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Old learning and the ambivalence of the reforming reader

Post-Reformation antiquarians maintained complex and ambivalent relationships to the religious textual cultures of the Middle Ages. This article discusses two sixteenth-century annotators of The Prickynge of Love, a text that might easily be understood to be antithetical to Protestant forms of religiosity. A highly affective devotional work renowned for its “blood piety,” this text nevertheless inspired constructive responses from two English reformist readers. The first, Stephen Batman, is well known to scholars of antiquarianism. The second is an anonymous churchman who represents those outside of elite ecclesiastical circles who engaged theologically with late medieval religious literature.

James Simpson’s discussion of John Leland’s and John Bale’s “highly schizophrenic” engagements with pre-Reformation
books, characterizing the “civic humanist” and “millenarian Protestant” as “agent(s) of the destruction of the past [they] seek to recuperate,” has been profoundly influential in recent scholarship.¹ This generation of antiquarians, Simpson argues, manifested a cognitive dissonance in that they lamented the destruction of monastic collections while at the same time they wished to bifurcate “the brilliance of their own age” from a “negative period ending in the immediate past.”² Jennifer Summit expands upon Simpson’s theme, demonstrating how Archbishop Matthew Parker and his book-collecting associate Stephen Batman held conflicting attitudes toward a literary heritage that (in Bale’s terms) included both “profytable corne” and “unprofytable chaffe.”³ John Bale and Stephen Batman similarly understood that the “profytable corne” embedded in the “ancient” monuments of the past was needed to seed a new pastoral theology in the bright new age of reformation. Bale in a letter to Matthew Parker (dated July 30, 1560) that complains of the “lamentable spoyle of the lybraryes of Englande” considers the obliteration of books as a tactic of the devil to hinder the project of battling the church in Rome—“all to destructyon of learnynge and knowledge of thynges necessary in thys fall of Anticriste to be knowne, but the Deuyll is a knaue, they saye.”⁴ Bale’s letter reveals that even the “chaffe”—sometimes especially the “chaffe”—can be used in the project of trumpeting the fall of the pope and his church, for such “Babylonysh trashe” allows Protestants to
trace the lineaments of Romish error. He highlights the example of the history of Roman popes attributed to Damasus, which Bale excoriates as a font of misinformation that was propagated in subsequent histories:

Damasus the Spanyarde and byshopp of Rome, wrote de gestis Romanorum pontificum, I haue seane at Basyll an olde copye therof . . . lete wyse men take hede of the deceit of that boke and suche lyke. . . . For therby haue all the hystorycall writers receyued deadly poyson by most notoryouse lyes.³

Nonetheless, antiquarians such as Leland, Bale, and Batman also grasped the need to winnow the “corne” from the “chaffe” in respect of pastoral education. Bale’s Laboryouse journey explains that Leland had hoped that “the scriptures of God might therby be more purely taught than afore in the Romish popes time” and “that al kyndes of wicked superstycyons, and of the sophistical doctrines, myghte be removed hens.”⁶ Yet Bale also hints in the Laboryouse journey at the difficulty of “winnowing” and even suggests that the only way to preserve the good corn, at least initially, is to preserve everything. Bale’s letter to Parker lists books and texts all deemed in some way relatable to the needs of the Reformation, though the majority of them are not framed (not could be) within the binary of “corne” and “chaffe.”⁷ The overarching problem with the despoiling of monastic libraries,
in the view of bibliophiles like Bale and Batman, was that such blind annihilation of books was far too crude a means for purging Romish error from England's literary heritage. Instead of thoughtlessly dispersing England's past writings, a much more nuanced process was required: individual books should be "polyshed"—as Bale said of medieval chronicles—cleansed of problematic and erroneous materials. Summit explains:

This work of "polishing" as Bale defines it—as an act of restoration that removes Catholic "blemish" and thus recovers chronicle for Protestant use—shows that processes of selection and purification take place in Reformation libraries not only from book to book, as some are selected for preservation whilst others are rejected, but also within books . . . the work of distinction extended to the act of reading itself.

This article looks at cognate processes of cultural preservation across the epochal medieval Catholic/early modern Protestant divide that Simpson and others have argued was being constructed at precisely this historical moment. Scholarship, epitomized by the work of Simpson and Summit, has rightly taken up issues of periodization and the conflicted nature of Tudor antiquarian encounters with a newly constructed and often demonized medieval past. However, relatively little scholarship documents post-Reformation engagements with actual books and the often productive processes of rehabilitating texts that had become doctrinally
problematic in Elizabethan England. Stephen Batman exemplifies the process of antiquarian recovery of ancient texts following the dissolution of the monasteries and the willed destruction of England’s Catholic past during the Henrician Reformation. This is not antiquarianism for its own sake: books are not rescued out of a general respect for the past, for their material value, for the historical insights they may impart, or because they look good on shelves. This process of recovery involves carefully selecting what is worth preserving, what can be beneficially discarded, and what can be made to serve present needs. Another form of preservation involves working inside books themselves in the manner of Bale’s “polishing.” We offer a detailed account of acts of discrimination, approbation, and rejection that occurred within actual books. Batman and the anonymous annotator we discuss pay careful attention to a medieval devotional text, The Prickynge of Love, to disentangle sound teaching from false and to discern which aspects are compatible with the new order of Anglican reformed theology. We offer a close reading and theological contextualization of their engagements with this medieval devotional text.

**Stephen Batman reading The Prickynge of Love**

On October 14, 1578, Stephen Batman (ca. 1542–1584), scholar, antiquarian, and Church of England clergyman, purchased a small late medieval miscellany containing five religious texts
for the sum of 18 pence. The manuscript, now Cambridge, Trinity College, MS B.14.19, was one of several collected by Batman containing Middle English devotional texts, including Piers Plowman, Ancrene Riwle, The Mirror of St. Edmund, The Doctrine of the Heart, A Treatise of Privy Counselling, The Cloud of Unknowing, as well as a volume of Wycliffite commentaries on the Gospels, and another of extracts from the Wycliffite Bible. The keen interest that Batman took in medieval religious writing and particularly in Middle English devotional texts is particularly evidenced by the Trinity manuscript, which, in addition to the pseudo-Bonaventuran Prickynge of Love and Meditations on the Supper of Our Lord and the Hours of the Passion, contains The Chastising of God’s Children, Richard Caistre’s Hymn, and a short Bernardine treatise on discerning fleshly desire. Prefacing The Prickynge of Love is the following comment written by Batman, which provides us with some insight into his perspective on, and esteem for, pre-Reformation English devotionalia:

In mani placis of this Stimulus amoris this pricke of Love, are veraye good & sounde documents of scripture, and what the reste are, consider the tyme. He is no wyse man that for the haueng of spiders, scorpions, or any outher noysom thinge in his howse will therefore set the whole howse on fier: for by that meanes, he disf[u]rnisheth himselfe of his howse: and so doo men by rashe b[u]rneng of ancient Recordes lose the knowledge of
muche learnenge: there be meanes and wayes to presarve the good corne by gathering oute the wedes. S. B. (fol. 67v)

These comments, the implications of which will be explored in this essay, register a respect for past devotional writing far from the norm of the day, and they provide some rationale for Batman’s ambitious antiquarian efforts to save books in manuscript and print for posterity. That much of the impetus for Batman’s book-saving enterprise was derived from his association with the remarkably erudite circle of Archbishop Matthew Parker (1504–1575) has been amply documented.12 If we believe his own account, Batman was the most prolific of a group of scholars supported by Parker to salvage the learning in old manuscripts that might otherwise be lost or neglected; in his The Doome warning all men to the Judgemente (1581), Batman remarks that with the dissolution of the monasteries “their Libraries wer most vtterly spoyled, to the great hurt and hindraunce of learning,” and he notes that his book-collecting efforts concentrate on the broad subject areas of “Diuinitie, Astronomie, Historie, Phisicke, and others of sundrye Artes and Sciences.”13 It was under the patronage of Parker that Batman claims to have accumulated 6,700 books “by my onelye trauaile,” many of which were subsequently deposited by Parker himself in Corpus Christi College, Cambridge.14
There can thus be no doubt that the association with the Parker household provided the funds and motivation for Batman’s antiquarian zeal and determination to preserve what he saw as “much learnenge” in ancient documents. However, as M. B. Parkes notes in an essay on Batman’s manuscripts, “he was not an antiquarian for its own sake; he read, published, and collected printed books and manuscripts for other reasons as well.” We want here to develop a suggestion in Parkes’s essay that Batman took a utilitarian approach to the spiritual writing of the past, and that as a minister in the established Church he sourced Middle English devotional writings for material for sermons and pastoral guidance.

Batman’s annotations and occasional glosses in texts such as *The Doctrine of the Heart*, *The Mirror of St. Edmund*, and *The Chastising of God’s Children* show that he took a keen interest in Middle English devotional literature; the works annotated all contain extensive resources for the management of spiritual ambition, and all make rich use of the sort of vivid and homely imagery that would have been popular in sermons. In British Library, MS Harley 2373, which contains *Benjamin Minor*, *The Cloud of Unknowing*, and *The Book of Privy Counselling*, Batman provides occasional marginal annotations, noting, for instance, gradations of spiritual progress (“common,” “special,” “singular,” “perfyt”) that might have guided him in the pastoral monitoring of individual spiritual progress, and he marks or underlines occasional passages
relating to conventional issues of pastoral guidance such as penitence, discretion, and the discernment of spirits. As A. S. G. Edwards has noted, Batman even transcribed in totality the treatise for contemplatives, *The Book of Privy Counselling*, into what is now Harvard University, Houghton Library MS f Eng 1015, copying from yet another medieval sourcebook, now Cambridge University Library, MS II.vi.31. Batman inserted a series of glosses into both books (sometimes, though not always paralleled in each volume), which range from explanatory treatments of difficult Middle English words to notes reflecting current theology and explaining the meaning of his medieval source. Edwards notes “how markedly unpolemical or [un]explicitly anti-Catholic most of his annotation is” and is even on occasion “positively approbatory.”

The Trinity College manuscript containing *The Prickynge of Love*, the Middle English adaptation of the Latin *Stimulus Amoris* in all probability written by Walter Hilton, an Augustinian canon writing in the late fourteenth century, gives us some further insight into Batman’s priorities. It is clear that he esteems the text for its relevance to his own time and for the “learnenge” it can impart to those willing to judge the “ancient” work favorably on its own terms. Batman’s annotations of *The Prickynge of Love* are rather few and far between; sometimes they appear in the outer margins where a substantial portion has been lost due to later cropping of the
Trinity manuscript. Whatever can be read, however, does provide us with some insight into the uses that Batman found for the sort of passages that particularly appealed to him. Apart from some sporadic endorsement of the chapter on the Pater Noster ("A deuouȝte exposicioun of þe pater noster"), it is particularly clear that the attention of Batman is caught by a number of striking formulations in the medieval text. For example, the Middle English describes one who despises God as "more erþely þanne erthe, nesshere [softer] þanne watir, more veyn þenne þe eyre, and more brennande [burning] in luste þenn ðe fere is in hete, he is harder þanne a stone, fellere [crueler] aȝeyn hym-self þanne a wylde beste"; Batman then repeats this passage in the margin with some modernization of spelling and punctuation. Likewise, a bit further down in the margin (fol. 88v) he rewrites the following passage (with a few archaisms updated): "De erþe seyth, wy bere I soche a creature vn-swolued [unswallowed], þe water seïp, wy bere I soche a theef vn-drowned, þe eyʒer seyth, wy ʒeue I him breeþ, þe feer [fire] sayth, why breне I not hym, ʒee & helle seyth, wy drawe I not to me soche a felounn" (56).

There is thus some indication that Batman was actively quarrying The Prickynge of Love, along with other of his Middle English devotional materials, for interesting rhetorical turns and ornament; passages of paradox, simile, and repetition appealed strongly to Batman, who appears to have been looking for striking sound bites with a didactic
thrust to incorporate into his preaching. That this particular text could have provided useful material for sermons and pastoral guidance, and generally appealed in a post-Reformation environment, should not surprise us: The Prickynge of Love offers a particularly rich mosaic of material relating to spiritual guidance, the discernment of spirits, and the management of spiritual ambition. It presents an unswerving Christocentric focus of sustained meditations and prayers, often conveyed through a fully mobilized repertoire of invocation, metaphor, paradox, and other ambitious rhetorical techniques.

It has been noted that, as Hilton renders the Stimulus Amoris available to readers in the English language, he produces a text characterized by a thoroughly Christocentric emphasis that is not a prominent feature of the Latin source. In almost every chapter of the English adaptation, theocentric references in the Latin are modified by an appeal to Christ, creating a constant focus on Christ’s Passion and his salvific works. An equally notable feature of the Middle English adaptation is a carefully articulated theology of grace that emphasizes the power of the divine will to grant or withhold grace and sweetness in devotion. In the theology of The Prickynge of Love, salvation is regarded predominantly as being humanly unattainable. Spiritual progress can occur through the sovereign grace of a God who, in a memorable
phrase, is characterized as “wondir liberall” (Prickynge, 133).

These emphases, which promote specific theological priorities in the Middle English, worked to ensure the later appeal of The Prickynge of Love as a resource for post-Reformation preaching. The long meditative glosses on central prayers like the Pater Noster (Prickynge, chap. 36), judging from manuscript evidence discussed below, conveyed the usefulness of the text and established its concordance with the theological priorities of the mid-sixteenth century and beyond. Furthermore, The Prickynge of Love is largely free of the host miracles, saints’ lives, and numerous exempla that are common features of late medieval sermon literature and appear in some of the sermons published by early English printers from Caxton onward, such as Jacobus Voragine’s Legenda Aurea, the anonymous Quattuor Sermones, and John Mirk’s Festial. As Helen Spencer notes, the word narrations, which in Mirk’s own usage designates exempla and stories from saints’ lives, “had become a loaded word in Reformist polemic” and was dismissed above all for being unscriptural.²² It is revealing that in the opening nota (quoted in full above) that Batman specifically intended to preface The Prickynge of Love, he commends this text for what is termed “veraye good & sounde documents of scripture.” The wording here suggests that Batman values the text precisely for the way it avoids certain kinds of unscriptural augmentation and provides instead layers of
meditative and penitential gloss focused closely on the central gospel narrative of Christ’s Passion.

In recommending the reading and preservation of a text like *The Prickynge of Love*, Batman was guided by his own personal piety, and we see in some of his annotations attempts to accommodate the devotional writing of an earlier epoch to his own beliefs and specifically to what Rivkah Zim terms a “moral impulse towards Protestant edification.” Thus when Batman, in his copy of the *Mirror of St. Edmund* now in Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS 416, glosses “purgatory” in the text as “troble of conscience” in the margin, this registers both respect for the pre-Reformation spiritual heritage and an attempt to assert its usefulness in a new cultural location. Here is none, or at any account very little, of the rejection of such doctrine as false, erroneous, or as “romish” or “papistical” that we might otherwise expect from this period’s religious writing and polemic; instead the emphasis is on the contemporary spiritual relevance of what Batman sometimes terms “papistical” texts and the application of medieval devotional literature to a Protestant rationale of moral and religious instruction.

But, crucially, Batman is also capable of distancing himself from what he sees as the errors of the past. As he notes at the beginning of the *Psalter of St. Jerome* in Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Bodley 416, “here is to be senne the ignoraunce of tyme past / praie that soche tyme be neuer a
gayne."\textsuperscript{24} Crucially for Batman, careful discernment, understood as rational theological judgment, must be applied to doctrine propagated in past devotional writing; only through the power of discernment can one assess the value of such doctrine, winnowing the "fals" teaching of the old order from valid teaching that can provide a lineage for sound reformed theology. Batman often underscores this practice of informed assessment—"to presarve the good corne by gathering oute the wedes" as he notes in the Trinity manuscript, clearly alluding to Matthew 13:29-30—sometimes in brief verse exhortations to readers such as we find in Cambridge, Magdalene College, MS Pepys 2498:

\begin{quote}
Let reason Rule the, that thus booke shall reede;
Miche good matter shalt thow finde in deede
Thowghe some bee ill, doo not the reste dispize
Consider of the tyme, else thow art not wize.\textsuperscript{25}
\end{quote}

In stressing the necessity for reasoned judgment, Batman shares a preoccupation with the virtue of discernment also embedded in \textit{The Prickynge of Love}, but his priorities are markedly different from his medieval text. In the \textit{Prickynge}, judgment and discernment never trespass into the arena of speculative theology: the idea of discernment concerns itself almost entirely with the discernment of spiritual impressions that an individual may receive, and it seeks to indicate a
secure course amidst spiritual stirrings and conflicted inclinations of the soul. By contrast, Batman foregrounds reason as the faculty that discriminates valid from invalid doctrine: his interest is perhaps more closely affiliated with another late medieval tendency, represented in exemplary fashion by Reginald Pecock (ca. 1395–ca. 1460), who advocates reasoned judgment (the "doom of resoun" in Pecock’s terminology) in the attempt to reassert orthodoxy and determine truths of theology and moral teaching. [AU: A note is needed here citing Pecock in full] In both Pecock and the annotations of Batman, the discipline of discretio spirituum is understood predominantly as the innate capacity of rational judgment in all individuals that enables the distinction between sound and false teaching.

In the annotations of Batman, we note a remarkable admiration for past learning, along with a determination to preserve it in order, finally, to let others judge its validity. When we turn to the extensive program of post-Reformation annotation in another manuscript of The Prickynge of Love, Yale University, Beinecke Library, MS 223, we see what the process of discernment advocated by Batman looks like in the hands of someone with considerable theological training, very possibly a person much closer to the front line of pastoral education in tune with the latest reformist theology.
We believe that the annotations of Batman and the particular interest he took in *The Prickynge of Love* point to the theologically considered approach of the Beinecke annotator, who systematically studies the theology of this text in order to distance himself from pre-Reformation “error,” but equally to trace a historical lineage for sound and reformed doctrine. Roughly contemporaries, Batman and the Beinecke annotator to whom we now turn, agree on the relevance of *The Prickynge of Love* in their own time; in their understanding, it is not the case that the entire text represents the Catholicism of Rome, but only that its obvious errors do.

**The annotations in Yale University, Beinecke Library, MS 223**

The annotator of Yale University, Beinecke Library, MS 223 has left us with an extraordinary record of engagement with *The Prickynge of Love*, providing a number of insights into how a theologically enlightened reader might engage with late medieval religious literature. This manuscript features a somewhat mixed dialect that indicates the book may have been penned in Norfolk in the early fifteenth century, with the exemplar for the text originating somewhere between Northampton (where the *Prickynge* was initially composed and transmitted, most likely in Hilton’s Augustinian priory of Thurgarton) and southeast Lincolnshire. The manuscript was perhaps copied in one of the urban centers in Norfolk, such as
King’s Lynn or even Norwich, where the text was expanded to include some additional and newly translated chapters from the Stimulus Amoris. There is some material evidence in the book for fifteenth-century reading activity pointing to an educated, spiritually ambitious reader, who pens commentaries beside a number of passages concerned with spiritual self-improvement, and who writes in an elegant, practiced anglicana script. The book may well have come into the secondhand book market following the break-up of a monastic house. The manuscript was handsomely made, written in a fine textura quadrata in the first half of the fifteenth century, and may well have been produced for, or within, a house of professional religious, a transmission setting in which the Prickynge is regularly found. Such a provenance is strongly hinted at by the unique version of the text found in the Beinecke manuscript, which contains five interpolated chapters otherwise not found in the English adaptation of Stimulus Amoris. Whoever expanded Hilton’s text must have had access to the Latin source, translating the additional chapters from the Stimulus and including these in the Prickynge according to the original schema of chapters as found in the Latin original. This endeavor to expand the Prickynge reveals adaptors who not only have extended access to the Stimulus, but possess the erudition to perceive that certain, apparently useful chapters had been omitted in Hilton’s vernacular version and the necessary translation skills to rectify the absence. The fact
that the Beinecke manuscript is unique in preserving these chapters suggests that the producers of this book were either directly responsible for the additions, or were somehow linked to those responsible for extending the Prickynge. Such factors make a scenario of learned monastic production and transmission very likely.

The sixteenth-century reader’s interactions with the text reveal a few facts that can help us broadly situate him, at least temporally. He probably penned his messy secretary scrawl into the manuscript between 1560 and around 1600, with the terminus post quem provided by the annotator’s direct and implied use of the Geneva Bible which was almost certainly at his elbow as he engaged with the Prickynge. This hugely popular English translation of the Bible had been produced by exiles from Mary Tudor’s England: it was dedicated to Elizabeth I and was quickly disseminated in England after its first publication, before being printed there following the death of Archbishop Parker in 1575. Although it was glossed with Calvinist-inflected commentaries, the Geneva Bible was by no means the marker of a Puritan in the late sixteenth century. Akin to Ralph Hanna’s description of the Wycliffite Bible in the late fourteenth and early fifteenth centuries, so it was with the Geneva Bible: until the publication of the King James Bible, it was, for all intents and purposes, “the only game in town.” In terms of contemporary English translations, it was rivalled only by the impractically
mammoth and inordinately expensive Bishops’ Bible (completed under Archbishop Parker in 1568 for use by the bishops and for parochial pulpit reading) until the printing of the King James Bible (1611), a publication which would take time to fully usurp the Geneva Bible’s popularity. There were a number of other English versions of the Bible from earlier in the century, but none were so commonly owned as the Geneva translation. During its incredible run of around 140 editions (not merely print runs) between 1560 and 1644, the Geneva Bible was produced in a variety of often relatively inexpensive and utilitarian formats and thus became almost ubiquitous in late sixteenth-century England among moderate and Puritan and lay and clerical readers alike. It is worth noting, though, that in some places the annotator of Beinecke 223 reveals knowledge of English scripture that extends beyond the Geneva Bible, potentially signalling his status as a churchman. Referring to 1 Kings 18, he names the Old Testament prophet as “Elias,” [AU: cite fol. ref. for this] repeating the name as recorded in the Bishops’ and Coverdale Bibles, as opposed to the form “Elijah” preferred in the Geneva translation, and there is at least one other occasion in which the annotator seems to recall a reading that chimes more closely with the Bishops’ Bible than the translation in either the Geneva Bible or other English translations. When taken into account with the theological knowledge of the annotator, this may be the best clue to the annotator’s status as a
reforming ecclesiast, someone who had years of exposure to several English biblical translations.

Unlike Stephen Batman’s interaction with many of the medieval manuscripts he owned and read, we cannot explain exactly how the Beinecke annotator gained access to the manuscript or pin down an original provenance for the book. His engagements with the text can seem strangely dissonant: he is simultaneously outraged and complimentary, sectarian and open; he might even sometimes be described as “hospitable” toward the powerfully affective late medieval devotional text. He establishes the utterly dissolute state of devotional and pastoral praxis within the “romish church,” while highlighting readings that chime with the “doctryne of the reformed churches,”[AU: again, supply fol. ref. for these quotations] institutions that are presented as being ideologically unified against the depraved Roman Catholic other. Indeed, as we shall see, some of the issues raised by the annotator would not have been accepted by all of the reformed churches, but such a homogenizing impulse was common among English sixteenth-century reformers. Particularly when faced with the “common enemy,” as was the case in the pages of Beinecke 223, “mitigating . . . divisions” and presenting a united front against Roman Catholicism was typical. Nevertheless, the annotator painstakingly works through the manuscript not only to point out heresy and error, but also to recuperate worthy devotions and articulations of theological
perspectives which he can appropriate to the cause of his own reformist beliefs. One of his most telling declarations occurs near the opening of the manuscript:

It is sayde by an auntient learned writer that there is noe doctrine soe fals which doeth not mingle many good, true and wholesome instructions with the fals. For it is impossible that any doctrine shulde be soe superstishouse, hereticall or Idolatrous but that sume true doctryne shoulde be mengled with it and svme good will be allewayes mingled with it. But yeat according to the saying of the apostle a little leaveneth the whole lumpe, wherefore all though there be many good doctrines in this booke, yeat the evill that is mingled with it and obstinately styll defended by the romish church and her hereticall fryers and cardynalls hath made the whole corrupt by teaching . . . and by compelling there disciples to beleeve full and receave good and bad together.

The annotator presents the lore of the “auntient learned writer,” a dictum drawn from the writings of St. Augustine which contends that there is always truth embedded within even ostensibly corrupted “doctrine”—“nulla falsa doctrine est, quae aliqua vera non intermisceat”—and juxtaposes it with a mantra drawn from the apostle Paul, whose words are starker: “a little leaveneth the whole lumpe” (1 Cor. 5:6)—a little evil, insidiously, will corrupt an entire body. The passage,
if understood without the context of the annotator’s engagements with the entire book, might suggest that Augustine’s maxim, employed by medieval writers including Peter of Abelard in support of an ideal of religious toleration, has been superseded, that this book has been adjudged irredeemable due to its admixture of “good, true and wholesome instructions with the fals.” It becomes clear, however, that this is not our annotator’s sense of the value of the Prickynge. He is able to marry the responses of both Paul and Augustine in his approach to the book. For him, it is within the pastoral agenda and false devotional practices of the “romish church” that evil doctrines are maintained. Its officers mingle good and bad, corrupting the “whole lumpe” of the Roman Catholic Church. As he engages with “superstishouse, hereticall or Idolatrous” elements of the Prickynge, the book mirrors for the reader the erroneous praxes of Rome in contrast to those held by members of the reformed churches. Yet, it is Augustine’s tolerant aphorism that will ultimately prove the greatest guide to the annotator’s response to the text, as he carefully unpicks the “mengled” strands of good theology from bad, corrupt devotional practice from wholesome piety. The annotator’s comments are, in effect, an apparatus through which a reader might distinguish the valuable devotional writing preserved in the late fourteenth-century text.
Mary and the saints

Among the theological corruptions perpetuated by the Roman Catholic Church that the Beinecke 223 annotator notices in *The Prickyne of Love*, treating the saints, Mary in particular, as sharing divinity with God is highlighted most. Literally dozens of marks and marginal comments refer to claims for the powers of the Virgin that are adjudged by the reformist reader to be erroneous or heretical. On a number of occasions, the annotator finds chapters so replete with such errors that he signals their occurrences with an apparatus of marginal alphabetic sigla. In chapter 43 (fols. 98v–105v), a meditation on the *Salve Regina*, the annotator signals seventeen Marian errors, adding the letters A through Q in the margins in order to track them. The basis for the annotator’s objection is sometimes explained—“Heare an error to be taken heed of” is penned in the inner margin of folio 5r. At this point, Hilton’s text invokes Mary as salve for spiritual suffering, someone to turn to in cases when a person is “goostli wounded” (*Prickynge*, 9). A bit further on, the *Prickynge* offers one of its most striking metaphors for veneration of Mary as motherly intercessor and Christ as *salvator*, in which the author imagines making a drink “ful ofhele” by mixing “to-gidere þe swete mylke of marie þe virgine with the blood of ihesu” (9). Perhaps surprisingly, in a post-Reformation pastoral/theological culture in which the devotional image was increasingly suppressed in favor of the word of the scripture,
the often graphic and corporeal “blood piety” that is so characteristic of the Prickynge is never in itself an issue marked for criticism by the reformed annotator. In fact, many chapters containing similar notions are commended as profitable reading matter. It is only when such metaphors promote “dangerous” theology that we see the annotator moved to intervene, as in this case, where he signals the text’s fallacy: “The error of the romish church: A dangerous herisye to make the blessed virgin a copartner with god in having absolute power to geve and bestowe grace” (fol. 5r). The Prickynge’s many articulations of Mary’s status in terms which announce her co-divinity, appellations such as “quene of heven” and “goddes moder,” are repeatedly criticized by the annotator, who characterizes these as the “superstitiouse opinion and herisye of the churche of rome, which all the reformed churches do greatly labour to have amended.”42 For the annotator, Mary and the saints—akin to the rest of humanity—are only ever vessels for the divine agency of God; they lack any potency in and of themselves to wield supernatural, intercessionary power. In this, the annotator’s beliefs are consistent with his reformed perspective on free will and grace. His theological understanding of a heavenly autocracy rather than hierarchy is set out in a response to a prayer to Mary in the Prickynge:
Angells, saints, nor menne are Ioyned nor ought to be Ioyned . . . in rule withe god but are substituts and rulers vnto god, to rule where and howe god poyneth them. This prayer to the blessed virgin is a superstishouse, hereticall and Idolatrous prayer geving her such an absolute power over the heart and soule as god hath. (fol. 12r; Prickynge, 24)

The demotion of Mary and the saints is entirely in line with both mainstream Anglican and Puritan thinking in sixteenth-century England. The Thirty-Nine Articles of 1563, a set of doctrinal rules for the Church in England that came to be included in The Book of Common Prayer, which were capacious enough to encompass both moderate and Puritan perspectives, invokes the idea of saintly intercession briefly and dismissively. In the twenty-second article, dealing with purgatory, the “invocation of Saintes” is mentioned among a list of “Romishe Doctrine[s]” that are “grounded upon no warfare of Scripture, but rather repugnaunt to the worde of God.” The words and theology of the Thirty-Nine Articles are echoed in a number of critiques of Roman Catholic teaching in Beinecke 223, and in respect of Marian devotion in particular; for example, the chapter directing a meditation on the Ave Maria rejects this material as suitable for “noe good christian . . . by cause it hath noe warrant . . . in holy scripture.”
Despite the annotator's copious annotations, markings, and erasures responding to Hilton's veneration of Mary, it would be wrong to see such engagement as an entirely negative reaction to this copy of the Prickynge. The fact that the annotator takes great pains to recuperate the text from what he saw as corrupting pastoral theology speaks to his conviction of the rich devotional worth of portions of the material. The error or heresy he finds and neutralizes is not intrinsic to the text from the annotator's perspective, but is partible, and once removed leaves valuable religious lore. We should see this excising of text that the annotator finds problematic less as a repressive act of violence against Hilton’s book and more as an attempt to salvage it, to recuperate it from its “romish” afflictions. The annotator is able to strike lines through, such as these from a prayer to God: “and for the souereyne hoolynes of his blissed modre, and for desertes of sainte Fraunces and of alle sayntes”; and he can make manifest the heretical nature of this cancelled text: “A dangerouse herisye of the romish.” Yet he nevertheless remains receptive to the positives in the book, stating at this point that the “most part of this chapter agreeth with the doctryne of the reformed churches” (fol. 7r; Prickynge, 13). In fact, many more chapters in the book are approved than are marked as being of little value. Some twenty-one chapters of forty-four in the book are explicitly lauded, declared appropriate within the annotator's sense of religious
orthodoxy, usually with variants on the line above, that the chapter accords with the doctrine approved by the reformed churches and Holy Scripture. Only three chapters in the book are wholly dismissed by the annotator, of which all are entirely focused upon the Virgin Mary. Following the chapter on the Salve Regina, he writes:

This chapter teacheth many corruptions, herisyes, superstitiouse and pernitiose opinions of the church of rome which noe reclous nor good christian can embrace with a good conscience but will rather reprove and condemne all such evill opinions. (fol. 105r)

The mention here of Christians rather than particular denominations is a signal of the annotator’s consistent aim to find common, universal religious values and devotional practices among the reformed churches. The term “Christian” is employed on a number of occasions, particularly relating to Christological prayers and meditations that the annotator believes will be widely beneficial. He commends, for instance, Hilton’s “very godly Christian prayer” framed as being a prayer from the penitent directed to Christ in relation to the Passion. The prayer meditates on Christ’s suffering and encourages a posture of utter humility, of complete submission to the will and grace of God. This chapter, he announces “agreeeth with doctrine of holy scripture” and is “greatly
comended by the doctryne of the reformed churches” (fol. 33v). This ideal of utter subjection to God’s will and grace, so fundamental to the soteriological theologies of the reformed churches and given its most substantial exposition in the third book of Calvin’s Institutes of the Christian Religion, is crucial to the annotator’s admiration for the Prickynge. In chapter 5, Hilton’s understanding of the value of good works resonates powerfully with the generally accepted understanding in the reformed churches whereby salvation is granted only through faith in Christ and God’s grace. The Prickynge contends that the penitent is “foule bi-giled” if “þow putt by trist in þyn owne desertes & in þi grete werkis” (36); in this the annotator finds what he already believes, the theology of justification, which, he writes, “the reformed churches teache and stedfastly believe” and is “beleeved by any christian church” (fol. 17r). Good works, according to this doctrine, have no intrinsic salvific value; as Caroline Stacey writes of the perspective formulated by Archbishop Cranmer for one of the English Church’s homilies on pastoral theology, “Good deeds can never avail to justification, but are the fruit of those who are justified.” Justification necessarily precedes meritorious acts according to this doctrine, which may be traced within the theologies of Lutheran, Calvinist, and all major Protestant denominations in the sixteenth century. The issue is also highlighted on several occasions by Batman in his glosses within The Book of Privy Counselling. In Cambridge
University Library, MS Ii.vi.31, he inserts the following note: "the deth of Christ is the purgation of sin, to beleue not only that he died but that his deth is oure Iustification, for wee being Iustified by faith are at peace with god through jesu Christ oure Lord"; he is glossing a sentiment in the medieval text, that in the Passion of Christ, "pei scholen fynde goostly fode of deuocion inowʒ, soffisaunt & abounding to the helpe & sauynge of here soules." The theology of justification operates within a nexus of other theological perspectives on free will and predestination, which are crucial to the soteriology of the reformed churches, and which the Beinecke annotator comments upon as he engages with the The Prickynge of Love.

Free will

It is well known that reformed theology rejected the idea of free will: as mankind is absolutely depraved and in thrall to sin, God’s grace is required to renew the will in the conversion of the elect. On this point, Calvin went significantly further than St. Augustine in allowing no place whatsoever to human free will in the scheme of redemption. In the Institutes, Calvin concludes, regarding the term free will, that "because it cannot be retained without great peril, it will be a great boon for the church if it be abolished. I prefer not to use it myself, and I should like others, if they seek my advice, to avoid it."
The reformed annotator follows this line, but as with so many of his notes in the Prickynge, those that pertain to the issue of free will register both dismissal and endorsement: dismissal of what the annotator terms “free will heresies” that accord inordinate power to human volition to perform moral acts, and endorsement of those passages in the Middle English text that are seen by the annotator to accord with reformed doctrine that denies free will and insists on the all-ruling providence of God. But the Beinecke annotator’s endorsement dominates his response to the Prickynge’s engagement with the subject of human will; if he adheres to Augustine’s dictum that some good must be embedded within a largely corrupt doctrinal schema, then it is perhaps on this key topic that he finds most to agree with. Moreover, and in a remarkable strategy of appropriation, he uses the Prickynge to provide a lineage for reformed doctrine, effectively invoking the text’s position on human volition and divine sovereignty as a corrective against what is regarded as a predominant voluntaristic strand in the theology of its own time.

It should be said that the annotator’s preoccupation with free will is not easily demarcated among his comments, as it feeds into and shapes other doctrinal concerns, most notably in those glosses that concern salvation and predestination. The brief observations below examine shared ground between the annotator’s reformed theology and the theology of the Middle
English text, concentrating on comments by the annotator that engage with the issue of free will exclusively and directly.

The two chapters of the Middle English text that spark substantial response on the issue are chapters 11 ("Hou a man shal stire hym-self to loue god and to kyndel his herte in his loue") and 30 ("Aʒeynst proude men thatte presumen of hem-self"). Of particular interest is chapter 11, where the marginal notations on the subject of human volition show the annotator’s firm grounding in a reformed doctrine that insists on total depravity without free will, seeing good choices as occurring by necessity and only as a consequence of God’s grace and predetermination of human acts. One annotation specifically targets a passage by Hilton on the divine mercy that answers man’s disobedience, and it is worth quoting this passage in full to understand what provokes the commentary:

Whenne þou forʒate [forgot] hym and þourʒe synne
wilfully despised hym, ʒitte he suffred þe, and
wenne þou smote hym and woundid hym in maner as a
wode [mad] seek [sick] man smyteþ a leche
[physician] that wolde hele hym, ʒit he for-bare þe
& a-ʒeynys þi wille stired þe for to leue synne and
serue hym. A fro wat perelis, fro wat myscheues &
fro what synnes hapy he delyuerid þe? I hope þou can
not rekeny all. And whi dide he þus to þe? Sobeli
Here Hilton’s Middle English rendition adds a dimension that is not developed in the Latin _Stimulus Amoris_ and which seeks to instil in readers a consciousness of God’s sovereign will and freely given mercy. In an article on Hilton’s translation and adaptation strategies in _The Prickynge of Love_, J. P. H. Clark notes “a careful emphasis in the English version on the theology of grace.” Clark gives several examples of how the English augments the Latin source with passages that underscore the “wondir liberall” power of God to freely grant and withdraw grace and justification; as the quotation above suggests, good acts are necessitated by God’s grace and are unattainable on a purely human basis. It is to additions such as these, which provide added precision about the necessity of infused divine grace and justification, that the reformed annotator responds particularly favorably. In the margin next to Hilton’s interpolation he remarks:

Note the thraledome of mans will & tyll it be made free by grace to will that which is good which confuteth the doctryne and error of free will and agreeth [to] the doctrynes o[f] the reformed churches. (fol. 39r)
It is clear here that the annotator sees continuity in the transition from pre-Reformation theology to a contemporary dismissal of the freely willed nature of human moral acts. He finds an echo in the text for his own conviction that man lacks the freedom to do right until God enables man’s will to perform morally virtuous deeds through his infused grace and justification. Two identical marginal notes in the same chapter similarly point to “another argument [to] confute the error of free will,” one of them adding further substance to the perceived accord between pre- and postreform teaching on the subject of human volition (fols. 41r–v). In this note, the reformed denial of free will is stated with admirable clarity:

This chapter agreeth very fully with the doctrine of the reformed churches touching the opinion of free will, who stedfastly holde that all mennes wills are in bondage to synne soe that they will not doe noe thing but that which is evill vntyll by grace the will be chaunged and made free both to will and doe that which is good. (fol. 41r)

Interestingly, this recorded opinion by the annotator glosses a passage in the Middle English, which, as in the example above, is also an original interpolation by Hilton into his source text. This passage reflects a characteristic Pauline emphasis that is often found in Hilton’s additions:
But well I wot [know] lord, I mai not loue þe but ʒif I haue hit [hope] of þe. For seynt poule seyth þat þe charite of god is helte [poured] in-to oure hertis only þourʒe þe holi goste þat is ʒeuen to vs. A good lord ihesu, ʒyue us þat good spiriʒte, sende in-to oure hertes þi holi spiriʒte, þat we may with seynt poule crie to þe, Abba þe fadir. (Prickynge, 83)

In this case in particular, the Beinecke annotator finds strong ground for agreement with the teaching of the Prickynge. The strategy employed in his approving notes is twofold. First, continuity is established between pre-Reformation and reformed theology on the subject of free will. The quotation from Paul (Rom. 5:5-6) inserted by Hilton provides fertile ground for establishing such concurrence across a cultural divide and reminds us that, for Protestants, justification by faith and divine grace in justifying sinners were understood to be at the heart of Pauline theology. Applying his determined and enterprising hermeneutics, the annotator finds validation in his text for a reformed separation of the virtue of justification from human volition: man is understood to be the passive recipient in whom God’s charity is “helte in-to oure hertis only þourʒe þe holi goste þat is ʒeuen to vs.” Secondly, the particular emphasis on the
theology of grace in the Prickynge is invoked by the annotator to “confute the error of free will” (fol. 41r)—a phrase he repeats several times in his annotations—and to rebuke those who see goodness as coming from oneself. According to the reformed position of the sixteenth-century annotator, there can be no question of voluntary cooperation with God’s saving grace.

The annotations to chapter 30 concern this aspect primarily and provide more direct linkage between a belief in free will on the one hand and error and pride on the other. Where the Middle English states, “wenest þou [do you think] þat ony gode [good thing] cometh out of þi-seelf? Þif þou wene so, þou makist þi-self a god” (Prickynge, 153), the annotator agrees and provides added and updated precision: “then our free will when it is good is the gyft of god according to the doctryne of the reformed churches” (fol. 77r). Similarly, when he comes across the exclamation in the Prickynge that “I may not make ful a seeth [fully atone] for my gyltes” (156), he comments, “note that man is vnable to make satisfaction vnto god for his synne” (fol. 78v). This involves categorical denial that Christians may exercise the free will to act and make choices in a way that determines their salvation or damnation. In other notes, this same concern is brought out through a strong emphasis on predestination and divine foreknowledge.
Predestination and election

Although the Beinecke annotator is able to highlight Hilton’s discussion of free will as exemplary, in related soteriological issues, including references to predestination, he feels compelled to point out what he deems as serious errors in the Prickynge. Much of the matter in the Prickynge makes sense in light of an acceptance of predestination and of a chosen elect, as our annotator no doubt recognized. The Prickynge dedicates the entirety of chapter 33 to combating the despair that might arise from contemplation of predestination, particularly the diabolically inspired melancholy arising from the belief that one may not be included in the chosen number who shall be saved (See Prickynge, 166–70). A section of this chapter is marked for approval by the annotator: “note tha[t] ac [according] to that whise is heare assumed vnto the next note agreeth [with] the doctrynye of the reformed churches” (fol. 84v); [AU: That is, “note that according to what is here assumed to the next note agrees with the doctrine of the reformed church.” This is very tough to decipher. I am sure about this except the “tha[t] ac”: this is clearly “thac ac” but what does it mean? I think the annotator misspells “that” as “thac” (anticipating the next word) and that “ac” may be an abbreviation for “according”, which all makes sense in this context and helps this quotation to read better. Is this OK with you?]and crosses in the margins demarcate useful text from the
obviously less worthy adjoining passage advising the afflicted person to appeal to the intercessionary power of Mary. The idea of predestination is not as unambiguously accepted in the Prickynge as it is in Hilton’s source, the Stimulus Amoris, though it is not explicitly refuted either. It is possible that the tempering of the more open discussion of predestination in the Stimulus has something to do with the increased association of the position with followers of the heresiarch John Wyclif, of whom some, based on Wyclif’s understanding of the church as equalling those who will be saved, styled themselves as the “congregacion of trew men predestinate & justified.”

The fourteenth-century treatise differs most substantially from the Calvinist inflected theology of the annotator in stressing the unknowability of God’s judgment. Particularly in the chapter headed “How a man shal ordeyne his þouʒtes, and þat he haue ay [constantly] god in his mynde,” the Prickynge repeatedly articulates the idea of humanity’s inability to access divine foreknowledge: “þou shalt not determyn fully, in þyn owne doom [judgement], wheþer þou be chosen or reproued” (Prickynge, 90). Such a position invites an energetic response from the annotator, who reflects a Calvinist insistence on assurance regarding election and describes such uncertainty as Rome’s “moste daungereous herisye” (fol. 44r). This sixteenth-century reader believes instead in the idea of assurance for God’s elect, that
although “gods doome be hydden from vs, yeat by sume meanes as he hath revealed his doome we ought to know it and to be assured” (fol. 44r). He finds confirmation in the portion of the scriptures that had since the time of Luther been understood by reformed theologians as key to understanding the New Testament—St. Paul’s letter to the Romans: 

Therefore search the scriptures what they testifye of gods doome, as in the viiith to the romaynes it is sayde there is noe condemnation to them which are in christe Iesus etc. Reade the whole chapter and ther you shall see that the faythfull are and ought to be [certain] of ther election and assured saluation thourough the meritts of christ. (fol. 44r) [AU: A word seems missing and I have supplied [certain]. Is this OK? Clearly this is the meaning of the comment, and “certeynely” is used a bit later in this note.]

The annotator’s concern with the issue of certainty of election was central to Calvin’s predestinarianism as set out in the Institutes, but it occupied relatively few English reformers, although the writings of one—the martyred John Bradford (ca. 1510–1555)—chime closely with the beliefs advocated by the Beinecke annotator. Bradford, in a letter sent from prison in support of the idea of assurance of election, argued, “It overthroweth the most pestilent
papistical poison of doubting God’s favour, which is very
dungeon of despair and contempt of God.”⁵⁶ The annotator of the
Beinecke manuscript likewsie responds forcefully to the lack
of certainty he perceives in Hilton’s statement: “We shul hope
& triste to be saaf porou goddis mercy” (Prickynge, 90), again
referring to the Pauline chapter cited earlier:

This is noe doubtfull hope but an assured hope, noe
doubtful truste but an assured trust, as the apostle
witnessseth in the viij to the romans . . . true beleevers
whoe not withstanding the feare they have of there owne
synne and frayiltye, yeat rest styll assured of gods free
mercye and pardone of all there synns thourough the
meritts, death and passion of Iesus Christe. (fol. 44v)

The annotator cites another biblical authority, this time
Ecclesiastes, in his third response to this chapter’s
continued musings on human inability to discern God’s
judgment, where the fourteenth-century text argues that no man
knows for sure (“sikerli” [90]) whether he is worthy of God’s
love:

By prosperitye or adversite, by sick[ness] or health,
lyfe or death, or bye outwarde temporal blessing or
privyst[?],[AU: I would change this reading to
“privy[te]”, which makes better sense here] noe man
knoweth whenne god loveth or hateth, as the wise man
sayth in ecclesiastes, for the assurance which the faythfull have of there everlasting happynes and lyfe is not by outwarde but inwarde graces as fayth, hope, charitye, temperance, patience and with free pardoun of alle there synnes and forgivevnes of all ther deformityes and defects thourough the alone meritts of Christ, by whome and from whome they have and shall have alle perfection and holynes as much as shall be necessarye in this lyfe and shall be thereby and not before without alle Imperfection, spott and blemish of synne when by the meritts of Christs passion they are translated vnto everlasting lyfe. (fol. 44v)

Here the annotator can be seen to provide a succinct and accurate account of Calvin’s thorough treatment in the Institutes (bk. 3, chap. 24) of how we find complete certainty of our election in Christ, the mirror of God’s mercy. Calvin intended his teaching on election and assurance to stand as the conclusion to his soteriology. The annotator also recalls the glosses in the Geneva Bible for Ecclesiastes 9:2-3: man knoweth not by these outwarde things, that is, by prosperitie or aduersitie, whome God doeth fauour or hate . . . In outward things, as riches and povertie, sickness and health, there is no difference betwene the godly and the wicked: but the difference is that the godly are
assured by faith of God's favour and assistance. (Barker [1583], fol. 315v)

In both passages, it is the “merit” of Christ’s sacrifice that is of paramount importance, cleansing the imperfections of the members of the elect in order that they might enter heaven. Of course, the elect have been granted “inwarde graces,” in themselves signs of assurance of salvation; Christ’s bestowal of “fayth, hope, charitye, temperance, patience” means that they remain less likely to sin in the first place, living with “alle perfection and holynes as much as shall be necessary in this lyfe.”

Obedience

In several of his annotations, the sixteenth-century reader responds to the Prickynge of Love’s teaching on obedience in a way that suggests some confrontation between different approaches to this important issue. A number of passages in the Prickynge expound on the virtue of obedience as a key moral and spiritual imperative. Here the Middle English author focuses specifically on what is diagnosed as a crisis in monastic, ceremonial observance and on frequent disobedience toward ecclesiastical authority and church precept. Insisting that true freedom of spirit for a Christian means to serve God under the yoke of obedience, the author highlights the central role of obedience to one’s immediate ecclesiastical superior, rebuking those who “wolen not
assenten mekeli to the willes of oure prelates" (Prickynge, 158). Within this didactic framework, the unconditional nature of obedience to a church superior occupies a central role, irrespective of the moral standing of this superior: “þou shulde not refuse to obeyʒe, not onli to God in hym-selfe, but to God in þi prelate thouʒe he were the vileste and þe werst man þat is” (162).

The responses of the later annotator react against the tendency in the Prickynge to gloss the virtue of obedience as a charitable and ascetic moral habit that ought to underlie the interaction with spiritual superiors. First of all, the reformed annotations provide some suggestion of Richard Rex’s observation that, in their discussions of obedience, “Lutheran, Calvinist, and Anglican expositions . . . displaced ecclesiastical authorities with secular rulers and magistrates in a way which perfectly reflected the altered jurisdictional and theological balance in reformed territories.”58 Such displacement is suggested in the annotator’s repeated underscoring (contrary to the teaching in the Prickynge) that it can never be inherently virtuous or charitable to obey one’s ecclesiastical superiors: the emphasis is on the importance of serving Christ diligently, while disregarding “idle monks and fryers” and other “menne of religion” who, “following ther owne rules and devises serve god in noe good christian calling and by ther errors and lyes have more
corrupted christian religion th[a]n brought any good vnto it” (Beinecke 223, fol. 52r).

The reformed annotations, of course, revolve around the doctrine of reconciliation (or “justification”) with God by faith alone and through God’s grace, and so they offer correctives to the emphasis on good works, ceremony, charity, and the doctrine of obedience expounded in the *Prickynge*. Where the Middle English text chastises the disobedient inclination of its readers who “will not assent meekly to the wills of oure prelates” (158), this elicits the following marginal qualification: “the will of our prelates is to be fulfilled when they shall commaunde any vertuouse worke agreable to gods word” (Beinecke 223, fol. 79v). This note provides a theologically informed adjustment of the spiritual directive and priority of the source text, and this is reinforced in a subsequent annotation responding to a passage on Christ’s exemplary obedience: “[he] wolde for vs obey3e to his fadir vn-to deth” (159), the *Prickynge* notes approvingly, to which the annotator adds that “the will of god is the lawe of alle righte[o]usnes and at alle times to be obeyed” (fol. 80r). The sixteenth-century annotator, continuing to redirect the *Prickynge’s* understanding of “perfite obedience” as linked with obedience to ecclesiastical superiors, insists that “perfect obedience is to be obedient in all things that gods worde commaundeth and strately to followe the rules of the same” (fol. 79r).
In the *sola fide* and *sola scriptura* context of the annotator, the will of prelates and superiors is manifestly subservient to the word and government of God.\(^{59}\) The annotator works to ensure this priority by theologically redirecting the notion of “perfect obedience” toward the reformed doctrine of accountability to God alone. But he encounters an insurmountable problem when confronted by the following narrative in the *Prickynge*, derived from the hagiographical *Vitae Patrum*. In this passage, a saint is commended for obeying a superior unreservedly:

> [The holy father] aȝeyn al maner resoun, only for þe biddynge of his abbot, watren [to water] a dryȝe tree bi space of a ȝer. For-whi þe heyȝenesse [highness] of obedience shewed sone aftir whenne þe tre þat was ded and dryȝe, pouȝe the merite of obedience at þe ȝeres ende florshed & bar forþ fryte. (160)

Finding this to be thoroughly opposed to reformed teaching on obedience, and thus beyond recuperation, the annotator is forced to abandon the strategy of comprehension and appropriation in favor of rejection: “a superstitiouse fals miracle in confirmation of erroniouse obedience” (fol. 80v).

**Confession**

When *The Prickynge of Love* recommends praying, preaching, teaching, and confession as ways to promote another person’s
spiritual health (114–15), the Beinecke annotator singles out the sacrament of confession for special commentary:

This custome observed by the ordynance of the church of rome agreeth not with gods ordynance to whome, only as holy scripture witnesseth, yf we truly confesse our synns and unfeynndly repent of the same, he is faythfull and juste to forgeue vs our synns; but the preiste neyther knowing the trueth of any mans confessiun nor the trueth of his repentance hath any power geven him to geve absulution for synne, such as the popish custome observeth, but only to declare, publish and preach to alle true penitent sinners forgevenes of alle there synns, for absulution, pardonne, and free mercye [are] geven free thourough the mediation and meritts of Iesus christe. (fol. 56r) [AU: this “so” clause at the end is faulty syntactically; I see “for” rather than “so” here, which does make the clause make better sense. Is this OK?]

The notes here suggest the radical denial of the sacrament of penance that is a hallmark of reformed orthodoxy. The implication is that compulsory auricular confession, a sacrament since the Fourth Lateran Council of 1215, is superfluous, that it constitutes a distortion of true religion and was never divinely ordained. Whereas the medieval
understanding was that justification begins in baptism and continues crucially in penance and confession, reformed orthodoxy divorces the real work of penitence from the institution of confession, teaching that the only and perpetual absolution we have is, in the words of the annotator, "thorough the mediation and merit of Jesus Christe." The note thus suggests a categorical dismissal of the efficacy of pastoral absolution; not only does the priest have no way of assessing intention and sincerity of a person's confession (the "trueeth" of repentance and confession), but absolution remains a divine property that no human, sacerdotal claim ought to infringe. Yet the role of the pastor remains highly important in reminding and assuring his congregation of God's forgiveness; he must exercise his power "to declare, publish and preach." Expanding upon this fault line between Catholic and reformed/Lutheran teaching on the extent and means of justification—the transformation of the sinner by God into a state of righteousness—the annotator further clarifies true and efficacious confession:

He that hath true compunction, sorrowe and repentance of his synns shall be cleanne washed and purged from the same by the blood, death and passion of Jesus Christe, whoe is the only true confessor before whome and by whome only all venym of synne may be cast out, and to him only the faythfull are bound to confesse all there synns from
whome only they shall and may have true absulution and from noe other. (fol. 58v)

This commentary directly addresses the Prickynge’s directive for the sinner to wash away what is stained with sin “wip teres of compunccioun and go to his confessour and keste [cast] ouȝt þourȝe meke [meek] shrifte al venym of synne” (120). The annotator’s note clarifies and reporposes this teaching rather than reject it outright: in the passages quoted above, the words only (“the only true confessor,” “to him only,” “in whome only”) and true (“true penitent sinners,” “truly confesse,” “true compunccion, sorrowe and repentance”) become the guarantors of reformed views on repentance and absolution, in which justification is by faith alone and made possible solely through the imputed merits of Christ (“thourough the mediation and meritts of Iesus christe”).

The reformed annotator demarcates valid from invalid teaching in the Prickynge’s treatment of confession and satisfaction for sins. He rejects any suggestion that a person other than Christ can effect real forgiveness: when the Prickynge presents Mary as “hope and refuyt [refuge] of all synneneful wrecches” and further suggests that she holds power to “helpen and to maken a seþ [satisfaction, compensation] for sinful wrecchis” (165), the annotator is forced to assert that “satisfaction for synne can be made by no one but by christe alone. This is therefore a blasphemous herisye of the church
of Rome” (fol. 83r). However, in other contexts where confession is discussed, the annotator can react with approval. For example, John 1:9 is quoted in the Prickynge toward the end of a chapter on the contemplation of the Passion, which leads to penitential reflection on sin:

as seynt Ion seyth þus, ʒif we shryue vs, trewe is oure lord. For-wy [Because] þe blod of his sone ihesu shal clense vs fro al oure wickednesse, þat blood is my tresour & my richesse, my good & my catell [property]. For-wy for me hit [it] was spilled and to me hit was ʒouen. (59)

The Beinecke annotator, who obviously takes this passage to mean that confession is to be made to Christ, endorses the Middle English author: “Note to whom confession of synn is required to be made with promise of forgevenes” (fol. 28v). Two points are worth making about this agreement and the context in which it occurs: first, the reformed annotator responds favorably to this thoroughly Christocentric chapter, in which the meditative voice makes confession and a heartfelt plea for mercy to Christ. The soteriology here suggests none of the mediation through priest, Mary, or saints, but rather an exemplary articulation of sincere contrition and an assured trust in the salvific power of Christ’s works (“þou bouʒt ist me wiþ þi werk & þat wonder dere” [59]) that is deemed
compatible with reformed opinion: “this chapter is agreable in alle good Instruction with the doctryne of the reformed churches” (fol. 29r). Secondly, this chapter of the *Prickynge* contains a number of passages that have been composed by Walter Hilton and have no equivalent in the Latin source. These consist primarily of the narrator’s meditations on his sinfulness and spiritual incapacity but also voice a firm knowledge of the power of Christ’s works and sacrifice to redeem mankind. To the narrator, Christ’s works are “my boke and my clergie, my studie & my meditacioun, for to strengþe my feyth and my hope þourʒe cristes blood & his passioun” (60). It is to these passages inserted by Hilton that the reformed annotator responds with most accord, finding in them a perspective compatible with his own theological priorities on assurance of salvation, justification through faith alone, and a preference for absolution and God’s promise over outward acts of penance. Even sections of the *Prickynge* dealing with the especially controversial topic of confession could be read with profit by the Beinecke annotator, and Hilton could even be taken as a kind of proto-Protestant by a learned reader firmly grounded in the reformed theological culture of the sixteenth century.

**Augustinianism and the Reformation**

The readings above have shown a particularly fertile common ground between the medieval devotional theology and the
priorities of the annotators rooted in what we may view as a shared Augustinianism in the key theological domains of faith, divine grace, and the predestination of human souls. In other words, what allows our two Elizabethan readers to approach the medieval text in a spirit of open curiosity and at times even enthusiastic endorsement is that they identify teaching about salvation identical to that expounded in the reformed churches—teaching that can be traced back to the Pauline epistles, the church fathers, and centrally to St. Augustine. Most important here is Augustine’s assertion of the centrality of divine grace to human beings living in bondage to sin: grace is the healing power that gets to the heart and will inwardly and enables one to make right choices and to earn merit, a merit that could not be earned on one’s own. That the human will of faith is a gift of God, and that God alone is responsible for it, was a belief that matured through Augustine’s writings and was articulated with increasing precision.61 This teaching forms the backbone of both the meditative theology of The Prickyng of Love and the Lutheran and Calvinist doctrine of salvation. As discussed above, the English Prickyng contains numerous additions to the original Latin text that place emphasis on the operations of divine grace. In a process of spiritual progress, divine grace and mercy come first, human will and good works come second. More so than the Latin source, the Middle English presents a rich theological perspective that seeks to fully persuade the
believer of God’s mercy and favor. The clear link here is to Hilton’s main devotional treatise, the Scale of Perfection, whose teaching on grace, sin, and salvation is thoroughly Augustinian in nature but expressed in an intimate mode of pastoral guidance. Where the Prickynge presents a tableau of meditative themes in a broadly patristic and Augustinian tradition, it is Hilton’s magnum opus, Scale of Perfection, that offers systematic exposition, full of biblical allusion and patristic quotation, of a process of reform in faith that continues Augustine’s teaching on the moral helplessness of man, God’s freely given grace, and the power of that grace to reform the soul to a state of virtue. These are all themes that would appeal strongly to theologians committed to the new ideological order of Elizabethan England, who of course claimed to find striking affirmation of their reformed doctrine in Augustine’s writings on sin and salvation.

The two readers examined here speak safely within this reformed religion and are triumphant about the new order, all the while they draw attention to layers of Pauline and Augustinian teaching in the medieval text that can be seen as prophetic of the present. Underlying their responses is Luther and Calvin’s Augustinian predestinarianism that makes salvation wholly dependent on God’s prior election and insists that grace cannot be given on the basis of previous works. Certain aspects of the medieval text are seen to herald what was organized and developed in comprehensive detail in the
seminal work of Protestant systematic theology—John Calvin’s *Institutes of the Christian Religion*, published in Latin in 1536 and issued in three further editions, with a final, much amplified edition of 1559 featuring hundreds of quotations and paraphrases from Augustine not found in the original version. Calvin’s self-confessed debt to Augustine is well known. In one of his polemical letters, he claims famously (if somewhat hyperbolically) that “Augustine is so wholly with me, that if I wished to write a confession of my faith, I could do so, with all fullness and satisfaction to myself, out of his writings. . . . He does not differ from me one pin’s point.” Calvin rightly identified Augustine’s doctrine of grace with his own: the belief that the only cure for man’s condition is God’s free grace sovereignly bestowed on whomever he chooses forms the foundation of Calvin’s doctrine of salvation. In ways that directly influence the sixteenth-century Anglican annotators’ engagement with the medieval text, Calvinist teaching brought forth a new sense of the profound consequences of the fall and original sin and the absence of human merit: we are not saved on account of works done in our own power or for our own glory, but saved by a working faith poured into us, a result of God’s power and grace revealed through Christ enabling us to do good works whereby we are saved. With Calvin we thus see a recovery of the fathers and an alignment of Augustinianism with his certain, systematic theological exposition that was instrumental in shaping the
reformed churches of Europe. But Calvin was not of course an uncritical disciple of St. Augustine. Certain elements of his teaching he adopted entirely, such as a profound awareness of human sin, the all-importance of grace understood as an indication of how God as he works through Christ is gracious toward man, and the teaching of justification (human beings made righteous) by faith alone without works. In other areas Calvin went further than Augustine, for example, by eliminating human merit in any sense (i.e., good works have no bearing on justification and salvation at all), and most notably by sternly and unambiguously asserting a doctrine of double predestination, that not only are some souls predestined to be saved and go to heaven but others are decreed by God to damnation and everlasting torment. Finally, Calvin distances himself from Augustine in yet other areas, for example, in preferring the grammatico-historical method in contrast to Augustine’s tendency to allegorize, and in dismissing much of Augustine’s writing on church doctrine, the sacraments, and prayers to the dead.

It is useful to outline such doctrines briefly because they represent theological priorities reflected by the sixteenth-century Anglican readers considered in this essay. As they pursue their own projects of cultural and theological recovery, they demonstrate a strictly applied periodic understanding: they must distinguish the errors and superstitions of the past, indeed the very environment and
institution that produced the medieval devotional text, sharply from the bright new epoch of reformed teaching. But at the same time, they determine lines of continuity and elements of teaching in the pre-Reformation text that are strikingly prophetic of the present. In other words, examining a vernacular devotional tradition that incorporates elements of Augustinian teaching and biblical quotation (notably from Pauline epistles), they are able to recover parts of their own Protestant prehistory. But to do so means to be ever vigilant against theological error in order to demarcate sound and approved teaching on justification by faith, grace, and God’s inscrutable selection of the saved.

* * *

The preceding discussion complements a body of recent Reformation scholarship that has shifted the focus from rupture and rejection to lines of continuity in the transition from pre- to post-Reformation. As Andrew Muldoon has noted, the tendency has been to slow down the Reformation: “A Reformation that once appeared in awesome, sweeping force, converting England to Protestantism by 1559, is now presented as more hesitant, less omnipotent, encountering significant resistance and widespread conservatism.”

The examples of Stephen Batman and the annotator of the Beinecke manuscript, who made themselves present in the margins of an “ancient” religious text, contribute to our
understanding of the tolerance, even sympathy, with which a medieval devotional tradition could be met in an environment of reformed theology. Hilton’s vernacular adaptation of the Stimulus Amoris finds a hospitable and accommodating reception with these reformed annotators, who prove tolerant of its Christocentrism and affectivity, at times seeing rich devotional worth in specific prayers and chapters, and who wish to find continuities with their own theological priorities. To accomplish this, they apply strategies of comprehension and appropriation, sometimes of a rather enterprising nature by employing the Middle English text to counter what are viewed as theological fallacies of its time (notably pertaining to the subject of free will). Finding much teaching in the The Prickynge of Love to accord with the reformed churches, both annotators agree that there is much worthy of preservation in this venerable text of medieval Christocentric devotion. Although the trimming of the margins that has taken place in Cambridge, Trinity College, MS B.14.19 limits our view of how Batman fully made use of the Prickynge, he no doubt recognized its value despite being a work that contains the sorts of doctrinal problems inherent in any work from past centuries: “consider its tyme” he tells us, if we are unduly upset by some of its ideas.

We may distinguish a more deeply engaged analysis in the copy of the Prickynge accessed by the Beinecke annotator than that witnessed to in the Trinity College manuscript. The
Beinecke annotations demonstrate a systematic process of discernment in which some of the most important aspects of reformed doctrinal positions are sharply articulated both in harmony with and against Hilton’s adaptation of the *Stimulus Amoris*. When touching on issues such as Marian divinity and the assurance of election, the fourteenth-century text affords the annotator the opportunity to delimit the bounds of error and heresy. The Beinecke annotator, in some contrast to Batman, does not merely waive off these errors or blandly attribute them to the text’s ancientness. These are not idolatries of a hazy past but pertain to the present, being still promulgated by a corrupt “Romish” Church; these are scorpions that may yet sting should they not be removed. However, even as the venerable text provides a clear window on current “Romish” heresies, it mirrors theologies that are seen by the annotator as characteristic of the reformed churches. As regards free will and grace in particular, the *Prickynge* bears witness to august theological roots for doctrines advocated within the reformed churches.

Of course, these reformed churches were by no means as doctrinally united as the annotator’s responses to the *Prickynge* tend to suggest. Most contentious among the new denominations was the issue of the Eucharist, where Lutheran influenced doctrines posited a “real presence” in the consecrated host, while Calvinist theologies interpreted Christ’s presence as an act of faith in which the Christ
offered in Communion is taken only spiritually, and only by
the faithful. In his few references to the Eucharist, the
Beinecke annotator most clearly reveals that he is steering
the middle ground of the English ecclesiastical reformers. He
makes no mention of reformed churches being unified in
Eucharistic belief, for, quite simply, it would be a knowingly
false claim. Yet his brief discussions of the sacrament
strongly hint at someone disposed to describe the sacrament in
ambiguous terms that would permit either Puritan or Lutheran
evangelicals to recognize their own beliefs. When the
Prickynge mentions receiving Christ in taking the "sacrament
of þe autere (78), the Beinecke annotator adds, "every true
believing christian when he receveth the sacrament receaveth
Christ (fol. 38v); and he later writes, responding to the
opening of a chapter on preparing to receive the Eucharist
(118), "wyne [and] the breade, [b]eing by pristes worde [m]ade
a sacra[m]ent, geveth christes true body and blood with all
spirituall effects and graces thereof to alle true beleevers"
(fol. 57v). The annotator's mention of "true beleevers" echoes
the Calvinist belief in the idea that only the faithful
receive Christ at all (and reminds us of his earlier use of
this phrase at fol. 44v when commenting on the assurance of
election); and yet the mention of the "true body" hints at a
real presence that would be amenable to both Romanist and
Lutheran influenced theology. The Beinecke annotator's
politically sensitive ambiguity on this issue shows himself to
be disposed to the “middle course” between Romanism and Calvinism that characterized the convocation under Archbishop Parker when devising the Thirty-Nine Articles in 1563.\textsuperscript{69} In fact, it might even be said the annotator’s description of the Eucharist subtly favors the idea of a real presence. In the Articles, although it is stated that “[t]he body of Criste, is given, taken and eaten in the Supper,” the qualification “after a hevenley and spirituall maner onylye” immediately follows.\textsuperscript{70} The Beinecke annotator, however, feels no need to temper the corporeality implicit in the word “body.”

The tendency among scholars has been to see late medieval dissident opposition to the institutional church as a precursor to the Reformation, and especially to see in the English Wycliffite heresy a premature Reformation. However, the glossed versions of the The Prickynge of Love point to shared theological ground between the priorities of reformed theologians and a Middle English orthodox or mainstream devotional text, one that was composed by Walter Hilton, regarded by many as “the mouthpiece of official theology.”\textsuperscript{71}[AU: You mean Hilton, right?] Much in the medieval text is found to chime favorably with reformed teaching, and we have noted that many of the annotations by Batman and especially the Beinecke annotator respond positively to teaching in the Middle English work that has been interpolated by Hilton and is not part of the Latin Stimulus Amoris. We might go as far as to say that there are layers of reformist
prematurity in the *The Prickynge of Love*, or, more accurately perhaps, that several of the additions added by Hilton to his Latin source have the effect of bolstering the text for reception (and possibly for continued practical and pastoral use) in a post-Reformation environment. Central to these English additions is a Pauline emphasis on the importance of divine mercy and grace, which is commended by the Beinecke annotator as agreeing with the doctrine of the reformed churches. Also, several of Hilton’s additions are judged compatible with a Protestant understanding of justification by faith and divine grace, and the annotator’s favorable commentary on the *Prickynge’s* teaching on obedience does not directly locate theological authority in the structures of the institutional church.

In both the Beinecke annotator and Batman we witness a profound interest in *The Prickynge of Love* not merely as a book that provides evidence of the past roots of reformed theologies (though this is certainly one aspect of their activity), but as a text that potentially retains pastoral benefits for the newly reformed Church of England. Batman, we know, served the cures, and although we cannot be certain as to the Beinecke annotator’s identity, there is little doubt that he was also a churchman, interested not only in academic questions of doctrine and theology, but in the practicalities of pastoral teaching too. A number of individual prayers receive positive comment, and on occasion he signals the
usefulness of a devotion within the *Prickynge*, such as his comment on Hilton’s chapter on the Pater Noster: “this prayer and meditations vppon the same is diligent[y] to be repeated and remembred of alle devout christians” (fol. 88v). In such moments, any sense of the text’s medieval and sometimes “Romish” otherness is utterly breeched, as the annotator recognizes and applauds the uses for which the work was initially intended. We might even imagine (for we can never know if it happened) that Batman and the Beinecke annotator, ultimately concerned with pastoral care, deliberately took such prayers and devotions out of a medieval work to teach to their late sixteenth-century congregations—a nearly subversive act of suppressing sectarian suspicion. [AU: I like this implication you are drawing out, imagining these reformed pastors deliberately taking prayers and devotions out of medieval works and teaching them in the reformed parishes! The sentence deserves much more punch. Is my change OK?]

It would be a fair question to ask whether this essay represents merely an interesting case study rather than a broader issue of importance to scholarship of the sixteenth century. It is our view that the ways in which post-Reformation readers appropriated and engaged with medieval books is barely yet understood. Indeed, medieval and early modern scholarship, so often divided along the very lines of periodization created in the sixteenth century, has, somewhat ironically, helped to hinder enquiry into early modern
engagement with books produced in the Middle Ages. Medievalists have tended to study medieval books and early modernists the writings of the sixteenth century and beyond. Take as an example the project Imagining History: Perspectives on Late Medieval Vernacular Historiography, a collaborative investigation of manuscripts of the Middle English Prose Brut, the most widely read vernacular chronicle of the late medieval period. Within this manuscript corpus, the project team found many examples of the kind of early modern "polishing" advocated by Bale. In some cases, the superstitious prophecies of Merlin have been removed, and on a number of occasions the account of the reign of King John, who both William Tyndale and Bale had attempted to revise as a proto-Protestant emblem of royal resistance to the papacy, has been either excised from the chronicle or somehow altered. The project, however, was set up to look for contemporary medieval engagement with the corpus and made little of these later interactions (the manuscripts in fact contain significantly more sixteenth- than fifteenth-century annotation). Such findings are enormously suggestive of a rarely explored field in scholarship. Close analysis of the ways in which sixteenth- and seventeenth-century readers "polished" the literary inheritance of the past is a topic that is surely ripe for further work.
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