● ● ● ●

Scriptures Fit for a King: Translational Doubling in the Revised Wycliffite Bible Text in Oxford University MS. Bodley 277

MATTHEW DIEM

Abstract This paper examines the use of translational doublets (multiple translations of a single expression presented together in a translated text) in the revised text of the Later Version of the Wycliffite Bible found in Oxford University MS. Bodley 277 (c.1420?). The manuscript in question contains a large number of doublets found in no other copy of the Wycliffite Bible, and these appear to be the contributions of an independent revisor. The various functions that doublets have in this text are discussed, and it is argued that, in his use of doublets, the revisor focused primarily on clarifying or explaining details of the text's literal, immediate meaning, especially in Old Testament historical books. It is suggested, moreover, that a large proportion of the revisor's doublets reflect the interests of an aristocratic or royal audience, in line with the probable origin of MS. Bodley 277 (which was probably owned by King Henry VI). Special attention is paid to the apocryphal 3 Ezra, for which Bodley 277 is the only copy of the Wycliffite Bible to include translational doublets and which appears in no other manuscript of the Later Version. It is suggested that this book may have been specially revised for this manuscript because of its interest for a fifteenth-century aristocratic readership, and that this is substantiated by the focus of its doublets on expressions having to do with politics and public observances.

Keywords Wycliffite Bible, Translation, Religion

1. Introduction: MS. Bodley 277 and Translational Doublets

The text of the Wycliffite Bible contained in Oxford University MS. Bodley 277 is remarkable on a number of fronts. First of all, there is its provenance: as indicated by the designation "King Henry's Bible" used by its most recent editor, Conrad Lindberg, the manuscript was apparently owned by, and perhaps prepared for, King Henry VI, well after the Wycliffite Bible had been effectively banned in England by the 1407 Constitutions of Archbishop Thomas Arundel. Its text is also unusual. On the whole, this manuscript may be considered a copy of the Later Version (LV) of the Wycliffite Bible, the more revised and polished of the two Wycliffite Versions (the other known

correspondingly as the Early Version, or EV).[1] The LV text contained in Bodley 277 (hereafter rLV) is, however, sometimes as different from other copies of LV as LV is from EV. Marcin Krygier (2017: 165) calls this manuscript "notorious for the extent of its revisions of the text," while Mary Dove (2007: 152) considers these revisions "by far the most thoroughgoing" of those found in any copy of LV. Although these revisions have been documented, both in the standard 1850 edition of EV and LV by Josiah Forshall and Frederic Madden (hereafter FM) and in Lindberg's edition (which uses a complicated system of symbols to show how its text diverges from LV as found in FM), much remains to be said about their significance for understanding rLV as a production distinct from all other versions of the Wycliffite Bible. This paper will examine one aspect of rLV's distinctiveness, its use of translational doublets, suggesting how rLV's peculiarities in this area point to specific focuses and purposes which further separate rLV from other redactions of the Wycliffite Bible and may relate to the apparent origin of rLV as a text prepared for a specific upper-class audience.

It should be clarified at the outset, however, that rLV is not completely alone as a revised LV text. Rather, Bodley 277 is one of a pair of complete LV Bibles that share many of the same revisions—including a large number of translational doublets (between one and two hundred) found only in these two copies—the other being Corpus Christi College Cambridge MS. 147. A third manuscript, Oxford St. John's College 7, contains an LV Old Testament featuring a number of alterations in common with these other two, at least from 2 Chronicles to Nehemiah (see FM 1.liii), but notably shares fewer of their peculiar doublets than of their other textual revisions. The similarities among these manuscripts are too strong to be coincidental, but at the same time each also features changes to the LV text not found in the other two. This

---

1   The relationship between Bodley 277 and other copies of LV has never been a matter of extensive speculation, but multiple theories have been proposed. The prevailing view is that it is a comparatively late revision of the Later Version (see Lindberg 1999 *passim*; Dove 2007: 150ff.; Krygier 2017: 168). Sven Fristedt (1953: 1.26), meanwhile, has argued that this text is based on EV, although the presence of some distinctive LV readings in it (*e.g.,* "woodnesse or strong veniaunce" for *furor* at 2 (4) Kings 13:3, "wodnesse" being the normal reading of EV, "strong veniaunce" that of LV) renders this improbable, and Fristedt's view has not been widely adopted.

is especially true of rLV. For present purposes, then, the relationship between rLV and other redactions of the Wycliffite Bible is not necessary to pin down, since what is most of interest about rLV is not what it has in common with those others, but what is unique to it. Thus we will consider only material that is peculiar to rLV and so seems to have originated with the revisor immediately responsible for it, excluding even material found only in Bodley 277 and CCCC 147 or St. John's College 7.[2] With rLV's unique translational doublets, it is possible to isolate the contributions of a single strand of revision and examine what it prioritizes in adapting the text for the use of a particular set of readers. This, in turn, can be used to help understand how the first complete English Bible was received by at least part of its original audience.

1(a). Approaches to Translational Doubling

The use of translational doublets is characteristic, to varying degrees, of most redactions of the Wycliffite Bible, including the mainstream of both EV and LV, as well as rLV. By "translational doublets" (also called "binomial glosses," "repetitive word pairs," "collocations," and so on by earlier scholars), I mean expressions in a translated text in which a single word or short phrase (what I shall call the "lemma") is rendered by two alternative or complementary translations, normally joined by a conjunction. For instance, where the Latin Vulgate text of Daniel 8:23b reads, *consurget rex inpudens facie et intellegens propositiones*, in both EV and LV (including rLV) the last word is doubled: "þere shal ryse a king unshamfast in face and undirstondynge *proposiciouns or resouns*" (EV), "a kyng schal rise unschamefast in face and undurstondyng *proposisiouns eþer resouns set forþ*" (LV/rLV).[3]

---

2   In determining what translational doublets are unique to rLV, I have counted any that appear in Lindberg's edition and are listed in FM's apparatus as occurring only in Bodley 277 (for which FM uses the siglum I). Any errors in FM's collation of texts are therefore reproduced here. For convenience, I have also excluded glosses introduced by "that is," though a few doublets in rLV mentioned below resemble or are based on such glosses in other MSS.

3   Quotations from EV and LV are taken from FM, with "þ" restored for "th" and use of "u"/"v" regularized. Quotations from rLV are taken from Lindberg's edition, with capitalization and the use of "u"/"v" regularized. Note that the Wycliffite Bible was translated from Latin, not the original biblical languages.

There are various uses to which doubling can be put—for instance, to clarify the sense of the lemma, or as a rhetorical embellishment. The nature and function of doubled (or "binomial") expressions have been studied in various contexts by a number of scholars, but these have tended to limit the applicability of their work to understanding *translational* doublets in particular by failing to distinguish such expressions from either of two related phenomena. On the one hand, studies like Inna Koskenniemi's *Repetitive Word Pairs in Old and Early Middle English Prose* (1968) and the essays collected in *Binomials in the History of English* (ed. Kopaczyk and Sauer 2017) deal indiscriminately with binomial expressions whether they are translational doublets in the narrow sense defined above, are translated from binomial expressions in another language, or are used in texts that are not translations. On the other hand, most previous examinations of the Wycliffite Bible that touch on its use of translational doublets treat these simply as one type of glossing among others and tend to dwell more on other, more elaborate types of glossing found in some copies of the Wycliffite Bible (see below).

Despite such limitations, a number of important points about doublets can be drawn from these earlier studies. To begin with, the taxonomy of binomials drawn up by Joanna Kopaczyk and Hans Sauer is as readily applicable to translational doublets as it is to other binomial expressions. According to this arrangement, the two elements of a binomial expression may possess one of three basic relationships (Kopaczyk and Sauer 2017: 12): 1. synonymy ("which includes near-synonymy, for example *tattered and torn*, as well as tautology, where two words can be claimed to have exactly the same meaning, for example *aches and pains*"), 2. antonymy ("which includes words with opposite meanings of different kinds"), and 3. contiguity ("which could serve as an umbrella term for other semantic relations which cover various degrees of hyponymy/hyperonymy, sequential and causal relationships, metonymic and metaphoric extensions of meaning, etc.").

Because, in a translational doublet, the expression's field of meaning is restricted by the lemma, antonymic pairings can be set aside, and we may speak simply of *synonymous* and *non-synonymous doublets*, the latter corresponding to "contiguous" binomials as defined by Kopaczyk and Sauer. Within a synonymous doublet, there may still be differences of register, such that one component is simpler or more common than the other and can

therefore act as an explanatory gloss on it. This is most obvious in pairings like "spouse or husbond" for *sponsus* (found at EV 1 Maccabees 9:39 and Matthew 9:15), where the doublet's first component is a formal Latinate term derived etymologically from its lemma and the second is the basic, ordinary word for the same thing—a common pattern in the doublets of both EV and LV. The Wycliffite translations, however, also contain doublets whose components lack any obvious distinction in either meaning or linguistic register, for instance "lace eþer nouche" (both plainly meant in the sense "necklace") for *fibula*, found a few times in 1 Maccabees in both EV and LV. In the case of non-synonymous doublets, meanwhile, essentially any of the types of "contiguity" suggested by Kopaczyk and Sauer may come into play, though two are especially notable. First, just as they suggest that different "degrees of hyponymy/hyperonymy" may be involved, sometimes multiple translations are given because the lemma has multiple denotations (is *polysemous*) and there is no English equivalent which fully encompasses the range of meaning that the translators find in it. For instance, at Amos 4:13, most copies of both EV and LV have "cloud or myist" for Vulgate *nebulam*, since *nebula* can refer to either of these two related but distinct meteorological phenomena but English has no single word that regularly refers to both. Second, "metonymic and metaphoric extensions of meaning" may be found when one component of a doublet is a *denotative* translation (*i.e.*, a translation corresponding to the lemma's dictionary definition) and the other a non-literal explanation or elaboration of the lemma's sense. For instance, when the Vulgate uses *dormire* as a euphemism for death, EV frequently, and LV once or twice, translates this with some variant of "sleep or die." In short, doublets can have both stylistic and explanatory functions, and different translations (including different versions of the Wycliffite Bible) implement these differently.

Koskenniemi, meanwhile, has examined how "repetitive word pairs" (including but not limited to translational doublets as defined above) can function in their larger context, irrespective of the exact semantic relationship of their components. She finds that such expressions are often used for emphasis or to improve clarity, and suggests that a text's use of doublets can reflect that text's overall purpose or focus. A model for such analysis is provided by her examination of doublets in the Old English translation of Bede's *Ecclesiastical History*. In the OE Bede (which contains

a huge number of translational doublets), she argues, "the majority of the word pairs denote things that are essential for the main theme of the work" and relate to its "educational purpose" as didactic history rendered into the vernacular (Koskenniemi 1968: 33). Though the Wycliffite Bible is a work of a very different nature, the same kind of reasoning may be applied in examining its doublets. In other words, it often becomes fruitful with a text like rLV to find patterns in the emphases of doubled expressions as units in addition to examining the relationships between their components.

With regard to the Wycliffite Bible in particular, scholars have sometimes seemed unsure of what to make of the doublets in EV and LV. Henry Hargreaves (1969: 405) tries to explain them in terms of stylistic development as the work of translation proceeded: "A difficult word in the Latin was apparently first rendered by a literal translation, or was anglicized into what must have been a quite unintelligible form. This was first [in EV] supplemented by, later sometimes used as a supplement to, and finally completely displaced by, a more idiomatic translation [in LV]." Though this account singles out a pertinent aspect of many of the Wycliffite Bible's doublets—the pairing of more "literal" with more "idiomatic" translations of the same lemmata—it fails both to account for the continued presence of translational doublets in LV and to explain what constitutes a "difficult" word. Michael Kuczynski (2016: 346) similarly speaks of "intertextual glosses, short phrases that usually provide alternate translations for difficult words" only briefly before moving on to examine the more elaborate marginal glosses in some copies, although he at least suggests one prominent area of "difficulty" when he notes an LV doublet ("of diluvye eþer greet flood" for *diluuii* in Genesis 6:17) in which the second component "clarifies a Latin cognate" (*ibid.*). Lindberg (2007: 44) observes more explicitly that sometimes "no easy equivalent could be found for a Latin word, either because the word was too unfamiliar or had to be rendered by a paraphrasis or circumlocution…so that the versions came to teem with more or less deviating alternatives in the region of vocabulary," but declines to explore the concept of "paraphrasis or circumlocution" in greater depth and groups simple "or" doublets together with longer glosses introduced by "that is." Dove (2007: 154–155) is more cogent in distinguishing between "variant translations" (*i.e.*, synonymous doublets) and glosses that provide "alternative meanings" (*i.e.,* non-synonymous doublets) and in

suggesting—though not in a systematic fashion—motivations for some of these, such as the presence of metonymies or of ambiguities arising from polysemous lemmata, or even from variants in the source-text. Again, however, there is little interest in accounting for the translators' choices about *where* to implement these kinds of interventions in the text, and Dove's analysis focuses more on glosses derived Nicholas of Lyra's commentary than on simple translational doublets. Observations like these, then, lay out some basic categories for examining the use of doublets in the Wycliffite Bible, but leave much to be determined about the implementation of the various translational approaches that give rise to doublets in this text.

Of particular note is a 2017 article by Marcin Krygier which presents the only systematic study of translational doublets in the Wycliffite Bible that I am aware of. Here, Krygier compares the use of "binomial glosses" in the EV and LV translations of Romans, using Lindberg's editions as his base-texts but collating them with FM. Krygier makes some valuable points about doubling in the Wycliffite Bible, but his work is hobbled in some ways by his choice of texts. In the first place, as he acknowledges, Lindberg's edition of LV is based on what I have termed rLV, and, though this happens not to make any difference in a study of Romans, "binomial glosses" are one area in which rLV's usage breaks with that of LV in many other books. Additionally, the choice to focus on one book causes Krygier to lose sight of the uneven distribution of doublets across the biblical books in both EV and LV, including rLV. His claim that Bodley 277 shows "a clear dispreference for binomials" (Krygier 2017: 166) is therefore true enough for the New Testament (indeed, for the NT in all redactions of LV) but, depending on how strongly he means "dispreference," either less true or demonstrably false for other parts of rLV. It should be clarified, first of all, that most copies of LV's Old Testament do contain a fairly large number of doublets. The rLV revisor did eliminate many of these, but he also added many new ones—about as many as he excised, in fact—and the new doublets mainly appear in the books that are rich in doublets in LV generally, all in the Old Testament. Thus, Krygier's initial, ultimately rejected hypothesis that rLV, as "a heavily revised manuscript of the LV," would "rely on binomial constructions to elucidate the meaning of concepts used in biblical translation" (169; cf. Koskenniemi's formulation, quoted above) can reasonably be broached again, though with the proviso

that it applies only to some parts of the text, and we can more profitably explore his starting notion that doublets serve "to perform clarifying rather than stylistic functions" (160) in LV and rLV.

1(b). The Manuscript

Before examining rLV as a revision of the Wycliffite translation apparently made for a specific audience, we should take a moment to establish its distinctiveness. The supposition that the manuscript was owned by Henry VI derives from a late-medieval or early-modern inscription on folio 375 reading, *Hic liber erat quondam Henrici sexti qui postea donabatur domui Cartusiensium quæ Londino contigua est* (qtd. Solopova 2016: 60), and there seems to be no particular reason for doubting the truth of this claim. The truth of the second part at least is essentially indisputable in view of annotations to the manuscript that, as Anne Hudson observes, show usage in conformity with Carthusian practices (see Hudson 2006: 737–738). Moreover, as Hudson further points out, Henry VI is known to have been a patron of the Carthusians (*ibid.*), so his donating a Bible to a Carthusian house would be unsurprising. (On the question of why the Carthusians would use an English Bible, see Hudson 2006: 738–740.) Moreover, as Leigh Ann Craig notes (2003: 202), someone, probably in the sixteenth century, pasted a woodcut image of Henry VI onto the manuscript's rear flyleaf, meaning that a connection between the manuscript and the king must already have been seen to exist in the early modern period (cf. Hudson 2006: 736). Kathleen Kennedy (2014: 171) suggests that the woodcut may even have been inserted by the Carthusians to whom the manuscript was first donated. Beyond that, the origin and history of the manuscript are uncertain. According to Hudson (2006: 736), Bodley 277 may be the English Bible known to have been owned by Henry IV, but almost no one dates the manuscript to so early a period. Lindberg (1999: 1.47) gives the date as 1430–1450, albeit with little explanation, following Forshall and Madden (1850: 1.xlvii), who suggest the 1440s. The earlier date of c.1417–1420 proposed by Lynda Dennison and Nigel Morgan (2016; cf. Kennedy 2014: 175) on the basis of the manuscript's decoration would be congruent with the reign of Henry V rather than either Henry VI or Henry IV, though the evidence they present is more useful in establishing a *relative* chronology of

Wycliffite Bible manuscripts than in assigning absolute dates and does not preclude a date closer to the range proposed by Lindberg.

At any rate, whether or not the king himself owned the manuscript, its aristocratic provenance can be taken as reasonably assured in view of its deluxe format. Bodley 277 is huge, measuring roughly 16.5 × 11.5 in. (415 × 290 mm), and contains often elaborate decoration. This decoration accords with Dennison's and Morgan's description (2016: 267–268) of "the most luxurious and highest level" found in Wycliffite Bibles, where "full borders are set all around the text area, and in addition include a central bar between the two text columns." The borders of several book openings are, as Elizabeth Solopova (2016: 58–59) summarizes, "made of gold, pink and blue bars, decorated with foliage, flowers, gold disks, human figures and grotesques," and Dennison and Morgan (2016: 272) note in particular that this manuscript is "unusual in incorporating other decorative forms, such as climbing figures…and dragons," with "three-dimensional scroll work, trumpet motif, [and] vigorous use of green pigment" characteristic of a developed decorative tradition. Hudson (2006: 732) in fact states that Bodley 277's book initials "usually" contain gold-leaf, a particularly conspicuous mark of richness. By contrast, Ralph Hanna (2015: 186ff.) finds that a solid majority of Wycliffite Bible manuscripts are in very small formats, so that a deluxe copy like Bodley 277 immediately stands out as a specialized upper-class artifact. Besides, if one accepts the truth of the aforementioned inscription, it is *prima facie* unlikely that the king would accept a hand-me-down from a member of the lower orders, though he might well have received it at second hand from a member of the nobility (Hudson 2006: 736).

Admittedly, while Bodley 277 unquestionably belongs to the highest and most lavish tier of known Wycliffite Bibles (cf. Hudson 2006: 734), it is far from unique in its elaborateness. Solopova (2017: 228) points out in fact that a plurality of *complete* Wycliffite Bibles, especially those from before about 1420, "are richly decorated, personalised with heraldic insignia, and are probably presentation copies made for aristocratic patrons," and concludes that this "seems to have been a result of a relatively short-lived political situation, that was in place during the last decade of the 14th and the first two decades of the 15th century," in which use of the Wycliffite Bible by the nobility was not yet associated with acceptance of Lollardy (*ibid.*). Even so, the distinctiveness

of Bodley 277 cannot be denied or ignored for two main reasons. First, it is apparently one of the latest deluxe LV pandects (Dennison and Morgan 2016: 272, 284–286), possibly postdating the "short-lived political situation" described by Solopova. Second, it is nearly unique even within this category for containing a text noticeably different from more workaday copies (both of the other two manuscripts sharing some of rLV's revisions also being large codices). Whereas the common redaction of LV, including its explanatory or clarifying insertions, was explicitly meant for a general audience, and is mainly preserved in small, pedestrian part-Bibles, rLV is apparently tailored to an aristocratic readership. We may thus presume at least tentatively that the doublets added in this special act of revision illustrate what its revisor thought would warrant comment or explanation for such readers.

2. Doublets Unique to rLV

The doublets unique to rLV, of which there are about two hundred, suggest distinctive emphases in what the revisor (hereafter "R")[4] sought to explain or clarify. On this front, two related observations are relevant. First, R was far from uniform in his insertion of doublets, the distribution of which varies from book to book in a manner unique to rLV. Second, because doublets generally serve to clarify the sense of the text in various ways, their distribution can often be linked to the peculiar uses and purposes of the translation as a whole, especially if (as is likely the case with rLV) that translation has been edited for a specific audience. With regard to the first point, Forshall and Madden, as well as Sven Fristedt, have noted that the extent of Bodley 277's revisions decreases after the Book of Psalms, which has been taken to suggest that "the revisor grew weary or became dissatisfied with the result" at that point (Fristedt 1953: 1.25–26; cf. FM 1.xlvii). Thus from Proverbs to the end of the Old Testament there are very few doublets unique to rLV, and almost none in the New Testament. It

---

4   Though I speak of a single revisor, an uncertain number of revisions must have been found in an earlier redaction underlying the three revised MSS. Even for material that was simply copied from an exemplar, however, the comparison with CCCC 147 and St. John's College 7 shows that "R" exercised a high degree of editorial privilege, and so all material unique to Bodley 277 can be understood as at least meeting with his approval, whether or not an earlier revisor originated it.

is equally possible, however, that the uneven distribution of unique doublets and other revisions peculiar to rLV is at least partly the result of a deliberate editorial choice. Indeed, the distribution of material unique to rLV *within* the section of the text from Genesis to the Psalms is variable enough to suggest that R intentionally focused on some sections more than on others. For instance, even if it is true that R grew tired of his work after Job and the revisions become less extensive thereafter for that reason, that does not explain why he also added relatively few doublets in the Pentateuch, which comes well before the section in which revisions become uniformly less extensive, or why Joshua features a higher density of unique doublets and other revisions than does 1 Chronicles. Rather, the paucity of unique doublets in many books might be a sign that R was simply less interested in them and so put less effort into glossing them.

With all this in view, the relevance of the second point (that the distribution of doublets may correlate with the emphases of the translation) should become more apparent. Here we recall Koskenniemi's conclusion that the OE translator of Bede used doublets to underscore points that he considered important to the translated text. Unfortunately, even less is known about the context in which R worked than about that in which Bede was translated into Old English, but that does not prevent us from trying to infer something about what the revisor considered "essential for the main theme of the work" based on his doublets. We have established that some books in rLV contain a larger number of unique doublets than others, and this selectivity, as well as selectivity at lower levels, may furnish a clue to R's *modus operandi*.

Broadly speaking, rLV's unique doublets seem focused on fleshing out the meanings of lemmata that are not intrinsically "difficult"—as Hargreaves and Kuczynski would have it—but that might be unclear in context. In general R achieved this by simply adding "or" and a second translation (placed either in the text or in the margin and marked with faint underlining[5]) to the usual LV reading, although he occasionally put the standard LV translation second

---

5   Two points should here be clarified. First, it should be noted that underlining is used in rLV, as in most other copies of the Wycliffite Bible, both for glosses and for words that are supplied for sense in English but do not directly correspond to any Latin lemma, more or less as italic type is used in the King James Version. Second, with both "or" doublets and "that is" glosses, there does not seem to be any qualitative difference between those placed in the text and those placed in the margins; the

or (more rarely still) used two translations entirely of his own devising.[6] R thus tends simply to make note of alternative literal translations rather than bringing out any "deeper" meaning with his doublets. (This is largely true for the doublets in LV as well, though not as consistently as for rLV's unique doublets.) Admittedly, the line between literal denotation and figurative meaning can become arbitrary, but for most of the doublets unique to rLV, even when one component is not a denotative rendering of the lemma, that component is generally still literal in the sense of representing what the lemma denotes *in its immediate context*, rather than suggesting allegorical or symbolic extensions. In short, rLV's revisor seems to have been primarily interested in clarifying rather than intrusively explicating.

2(a). "Contextualizing" Doublets

An example of a doublet unique to rLV which performs a "contextualizing" operation is found at 1 Samuel (1 Kings)[7] 10:5, in Samuel's speech to Saul after his anointment. Since context is key, it will be useful to consider the whole second half of the verse:

> Vulgate: *et cum ingressus fueris ibi urbem, obuiam habebis <u>gregem</u> prophetarum descendetium de excelso, et ante eos psalterium et tympanum et tibiam et citharam ipsosque prophetantes.*

> LV: And whanne þou schalt entre in to þe citee, þere þou schalt have metynge þee <u>þe flok</u> of prophetis comynge doun fro þe hiȝ place, and a sautree and tympane and pipe and harpe bifor hem, and hem prophesiynge.

---

distinction (which may in many cases have been a matter of space more than anything else) will therefore be disregarded in this paper.

6   Because the first of these three procedures is by far the most common, unless otherwise specified, in all rLV-unique doublets cited in this paper, the doublet's first component is the usual reading in other MSS. of LV according to FM.

7   Throughout this paper, the modern naming and numbering of the Books of Samuel and Kings will be preferred to the Vulgate designation 1–4 Kings. Likewise, the title "Chronicles" (abbreviated "Chr.") will be preferred to "Paralipomena" for the two books known variously by those titles.

rLV: And whanne þou schalt entre in to þe citee, þere þou schalt have meetynge þee <u>a flok or a cumpanye</u> of prophetis comynge doun fro þe hiʒ place, and a sautrie and a tympan and a piipe and an harpe bifore hem, and hem propheciynge.

Here, the first component of R's doublet is the conventional basic translation of *grex*, but since "flock" is normally used only for animals, or applied to humans only by metaphorical extension, the second component supplies a word more literally associated with humans. This is a quite literalistic interpretation, given that application of *grex* to humans is common—the *Oxford Latin Dictionary* includes "company" among its definitions of this word (*OLD* 2a)—and given that the context leaves no room for doubt that the more "human" term is appropriate. Nevertheless, R (uniquely) opts to include the more "human" term without losing the "animal" term which corresponds to the lemma's most basic denotation and to the usual reading of LV. The result is an expanded, explanatory translation, but one that is still literal and straightforward. Much the same is true for other rLV-exclusive doublets: even if only one component is a strictly denotative translation, each component expresses what the lemma denotes *in context*.

Though "contextualizing" doublets are common in different parts of both EV and LV, among rLV's unique doublets they form an outsize proportion. Whether a denotative translation or a paraphrase of the lemma, the second component of many rLV doublets is more literally appropriate to the object, person, or action it describes than is the first component, sometimes even than the lemma. Instances of such interventions by R are numerous and easy to find (Table 1).[8]

---

[8]   All tables of doublets this paper (except Table 5) should be understood as representing a selection rather than providing all instances of a given category. In the case of Table 1 especially the phenomenon in question is open-ended enough that a definitive comprehensive listing would be impossible.

Table 1. "Contextualizing" Doublets in rLV.

Gn. 37:7: *manipulos* = scheves or handfuls ["handfuls" in other LV MSS.]
Lev. 18:25: *euomat* = voome or þrowe ["spewe" in other LV MSS.]
Lev. 27:25: *aestimatio* = preisyng or valu
Num. 11:26: *descripti* = descryved or ordeyned
Jos. 20:6: *reddens* = ȝelde or schewe
Jdg. 1:35: *adgrauata* = maad hevy or dul
Jdg. 6:16: *percuties* = smyte or skunfite
Jdg. 17:5: *aediculam* = a litil hous or an oratorie
1 Sam. 10:5: *gregem* = a flok or a cumpanye
1 Sam. 12:3: *christo eius* = his anoyntid or kyng ["þe crist of hym" in other LV MSS.]
1 Kg. 1:50: *cornu* = horn or corner
2 Kg. 4:16: *si uita comes fuerit* = if liif be felowe or if I lyve
2 Kg. 8:6: *dedit* = ȝaaf or assignyde
2 Kg. 16:3: *transferens* = and bare or drewe
2 Kg. 19:26: *arefacta* = driede or welewide
2 Chr. 18:33: *incertum* = uncerteyn or to gesse
Neh. 13:11: *causam* = cause or execucioun
Jdt. 8:6: *domus* = hous or temple
Est. 1:12: *succensus* = kynlide or tende
Est. 14:16: *signum* = signe or schewyng
Jb. 1:5: *sanctificabat* = halewide hem or movyde hem to holynesse
Jb. 21:13: *bonis* = gode þingis or lustis ["goodis" in other LV MSS.]
Jb. 40:6: *respiciens* = biholde þou or tak hede
Ps. 19:11 (18:12)[9]: *retributio* = ȝelding or reward
Ps. 97:7 (96:7): *sculptilia* = graven þingis or ymages ["sculptilis" in other LV MSS.]
Prv. 1:19: *rapiunt* = ravyshen or taken awey
Prv. 12:11: *suauis* = softe or esy ["swete" in other LV MSS.]
Prv. 12:13: *ruina* = ruyne or myschef ["falling doun" in other LV MSS.]
Prv. 28:4: *succenduntur* = ben teendid or stirid ["kyndlid" in other LV MSS.]
Ecc. 7:10: *sinu* = herte or bosum[10] ["bosum" in other LV MSS.]

In most of these cases, it is difficult to say whether the second component is a second denotative translation of a polysemous lemma or an explanatory paraphrase of a lemma used figuratively, and it is often useless to make the distinction. Again, this kind of translation is found, with similar effect, in

---

9   For all references to the Book of Psalms, the numbering used in modern English translations is given first, the Septuagint/Vulgate numbering (used also by FM and Lindberg) second.
10 Note that, in this case, the more basic translation (which is also the usual LV reading) is given second.

other redactions of LV, but the addition of new doublets shows that R was active in extending this principle into new contexts. With that established, we can now consider what kinds of expressions R subjected to such handling.

The first thing that becomes obvious when one examines the doublets unique to rLV is that most of them occur in Old Testament narrative books, especially those concerned with the political history of Israel. Indeed, about half of the doublets found in rLV but absent from all other copies of LV occur in the Deuteronomistic History (Joshua, Judges, Samuel, Kings). Most of the rest are in the Books of Ezra (*i.e.*, Ezra, Nehemiah, and 3 Ezra), Tobit, Judith, Esther, and Job. The only completely non-narrative books that contain more than a dozen unique doublets are the Psalms and Proverbs (and despite its great length the former contains no more than fifteen). Moreover, there is no attempt in any unique doublet to insert specifically Christian interpretations into the Old Testament material.[11] This emphasis on narrative and its historical context is reflected in an emphasis on concrete nouns and verbs for purposes of explanatory doubling, as can be seen in Table 1.

It also bears pointing out, in line with R's general avoidance of explicitly Christian insertions, that at least a few doublets seem intended specifically to emphasize the pre-Christian nature of their context. For instance, in most copies of LV (and EV), at 2 Chronicles 7:8 *ecclesia* appears as "chirche," but R adds the alternative "congregacioun." The latter translation is no less literal than the former, and in fact the more generic "congregation" is closer to the original meaning of the lemma than is "church," but "chirche" is the usual rendering of this word in the Wycliffite Bible because it is the usual meaning of *ecclesia* in medieval Latin. Nevertheless, the Christian associations of "chirche" are overpowering, and yet rLV is the only LV text to correct for this here by giving an alternative that lacks specifically Christian overtones and fits more neatly into the context of Old Testament Judaism. Similarly, with "Lucifer or dai sterre" for *luciferum* at Job 38:32, the doublet's second component clarifies that the expression does not refer to the devil,[12] and with "don penaunce or forþinken her synne" for *agentes paenitentiam* at 1 (3)

---

[11]   But see section 3 for two instances of Christian interpretation in other unique revisions.

[12]   The second component of this doublet appears as a "that is" gloss in many copies of LV's Job, but only rLV incorporates it as an "or" doublet.

Kings 8:33, the second component prevents the expression from referring to formal penance, with implications of Christian practice unsuited to a pre-Christian Old Testament narrative.

2(b). Polysemous Doublets

Although in cases like those discussed in 2(a) it is often difficult to distinguish between a polysemous lemma and a figurative lemma, the three main categories of doublet outlined in 1(a)—synonymous, figurative, and polysemous—still have basic validity. Moreover, even when used in service of the same ends, the different types serve those ends in different ways. We may take doublets which translate polysemous lemmata first because these illustrate especially well R's priorities in making the text fuller and more explicit. I say this because polysemous words are always potentially difficult words, even if they are common, in that identifying the correct meaning in context can present a challenge. Thus, the use of a doublet to capture multiple possible meanings of its lemma shows what "difficulties" the translator considers worth making note of rather than silently resolving with a single translation. For instance, at 2 (4) Kings 19:6, after the king of Assyria has threatened Hezekiah and the latter has sent messengers to the prophet Isaiah, Isaiah responds as follows:

> Vulgate: *Haec dicetis domino uestro: Haec dicit Dominus: Noli timere <u>a facie</u> sermonum quos audisti, quibus blasphemauerunt pueri regis Assyriorum me.*

> LV: Seie ȝe þese þingis to ȝoure lord: Þe Lord seiþ þese þingis: Nyle þou drede <u>of þe face</u> of wordis whiche þou herdist, bi whiche þe children of þe kyng of Assiriens blasfemeden me.

> rLV: Sey ȝe þese þingis to ȝoure lord: Þe Lord seiþ þese þingis: Nile þou drede <u>of þe face or schewyng</u> of þe wordis þat þou herdist, bi whiche þe children of þe kyng of Assiriens blasfemyden me.

In this case, a variant denotative translation offers a second way of understanding an odd Hebraism, showing that the Latin phrase does not necessarily anthropomorphize "words" in the way "face" suggests, but does not exclude that possibility.[13]

Other doublets unique to rLV which reflect polysemy in their lemmata include those listed in Table 2.

Table 2. Polysemous Doublets in rLV.

Ex. 33:4: *cultu* = ournyng or atiir
Ex. 38:9: *atrium* = grete porche or greet entree
Dt. 11:17: *caelum* = heaven or þe firmament
Jos. 2:6: *stipula* = stobil or schyveres
Rt. 4:17: *congratulationes ei* = þankiden hir or ioieden togidere wiþ hir
1 Sam. 2:33: *anima* = liif or soule ["soule" in other LV MSS.]
1 Sam. 3:14: *domus* = meynee or hous ["hows" in other LV MSS.]
1 Sam. 24:17: *conplesset* = hadde fillid or endid
2 Sam. 23:11: *lente* = lentis or fetchis ["lent" in other LV MSS.]
1 Kg. 7:1: *perfectum* = perfeccioun or perfit eend
1 Kg. 19:12: *aurae tenuis* = þynne wynd or breþinge softly
1 Kg. 20:14: *pedisequos* = þe squyers or þe footmen
2 Kg. 4:24: *puero* = child or servaunt
2 Kg. 7:8: *castrorum* = castels or tentis
2 Kg. 17:17: *diuinationibus* = fals dyvynyng or witchecraft
2 Kg. 19:6: *facie* = of þe face or schewyng
2 Kg. 20:10: *facile* = liȝt or esy ["esy" in other LV MSS.]
2 Kg. 21:5: *caeli* = of heven or firmament [again at 23:5]
2 Kg. 21:12: *tinniant* = tyncle or ringe
1 Chr. 3:11: ortus = born or goten
Jdt. 12:11: *inrideat* = scorne or desceyve
Jdt. 15:4: *inuenire* = fynde or take
Est. 1:3: *pueris* = children or servauntis
Acts 19:13: *exorcistis* = exorsistis or coniurers

There is again a wide array of objects and actions denoted by these doubled expressions. Some patterns emerge, however, particularly when one takes

---

13   The Vulgate's *a facie sermonum* is itself an ultra-literalism, and modern biblical translators usually make no attempt to retain the *facies*/"face" (*pāneh*) element of the Hebrew idiom this phrase translates (which really means "in the presence of" or "because of;" cf. the gloss "þat is, for þe wordis" found in another LV MS. [FM *ad loc.*]).

the larger contexts into account.[14] Words referring to the households and servants of the ruling class account for multiple items, such as the recurring note that *puer* can mean "servant" in addition to its most common denotation "child." (Something similar might be suggested for the doubling of *ortus* in a genealogy, and of *castra* and *inuenire* used as military terms.) Most of the rest of Table 2 comprises, again, expressions for concrete objects and actions whose only real function is fleshing out details of a narrative. For instance, the doublet at Joshua 2:6 merely notes an ambiguity in the source-text about the kind of material used by Rahab to hide the Israelite spies at Jericho, and that at 2 Samuel (2 Kings) 23:11 marks an ambiguity about the crop grown in a field where one of David's "mighty men" defeated an army of Philistines. Likewise, at 1 (3) Kings 7:1, R notes that *perfectum* when referring to the building of the Temple can mean that it was "perfect" but also simply that it was finished. These kinds of expressions, by documenting minor cruxes or ambiguities, show a care for not misleading the reader about what is stated unequivocally in the course of a narrative, even if the point is not significant for anything other than envisioning some aspect of the action.

2(c). Figurative Doublets

The pairing of a denotative translation with a paraphrasal translation that (not always correctly) explicates a figurative usage is also common among R's doublets. There are many cases in which it can be difficult to distinguish a figurative sense from a secondary literal sense, but there are perhaps just as many cases in which a doublet's second component is clearly not a denotative translation of its lemma. For instance, at Tobit 9:10, when Gabael calls for a *benedictio* on Sarah following her marriage to Tobias, R suggests that this refers to the blessing of offspring or material prosperity, and so adds "or encresyng" to LV's "blessyng." In this group also there is, perhaps ironically, an emphasis on the concrete: even though their lemmata are used figuratively, these doublets still mainly appear in passages of narrative and mostly refer to tangible things. Doublets in this group include, among others, those in Table 3.

---

14   Unfortunately, there is no good way of noting context for all items on the list, but I have given references to enable readers to examine the text for themselves.

Table 3. Figurative Doublets in rLV.

Ex. 6:12: *labiis* = in my lippis or spechis
Ex. 14:31: *manum* = hond or power
Lev. 17:4: *sanguinis* = of blood or gret synne
Jos. 3:13: *mole* = o gaderyng or a certeyn place ["o gobet" in other LV MSS.]
Jos. 4:25: *discant* = lerne or know
Jos. 22:31: *alieni* = alien or giltlees
Jos. 24:15: *malum* = yvel or grevous
Jdg. 3:4: *manum* = witnesse or hond ["hond" in other LV MSS.]
Jdg. 5:15: *repperta* = foundun or perceyved
Jdg. 14:18: *arassetis* = eried or bisied ȝou
1 Sam. 2:31: *brachium tuum* = þin arm or þi power
1 Sam. 2:31: *senex* = an olde prest or wiise ["an eld man" in other LV MSS.]
1 Sam. 14:38: *angulos* = þe corners or þe uttermeste parties
1 Sam. 24:6: *percussit cor suum* = smoot his herte or repentide him
2 Sam. 7:2: *in medio pellium* = in þe myddis of skynnys or kyvered wiþ leþir
1 Kg. 20:24: *uerbum* = word or counseil
1 Kg. 20:25: *ceciderunt* = fellen or weren sleyn
2 Kg. 12:15: *tractabant* = tretiden or spendiden
2 Kg. 13:3: *furor* = woodnesse or strong veniaunce ["strong veniance" in other LV MSS.]
2 Kg. 17:11: *fecerunt* = þei diden or spaken
2 Kg. 20:10: *lineis* = lynes or houris
Neh. 2:8: *manum* = hond or help [again in v. 18]
Neh. 9:30: *manum* = hoond or sonde
Jdt. 8:20: *exquiret* = schal seke or venge
Jdt. 14:10: *uirtutis* = of þe power or cheef prince
Jdt. 14:14: *sensu* = þe witt or listnyng
Est. 1:19: *praeteriri* = to be overpassid or broke ["passid" in other LV MSS.]
Jb. 4:16: *uultum* = chere or lickenesse
Jb. 5:14: *per diem* = bi dai or openly
Jb. 9:17: *in turbine* = in a whirlewynd or sodeynly
Ps. 22:20 (21:21): *manu* = hond or power
Ps. 51:14 (50:16): *sanguinibus* = bloodis or synnes
Ps. 56:4 (55:5): *caro* = fleish or man
Hos. 4:13: *capita* = þe hedis eþer coppis

The lemmata translated with doublets here are varied, but in most of these the general movement is toward greater vividness or concreteness in the less-literal component. That is to say, the second component of the doublet almost always restricts rather than broadens the meaning. For example, in translating *sensus* at Judith 14:14, the generic term "witt" is given first as a denotative translation of the lemma, but then hearing is specified because the context (Bagoas listening at the entrance of Holofernes' tent) makes unambiguous that

this is the "witt" in question. Similarly, the verbs *tractare* and *facere* are given the non-literal second translations "spendiden" and "spaken" at different points when their objects are, respectively, money and words. Often, in the second component R provides the tenor of a metaphor for which the lemma (translated literally in the doublet's first component) gives the vehicle. For instance, in the prophecy against Eli, the declaration "I schal kitte awey þin arm" (the usual LV reading of 1 Samuel 2:31) does not mean that Eli's arm will be physically cut off, but is a metonymy whose tenor ("þi power") rLV alone states explicitly. This kind of adaptation can be especially useful when the same lemma has different figurative senses in different contexts, as with the multiple doubled translations of *manus* listed in Table 3. Thus, even in the few cases where the movement is from more specific to more general, as with "arm or power," this tends to be because the specific is "logically problematic" (Sutherland 2017: 196) unless understood as standing in for something more general. This again dovetails with R's literal-minded focus on narrative clarity.

2(d). Synonymous Doublets

Synonymous doublets in rLV tend to fulfil a clarifying purpose similar to their non-synonymous counterparts. With synonymous doublets in the Wycliffite Bible generally, as noted above, it often occurs that one component (usually the first) belongs to a decidedly higher register than the other. Most frequently, as noted in 1(a), the first component is an Anglicized form of the lemma, paired with a Germanic or more ordinary Romance term that means the same thing. This second component is, moreover, sometimes more elaborate in that it expresses the lemma's meaning in multiple words that break it into constituent parts. R follows both of these patterns in many of his doublets. For him, evidently, this kind of doubling was useful in dealing with various technical expressions, where it may be helpful to include an Anglicized form of the Latin term followed by a more explanatory or periphrastic rendering. A representative selection of synonymous doublets—most but not all of them Latinate-Germanic pairings—can be found in Table 4.

Table 4. Synonymous Doublets in rLV.

Ex. 8:2: *terminos* = teermes or coostis
Ex. 26:19: *bases* (1) = baasis or foundement
Ex. 27:21: *successiones* = successiouns or aftercomyngis
Ex. 30:3: *craticulam* = þe gridil or þe over part
Ex. 30:18: *basi* = foundement or seete
Lev. 11:32: *pelles* = skynnes or pilchis
Dt. 32:36: *residui* = remnaunt puple or left ["residues" in other LV MSS.]
Jdg. 14:12: *problema* = a probleme or a privy douteful word
1 Sam. 29:6: *satrapis* = princis or satrapis[15]
1 Kg. 8:33: *agentes paenitentiam* = don penaunce or forþinken her synne
2 Kg. 10:5: *praefectus* = provostis or bailies ["prefect" in other LV MSS.]
2 Kg. 19:23: *terminos* = termes or uttermost coostis
2 Chr. 32:11: *adfirmans* = affermiþ or bihotiþ
Tob. 8:19: *uniuersitas* = þe unyversite or al manere
Jdt. 13:7: *confirma me* = conferme me or make me stable
Est. 2:17: *diadema* = diademe or crowne
Est. 14:2: *stercore* = vile poudre or dust ["dust" in other LV MSS.]
Est. 14:11: *sceptrum* = ȝerde or governaile
Est. 15:14: *sceptrum* = þe ceptre or ȝerde
Jb. 20:25: *uagina* = scheþe or caas
Ps. 50:17 (49:17): *disciplinam* = lore or disciplyne
Prv. 1:18: *fraudes* = fraudis or giiles
Prv. 4:13: *disciplinam* = disciplyne or teching ["teching" in other LV MSS.]
Prv. 5:23: *disciplinam* = disciplyne or chastising ["lernyng"/
     "lernyng eþer chastising" in other LV MSS.]
Prv. 12:13: *ruina* = ruyne or myschef ["falling doun" in other LV MSS.]
Prv. 23:2: *cultrum* = a cultre or a wiþholding ["wiþholding" in other LV MSS.]
Ecc. 4:1: *destitutos* = destitute or failinge ["destitut eþer forsakun" in other LV MSS.]
Sg. 1:11: *nardus* = narde or oynement boxe
Is. 6:13: *decimatio* = þe tiþyng eþer tenþe part
Is. 63:3: *gentibus* = folkis eþer gentilis

Most items on this table can be assigned to just a few categories. First, there are terms related to politics and ruling or the trappings of royalty (*successiones, satrapus, praefectus, diadema, sceptrum, nardus, terminus* in the sense of "border"). Second, there are expressions relating to practical morality (*agentes paenitentiam, disciplina, fraus, ruina*). Third, there are

---

15   Note that here and at Ps. 50:17, rather than supplying a more common alternative to LV's usual reading, R supplies an Anglicization of the lemma where LV normally has only a more common Germanic or Romance word.

terms for concrete objects or actions that clarify potential obscurities in a narrative (*e.g.*, *problema* referring to Samson's riddle,[16] *confirmare* in Judith's prayer for strength) or whose most basic translation, while accurate, is easily misinterpreted (*uniuersitas, decimatio, etc.*). The dominance of these categories underscores especially clearly the focus on matters that a worldly upper-class audience would find of primary interest. Even the explicitly religious ideas that are given this kind of clarification or emphasis are fairly basic and practical, such as repentance (see above, pg. 556f.) and moral instruction, rather than serious doctrinal matters. Both the first and third categories, meanwhile, place an emphasis on issues that occur most commonly in narrative, and historical narrative in particular.

2(e). Doublets in rLV's 3 Ezra

Further confirmation of these observations about doublets in rLV may be drawn from those found in its text of the apocryphal 3 Ezra (known in modern English translations as 1 Esdras), which seem to be entirely R's handiwork. Bodley 277 is the only copy of LV to include 3 Ezra (see Fristedt 1953: 1.26), though the book features regularly in EV: as Hudson observes (1988: 230), "The rejection of 3 Esdras seems to have been relatively late, after the original literal translation [*i.e.*, EV] had been made." Its absence from all other copies of LV (including CCCC 147 and St. John's College 7) thus suggests that the book was independently reinstated into the translation by R. It is apparent, moreover, that rLV's version of this book "is but a recast of the early version [EV], which is followed very closely, except for some explanatory additions, the substitution of one word for another, and the introduction of the methods of LV," as Fristedt puts it (1953: 1.25). The "explanatory additions" (meaning doublets) are of particular interest in this case because they lack counterparts in EV, in which 3 Ezra is free of doublets. The doublets in 3 Ezra therefore illustrate R's peculiar *modus operandi* more directly than do those in other books.

The doublets in rLV's 3 Ezra are the following (Table 5).

---

16 This is adapted from a "that is" gloss found in other LV MSS. The same is true of the doublet at Est. 15:14.

Table 5. Doublets in rLV's 3 Ezra.

1:2: *stolas* = stolis or longe cloþis
1:21: *commemoratione*[17] = þe commemoracioun or mynde making
1:24: *prae* = bifore or more þan
1:30: *pueris* = children or servauntes
1:48: *adiuratus* = adiurid or chargid bi ooþ
4:17: *stolas* = stoles or longe cloþis
4:28: *regiones* = regiouns or kingdoms aboute
4:31: *blanditur* = glosiþ or plesiþ
4:45: *exterminata* = put out of her termes or marchis
4:54: *stolam* = stole or vestyment
4:61: *epistulas* = epistlis or lettres
5:7: *captiuitate* = caitiftee or þraldom
5:9: *praepositi* = provostis or reevys
5:44: *praepositis* = provostis or reeves
5:58: *exsecutores* = executours or folewers
5:59: *stolas* = stoles or longe cloþis
5:61: *in saecula* = in to worldis or ever
6:12: *praepositos* = provostis or revys
7:13: *gentium* = gentiles or heþen folk
9:54: *denuntiabant* = denounciden or schewiden

This set is larger than that for most comparable stretches of text in other copies of LV (for comparison, the canonical Ezra, to which 3 Ezra is largely identical, has only three doublets in most copies), and that on its own would suggest fairly careful revision on R's part. Thus, although Dove (2007: 101) finds that on the whole 3 Ezra as found in rLV "is only lightly revised" from EV, she also notes that the book does contain some distinctive "textual glosses" (*ibid.*, n. 88)—all of them doublets—and it is apparent that R was relatively thorough in modifying the text in this latter regard.

What we find in Table 5 is broadly consistent with patterns identified above for other books in rLV, though with a different ratio of synonymous to non-synonymous doublets. The doublets in 3 Ezra are primarily synonymous: only about four show a noticeable difference in meaning between their two components. All four of these ("children or servauntes," "bifore or more þan," "glosiþ or plesiþ," and "executours or folewers") are most readily classified as

---

17   This is presumably the reading of the source-text: the standard Vulgate text has *commoratione*.

polysemous, and it continues to appear that R's doubling is based on strictly literal exegesis, as all four refer to concrete entities or actions. We see this, for instance, even with *prae* at 1:24:

> Vulgate: *et quae circa illum quidem conscripta sunt in pristinis temporibus, de eis qui peccauerunt quique inreligiosi fuerunt in Dominum <u>prae</u> omnem gentem et regnum.*

> EV: And þoo þingus forsoþe þat abouten hym [King Josiah] ben writen in þe raþere times of hem þat sinneden, who so evere weren unreligious aȝen þe Lord <u>befor</u> alle folc.

> rLV: And þo þingis forsoþe þat weren aboute him ben writen in þe raþere tymes of hem þat synnyden and þe whiche weren unreligious aȝen þe Lord <u>bifore or more þan</u> al heþen folk.

Here, the doubling of the preposition clarifies the text's characterization of the "unreligious" of Josiah's time, suggesting that *prae* indicates the severity of their sin rather than meaning that it was done in the presence of or earlier than others (as "before" on its own is most naturally interpreted). The meaning of this verse is hard to follow in both Latin and English, but R shows special concern to clarify the central narrative point being made here about the persons it describes—that their "sinfulness" exceeded that of others around them.

    With synonymous doublets, too, the second component is not generally *explanatory* in the sense of giving a more in-depth explanation of the lemma and of the first component, but merely tends toward restatement in simpler terms. In that sense, the doubling of rLV's 3 Ezra is largely a means of expressing certain concepts in both a more technical and a more ordinary register. Furthermore, the majority of lemmata that are given doubled renderings, including both of the two that are doubled multiple times (*stola* and *praepositus*) are words with technical religious or legal/political significance. Although, again, the second component is not markedly explanatory in most cases ("adiurid or chargid bi ooþ" is the one clear exception), greater simplicity or familiarity in its words can be an aid to understanding the expression.

For instance, "longe cloþis" does not fully unpack the significance of *stolae*, but it does provide a more elementary translation than does "stolis," a word with which lay readers might not be familiar. In at least one case ("termes or marchis"), the second component introduces a word that is also technical but serves to clarify what technical field the expression draws on (in the case of "marches," this makes unambiguous that the implied expression *termini* means "terms" in the sense of national borders; cf. the doublets at Exodus 8:2 and 2 Kings 19:23 listed in Table 4).

Regarding the fields from which doubled technical expressions—both synonymous and non-synonymous—are drawn, the suggestion made in section 2 that rLV's doublets reflect upper-class political and cultural interests holds up especially strongly for 3 Ezra. I have already stated that most expressions have political or legal connections, as is obviously the case for *adiuratus, regio*, the *termin-* element in *exterminata*, and *praepositus*, but this grouping encompasses also a number of expressions with both non-technical and technical meaning that would be of concern to those interested in law, politics, or the trappings of the ruling classes. For instance, the note that *puer* can mean "servant," which we have seen in other books of rLV, appears here as well. In related fashion, *commemoratio, epistula, captiuitas*, and *denuntiare* all have quotidian denotations, but their doubled translations, by starting with a technical Latinate term, emphasize that they can also have special senses, as public celebration, official communication, political subjugation, and official proclamation, respectively.

Even the expressions whose technical meaning is religious rather than strictly secular (though the distinction can be hard to maintain for semi-theocratic ancient Israel) have to do with public religious offices rather than with doctrine or theology. Thus *stola*, doubled four times in rLV's 3 Ezra, refers in all cases to priestly garments, a visible and outward-facing aspect of religious life, as opposed to more inward-facing spiritual matters or personal devotional practices. This connection to the trappings of *public* religious functions is emphasized especially at 5:54, when the second translation of *stola* is not the pedestrian "long cloth," but another technical term, "vestment," often (though by no means exclusively) associated with Christian priesthood in its public functions. Similarly, in the doubling of *gens* as "gentiles or heþen folk," R, in introducing the doublet's second component, makes the expression

refer explicitly to a religious identity, but one that borders on a national identity, independent of specifics of doctrine or theology.

The larger question of why 3 Ezra was included in rLV in the first place is also worth asking at this point. We have already observed that 3 Ezra was rejected in the development of EV into LV. As the General Prologue to LV states, "Ierome...biddiþ þat no man delite in þe dremis of the iii. and iiii. book of Esdre þat ben apocrifa, þat is, not of autorite of bileve...And þerfore y[18] translatide not þe þridde neiþer þe fourþe book of Esdre, þat ben apocrifa" (FM 1.2). Interestingly, this statement is found in Bodley 277, which contains the first chapter (and only the first chapter) of LV's General Prologue. The inclusion of 3 Ezra is thus unlikely to have been incidental, given that R would have to have been aware of the tradition that rejected this particular apocryphon from the English translation. The reason for R's choice to ignore the prologue's statements about 3 Ezra can only ever be matter for speculation. Nevertheless, we do have some sense of the audience of this revision of the English Bible, which may be useful for thinking about why 3 Ezra would be of interest. Again, even if Bodley 277 was not prepared for the royal family, it was presumably always intended for an aristocratic readership, and it is possible to think of reasons this book might appeal to such an audience.

It is particularly tempting, if we accept Lindberg's date for the manuscript, to link an interest in the later history of Israel with the internecine strife that would eventually develop into the Wars of the Roses. 3 Ezra, like the canonical Ezra, concerns the Jews' return from the Babylonian Exile and the rebuilding of Jerusalem. In that connection, the book could perhaps have been seen as furnishing a parallel to the political situation in Henry VI's England, characterized by growing resistance to Henry's rule. Certainly the Babylonian Exile represents a period of chaos and devastation, in which a rightful king is deposed, and the Books of Ezra represent a restoration of governance and stability. Viewed thus, the story of Ezra could furnish the comforting thought of an end to persecution for a beleaguered king and his

---

18   Though EV and LV are both accepted to be group productions, LV's Prologue consistently uses the singular in referring to the translator/translators. This is usually understood to be a deliberate simplification.

loyalists. Though Bodley 277 certainly comes from an earlier period than the 1450s, when war began in earnest, discontent with Henry VI is also of an older date. Certainly, too, the later owner who inserted the woodcut of Henry mentioned in 1(b) seems to have connected the manuscript with, as Craig (2003: 202) puts it, "the theme of adversity, and of Henry as its cure" in choosing an image in which the king appears in full regalia performing miraculous healings. All this, of course, is purely speculative, and I advance it as a tentative hypothesis only to emphasize that we can envisage concrete ways in which the content of 3 Ezra, as a document of politico-religious reform and revival, might have had relevance to the English aristocracy in the time rLV was apparently produced.

3. Explanatory Insertions and the Audience of rLV

With all this in mind, it will become useful to reexamine the purpose or intended use of the biblical text as revised in Bodley 277. I have already suggested that there is a focus on narrative sections of the Old Testament in the selection of words which R clarifies and emphasizes by doubling. It should be added that this emphasis is out of step with the textual tradition of the Wycliffite Bible in general, as most copies contain only New Testament books. It does, however, echo an older non-Wycliffite tradition associated with clerical attempts to reform aristocratic reading habits: Old Testament stories as a substitute for secular literature. One of the best-known expressions of this tradition in English is the opening of the *Cursor Mundi* (c.1300), which describes Old Testament narratives as "iestes" (116) and explicitly identifies these as a more edifying substitute for "Storis...o ferekin things / O princes, prelates, and o kynges" (21–22). Indeed, the *Cursor* goes into great detail describing what it aims to replace, all of it suggesting the tastes of an upper-class readership: stories of Alexander, Caesar, King Arthur, *etc*. It is notable, in any case, that the poet considers Old Testament narrative the most ready religious substitute for profane literature. An even more specific parallel with rLVcan be found in French biblical literature, including both prose translations and poetic paraphrases. Delbert Russell (2017) has examined a range of Anglo-Norman religious texts known to have been written for upper-class readerships of the 12th–14th centuries, and finds a resonance

between the values of an aristocratic audience and an emphasis both on "what one might be tempted to call the 'military-ecclesiastical complex', and the appeal that narratives of biblical battles and historical conflicts exercised on the medieval military classes" (60) and on the Psalms and Proverbs "for devotional and educational use" (*ibid.*). As we have seen, the nature and distribution of doublets in rLV accord with quite similar emphases. Though rLV comes from much later than the *Cursor* and most of the French texts discussed by Russell, its emphases may follow a related sensibility: that the interests of the upper classes will lead them to those sections of the Bible which concern "princes, prelates, and kings" more than to the New Testament and to basic devotion and morality rather than arcane doctrinal matters.

These emphases on historical narrative and on simple matters of practical morality in rLV's unique doublets are, moreover, congruent with a number of other textual additions unique to Bodley 277. Annie Sutherland (2017: 197–198), for instance, has examined the peculiarities of rLV's rendering of the Psalms and points to some places in which R's revisions make explicit various moral points that are merely implicit in the Vulgate and LV. This can be seen, she notes, in changes like the addition of "wicked" in "þei ben taken in þe *wickide* counseilis which þei þinken" at Psalm 10:2 (9:23). Sutherland adds that "it seems possible that some of Bodl.277's revisions are attempts to clarify what could have been perceived as moments of ambiguity in LV" (198–199), her example being Psalm 6:3 (6:4), where only rLV supplies a verb: "but þou, Lord, hou longe *tariest*?" Similar tendencies can be found in other books as well. For instance, R twice qualifies the Mosaic injunctions against working on the sabbath by restricting the prohibition to "servile" work, once (at Exodus 35:2) by simply adding "servyle" before "werk" and once (at Leviticus 23:3) with the marginal gloss "þat is servyle werk" on "ȝe schul not do in it ony werk." It is especially tempting in this case to make something of the class associations of "servile" (which could be taken as implicitly authorizing the kind of "work" performed by the upper orders), but even apart from such speculation we can see that these glosses aim to address a practical question about how an Old Testament commandment should be applied and do so in a way that focuses on secular social distinctions.

Much more common are glosses and other added material that work to clarify the course of a narrative. This frequently includes marginal or textual

glosses reiterating the antecedent of a pronoun, as when "þe puple" is placed in the margin by "þei" at Exodus 32:4, or when the first-person pronoun "y" in a speech by Caleb in Joshua 4 is twice glossed (once in the margin, once in the text immediately after the pronoun) with "Caleph." Clarifying repetitions of verbs and verb-phrases are also common in rLV, again mainly in narrative sections, as with "he ȝaf" several times throughout Joshua 21, where Joshua apportions cities to the various tribes of Israel. Likewise, R often marks names of persons and places with glosses reminding the reader of who or what the lemma is. To give just a few random instances unique to rLV, throughout Esther "Susa" is routinely preceded by the phrase "þe citee of," while at 1 (3) Kings 12:15 "Ahias" is preceded by "þe prophet," and at 1 Samuel (1 Kings) 16:6 "Heliab" is followed by "a sone of Ysai." In view of what has already been said here about R's apparent emphasis on interests of the aristocracy, it may be interesting to note that this latter kind of gloss seems particularly common with names of kings (*e.g.*, "Iosophat king of Iuda" at 1 [3] Kings 22:4, "Azael kyng of Sirie" and "Ioachaz kyng of Israel" in fairly quick succession in 2 [4] Kings 13:3, 7). None of this is qualitatively foreign to the mainstream of LV, but expansions of these sorts are unusually common in rLV and, as with R's doublets, particularly common in passages of historical narrative.

R's more elaborate glosses and insertions also tend to occur in narrative books and, if not always directly part of a narrative, tend to be concerned with clarifying the text's immediate narrative or historical referent. For instance, when at Exodus 4:2 Moses tells God in the Burning Bush that he carries in his hand "a ȝerde," R inserts the gloss "þat is a scheperdis staff," demonstrating a precise concern for the identifying an object that becomes central to the ensuing action. Likewise, only rLV clarifies Joseph's characterization of Pharaoh's second prophetic dream at Genesis 41:32 as a "schewyng of sadnesse" with the marginal gloss "þat is confermyng of þe first"—a far more comprehensible statement of Joseph's point than the LV text itself provides. In a number of other cases, R makes explicit actions or characterizations inferred from the broader context. For instance, at Joshua 22:17 he expands "many of þe peple fellen doun" into "many of þe peple fellen doun *bi veniaunce for her mawmetrie,*" and at Judges 11:25, he adds a marginal note on the name "Sephor" (Zippor) indicating that Zippor is one "þat made no chalenge of the lond that God toke fro him." Even glosses on non-narrative passages often

work to place the phrases they gloss into their narrative context. For instance, at Genesis 49:4, in the section of the Jacob's Blessing addressed to Reuben, R adds two marginal glosses—"into foul leccherie" on "þou art sched out as watir" and "his wiif" on "for þou wentis up on þe couche of þi fadir and defouledist his bed"—which together make explicit the connection between Jacob's words and the story of Reuben's affair with his father's concubine narrated in Genesis 35. There are admittedly at least two allegorical or "mystical" glosses unique to rLV, with the identification of "þin helþ ȝivere" at Psalm 13:5 (12:6) as "Crist" and of the "wickid man" at Job 20:29 as "Anticrist," in addition to Christological insertions at Psalm 45:2 (44:3) and Zechariah 3:8 regularly found in LV. R's "Christianizing" Old Testament glosses, however, are isolated cases rather than part of any broader pattern, and noticeably go against the grain of the vast majority of his explanatory insertions, doublets or otherwise.

4. Conclusion

That the King of England owned a copy of LV is one of the many pieces of evidence adduced by Henry Ansgar Kelly in favor of his argument that the Wycliffite Bible was not actually Lollard in origin (see Kelly 2016: 115). The usefulness of this evidence for Kelly's argument is, however, undercut by the distinctiveness of the text contained within "King Henry's Bible." As Hudson (2006: 742) remarks of this manuscript, "Whether either [the London Carthusians], or its previous owners, realised the background to the text presented seems…extremely dubious; certainly none of their annotations reveal any such suspicion." This text is still essentially that of the Later Version of the Wycliffite Bible, but it is one that nonetheless stands apart from LV (and EV). The biblical text here is revised in unique ways, and although this does not amount to censorship it does suggest appropriation of the translation by independent revisors rather than direct association with the original translators and their agenda. The logical inference from the similarities between rLV and CCCC 147's text is, as Lindberg realized, that both manuscripts reflect a lost revision of the LV text, but that both were also further (and independently) edited by later revisors, "R" being one of these. (Incidentally, this conclusion precludes Solopova's suggestion [2017: 231]

that the revisions in both Bodley 277 and CCCC 147 taper off after the Psalms because the rLV revisor was under time-constraints, as this assumes that the revisions the two manuscripts share originated in Bodley 277.) Lindberg (1999: 1.47) dates this lost urtext to the last decade of the fourteenth century, and supposes it to be a direct continuation of the project of LV (*ibid.*). Dove (2007: 152) goes so far as to posit—though professedly just as a guess without material evidence—that the Bodley 277 revisor was one of the original LV translators. Nevertheless, both Bodley 277 and CCCC 147 probably date to no earlier than the late 1410s, giving us little cause to assume the revision to be much older than that, and both are large, deluxe pandects, which is more consistent with a revision for a specialized audience than with one intended for the same broad audience as the "common" LV. As Hanna (2015: 184) observes, books like these cannot have been products of a "clandestine" movement but "required extended professional involvement."[19]

Still, rather than radically altering the text, the revision of LV into rLV in general follows the same drift as the earlier stage of revision that had produced LV itself: the revisors' main concern, in both cases, was to improve the naturalness of the text as English prose. For both stages of revision, this improvement has mainly to do with matters of syntax that bear little significance for the meaning of the words, but rLV features some peculiar and characteristic changes that set it apart. Perhaps most noticeably, as Dove summarizes (2004: 36), "what Lindberg calls the 'existential' þer is frequently added…[For instance], 'and no wem is in þee' (LV) becomes 'and þer is no wem in þee' in this manuscript." Nevertheless, although doublets may not be the area of most frequent modification in rLV, they can be used especially neatly as an index of what the promulgation of the text meant for R. This in turn seems to suggest that the immediate purpose of rLV differs from that of the biblical translation project generally, and thus that the nature and immediate origin of Bodley 277 cannot tell us anything except how the Wycliffite Bible text was used and redacted *in a certain context*.

Discussion of the unique revisions found in MS. Bodley 277 will have to remain partly speculative. There is simply too little evidence about the

---

19   Hanna himself, however, supposes that this applies to the Wycliffite Bible (and Lollardy) generally, not just the deluxe copies.

process of revision to know with certainty what audience R had in mind when adapting the text, or even what revisions he may have copied from his now-lost exemplar. Nevertheless, a number of conclusions can be drawn from the evidence we have examined. The proliferation of new translational doublets in rLV puts R's considerations of the text's meaning on clear display. If nothing else, the selection of lemmata for which doubled translations are given follows some noticeable tendencies. To recapitulate, rLV introduces doublets not found in other copies of LV mainly into the narrative sections of the Old Testament, and mainly uses them for expressions whose referent is something concrete. This includes specifying multiple meanings for expressions with more than one possibly-applicable denotation in some cases, and suggesting the implied referent of a figurative expression (while also retaining this figurative expression) in others. These uses of doublets are characteristic of LV in general, but rLV is distinctive in limiting doublets of these types largely to matters having to do with the course of a story, as well as for applying them particularly often to political or aristocratic elements. It should be emphasized in closing, however, that these are tendencies rather than absolute rules, and R should not be considered single-minded in his focus. For instance, none of the trends outlined here can explain doublets like "is eþer was" at Isaiah 63:3, which seems to have been introduced simply to match the tense of the surrounding verbs. Space has also forbidden me to discuss instances where R drew his alternative translations from EV, many but not all of which are explicable in terms of the categories examined above (see footnote 1 for an example). Nevertheless, R's introduction of unique doublets into the translation shows what issues he was concerned to clarify at the level of the individual word, and in this he seems to have adapted his focus to the interests of the (upper-class) audience for whom he revised the LV text.

The emphasis on the Old Testament in this revision is remarkable, given that, as noted above, the broader textual tradition of the Wycliffite Bible shows a primary emphasis on the New Testament. Even the presence of 3 Ezra in rLV points to a break with the mainstream of LV. It seems clear, then, that R's revision was not part of any centralized plan to refine the text of the Wycliffite Bible. This royal manuscript thus underscores how non-monolithic the distribution and reception of the first complete English Bible must have been. LV was not used exclusively to help Latin-illiterate Lollards analyze

apostolic doctrine for themselves, but could be consumed by unquestioningly orthodox readers as well as by would-be reformers. Kelly is probably right to suggest that the text in Bodley 277 is of non-Lollard origin—his mistake is to transfer this conclusion from one manuscript deemed suitable for the household of the king to the translation project's overall agenda. The text of rLV is derived ultimately from heterodox roots in LV, but its distinctiveness points to the co-opting of an original product by a variety of readerships. **N**

MATTHEW DIEM

THE UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA AT CHAPEL HILL

Works cited

CRAIG, Leigh Ann 2003. Royalty, Virtue, and Adversity: The Cult of King Henry VI. *Albion* 35 (2): 187–209. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0095139000069817

DENNISON, Lynda, and Nigel Morgan 2007 The Decoration of Wycliffite Bibles. *The Wycliffite Bible: Origin, History and Interpretation*, ed. Elizabeth Solopova, 266–345. Leiden — Boston: Brill. https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004328921_015

DOVE, Mary 2007. *The First English Bible: The Text and Context of the Wycliffite Versions.* Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press.

DOVE, Mary 2004. Review: *King Henry's Bible, MS Bodley 277: The Revised Version of the Wyclif Bible, vol. III, Proverbs–II Maccabees. Notes and Queries* 51 (4): 436–437. https://doi.org/10.1093/nq/510436

FORSHALL, Josiah, and Frederic Madden (eds.) 1850. *The Holy Bible, Containing the Old and New Testaments, with the Apocryphal Books, in the Earliest English Versions Made from the Latin Vulgate by John Wycliffe and His Followers*, 4 vols. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

FRISTEDT, Sven L. 1953. *The Wycliffe Bible*, 2 vols. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell.

GLARE, P.G.W. (ed.) 2012. *Oxford Latin Dictionary*, 2nd ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

HANNA, Ralph 2015. The Sizes of Middle English Books, ca. 1390–1430. *Journal of the Early Book Society for the Study of Manuscripts and Printing History* 18: 181–191.

HARGREAVES, Henry 1969. The Wycliffite Versions. *The Cambridge History of the Bible*, vol. 2, ed. G.W.H. Lampe, 387–415. Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press.

HUDSON, Anne 1988. *The Premature Reformation: Wycliffite Texts and Lollard History.* Oxford: Clarendon Press.

HUDSON, Anne 2006. The Carthusians and a Wycliffite Bible. *Ecclesia—Cultura—Potestas: Studia z dziejów kultury i społeczeństwa,* ed. Pawła Krasa et al., 731–742. Krakow: Societas Vistulana.

KELLY, Henry Ansgar 2016. *The Middle English Bible: A Reassessment*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania. https://doi.org/10.9783/9780812293081

KENNEDY, Kathleen E. 2014. *The Courtly and Commercial Art of the Wycliffite Bible.* Turnhout: Brepols Publishers. https://doi.org/10.1484/m.mcs-eb.5.112245

KOPACZYK, Joanna, and Hans Sauer 2017. Defining and Exploring Binomials. *Binomials in the History of English: Fixed and Flexible*, ed. Joanna Kopaczyk and Hans Sauer, 1–24. Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781316339770.001

KOSKENNIEMI, Inna 1968. *Repetitive Word Pairs in Old and Early Middle English Prose: Expressions of the Type "Whole and Sound" and "Answered and Said" and Other Parallel Constructions*. Turku: Turun Yliopisto.

KRYGIER, Marcin 2017. Binomial Glosses in Translation: The Case of the Wycliffite Bible. *Binomials in the History of English: Fixed and Flexible,* ed. Joanna Kopaczyk and Hans Sauer, 159–172. Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781316339770.009

KUCZYNSKI, Michael P. 2017. Glossing and Glosses. *The Wycliffite Bible: Origin, History and Interpretation*, ed. Elizabeth Solopova, 346–368. Leiden — Boston: Brill. https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004328921_016

LINDBERG, Conrad (ed.) 1999–2004. *King Henry's Bible, MS Bodley 277: The Revised Version of the Wyclif Bible*, 4 vols. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell International.

LINDBERG, Conrad 2007. *A Manual of the Wyclif Bible, Including the Psalms: Dedicated to the Memory of Sven L. Fristedt*. Stockholm: Stockholm University.

MORRIS, Richard (ed.) 1874. *Cursor Mundi (The cursur o the world)*. London: Early English Text Society.

RUSSELL, Delbert 2017. The European Background: "þe Bible and oþere bookis of deuociun and of exposicioun" in French. *The Wycliffite Bible: Origin, History and Interpretation*, ed. Elizabeth Solopova, 49–65. Leiden — Boston: Brill. https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004328921_005

SOLOPOVA, Elizabeth 2017. The Manuscript Tradition. *The Wycliffite Bible: Origin, History and Interpretation*, ed. Elizabeth Solopova, 223–245. Leiden — Boston: Brill. https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004328921_013

SOLOPOVA, Elizabeth 2016. *Manusripts of the Wycliffite Bible in the Bodleian and Oxford College Libraries*. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press.

SUTHERLAND, Annie 2017. *The Wycliffite Psalms. The Wycliffite Bible: Origin, History and Interpretation*, ed. Elizabeth Solopova, 183–201. Leiden — Boston: Brill. https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004328921_011