linguistic evidence outlined above for the Irish provenance of its scribe's other known manuscript, Longleat 29.

If the evidence presented above is accepted, then the Irish provenance indicated dialectally of the two manuscripts discussed is assured. What then, are the implications of this provenance for considerations of Anglophone literary culture in late medieval Ireland? I have suggested elsewhere that Anglophone works in late medieval Ireland (certainly in general accounts) have received relatively little critical attention from a literary, rather than linguistic perspective.<sup>40</sup> Moreover, the attention they have received—Dolan 1991 and 1999; Bliss 1984; Bliss & Long 1987—has, by virtue of where these accounts appear, been explicitly weighed towards a key concern of literary scholarship concerning MHE materials: that is, in Dolan's formulation, of "original works related specifically to Ireland" (1999: 223).<sup>41</sup> The preoccupation in these accounts with

---

<sup>40</sup> Stevenson 2011.

<sup>41</sup> The discussion offered by Thompson (2011) brings a useful perspective to bear on these materials.



original works—in practice, more often than not, the Anglophone contents of British Library MS Harley 913<sup>42</sup>—is understandable, but it serves, perhaps, to overshadow some of the other extant evidence for Anglophone reading communities in late medieval Ireland. In contrast to the alterity of cultural identity which is emphasised in such accounts, the evidence of Longleat 29 and Bodleian e Mus 232, in conjunction with that of other manuscripts of demonstrable Irish provenance containing copies of Middle English texts (such as Dublin, Trinity College MS 156 [the *Prick of Conscience*] or Oxford, Bodleian Library MS Douce 104 [*Piers Plowman*]) draws attention to some of the commonalities of late medieval reading communities on either side of the Irish Sea. In doing so, this evidence hints at points of cultural contact and textual transmission that are worthy of much further examination than they have received thus far.

Kath STEVENSON  
Queen's University Belfast

APPENDIX A: LONGLEAT MS 29 (FF. 19<sup>R</sup>–22<sup>R</sup>). SEMI-DIPLOMATIC TRANSCRIPTION<sup>43</sup> OF AN ANONYMOUS ENGLISH EXPOSITION ON THE LORD'S PRAYER (NOT KNOWN ELSEWHERE)

[f. 19<sup>r</sup> line 1]

**Pater noster qui es in celis sanctificetur nomen tuum.**

O almyghty O alwise & witty. O al *gracious* & good  
euerlastynge heuently fader & son & holy goost hey trinite  
that art in heuyn ihalowed be thy name. O fourmer  
of heuen & erth & of al thyng that in ham is. In whom 5

---

<sup>42</sup> Ed. Lucas 1995.

<sup>43</sup> Lineation, capitalisation and punctuation of the original retained. Raised letters retained, otherwise contractions have been expanded and the supplied letters italicized. Tironian “et” silently replaced with “&” throughout. [?] after a word indicates an uncertain reading.

by whom & of whom al thyng good visible & onvisible  
bene my lord god my lord maker my sustener my mercy  
my *grace* my socour & my sauour / the I calle the I wor  
shipe. the I thanke commend & preise with al my soule  
with al my herte & w<sup>t</sup> al my mynde that þ<sup>u</sup> neuer need 10  
of no creature hauynge bot of thyn owne infinite bounte  
desyrynge that creatures weren to haue parte of thy  
blesse amonge al others thou endeignest me to *fourme*  
of noght. Witte cunnyng. streynth of body. dyuers goddes  
of kynd & of fortune me yevynge the wey of thy heuynly 15  
roialme me techynge. And by al these goodes me þedre  
as an heire ther of callynge. by thyn intollerables pey-  
nes of Iues *reprouet* betrayet with a cosse i sold. With  
hard cordes ibounde ilyke an innocent lambe afoor  
Anne pilat & herode falsly accuset with scourges 20  
ibette *reprouet* scornet ivexet ispotte crownet w<sup>t</sup>  
thornes ibuffeted in croice isette with sharp nayll  
feet & handes ithurlet. Al the veynes & synowes of  
thy body ibroken fro the corone of thyn heed in to the  
solles of thy feet thy blessed body al to torne. thyn 25  
owne clothes itake fro the with other men clothes *in*  
scorne iclothe. these clothes al blodi of thy body þerto  
fast cleuyng onclothe. þi body nailet[?] inayllet to þe  
hard crosse at ons vp lifte w<sup>t</sup> þi crosse isquat down  
into a morteyes that al þy veynes ioyntures syno- 30  
wes & membres of thy body ibroke & departed were  
w<sup>t</sup> a sharp speer þyn hert clouen al the blod of thy  
body out ranne w<sup>t</sup> eyesel & galle idrynket. thy moder  
to seynt Iohn þyn apostle commendett deynge iberiet  
[f. 19<sup>v</sup>]

agayn risynge to lyue & merciably me to thy heuenly lif of 35  
*grace* by al these peynes & passions & myche moor restorynge  
Bot euer alaas my gilt my most gilt & my trespasse that  
I as an vnkynd most fals foul stynkynge traytour onwor  
thy heuyn vp to loke infynytly ayeyns so kynd so benigne  
& so infynyte good lord I haue i synnet in pride. enuy. 40  
Wrath. detracion sleuth. glotony. lechurye. & coueitise

my ten *commandements* brekyng. my fyve wittes in  
syght hyryng. smyllyng tasteinge & felyng. misusyng  
my goodes of kynd & of fortune mispendyng my tyme in  
ydelnesse & syn wastyng. the vij. workes of *mercy* nat ful 45  
fillyng. bot rather lord saue thy *mercy perdurables* peynes  
ffor these & myche more than I can telle deseruyng. In  
ferther meschief I am knyght ¶ For al these vices me co-  
meth of kynd & *verray virtue* naue I none: bot thou hit  
me lene lord of thi *grace*. Bot sethen lord that thi *mercy* 50  
thy workes passeth. Wherthroghe by thy *passionne* to al  
synful man thou hast oppened thy yates of *grace* I most  
synful man of al for thy alaas. In hoop of thy helpe  
þy *mercy* I cry: lord hyt & þy *grace* thou me *graunt*. And  
aftre the multitude of thy *mercy* haue pitte of me amen. 55  
**Adueniat regnum tuum** ¶ Fadyr of heuyn bigger  
of al & holygoost confortour only god in trinite  
thy kyngedome come to vs. lord god for thyn habun  
daunt goodnesse *graunt* me *grace* of al the forsaiden  
synnes *verray* repentaunce vices to leue & in þe vij 60  
*virtuz* w<sup>t</sup> *profite* continuaunce to growe. While I lyve  
shal. that al my thoghtes wordes & dedes may *turne*  
to thy *profite* & plesaunce and me thy creature throghe  
thy *grace* to thy kyngedome bryng. ¶ To these *prayers*  
the state & *prosperitee* of al holy chirche our holy 65  
fadre the pope hys Cardynals. his Consaill. our  
bisshop our curates withal degrees in holy chirch  
[f. 20<sup>r</sup>]  
our kyng the Quene the *Gouernour* of this land with al  
har trewe consaill. The estate & *prosperite* of the roialmes  
of England Irland & Fraunce Al tho that pee3 maynteneth 70  
& trewe peple defendeth. my Fadre my modre sowles  
my bretheren my sustres my kyn alliaunces al my good  
frendes and in especial I. b. I. I. A. K ¶ And al tho þ<sup>t</sup>  
I am bound to *pray* for both quik & deed *recommendyng*  
That these my priers take effecte O glorious *virgyn* 75  
mayd mary Moder of god Queen of heuyn lady of al  
land. Emperice of helle. O ye *vertuz* angels michael *Gabriel*

Raphael w<sup>t</sup> al þ<sup>e</sup> cler<sup>e</sup> compayny of the heuynly courte  
 O seynt Iohn Baptiste O al ye holy patriarches prophet<sup>3</sup>  
 & seyntes for the rewardes which ye haue of god re- 80  
 ceuyed pray ententify for vs in so greet worldly mys  
 sayse isette. amen

**Fiat voluntas tua sicut in c[aelo] & in terra.** O blessed  
 O glorious o euerlestynge trinite thi wille be hit  
 fulfillet in vs thi creatures in erthe as hit is in thi holy 85  
 aungels & halowes in heuyn. And grant vs grace al  
 thynge thi plesynge bisily to desyre wiseli to enserche  
 Trewly to knowe and perfity to thyn honour to fulfille  
 And hyr us graciously in these & al oure prayers through þ<sup>e</sup>  
 ententifs suffrages of thyn holy apostles—petre paule 90  
 Andreu. Iames. Iohn. Philep. Matheu / bartholomeu  
 Thomas symon & Iude Barnabe Mark and Mathy O ye  
 holy apostles and al seyntes pray ye for vs. Amen.

**Panem nostrum cotidianum da nobis hodie** ¶ Lord  
 þ<sup>t</sup> al leuest graunt vs to day our euery dayes 95  
 breed with al necessaries of our lyuyng help vs euer  
 at need þe breed of science and verite thi holy commu  
 nyoun graunt us grace to receyue w<sup>t</sup> so pure deuocion that  
 heuyn may be our meed. ¶ hy<sup>t</sup> vs. help vs & comfort  
 [f. 20<sup>v</sup>]

vs in dreed through the vertue of the pacience of al þese preci  
 ous Martires that for þi loue were deed. Seynt<sup>3</sup> Stephen 100  
 lyne. Clete. Clement & sixte. Corneli Cipriane laurence  
 Vincent dyonise & ypolite George Albane. Esmond. Oswald  
 Fabian Sebastian. Geruase Prothase Cosme & Damyan Mar-  
 celyn Iohn & poule Thomas Tibrise. Abdon & senne and 105  
 al oþer holy martyres in heuyn pray ye al for vs help forth  
 in the virtu of fortitudo of perfite feith hope & charite that  
 we nat fayl. amen

**Et dimitte nobis debita nostra sicut & nos dimittimus  
 debitoribus nostris** ¶ O lord god of pitte mercy & of grace 110  
 foryeue vs our dettes our synnes & our trespasses:  
 as we foryeuen to oure dettors. lord of amendes þ<sup>u</sup> graunt  
 vs space. Of charite þ<sup>u</sup> let vs nat mysshe of thy blisse þ<sup>u</sup>

graunt vs solace throug þe swet callynge & bisy besechyng  
of thi clere & holy confessours. Syluestre leo. hiller nicholas 115  
Martyr. Ambrose. Ierom Gregorie & Austeyn dunston  
swythyn Cuthbert & Birryn German dompnic Fran  
ceys & leonard Benet Esmond & Bernard Patrike Fyn  
nyan Columbe Canik & Brandane Molyng Synok  
Keuyn & Lasriane[?] Machot Abbane Euyne & Colman And 120  
al other confessours of Cristes Courte in perfite charite  
stalle vs of holy conscience sharpe compunccioun verray  
contricioun hool confessioun ful satisfaccioun & of al oure  
synnes ful pardoun þrogh al yo<sup>r</sup> holy intercessioun let vs nat  
mysshe: bot vs al bryng to þy heuynly habitacioun. Amen 125  
**Et ne nos inducas in temptacionem** ¶ O only god com  
fort in care In to temptacioun in leed vs nat. Bot  
by þe grace of thy passioun graunt vs vertue of mekenesse  
abstinence clenness chastite largesse almesse & charitee 130  
and by þese vertu3 power victorie to haue & hold of oure  
flesshly lustes & lykynges þe fendes fondyng worl-  
dly coueitise & fool hard holdyng. O adonay lord  
gret merueillous god of Abraham Isaak & Iacob. Criste  
of al good men incarnatet of thy blessed moder Mary  
[f. 21<sup>r</sup>]  
Maid myld throug loue of man þrogh thy wondes fyve ffor 135  
þi crosse & thy passioun þi precious deth & resurexioun ffor þi  
goostly comfortable visitatioun & for þi wondreful ascencioun  
and by the dreedful iugement that al thou shalt deme. And  
for þe loue of our lady Mary þi moder heuen queen Mary  
magdale marie Egipciē. seynt Anne perpetue Agnes Agaas 140  
& Cecilie Anastase Margaret & Kateryn Lucy petronelle Teclē  
Scolace barbre & Bryde Frideswyde Warbugh Elene Iuli[e]tt  
& Cristyne Feith hope & charite Radegund Iuliane & prisce  
Otili & helyn and al holy halowes wonnyng in þi blisse  
In this lond lord make pees for thi hey holy names. Al 145  
ilwille & malice of unlawful werryours abaat that  
þi due reuerence þer in fulfillet be ¶ O lord god maker of  
pees þ<sup>t</sup> art not wirshippet bot intyme of pees send  
trewe men pees to þy honour & al seynt3 al þi holy pla

ces in lond pesibli to visite. O holy fader Patrike oure 150  
 patroun with Columb & bride whose bones resten in dounne  
 And al seyntes suyng *your* trace *pray* þe the pierles *prince*  
 of *paradise* that of al wiked wormes this lond wedet:  
 that he endeigne for his dignite & his *mercy* which his  
 werkes passeth. þe destruers of his trewe peple may 155  
 approwe in þi pees *perfitly* to þi *plesaunce* amen. ¶ O  
 pierles *precious* emperour confer ine þyn *honour* anent fals  
 folke þi trewe peple destroyng. O lord god of endles  
 pitte pees rightfulness & *Veritee*. For þe pitte & *mercy*  
 that þou haddest of al mynkynnd by disceite of þou ene 160  
 mye for syn ilost & departed from holy aungels. Whan  
 þou endeignest to descende in to þe bosome of þi blessed  
 moder mayd marye incarnated of hir mankind to recon  
 cile to þe pees of þi fader plesyng to þyn aungels:  
 For that pitte & *mercy* w<sup>t</sup> al *maner* of humilite we þ<sup>e</sup> besech 165  
 that we myght be worthy to þyn *euerlestyng* pees in  
 heuyn to be reconcilet & as oon flok of þi fold in þis  
 lond vndre oon prince to þin *honour* bemirly to be *gouernet*  
 amen.  
 [f. 21<sup>v</sup>]  
**Sed libera nos a malo.** O messias sother emanuel sa  
 boath. adonay *principium primogenitis* sapiencia virtus 170  
 Alpha caput finus simul vocitatur & est O fons & origo boni  
*paraclitus* ac mediator. Agnus ouis vitulus *serpens* aries  
 leo vermis os *verbum* splendor sol gloria lux & ymago panis  
 flos vitis mons Ianua *lapisque* Angelus & sponsus. *pastorque*  
*propheta* sacerdos. Athanatos kyros theos panton craton & 175  
 ysus. ¶ O almyghty god throug þe *vertue* of al these thy names  
 fro al *manner* of synnes anguysshes. tribulaciouns meschiefs det  
 tes & necessitees temptaciouns & perilles now & to *cume* of body &  
 soule And fro al *manner* perilles meschiefs & desaires of oure ene  
 mys visibles & vnvisibles kepe vs saue vs mayntene 180  
 & defend gracousli vs delyur. And euer in thi *proteccioun* glorious  
 trinite in heuyn trone. And throug þe *vertue* of þy pas  
 sioun þi *grace* & þi *mercy* the sacrementz of holy chirche de  
 uoutly receyuet vs bryng to thy blisse that neuer

shal haue ende amen. 185  
In *nomine patris* & filii & *spiritus sancti* amen. The sign ✱ of þe  
holy croice me defend fro harmes ipassed nowe & to *cum*  
inward & outward. ✱ By þe signe of þe holy croice fro  
*persecucioun* of þe fend & al myn enemys delyuer me. ✱ By  
þis signe al myn aduersaries be thei i cast down & fle þay 190  
fro me. ✱ By this signe of the holy croice fro al worldly  
*perilles* lord god delyur me. ✱ The blessinge of god þe fadre  
almighty with his angels be hit vpon me. ✱ The bles  
syng of criste with his apostles be hit vp on me. ✱ The  
blessyng of þe holy goost. the *proteccioun* & þe holynesse of 195  
þe hei god with þe *virtue* of his Misteries & þe holye  
godspel be hit vpon me. ✱ The blessinge of cristes  
*incarnacioun* his holy birth his glorious *circumcisioune*  
his blessed *passioun* his reuerent *resureccioun* his won  
*dreful ascencioun* his holygoost comfortable *visitacioun* 200  
And þe ✱ signe of þe holy croice be hit vpon me  
w<sup>t</sup> in me about me by. after me & in euery place  
þer as I am & shal be. ✱ The blessinge of our lady  
[f. 22<sup>r</sup>]  
blessed seynt Mary moder of ihesu al holy *prophetes* patriarches  
apostles *euaungelistes* Martires confessours virgynes & al halo 205  
wes be hit upon me with in me about me & in euery stidde  
þer as I shal be. And I commend my body & my soule to þe ho  
ly trinite þ<sup>t</sup> he me kepe nowe & euer. ✱ Thi croice lord ihesu  
crist be hit þe signe of my helth by þe which þ<sup>u</sup> endeig  
nest to by me. an helper a defender a consaillor a gou 210  
noure & confortor & a lyght yeuer of me be þou my lord  
god ihesu ✱ The blessinge of þe holy trinite me kepe  
*fauoure* defend & couer [?] from al manner of harmes & me *comfort*  
in al manner of good workes þ<sup>t</sup> I may be I sauet here &  
euerlestyng ioy deserve & haue amen. ✱ In *nomine patris* 215  
& filii & *spiritus sancti*. Amen.

APPENDIX B: LINGUISTIC FEATURES OF MEDIEVAL HIBERNO-ENGLISH AS IDENTIFIED BY MCINTOSH AND SAMUELS, *PROLEGOMENA TO A STUDY OF MEDIAEVAL ANGLO-IRISH*<sup>44</sup>

- (1) *ham*, *bar*, “them, their;” occasionally *harre*, and later *tham*, *thar*.
- (2) *streinh*, *leinh*, *streynth(e)* etc. “strength, length,” with variants *streynng(t)h*, *leynnt*, *strenyt*.
- (3) *euch(e)* “each.” *Vcb(e)*, *uch(e)* also occur, more rarely *ech(e)*, *ich(e)*.
- (4) *pro3*, *þrow*, *throgh*, *throw(e)* “through.”
- (5) *hir(e)*, *hyr(e)* “hear.”
- (6) *þay*, *þai*, *þay* “they,” combined in earlier texts with *hy*, in later texts with *þei*, *they*.
- (7) *hit*, *hyt* “it” always outnumbers forms without *h-*.
- (8) *bep* “are” (variants *beth*, *byth*, *bet*) survives later than in southern ME texts, and similarly *-et(h)*, *-it(h)*, *-yt(h)* in the present indicative plural of other verbs.
- (9) *fale* “many” is much commoner than *fele*.
- (10) *sill*, *syll(e)* “sell.”
- (11) Frequent doubling of medial and final consonants, e.g. *wonni* inf. “dwell,” *woddis* “woods,” *berr(e)* “bear,” *didde* “did,” *commynng* “coming,” *helþpe* “help,” *wentten* “went,” *botte* “boat,” *clepped (-yt)* “called,” *plessyd* “pleased.”
- (12) *stid(de)*, *styd(de)* “stead.”
- (13) The late survival of *-y*, *-i* in the infinitive, e.g. *auordy* “afford” (1459), *amercy* “fine” (1460).
- (14) The prefix *y-*, *i-* is frequent in past participles, and occasional with the infinitive after auxiliary verbs, e.g. *shulde ybe* (1454).
- (15) *-ir*, *-yr* are the usual endings in words like *fadir*, *afþyr*, and *-er*, *-ur* are much rarer; *-re* appears in later texts (*fadre*, *after*).
- (16) The usual forms for “though” are *þe3(t)*, *thegh(t)*, *þo3(t)*, *thogh(t)*, not *þei3*, *theigh*, *þou3*, *though*, *þa(u)3* as commonly in ME.

<sup>44</sup> McIntosh & Samuels 1968: 4–5.



- (17) Final *-e* has no morphological significance. Its early loss is shown by the otherwise conservative form *hab* “have.”
- (18) ME *v* is often represented by *w*, e.g. *yewe* “give,” *ewill* “evil” and, in texts where *hab* is not preserved (cf. no. 17 preceding), *haw(e)* “have.”
- (19) *opir*, *othyr* “or” survives later than in southern ME.
- (20) The endings of the weak preterite and past participle are frequently unvoiced: *-et*, *-it*, *-yt*.

Other frequent but not universal features are:

- (1) *w(h)och(e)* “which.”
- (2) *brand*, *brant* “burnt,” and occasionally *branne* “burn.”
- (3) *silf*, *sylf(e)* “self.”
- (4) (a) the writing of *n*, *l(l)* for ME *nd*, *ld*, as in *fyne* “find,” *hell* “held,” *undirston* “understand,” *sune* “sound.”
- (5) (b) the reverse spellings *nd*, *ld* for ME *n*, *l*, as in *fynder* “finer,” *wand* “when,” *hold* “whole,” *sonde* “soon.”
- (6) The writing of *th* for ME *t* and of *t* for ME *þ*, *th*, e.g. *thyme* “time,” *thwey* “two,” *playnth* “plaint,” *tree* “three,” *tis* “this.”
- (7) *-it*, *-yt*, *-et* for ME *-ith*, *-eth* in both the 3<sup>rd</sup> singular and the plural of the present indicative (since this may occur in texts not showing no. 5 preceding, it should probably be regarded as a separate feature).
- (8) The earlier form for “say” is *sigge*, *sygge*, not *segge*.
- (9) *ar* (conj. and prep.) “before” is in most texts preferred to *er* and *or*.
- (10) *no* “nor” (and also occasionally in the meaning “not”).
- (11) *togadir* (*togaddy*, etc.) survives at a time when ME texts show only *e-* and *i-*forms for “together.”

#### REFERENCES

Cambridge, Corpus Christi College MS 405  
Dublin, Trinity College Dublin MS 156

- London, British Library MS Harley 913  
Oxford, Bodleian Library MS Douce 104  
Oxford, Bodleian Library MS e Mus 232  
Wilts, Longleat House, Marquess of Bath MS 29
- Allen, H. E. 1927: *Writings Ascribed to Richard Rolle Hermit of Hampole and Material for his Biography*. New York, Heath.
- Barratt, A. 2008: Spiritual Writings and Religious Instruction. In N. Morgan & R. Thomson eds. *The Cambridge History of the Book in Britain*. Vol. 2. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press: 340–366.
- Benskin, M. 1997: Texts from an English Township in Late Medieval Ireland. *Collegium Medievale* 10.1–2: 92–173.
- Benskin, M. & M. Laing 1981: Translations and Mischsprachen in Middle English Manuscripts. In M. Benskin & M. L. Samuels eds. *So meny people longages and tonges. Philological Essays in Scots and Mediaeval English Presented to Angus McIntosh*. Edinburgh, The Editors: 55–106.
- Brown, C. & R. H. Robbins 1943: *The Index of Middle English Verse*. New York: Columbia University Press. With Supplement by R. H. Robbins & J. Culter 1965, Lexington, University of Kentucky Press.
- Bliss, A. 1984: Language and Literature. In J. Lydon ed. *The English in Medieval Ireland: Proceedings of the first joint meeting of the Royal Irish Academy and the British Academy, Dublin, 1982*. Dublin, Royal Irish Academy: 27–45.
- Bliss, A. & J. Long 1987: Literature in Norman French and English to 1534. In A. Cosgrove ed. *A New History of Ireland: Medieval Ireland 1169–1534*. Vol. 2. Oxford, Oxford University Press: 708–735.
- Boffey, J. 2005: Middle English Lyrics and Manuscripts. In T. G. Duncan ed. *A Companion to the Middle English Lyric*. Cambridge, D.S. Brewer: 1–18.
- Crooks, P. ed.: A Calendar of Irish Chancery Letters, c. 1244–1509, Close Roll 2 Henry VI, §40. <http://chancery.tcd.ie>.

- Dolan, T. 1991: The Literature of Norman Ireland. In S. Deane ed. *The Field Day Anthology of Irish Writing*. Vol. 1. Derry, Field Day Publications: 141–170.
- Dolan, T. 1999: Writing in Ireland. In D. Wallace ed. *The Cambridge History of Medieval English Literature*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press: 208–228.
- Doyle, A. I. 1953: *A Survey of the Origins and Circulation of Theological Writings in English in the 14th, 15th and early 16th Centuries with Special Consideration of the Part of the Clergy Therein*. 2 vols. (Ph.D. dissertation). Cambridge, University of Cambridge.
- Farmer, D. H. 1987: *The Oxford Dictionary of Saints*. Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Gillespie, V. 1989: Vernacular Books of Religion. In J. Griffith & D. Pearsall eds. *Book Production and Publishing in Britain 1375–1475*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press: 317–344.
- Hanna, R. 2010: *The English Manuscripts of Richard Rolle: A Descriptive Catalogue*. Exeter, Exeter University Press.
- Heuser, W. ed. 1904: *Die Kildare-Gedichte: Die ältesten mittelenglischen Denkmäler in Anglo-Irischen Überlieferung*. Bonn, P. Hanstein.
- Hughes, K. 1954: The Cult of St. Finnian of Clonard from the eighth to the eleventh century. *Irish Historical Studies* 9.33: 13–27.
- James, M. R. 1912: *A Descriptive Catalogue of the Manuscripts in the Library of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge*. 2 vols. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Jolliffe, P. S. 1974: *A Check-list of Middle English Prose Writings of Spiritual Guidance*. Toronto, Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies.
- Kelly, S. & J. J. Thompson eds. 2005: *Imagining the Book*. Turnhout, Brepols.
- Lewis, R. E. and A. McIntosh 1982: *A Descriptive Guide to the Manuscripts of the "Prick of Conscience."* Medium Aevum Monographs, New Series 12. Oxford, Society for the Study of Mediaeval Language and Literature.

- Lucas, A. M. ed. 1995: *Anglo-Irish Poems of the Middle Ages*. (Maynooth Bicentenary Series). Blackrock, Columba Press.
- Manly, J. M. & E. Rickert 1940: *The Text of the Canterbury Tales: Studied on the Basis of All Known Manuscripts*. 8 vols. Chicago, University of Chicago Press.
- McIntosh, A., M. L. Samuels, M. Benskin *et al.* eds. 1986: *A Linguistic Atlas of Late Mediaeval English*. 4 vols. Aberdeen, Aberdeen University Press.
- McIntosh, A. & M. L. Samuels 1968: Prolegomena to a Study of Mediaeval Anglo-Irish. *Medium Aevum* 37.1: 1–11.
- Morris, R. ed. 1863: *The pricke of conscience (Stimulus Conscientiae): a Northumbrian Poem*. Berlin, A. Asher & Co.
- Ó Riain, P. 2011: *A Dictionary of Irish Saints*. Dublin, Four Courts Press.
- Ogilvie-Thomson, S. J. 1980: *An Edition of the English works in MS. Longleat 29, Excluding the "Parson's Tale."* 4 vols. (Ph.D. dissertation). Oxford, University of Oxford.
- Ogilvie-Thomson, S. J. ed. 1988: *Richard Rolle: Prose and Verse Edited from MS Longleat 29 and Related Manuscripts*. (E.E.T.S. 293). Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Otway-Ruthven, A. J. 1965: The Chief Governors of Mediaeval Ireland. *Journal of the Royal Society of Antiquaries of Ireland* 95.1: 227–236.
- Pearsall, D. & K. Scott 1992: *Piers Plowman: A Facsimile of Bodleian Library Oxford, MS Douce 104*. Woodbridge, D. S. Brewer.
- Seymour, St. J. D. 1970 [1929]: *Anglo-Irish Literature 1200–1582*. repr. New York, Octagon Books.
- Stevenson, K. 2011: "Of the holy londe of Irland:" *A Reconsideration of Some Middle English Texts in Late Medieval Ireland*. (Ph. D. dissertation). Belfast, Queen's University Belfast.
- Stokes, W. 1906: The Birth and Life of St. Moling. *Revue Celtique* 27: 257–312.

- Thompson, J. J. 2011: Books Beyond England. In A. Gillespie & D. Wakelin eds. *The Production of Books in England 1350–1500*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Vauchez, A. 1997: *Sainthood in the later Middle Ages*. [Jean Birrell trans. 1981: *La sainteté en Occident aux derniers siècles du Moyen Âge (1198–1431)*]. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Williams, B. ed. and trans. 2007: *The Annals of Ireland by Friar John Clyn*. Dublin, Four Courts Press.
- Wolf, R. 1968: *The English Religious Lyric in the Middle Ages*. Oxford, Clarendon Press.



---

*Received 06 Mar 2014; accepted 03 Apr 2014*