

---

All Faculty Open Access Publications

Faculty Open Access Scholarship

---

2016

## English and Latin Lexical Innovations in Reginald Pecock's Corpus

J. A. T. Smith

Follow this and additional works at: [https://digitalcommons.pepperdine.edu/faculty\\_pubs](https://digitalcommons.pepperdine.edu/faculty_pubs)



Part of the [English Language and Literature Commons](#), and the [Medieval Studies Commons](#)

---

J. A. T. Smith  
English and Latin Lexical Innovations in Reginald Pecock's Corpus  
Pepperdine University  
24255 Pacific Coast Highway,  
Malibu, CA 90263

jennifer.smith@pepperdine.edu  
Telephone: (310) 506-6265  
Fax: (310) 506-7307

### **Abstract**

This article examines the Middle English and Latin word formations of Bishop Reginald Pecock (d. 1459). In particular, it addresses the false assumption that Pecock was intentionally writing in an English that was primarily Germanic in etymology. The article concludes that Pecock's lexical innovations were primarily Latinate, that he was unlikely to be concerned with the "purity" of his word formation, and that it was highly unlikely that he was trying to eschew Latinate vocabulary. These conclusions were ascertained through a comprehensive assessment of Pecock's vocabulary which shows that Pecock created 715 new words out of a total estimated vocabulary of 7,273 words. To put it another way, roughly 10% of Pecock's vocabulary was composed of neologisms of his own making. Finally, it demonstrates that the lexical practices that Pecock puts to work in his English word formations are also at work in his Latin word formations.

### **Keywords**

Reginald Pecock, translation, Middle English, Latin, vocabulary, lexical innovation, word formation, vernacular

### **Recommended Citation:**

Smith, J. A. T. (2016). English and Latin Lexical Innovations in Reginald Pecock's Corpus. *Neophilologus*, 100(2), 315-333. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11061-015-9457-1>

## English and Latin Lexical Innovations in Reginald Pecock's Corpus

### 1.1 The Englishing of Pecock's English

It would be a gross understatement to say that bishop Reginald Pecock's prose has inspired much spirited critique and defense. The extensive writings of the fifteenth-century theologian, most widely known for his conviction of heresy in 1457, have, on the one hand, been described as "labored and tediously verbose," (Krapp 1915, p. 73), "monumental, heavy, massive, dull," (Green 1945, p. 190), "ponderous" and "annoying" (Hitchcock 1924, pp. lxxv-i). On the other hand, his writings have been described by the same critics as "refined and dignified" (Hitchcock 1924, p. lxxvi), "comprehensive and exact" (Krapp 1915, p. 73), even "crystal clear" (Green 1945, p. 189). Despite these differing points of view, however, one fact is certain: the sheer quantity of English theology that Pecock produced is notable for its groundbreaking work in vernacular pedagogy. Although only six of the fifty-two books that he wrote survive,<sup>1</sup> they still constitute over 1,700 pages of Middle English theology and enough to make him the most prolific English theologian of the fifteenth-century.

The six surviving English books of theology are *The Reule of Crysten Religioun* (c.1443), *The Donet* (c.1443-9), *The Folewer to the Donet* (c.1453-4), *The Poore Mennis Myrroure* (c.1443-9), *The Repressor of Over Much Blaming of the Clergy* (c. 1449), and *The Book of Faith* (c.1456). A smattering of short excerpts in Latin survive: *Collectanea quaedam ex Reginaldi Pecock Cicestrensis Episcopi* (c.1456), a copy of his "Confession" (c.1457), and the *Abrenunciacio Reginaldi Pecok* (c.1447-1449), a subject to which I will return at the end of this essay.

Various theories have arisen to explain the oddities of his style, many of them related to modern attitudes towards Latinity. George Philip Krapp, writing in 1915 in *The Rise of English Literary Prose*, criticized Pecock for not being nearly Latin enough in his syntax or his vocabulary:

His style in the main is a highly Latinized style, and his use of native words and constructions is not due to any consistent or *puristic* respect for the English language. It is due largely to an incomplete realization on the part of Pecock of the value of the Latin

---

<sup>1</sup> Most of his books were presumably burned at two book burnings following his conviction of heresy in 1457 at St. Paul's Cross and Oxford University, respectively ("Reginald Pecock (c.1392-c.1495), bishop of Chichester," Scase 2004).

vocabulary as a source for the enrichment of the English vocabulary. (Krapp 1915, p. 75, italics mine)

The problem, Krapp laments, is that “if Pecoock had been more consistent in his style, if he had written altogether in popular language or had invented a thoroughly Latinized style, his influence as a writer might have been greater” (Krapp 1915, p. 75). Krapp’s privileging of Latin vocabulary and style and the evident failure of Pecoock to engage completely in one form of discourse or another, “discourse” here implying more than just language but rather popular and classical (perhaps humanistic) language, reflects Krapp’s own discomfort with the transitional nature of Pecoock’s prose. Pecoock wrote in English, but not a thoroughly Latinate English—an English unfamiliar to scholars living after the Renaissance revival of classical learning.

Krapp’s negative assessment of Pecoock, however, would have a short life span. By the first quarter of the twentieth century, dramatic changes in the humanistic education of American and English universities were already under way. The value of English as a literary language began to grow in popularity, and along with it, the value of the English vernacular. Elsie Vaughan Hitchcock, one of the great editors of Middle English and Early Modern English, was among this group of scholars. From 1924, the year of publication of Hitchcock’s modern edition of the *Folewer to the Donet*, onwards, all scholars writing on aspects of Pecoock’s prose style have looked to Hitchcock’s introduction for guidance and affirmation for their own conclusions. In addition to the traditional linguistic matters available in the front matter of most Early English Text Society (EETS) editions, Hitchcock included a discussion of Pecoock’s prose in historical context, comparing it to the works of Fortescue, Mandeville, Chaucer, Trevisa, Rolle, Capgrave, and “Wyclif”<sup>2</sup> (Hitchcock 1924, pp. lv-lx). Her more important contribution, however, was in her characterization of Pecoock’s vernacular prose, as a prose that looks to English for new word formations when forced to improvise:

It is a mistake to represent Pecoock’s works as a mere treasure-trove for the Teutonic philologist and dictionary-maker. They are more. Pecoock is no *purist*. . . . Pecoock

---

<sup>2</sup> ‘Wyclif’ is in single quotes because at the time of E.V. Hitchcock’s writing, editors believed that a number of English Wycliffite texts were by Wyclif himself. Hitchcock was likely working from the *Select English Works of John Wyclif* (1869-71) ed. Thomas Arnold and *English Works of Wyclif* (1880) o.s. 74 ed. F.D. Matthew. Anne Hudson, however, in “Some Aspects of Lollard Book Production” demonstrated that there is little evidence to support Wyclif as the author of these English language texts (1982, p. 186).

incorporates a very large French and Latin element, accepting without question all those borrowings which had safely established themselves. (Hitchcock 1924, pp. lxi-lxii, italics mine)

In Hitchcock's eyes, it is not that Pecock was unaware of Latin's linguistic potential in English; it was that Pecock did not want to use Latin terms because he wanted to be as transparent as possible for an English reading audience. With Hitchcock, the oddity of Pecock's diction transformed into a positive sign of his Englishness.

Writing just three years afterward Hitchcock, William Cabell Greet continues what eventually develops into a long tradition of agreement and positive augmentation of Hitchcock's assessment of Pecock's Englishness:

The mechanics of [Pecock's] syllogistic prose and the considerable achievement of welding an English vocabulary for the discussion of theology contributed little to the development of English language and style. Modern prose grew from the popular Lollard writings which Pecock despised, and the modern learned vocabulary drew perversely on Latin roots ... His style is very awkward and pompous and obscures the genuine goodness of the man and his sensible advice on eternal moral questions. (1927, p. xvii-xviii)

Here, Greet takes for granted that Pecock was "welding an English vocabulary," and he characterizes Pecock's dislike of Lollard writings in terms of their Latinity rather than their contents. What once required an explanation and justification by Hitchcock had just a mere three years later become virtual fact. English's acquisition of Latin vocabulary was now perverse, tied inextricably to Lollardy (not, strangely enough, to the rise of Humanism in the Renaissance).

And by the time that V. H. H. Green was writing in 1945, Pecock had become a veritable hero for English vernacularity. She says:

Pecock was not only an innovator but was also one of the first great writers of English prose, a pioneer. . . . Pecock has not only managed to evolve a vocabulary that was sufficiently extensive to deal with his subject clearly, emphatically and logically, but he uses phrases quite as fresh and as vivid as those of Wyclif (Green 1945, p. 203).

Green's praise of Pecock's English style was quite untempered. She attempts to raise Pecock to the linguistic level of Wyclif as "innovator" and "pioneer." This progressive association between Pecock and the Englishing of theological education prose continues in all of the major scholarly works dedicated to him. Joseph F. Patrouch, Jr., writing in 1970, says:

It should be clear from Pecock's intent in his works that he was as great a *purist* in his use of English as he could be. He intended his works, after all, as a communication of theological principles from a learned cleric, Pecock, to the unlettered masses, the laity, who needed the information Pecock was trying to give them, despite the fact that they did not know Latin. (Patrouch 1970, p. 52, italics mine)

Thus, the scholarly opinion concerning Pecock's English has slowly been changing the balance between Latin and English. What in Krapp was a primarily Latinate style with not enough Latin has become in Patrouch a primarily English style with too much Latin.<sup>3</sup>

This transition can be seen in the way that Krapp, Hitchcock, and Patrouch all use the term "pure." Krapp says that Pecock had no "*puristic* respect for the English language," a point which Hitchcock echoes when she says that he was "*no purist*." As already demonstrated, however, with Hitchcock came a change in the tone of that purity, so that by 1970, Patrouch could say that Pecock "was as great a *purist* in his use of English as he could be." This ironic repetition of the same word to describe Pecock's attitude and the slow metamorphosis in the representation of Pecock and his English is a clear example of a good reason why Pecock's vernacularity needs to be revisited by a study such as this one.

The single exception appears in James Simpson's article, on "Reginald Pecock and John Fortescue" in *A Companion to Middle English Prose* (2004). In it, Simpson asserts that "Pecock's vocabulary throughout his *oeuvre* is fundamentally Latinate; he does translate many Latin terms into English, but in such a way as to insist on their technical force" (Simpson 2004, p. 277). This position is at odds with the previous hundred years of scholarship on Pecock's vernacularity.

The following study directs its attention not to Pecock's motivation, a harder issue to prove, but rather to the outcome and circumstances under which Pecock did create new words. That is, it addresses

---

<sup>3</sup> It is unclear what proportion of Pecock's works were in Latin and which were in English. Pecock makes internal references to approximately forty-nine different works. (It is occasionally unclear whether some books of slightly different titles are the same work or not.) Eleven of those works are in English; fifteen are in Latin; twenty-three are of unknown language.

not why Pecock would have written in English, but in exactly what ways he does write. It addresses not his attitude towards Latinity, but rather the Latin loan words that he himself imports into English. It addresses not his attitude towards English, but rather the English loan words that he himself imports into Latin.

## 1.2 Methodology

All of the characterizations by previous scholars, however, have a fundamental flaw: they are impressionistic assessments rather than systematic ones. Hitchcock's work is as balanced and as thorough as can reasonably be expected, given the tools available at the time; however, she was writing in the 1920s and her volume on Pecock's prose was published four years before the last fascicle of *A New English Dictionary on Historical Principles* (1888-1928), or the *NED*, had even appeared. While she does recommend in her footnotes to readers to refer to the *NED* as an excellent resource for the study of Pecock's vocabulary enrichment, she also points out that the dictionary-makers had excluded some seventeen first attestations that her own research had uncovered (Hitchcock 1921, p. lxi.) She recognized the potential as well as the limitations involved in surveying Pecock's vocabulary.

Since then, the resources available to scholars of Middle English have changed dramatically, in scope and technological capacity. The *NED*, now *Oxford English Dictionary*, or the *OED*, has seen the publication of five supplemental volumes (the first in 1933 and the last in 1986), the integration of those entries into what would become the second edition of the *OED* in 1989, the digitization of the entries in 1992, and since 2000 the ongoing systematic revision of every entry. That is, scholars today have a much larger store of information and much easier means to obtain it than ever existed before in the *OED* (not to mention the *Electronic Middle English Dictionary* (2001), treated below).

In Patrouch's chapter on Pecock's style, dated 1970, he refers to six of the seventeen words that Hitchcock cites as instances that the *New English Dictionary* did not note Pecock as the first attestation.<sup>4</sup> Patrouch was basing his characterization of the Englishness or purity of Pecock's English on scholarship done in the 1920s; writing two years before the first supplemental volume of the *OED*'s four volume supplemental series became available, he simply did not have the opportunity to benefit from a more comprehensive survey.

---

<sup>4</sup> Patrouch, *Reginald Pecock*, p. 52. Actually, Patrouch incorrectly read the footnote; he thought that those were words for which the *NED* did cite Pecock as the first attested use.

To give an example of the importance of these ongoing revisions to linguistics, consider the case of the word “orthodox.” In the second edition of the *OED*, the oldest attested use of the term occurred in 1581 by Hamilton.<sup>5</sup> In the ongoing revision, updated on September 9, 2004, the two oldest attestations for “orthodox” both come from the writings of Pecock, the *Folewer to the Donet* (c. 1454) and the *Book of Faith* (c. 1456) respectively. As this single entry should demonstrate, Pecock is an extremely important innovator (to use Green’s terminology, 1945, p. 203) of the English language.

To answer the question of whether or not Pecock was intentionally trying to remain pure in his vocabulary use, we must first ask: How innovative was he? How many words did Pecock create and of what type (nouns, verbs, adjectives, etc.)? Were they primarily Latinate or were they primarily Germanic?

### 1.3 Word Formation

#### 1.3.1 Total Vocabulary

How to go about analyzing the results of Pecock’s efforts to complete this transformation requires a thorough examination of Pecock’s lexicon. To do so, let us return to the first set of questions that I posed: Exactly how innovative was Pecock? The simple answer to the first question is that Pecock created 715 new words out of a total estimated vocabulary of 7,273 words, or roughly 10% of his total vocabulary.

The way that I arrived at those numbers requires some explanation. The *MED* cites Pecock 4,459 times as compared to the *OED*’s 1,951.<sup>6</sup> Neither of these sources, however, purport to give a complete listing of Pecock’s entire vocabulary. In order to obtain a relatively complete listing of Pecock’s vocabulary, I turned instead to the text analysis software, WordSmith. I converted the digitized versions of *Repressor* and *Faith* that are available at the *Corpus of Middle English Prose and Verse* (2006), the body of digitized literature used for the compilation of the *MED* entries, into plain text documents. As my two base texts, they are a reasonable survey of Pecock’s vocabulary, because they are his two latest compositions and would, therefore, be likely to show the full development of Pecock’s lexicon (assuming, of course, that Pecock’s vocabulary did not experience vocabulary loss over time). Combined, *Repressor* and *Faith* also

---

<sup>5</sup> There is a problem with the *OED* regarding this citation. Its bibliography has a number of authors by the name of J. Hamilton, but none have the title *Certane orthodox and catholik conclusions vith yair probations* that the citation claims is now the third earliest (after the two Pecock references) of the word *orthodox*. The likely author of this book is Archbishop John Hamilton, for whom the *OED* cites three other works, and who was alive and writing at the time *Certane orthodox and catholik conclusions*, etc. was composed.

<sup>6</sup> *OED*, May 25, 2012.

constitute approximately one third of Pecock's extant writings, with *Repressor* constituting one quarter of his writings alone.

The complete WordList that WordSmith generates, however, is a raw list of every word that Pecock uses in each of those two texts without differentiation for part of speech or consolidation for allowable variations in orthography, conjugation, or declension. The unprocessed WordList is 10,501 words long. In order to consolidate and differentiate word forms and variant spellings, I used the Concordance tool to survey the actual use of a significant sample of words in context. Latin words and abbreviations are not included in the final count. Following the practice of the *MED*, I also recognized only seven basic parts of speech: noun, pronoun, adjective, verb, adverb, article, preposition, and gerund. Using these techniques and after combining and cross-checking that set of vocabulary against the yield from the *MED* and the *OED*, I determined that Pecock has a total estimated vocabulary of 7,273 words.

### 1.3.2 *First Attestations*

Of the 4,459 citations from the *MED*, Pecock is the first attested author for 705 entries as compared to the *OED*'s 348.<sup>7</sup> When conflated and checked for the *OED*'s lapses in identification, Pecock is verifiably the first attested author for 715 words in the English language. Many of these terms are in common use today: "precise," "reformer," "famously," "habitually," "unlimited," "day labour," "subordination," "decision," "misunderstanding," "conceivable," "caring," "neutral," "narrowing," "irremediable," and "beneficence."

By what means did Pecock create words? Well, all words new to the English language generally fall into one of the following categories: neologisms, blends, shortened forms, derivations, compounds, eponyms, and borrowed words. Pecock used most of these methods, with the exception of creation *de novo*, since Pecock's vocabulary was, for the most part, transparent even in his invention of new grammatical forms. As strange as some of his creations may be to modern ears, they were for the most part logical applications of pre-existing word-formation patterns.

---

<sup>7</sup> *OED*, May 25, 2012.

### 1.3.3 Derivation by Affixation

One of the most productive of Pecock's methods of word formation was derivation by affixation, that is basing a new word formation on a previously known root or stem and adding a standard prefix or suffix to change the part of speech (*e.g.* a non-Pecock example, innovate (v.) → innovation (n.)). It is in the area of derivation by affixation that Pecock was most experimental, often offering multiple forms of a lexical item; hence, both "circumstanciated" (ppl.) and "circumstancionated" (ppl.), "conningal" (adj.) and "conningful" (adj.). Some very closely related words, however, did differentiate in meaning.

In many instances, Pecock favored the use of a word in every part of speech available. For example, Pecock is attested in all of the following forms: "remembratif" (adj.), "remembre" (n.), "remembren" (v.), "remembrer" (n.), "remembring" (ger.), and "remembringli" (adv.). Of those words, only "remembren" and "remembring" are attested in English before Pecock's use. That is, only the verb and its gerund were of common use. The other forms were invented by Pecock to encapsulate the full spectrum of grammatical forms available.

The most productive of Pecock's suffixes is *-able, -abil*. 136 of the 705 new attestations in the *MED* contain an *-able* suffix; that is, 19.3%, or nearly one fifth of the entire set, contains this affix. Most of these affixes are used alone for the formation of an adjective. There is only one example of Pecock creating a new word with the *-ible* suffix: "exercible," although he does use many pre-existing Middle English words that end in *-ible*.

**Table 1 New Words with the *-able* Suffix**

<b>A.</b> approvable, assignable, avoidable, aweldable	<b>I.</b> immesurable, inclinable, inevitable, infailable, inviolable, irrecoverable, irremediabile	<b>T.</b> takable, tariale, techeable, temptable, thankeable
<b>B.</b> berable, bigilable, biholdable, bireuable, bringable	<b>J.</b> joinable, jugeable, justificable	<b>U.</b> unavoidable, unaweidoable, unaweifallable, unberable, unbigilable, unbrekeable, undeclarable, undelectable, underkeable, unendeable, unfindable, unforberable, unlackable, unnotable, unovercomable, unremovable, unrewardable, unsoilable, unsparable, untalkeable, unthinkable, unwemeable,
<b>C.</b> chesable, commaundable, conceivable, cuttable, considerable, constreinable, contemplable	<b>K.</b> kepable <b>L.</b> lettable <b>M.</b> makable, markable, medable	<b>W.</b> wepable, wernable, witable
<b>D.</b> derkable, destroiabile, disciplinable, dispreisable, doable, drauable, dressable, drinkable	<b>N.</b> nedable <b>O.</b> obeiable, overcomable, overreuable, overwepable	
<b>F.</b> failable, fallable, fillable, findable, fleable, forbedable, forberable, formable	<b>P.</b> pareable, passionable, prechable, procurable, propreable <b>R.</b> refusable, reulable, rewardable	
<b>G.</b> groundable <b>H.</b> hateable, herable,	<b>S.</b> settable, smelleable, speulable, strivable	

On occasion, however, the *-able* affix is also paired with an adverbial ending:

**Table 2 New Words with the *-abli* Suffix<sup>8</sup>**

allouabli,	rewardabli	undepartabili
assignabili	thankeabli	ungroundabili
availabli	unayendressabli	unlackabli
groundabli	unayenseiabli	unlosabli
indepatabli	unayenstondabli	unrecoverabli
inevitabli	unbowabili	unscapabli
irremediabili	unbrekeabili	unsoilabli
repreveabli		

On other occasions, the *-able* affix is paired with a nominal suffix:

**Table 3 New Words with *-able+-ness* Suffixes**

conceivablelness	receivablelness	unmesurablelness
delitablelness	resonablelness	unremovablelness
labilness	takeabilness	unreuleablelness
presablelness	unchaungeabilness	witablelness
probabilness	undepartabilness	

Only two examples of the following type exist: “campaignabilte” (*Follower* 1454) and “probabilite” (*Rule* 1443).

<sup>8</sup> All spellings ending with *-ly* merged.

Some bases were successful in some forms but not in others. For example, “avisedli,” “avisednes,” “aviseful,” “avising,” “avisingli,” “avisose,” “avisoseli,” and “avisoseness” are all first attestations by Pecoock. They are all formed from the base of advice (ad+vis), yet only “avisedli,” “avisedness,” and “avising” survive in common usage today as ‘advisedly,’ ‘advisedness,’ and ‘advising,’ respectively.

Despite the seeming awkwardness of some of Pecoock’s constructions (*e.g.*, “circumstanciounated,” “unaweifallable”), the allomorphy of his constructions, do not reflect the phonetic or orthographic changes present in older borrowing or word formations that would obscure the constituent parts. Indeed, it seems as if his affixes were often chosen for their transparency and his orthography (or the scribe’s) purposeful in preserving the root and affix divide. In the cases where it seems as if a newly attested word has undergone assimilation, the borrowed item invariably reflects assimilation in the source language; hence, in the case of “irrecoverable,” “irremediabili,” “irremediable,” “irreverenced,” and “irreverencing,” the assimilation of ‘n’ in ‘in+r’ occurred in Latin or Old French rather than English. For words of his own making, however, Pecoock maintains the prefix form: hence, “inpresseli” not ‘impresseli,’ “inperseueraunt” not ‘imperseueraunt,’ “inpertinentli” not ‘impertinentli,’ “inpite” not ‘impite,’ “inprouyng” not ‘improyng,’ and “inpugners” not ‘impugner.’ This transparency of form is also present where the affix is a suffix, like in the case of “unendeable,” “techeable,” and “pareable,” where the presence of the “e” between the root and the suffix could easily be dropped in scribal practice.

#### *1.3.4 Derivation by Compounding or Combining*

Equally important to Pecoock's practice of word formation is derivation by compounding. Generally speaking, compounding is the most important source of new words in the English language because it is the largest category of word formation, with the exception of borrowing (Stockwell and Minkova 2001, p. 13). Although compounding is never a simple category of lexical innovation to describe, the discussion of compounding in relation to Pecoock’s lexical innovation is especially difficult for two reasons. 1) Usually, the relative transparency or opaqueness of a compound word’s meaning is related to the length of time that the compound word has been used in that particular combination. Words usually begin as syntactic compounds with transparent meaning and transition into lexical compounds with a somewhat obscured meaning. But in the case of Pecoock’s words, most of his compounds, though they maintain morphemic transparency, do not maintain semantic transparency because they are translations or

calques from Latin. That is, they are immediately opaque compound words for all English speakers, except for those who are also familiar with Latin—in which case, they are transparent compound words; however, the transparency for English-Latin bilingual speakers stems from translation of the Latin forms rather than from the transparency of the morphemes themselves. 2) Pecock’s usual practice of compounding also depends primarily on two roots of unequal semantic force, so that the new word formations are somewhere between new compound words and words derived from affixation, which, when combined with the scribal inconsistency in the representation of spacing between words, makes it all the more difficult to decide whether or not Pecock has truly created a new word.

Of the 715 new Pecock word formations, there are only four examples of compounds that are the unification of roots of equal semantic force: “day labour,” “mother’s language,” “opinion holder,” and “vouching saf.” By contrast, 39 of the new word formations are examples of compounds which are constituted by one free-standing root and one combining form. These combining forms, according to *MED* practice, are morphemes which are free-standing but behave as affixes either because they are translations of affixes (free-standing or bound) from a source language or because they modify or augment the meaning of the base morpheme rather than acting as an equal semantic force in the creation of meaning.

Among Pecock’s most productive combining forms is *over-*, which he uses to modify nouns, adjectives, verbs, adverbs, and gerunds. His preference for the *over-* combining form is reflective of the same trend in Middle English. The *MED*, for example, lists over six hundred words with the *over-* prefix. Pecock was not the only one to experiment with the combinatory potential of forms; other writers were also experimenting. The *MED*, for example, includes the term “almightihede” from the *The Book of Privy Counselling* (c. 1400), which, like its Pecockian cousin “almightines” (n.), was also used to mean ‘omnipotence.’

**Table 4 Examples of Derivation by Compounding**

out hilding	overbiholden	to gidere wordis	vndir ordyned
out spake	ouer carkful	to gidere comunyng	
out throwyng	ouercomeable	togidere fallyng	
out wellen	ouer confuse	togidere lyuyng	
	ouer deintyli	togider talking	
	ouer derk		
	ouer dolorose		
	ouer excellent		
	ouer excellently		
	over favorable		
	ouer general		

ouer ofte  
ouerneishli  
ouerpeise  
ouer pore  
ouerreder  
overreding  
ouer reweable  
ouer reverend  
ouer scharpli  
ouer studie  
ouer tendirly  
ouer thou3tful  
ouer waite  
ouer wepeable  
ouer weriful  
ouer wonderfully

As mentioned earlier, however, the line between affixation and compounding is blurry for some terms. *Out-*, *over-*, *together-*, *under-*, *again-*, and *away-* are all unbound roots in the English language. Pecoock, however, does not always treat them as independent roots when translating from Latin. Instead, he treats them as English equivalents for Latin affixes; *out-* or *over-* may be English translations of Latin *ex-*; *together-* a translation of *co-*; *under-* a translation of *sub-*; *again-* a translation of *re-* or *contra-* (depending on whether the intended translation is again or against); and *away-* a translation of *ab-*. Except for *ab-*, those Latin prefixes, however, unlike their English equivalents, are bound morphemes in Latin.<sup>9</sup>

The status of these morphemes as bounded or unbounded in both the foreign and native language matter to the extent that boundedness usually determines the parameters of a new word formation.<sup>10</sup> Related to that issue is the scribal practice of word separation in compound words. Compound words, if perceived as a single lexical unit by the scribe, should generally be represented as a single word on the page with no spaces between the combining form or affix and the root. The practice of eliminating spaces in these compound words, however, is inconsistent in the manuscript record and initially suggests that Pecoock or, more likely the scribe, may have perceived many of these terms to be two lexical items rather than one. For example, only a handful of the *over-* words do not show scribal separation: “ouercomeable,” “ouerbiholden,” “ouerhi3li,” “ouerneishli,” “ouerpeise,” “ouerreder,” and “overreding.” The vast majority do.

---

<sup>9</sup> In the case of *out-*, the *OED* observes that it is a common substitution for the Latin prefix *ex-*, especially in the works of Wyclif (or rather, English language Wycliffite texts since there are no surviving English-language texts by Wyclif.) (*out-*, prefix, *OED*).

<sup>10</sup> Bounded morphemes are morphemes that cannot stand as independent lexical units whereas unbounded morphemes are morphemes that can. For example, *over-* may serve as an affix or as an independent word; *un-* may serve only as an affix but not as an independent word.

Some of the word separation can be attributed to the creation of English calques from Latin words. A calque or a loan-translation is “an expression adopted by one language from another in more or less literally translated form.”<sup>11</sup> There are many examples of such words in Middle English which predate Pecock’s coinings: “again-buy” for *redimere*, “again-say” for *contradicere*, “again-stand” for *resistere*, “again-rise” for *resurgere*, etc. In fact, Pecock regularly uses all of these English formations. New calques by Pecock include “almy3tynes” (n.), “togidere fallyng” (ger.), “togidere lyuyng” (ger.), “togider talking” (ger.) from the Latin, *omnipotentia*, *coincidere*, *cohabitare*, and *colloqui*. Pecock’s formation contrasts with the standard English format of verbal phrases to express the same concept: ‘living together,’ ‘speaking together,’ etc.

Pecock’s use of *togeder-* as a combining form is rare, although not unique. The *MED* identifies three other uses of *togeder-* in similar constructions: 1) “togederstiring” (ger.) a calque from the Latin *commovere*; 2) “togederstourbling” (ger.), a blending and borrowing of forms (the *-stourb-* takes the <s> from the prefix *dis-* and the root *-turb-* from *disturbare*); and 3) “togederspekinge” a calque similar in morpheme but not in form from *communiloquium*, meaning ‘general discourse.’ Pecock’s description of “Togeder-words” describes not compound words but rather is one way that he signals a quotation or the specific rendering of a phrase (see *Repressor* p. 283). One other notable coinage is “togedercommuning,” used to mean ‘intercourse.’ Although the term “communing” can be used alone to mean ‘sexual intercourse,’ as Pecock and Margery Kempe both exhibit, here Pecock retains the root of the Latin *communis* and adds to it the English prefix *togeder-* to act as an intensifier. Perhaps his use of “togiderecommuning” is a way for him to distinguish the use of “communing” in its spiritual sense (to mean to receive the Eucharist, for example) with its use in the sexual sense.

Pecock does not coin any new words that use only the prefix *again-*. He does, however, make the unique decision to combine *-again-* with an additional prefix *un-*: “unayendressabli,” “unayenseiabli,” “unayenstondabli.” There are no other words in the *MED* that use that particular combination. Pecock’s experimentation extends to his use of *-away-* in an analogous formation: “unaweidoable” and “unaweifallable.” He does not, notably, use *-awei-* without the presence of *un-*. The use of *-awei-* as a combinatory form seems to be very limited. The *MED* cites only three other instances of *-awei-* in

---

<sup>11</sup> “calque,” *OED*.

combination with other morphemes—“al awei,” “her awei,” and “ther-awei” —all of which are exclusively adverbial in their use. The *OED* cites ‘away-bear’ and ‘away-put,’ both from the Early Version of the so-called Wycliffite Bible. Although *away-* and *again-* are usually unbounded morphemes, their combination with the bounded prefix *un-* makes it clear that in these instances, the scribe certainly perceived each of these compounds as new word formations. The manuscript record reflects that fact as well; there are no spaces in “unayendressabli,” “unayenseiabli,” “unayenstondabli,” or “unaweidoable” and “unaweifallable.” But what to do about the other words discussed above which do not have a bounded morpheme along to help make the situation unambiguous? Should we consider these compounds new word formations, if the scribes repeatedly wrote them as two separate lexical items?

I argue that we should follow the *MED* practice of counting all compound words as one new headword even when scribally separated, because so many are modeled on Latin words for which the lexical unity is well established. The reasons why the English calques are usually represented as two items on the page is more closely related to whether or not the affix or combining form can be considered a free standing lexical item in English: *out-*, *over-*, *together-*, and *under-*. They are both combining forms and free-standing words. Scribal practice was not, moreover, always consistent and the bound lexical items of *mis-*, *non-*, and *to-* were also represented separately from their bases on the manuscript page. See Table 5. The status of these affixes or combining forms should be determined by the practice of the source language or by analogy from the source language rather than by the traditional practice of determination through boundedness. To put it simply, if Pecoock coins the word “togeder living” from the Latin *cohabitare*, then he must conceive of the *togeder-* morpheme as a prefix and not as an independent word.

**Table 5 Word Separation in Derivation by Affixation**

mys vndirstonding	noun beyng	to settyngis
mis vndirstonding	noon being	to wirchyng
mys callen	noun keping	to cryng
	noon voluntari	
	nooun voluntari	

How one might choose to divide words which do not have Latin correlates, however, can be much more challenging. I shall let the reader ponder Hitchcock’s famous example from the introduction to the *Donet* (1921): “vnto-be-þouzt-vpon.” How many words is that?

## 1.4 Etymology

Finally, the questions will be addressed with which this essay began: 1) Are Pecock's word formations primarily Latinate or were they primarily Germanic? 2) Could Pecock have been concerned with the 'purity' of his word formations? and 3) Did Pecock purposefully try to eschew Latinate vocabulary? The answers to those questions are: 1) primarily Latinate; 2) unlikely; and, 3) no. Using the root of the words to determine etymology, I found that 479 of his first-time words were of Latin (and Romance) origin, 227 were of Germanic origin, five were of unknown origin, and four of dual origin. If Pecock had been trying to be "pure," then he was not doing a very good job of it. There were over two times as many new Latinate words as new Germanic ones.

Pecock also regularly derived new words that combined morphemes of different morphological origin. Of the new *over-* words, for example, seven are etymological hybrids: "overconfus," "overdeinteli," "overdolorous," "overexcellent," "overexcellentli," "overgeneral," and "overreverend." *Over-* is a Germanic affix, whereas 'confus,' 'deinteli,' 'excellent,' 'general' and 'reverend' are all derived from Latinate words.

In fact, the practice of preferring Latinate vocabulary over Germanic vocabulary that started in the Early Modern period may make Pecock seem artificially more Germanic than he was. A good illustration of the disjuncture between modern expectations for a Latinate rooted vocabulary and Pecock's own mingled Germanic/Latinate vocabulary occurs in the title of the *Repressor*. Few titles in the history of the English language can claim to be so paradoxically transparent and confusing as Pecock's *The Repressor of Over-Much Wiiting of the Clergie*. In many respects, this title is Pecock at his finest and his least comprehensible, at least to modern eyes and ears. If, however, the Latinate "Repressor" were replaced with 'Defender,' the Germanic "Over-Much" were replaced with the Latinate 'Excessive' and the Germanic "Wiiting" were replaced with the Latinate 'Criticism,' all more common equivalents in today's parlance, the sense would be much clearer: *The Defender against Excessive Criticism of the Clergy*.<sup>12</sup>

---

<sup>12</sup>"Repressor" probably refers to Pecock himself instead of the book. Pecock is the only author attested for this form in the *MED*, though the form continues to be used well into the modern day. Although the *MED*'s definition of "Something which suppresses or curbs something" implies that the agent is an inanimate rather than animate form, historical usage implies the opposite. As a lexical form, "repressor" is attested in Classical Latin sources as well as medieval Latin sources. In both instances, the repressor is "one who checks or restrains, repressor" (*DML*). It is likely that Pecock simply borrowed the Latin form for English use.

Pecock was writing at a time when there simply were proportionally more Germanic rooted words than Latinate words in the English vocabulary. The rate of Latin borrowings into English in the Early Modern Period is well attested.<sup>13</sup> As a result, more than sixty percent of the English language today is Latinate in origin (45% French and 16.7% Latin, Roberts 1965, p. 36).

This is not to say, however, that Pecock's work in English was not unusual or unique among writers of the fifteenth century. Pecock was among a generation of writers for whom there was no acceptable orthodox vernacular model to follow, since English prose in its syntax, vocabulary, and authority was still a work in progress. As Green states, "From the point of view of the historian or theologian if not the philologist, this is the most significant fact about his prose: he was the first Englishman to tackle a philosophical treatise in the English language" (1945, pp. 204). Sarah James' recent work (2011) on Pecock's methods of translation may also shed light on his practices. Latin's rules and longstanding practices may in fact have been a hindrance. Writing in a language in which the rules are not written mean that there are fewer rules to break, and more freedom to write as the occasion demands.

### 1.5 Innovations in Latin

Although the main object of this paper is to discuss the innovations that Pecock made in English, there does remain something to be said of Pecock's Latin innovations. Very little of Pecock's Latin prose survives and none of his books, though we know that he probably wrote at least thirteen books in the language. What survives is his "Confession" in the *Whethamstede Register* (c.1457), the *Collectanea quaedam ex Reginaldi Pecock Cicesterensis Episcopi* (c.1456) from John Foxe, and lastly a text known as the *Abrenunciatio Reginaldi Pecok* (c.1447-1449).<sup>14</sup>

It is this last item to which I now turn my attention. In Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodley 117, there are two and half pages which record Pecock's self-defense given before John Stafford, archbishop of Canterbury, about his opinions on the responsibilities of bishops, which he first preached in an infamous

---

<sup>13</sup> See Hogg and Denison, *A History of the English Language* (2006, pp. 256-258).

<sup>14</sup> The *Abrenunciatio* (c.1447-1449) may be found in two modern print editions: the Appendix to Chuchill Babington's *Repressor of Overmuch Blaming of the Clergy* (1860) where it is titled *Abbreviatio* ... and in the Appendix to Wendy Scase's biography of Pecock (1996), where it may be found under the title used herein. Scase makes the argument that Babington misread the original manuscript—it is quite illegible—and that the actual title and meaning behind the title is one of warning not of abridgment (1996, p. 96).

sermon at St. Paul’s Cross in 1447. The defense, known as the *Abrenunciacio*, is a short piece, just under 1,000 words. This sermon was the cause of widespread animosity against Pecock among the clergy, for it stirred the people against them. The first accusations against Pecock for heresy stemmed from this sermon and the publication of his summary of arguments as well as his public debate in support of these arguments. It is not, however, the content of the seven main arguments defending the rights of absentee bishops, but rather the context of its linguistic composition with which I am concerned.<sup>15</sup>

The *Abrenunciacio* includes at least three Latin words for which there are no other medieval Latin attestations: “allocabiliter,” “inhabiliores,” and “impotenciores,” meaning ‘allowably,’ ‘unsuitable,’ and ‘incapable,’ respectively. The first term, “allocabiliter,” occurs in the sentence on the fifth conclusion:

Episcopi possunt propter diuersas causas absentare se a suis diocesis et fieri non ibidem residentes excusabiliter et meritorie et allocabiliter penes Deum durante toto tempore illarum causarum.

Bishops may, because of various causes, be absent from their own dioceses, and become non-resident therein, excusably and meritoriously and **allowably** in the sight of God, for as long as these causes persist.”<sup>16</sup>

The *Dictionary of Medieval Latin from British Sources* (1975-2013) or *DML* defines “allocabiliter” as “allowably, so as to be credited.” It is hardly surprising that Pecock would have formed a new Latin word from either the Latin *allocare* ‘allocate’ or the English ‘allow’ since the root, ‘allow,’ is one of Pecock’s most commonly used roots for word clusters. It occurs in all of the following clusters:

accepted and allowed	biddith, counselith, or allowith
allowed and confirmed	iuge, allowe, and approve
allowed, approved, and confirmed	counselith, allowith, approveth
granted and allowed	allowable and convenient
allowable and praisable	alloweable, fair and honest
allowable and sufficient	allowith and confermeth
admyttith and allowed	allowith, witnessith, and confermeth
admyttith, receveth, and allowith	sufferable and alloweable
allow, reward, accepte, and take	suffered, allowed, and received,
wole and allowe	reasonable, allowable, profitable
comending or allowance	alloweable, good, resonable
allow and approve	alloweable, profitable, and procurable

<sup>15</sup> Scase discusses this issue in full (1996, pp. 95-99).

<sup>16</sup> “None of the earlier biographers ... [had] access to important material in Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodley 117, using instead Babington’s partial and misleading edition” (1860, p. 1, n. 1).

What is especially noteworthy is that Pecock is the first attestation for “allowably” in English, too, having been attested in all of the following spellings: “allowably,” “allowably,” “alloweabili,” “allowabli.” The ambiguity of its first formation stems from the root of the word itself, which is Latinate.

Allow -> from the post-classical Latin *allocare*

Allowable -> allow v. + *-able* suffix

Allowably -> Allowable adj. + *-ly* suffix

The *MED*, furthermore, cites “allocabiliter” as a definition for the ME word: “Allocabiliter, allowably, so as to be credited. (fig.)” And it is the *MED*’s definition of ‘allowably’ that the *OED* incorporates.

Ironically, therefore, both the *OED/MED* and the *DML* seem to be pointing to the same lexical innovator for the same term and concept, invented at roughly the same time: Reginald Pecock. For the etymology of “allowably,” the *OED* remarks, “Compare post-classical Latin *allocabiliter* so as to be credited (c.1450 in a British source)” and names Pecock in doing so. However the *DML* is dependent upon the “Abbreviatio” (called the *Abrenunciacio* in this essay), which also cites Reginald Pecock, though from a different source. There is not enough surviving Latin evidence by Pecock to say definitively whether he derived the Latin formation first or the English formation first. What we do know, on the one hand, is that the surviving English formation pre-dates the Latin formation, since the *Abrenunciacio* is dated c.1447-9 and at least after the 1447 preaching controversy. The first attestation for the word “allowably” in English, on the other hand, comes from *The Reule of Christian Religioun*, dated c. 1443: “þe seide preestis kepten ... her presthode to gidere wiþ her wedlok holilye and allowably.” This means that the attestation of the English, “allowably,” pre-dates the Latin, “allocabiliter,” by some four years.

Given James’s argument that Pecock regularly composed in English first and then translated from English into Latin when actually writing (James 2011, pp. 104-5), Pecock may have simply translated his frequently used “allowably” into “allocabiliter” when needed. Although it is likely that the seven surviving items that he circulated afterwards (and as attested in the *Abrenunciacio*) were written in English, it is also highly plausible that the original sermon was itself given in English; therefore, the driving force behind the invention of the Latin, “allocabiliter,” would have been the need to translate it from the English. This hypothesis, however, is impossible to prove given current evidence.

The two other Latin words for which Pecock is the first attestation in the *Abbrenunciacio* are “inhabiliores” and “impotenciores,” both occurring in the third cause of the seventh conclusion:

Unde episcopi non predicantes populo, et episcopi a suis diocesibus propter rationabiles causas absentes, detraccionibus vulgi crebrissimis subiacebant, ac suis subditis vilescebant, a quibus debuissent reuereri. Immo et ad corripiendum, mandandum, regulandum suos subditos ipsi erant tanto **inhabiliores** seu tanto **impotenciores** effecti quanto in tantum infamiam secundum reputationem hominum fuerant deiecti, quod nullus sapiens negabit esse malum, digne et merito remediandum, cum indigniorum personarum succurrendum est infamie et immo multo magis infamie episcoporum. (Scase 1996, p.131)

Whence it is that bishops who did not preach to the people, and bishops who were absent from their dioceses for good causes, were subjected to multitudinous detractions of the common people, and they grew vile in the eyes of their subjects, by whom they should be revered; moreover, they became all the more **unsuitable** and **incapable** of correcting, commanding, and ruling their subjects as they were cast into such great infamy in the estimation of men. No wise man will deny that this is an evil thing, worthily deserving to be remedied, since the infamy even of undeserving persons should be remedied (succored), and therefore much more the infamy of bishops.<sup>17</sup>

Both of these new words occur in a sentence with multiple word clusters that demand grammatical parallelism: “corripiendum, mandandum, regulandum” and the *tanto-quanto* clause “inhabiliores” and “impotenciores.” Unexpectedly, Pecock is cited for the term “inhabiliores” in the *DML* though not for “impotenciores.” In fact, “impotenciores” has no attestation in the *DML* at all, although it is based on the Latin term “impotens” meaning ‘powerless’ or ‘weak.’ The formation of the word itself shows that it may be an adjective in either the accusative, nominative, or vocative forms, although in this case, it is clear that they are in the nominative case, following a copulative verb (*esse*). “Inhabiliores,” according to the *DML* means “unfitted, unsuitable, incapable (usu. w. indication of spec. activity or purpose).”

---

<sup>17</sup> My thanks go to Henry Ansgar Kelly for assistance with the translations.

While it is possible that these forms were in use in medieval Europe, I would argue that it is at least as likely that Pecoock engaged in the same kind of active word formation when writing in Latin as when he was writing in English. The old argument has been that Pecoock had to create these new words to “translate” from Latin into English (James 2011, p. 103). And he does, of course, do this as I demonstrated above in his use of calques. However, I would also argue that there is something else at work in Pecoock’s writing: notably, lexical innovation dependent upon a greater desire for grammatical parallelism. What is interesting here is that, although language can be seen as the outer limits of expressible thought, Pecoock behaves in a different manner by forcing the language to expand to the limits of his ideas. Pecoock’s oddities, therefore, if they are at all odd, extend across multiple languages. The argument that Pecoock was writing for the sake of the elevation of English is wholly implausible. The linguistic data simply do not support such a conclusion. The co-opting of the narrative surrounding Pecoock’s writings for the purposes of linguistic and, I would argue, nationalistic and political reasons, detracts from the fact that Pecoock’s English was, for him, a tool for the clearer communication of theology, not the first act in a political exchange.

## Works Cited

- Babington, C. (1860), see Pecoock, R. (c.1449). *Repressor of Over Much Blaming of the Clergy* (c.1449). *Corpus of Middle English Prose and Verse* (2006). Ed. F. McSparran. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Digital Library Production Service.
- Dictionary of Medieval Latin from British Sources*. (1975–2013). Ed. R. E. Latham, D. R. Howlett, & R. K. Ashdowne. Oxford: British Academy. [abbreviated as *DML*]
- Electronic Middle English Dictionary*. (2001) Ed. F. McSparran. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Digital Library Production Service. [abbreviated as *MED*] <http://quod.lib.umich.edu/m/med/>
- Green, V. H. H. (1945). *Bishop Reginald Pecoock: a Study in Ecclesiastical History and Thought*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Greet, W. C. (1927), see Pecoock, R. (c.1443). *Reule of Chrysten Religioun*.
- Hitchcock, E. V. (1921), see Pecoock, R. (c.1443-9) *Donet*.
- (1924), see Pecoock, R. (c.1453-4) *Folewer to the Donet*.
- Hogg, R. M., and D. Denison. (2006). *History of the English Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP.

- Hudson, A. (1982). "Some Aspects of Lollard Book Production." *Studies in Church History* xviii: pp. 261-83. Reprinted in *Lollards and their Books* (1985) London: Hambledon Press, pp. 181-191. Page references are to the 1985 edition.
- James, S. (2011). "'Langagis, whose reules ben not writen': Pecock and the Uses of the Vernacular." *Vernacularity in England and Wales, c. 1300-1500*. Ed. E. Salter and H. Wicker. Turnhout: Brepols.
- Krapp, G. P. (1915). *The Rise of English Literary Prose*. Oxford: Oxford UP.
- New English Dictionary on Historical Principles* (1884-1928). Ed. J. Murray. Oxford: Clarendon Press.  
[abbreviated as NED]
- Oxford English Dictionary Online* (2015). Ed. J. Simpson. Oxford: Oxford UP. [abbreviated as *OED*]  
<http://www.oed.com/>
- Patrouch, J. F., Jr. (1970). *Reginald Pecock*. Twayne's English Author Series 106. New York: Twayne.
- Pecock, R. (c. 1447-1449). *Abrenunciacio Reginaldi Pecok*, Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodley 117 (preaching controversy) ff.11r-13r; related notes ff. 13r-14v (xv3; notebook of William Mede, monk of Sheen) (reprinted in Babington pp. 615-619, Scase 1996, pp. 130-132 [56-58])
- . *Book of Faith*. (c. 1456). In *Reginald Peacock's Book of Faith: a Fifteenth-Century Theological Tractate*. Ed. J. L. Morison. Glasgow: J. Maclehose and Sons, 1909. Facsimile reprint: N.p.: Kessinger, 2009.
- . "Collectanea quaedam ex Reginaldi Pecock Cicestrensis episcopi opusculis exustis conservata, et ex antiquo psegrate conscripta." (c.1456) Quoted by Foxe, John. *Comentarii Rerum in Ecclesia Gestarum Maximarumque, per Totam Europam, Persecutionum, a Wiclevi Temporibus ad hanc usque Aetatem Descriptio*. Strasbourg: Wendelinus Rihelius, 1554, ff. 199b-203 b.
- . "Confession." (c.1457) In *Registra Quorundam Abbatum Monasterii S. Albani, Qui Saeculo XVmo. Floruere, vol. II: Registra Johannis Whethamstede, Willelmi Albon, et Willelmi Walingforde, Abbatum Monasterii Sancti Albani cum Appendice, Continente Quasdam Epistolas, a Johanne Whethamstede Conscriptas*. Ed. H. T. Riley. *Rerum Britannicarum Medii Aevi Scriptores or Chronicles and Memorials of Great Britain and Ireland during the Middle Ages* (Rolls Series), London: Longman, 1873.

- . *The Donet*. (c.1443-9). In *Pecock's "The Donet" Collated with "The Poore Mennis Myrrour."* Ed. E. V. Hitchcock. EETS o.s. 156. London: Oxford University Press, 1921 (for 1918). Facsimile reprint: Woodbridge: Boydell & Brewer, 1996.
- . *Folewer to the Donet*. (c.1453-4). Ed. E. V. Hitchcock. EETS o.s. 164. London: Oxford University Press, 1924 (for 1923). Facsimile reprint: Woodbridge, Suffolk: Boydell & Brewer, 2002.
- . *Poore Mennis Myrrour*. (c.1443-9). See Pecock, R. (c.1443-9) *The Donet*.
- . *Repressor of Over Much Wiiting of the Clergy*. (c.1449). In *Repressor of Over Much Blaming of the Clergy*. Ed. Churchill Babington. 2 vols. *Rerum Britannicarum Medii Aevi Scriptores or Chronicles and Memorials of Great Britain and Ireland during the Middle Ages (The Rolls Series)*. London: Longman, Green, Longman and Roberts, 1860. Facsimile reprint by Elibron: N.p.: BookSurge, 2001.
- . *Reule of Chrysten Religioun*. (c.1443). In *Pecock's Reule of Crysten Religioun*. Ed. W. C. Greet. EETS o.s. 171. London: Oxford University Press, 1927 (for 1926). Facsimile reprint: Woodbridge: Boydell & Brewer, 2002.
- Scase, W. (1996). *Reginald Pecock*. *Authors of the Middle Ages*. Ed. M.C. Seymour. Series 3, no. 8, pp. 69-146 [1-72]. Brookfield: Ashgate.
- Simpson, J. (2004). "Pecock and Fortescue." In *A Companion to Middle English Prose*. Ed. A.S.G. Edwards, 271-88. Woodbridge: Boydell and Brewer.
- Stockwell, R., and D. Minkova (2001). *English Words: History and Structure*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- [Wyclif, J.] (1880). *English Works of Wyclif: Hitherto Unprinted*. Ed. F.D. Matthew. EETS o.s. 74. London: Trübner & Co.
- [Wyclif, J.] (1868-71). *Select English Works of John Wyclif*. Ed. J. Arnold. 3 vols. Oxford, Clarendon Press.