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ABSTRACT

This dissertation offers a comprehensive annotated bibliography of the main English-language critical references, from the earliest times to about 1999, regarding five 15th-century poets. Annotations are drawn almost exclusively from articles and books. A Note on the Annotations (x-xiii) details the selection criteria. My intention is to give informed readers enough detail, albeit in the form of concise notes, to know whether the original critical material is likely to be of use to them. I have included an index to the critics. For the published version, I will also prepare a general index (my work is intended to be the basis of a volume in the series of critical bibliographies published by D.S. Brewer under the general editorship of Dr T.L. Burton).

The five poets of the bibliography are the most significant of that group often referred to as the 15th-century English Chaucerians. In the past, ‘15th-century English Chaucerian’ has frequently meant little more than ‘bad poet’ and it has, just as frequently, introduced discussions that have paid scant attention to the diversity of the poets concerned. I note in my introduction, however, that criticism is now investing this old label with a new and positive meaning. Each of my poets worked in a tradition of which Chaucer was a part, and, with the exception of Ashby, produced works that had a considerable readership in the late Middle Ages. All of these poets, except Norton, have a notable place in the current discussion of English cultural and political life in the 15th century. In this discussion, Hoccleve and Lydgate attract by far the most attention.

I have included criticism for Norton’s Ordinal of Alchemy for several reasons, even though the Ordinal attracts little critical interest. It is the principal English alchemical text of its period, and so reminds us of the existence of a tradition that is outside the courtly or middle-class concerns of the other poets of the bibliography; the extent of its printing history shows it to be a prominent 15th-century poem that warrants attention; it has flashes of wit that genuinely recall Chaucer; and it shows an engagement with European culture that is characteristic of the English Chaucerian tradition. Bokenham is probably the most significant of my omitted authors, but he is to be included in another volume of the Brewer series edited by Laurel Means.
My introduction offers an overview of the significant features of the critical record: I discuss Hoccleve and Lydgate in parallel as their history has many points in common; then I consider Ashby, Norton, and Hawes. Nearly 1400 annotations, arranged chronologically by poet, and an index to the critics, complete the dissertation.
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ABBREVIATIONS AND SHORT TITLES

Works that are commonly referenced in the annotations are abbreviated as shown in the following list. (I do not use abbreviations for individual works in my introduction.)
There are a number of poems, not abbreviated in the list below, for which editors and critics use different titles. My approach with these has been to use in an annotation the title, or one very close to it, preferred by the critic or editor concerned.

Geoffrey Chaucer

Canterbury Tales CT

Thomas Hoccleve

Address to Sir John Oldcastle ASJO
Hoccleve's Complaint Complaint
Hoccleve's Dialogue with a Friend Dialogue
La Male Regle LMR
Learn to Die LD
Letter of Cupid LC
Mother of God (Ad beatam Virginem) MG
Regement of Princes RP
Tale of Jereslaus's Wife TJW
Tale of Jonathas Jonathas

John Lydgate

Aesopes Fabules AF
Complaint of the Black Knight CBK
Dance Macabre DM
Fall of Princes FP
Horse, Goose, and Sheep HGS
Life of Our Lady LOL
Lives of Saints Alban and Amphibal LSAA
Lives of Saints Edmund and Fremund LSEF
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pilgrimage of the Life of Man</td>
<td>PLM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reason and Sensuallyte</td>
<td>RS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serpent of Division</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siege of Thebes</td>
<td>ST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stans puer ad mensam domini</td>
<td>SPMD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temple of Glass</td>
<td>TG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timor mortis conturbat me</td>
<td>TMCM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Troy Book</td>
<td>TB</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**George Ashby**

- *Active Policy of a Prince*                         | APP          |
- *Dictes philosophorum*                              | DP           |
- *Prisoner’s Reflections*                            | PR           |

**Thomas Norton**

- *Ordinal Of Alchemy*                                | OA           |

**Stephen Hawes**

- *Consolation of Lovers*                             | CL           |
- *Conversion of Swerers*                             | CS           |
- *Example of Virtue*                                 | EV           |
- *Joyful Meditation*                                 | JM           |
- *Pastime of Pleasure*                               | PP           |

**Some other common abbreviations**

- Book                                               | Bk           |
- Chapter                                            | Ch.          |
- Library (in the names of manuscripts)              | Lib.         |
- Manuscript (in the names of manuscripts)           | MS           |
- Middle English                                     | ME           |
- §                                                   | §            |
A Note on the Annotations

The annotations for each poet begin with a section for editions followed by a section for critical references. Within each of these two groupings annotations are arranged in chronological order of publication except that items primarily authored by the same critic are given in date order under the first annotation for the critic. In this way, the work of a particular critic within a section can be seen almost at a glance. For example, the first item of general criticism by Paul Strohm on Hoccleve, 291, dating to 1982, is immediately followed by Strohm's later references to Hoccleve, 292-4. Critics who appear in the same year for the first time are arranged alphabetically. In a few instances, including some posthumous publications and early references where composition precedes publication by some years, I have placed an item according to the supposed date of composition instead of publication. The ordering of some of the early Lydgate references is sometimes necessarily approximate. For example, in the case of Skelton, 517, where the composition dates are uncertain as he seems to have worked on pieces over many years, I have placed his annotation next to that of Hawes, 518-19, because the two writers are often referenced together.

There are only three exceptions to the general arrangement described above. The first is in the case of the early printed editions where I have included the name of the printer in the author/editor field of the bibliographic listing. If the printer publishes more than one work, I do not group the annotations, as I do for general criticism, but I leave them in date order so that the chronology of the printing history remains intact. The second exception is for review articles: I gather these after the entry for the book to which they refer. Lastly, in the case of a handful of jointly authored works, I list the annotation under the name of the critic who appears first on the title page.

I have provided some cross-referencing between annotations when this seemed necessary. I should note, however, that a cross-reference from critic A to critic B does not necessarily mean that the material relevant to critic A will be mentioned in the annotation for critic B. The cross-referencing is generally meant simply to point readers to other relevant discussions.
Many of the early critical references are found in the works of other poets and writers; in these instances I usually annotate a convenient modern edition. In general, however, the annotations bias toward the more significant items of modern criticism. I give a generous representation of early references (editions and criticism), but my listing is certainly not complete.

At the other extreme, I have included some items from 2000 that came to hand during my final preparations for printing. I have found, however, that one or two years need to elapse, even in the Electronic Age, before it is possible to overview all the critical work for a given year. For this reason, I do not claim to present an informed selection after about 1999.

In all cases when I have not examined a volume in the original or reprint, yet still provide an annotation, my secondary sources are acknowledged and the annotation begins with the words 'Not sighted.'

There are now many electronic data bases that may be used by scholars, and it is not my purpose to compete with these. For instance, the entire text of the early Notes and Queries is now searchable through the Internet Library of Early Journals (ILEJ) project (www.bodley.ox.ac.uk/ilej/). A search of the ILEJ site will reveal many references to the Chaucerians that are not included in my bibliography. The annotations I present are those that seem to me to be most relevant to the current English-language critical debate and to the history of its development.

The annotations vary in length, often simply according to the length of the source, and this should not be taken as an indication of relative importance. Sometimes the most significant material defies annotation. The limitations of space have also been a consideration. For example, I annotate for Lydgate the relevant parts of Hammond’s general introduction to her seminal English Verse between Chaucer and Surrey, 454, but leave aside, in spite of their interest, the individual introductions that she provides for each of her Lydgate selections. I have tried to represent a fair summary of what I have found and to maintain an objective tone; but, after preparing nearly 1400 of these annotations I know that they cannot speak in place of the originals or offer more than a suggestion of their scope. The annotations can only be a guide.
Life records are excluded from my bibliography. The same is true of unpublished dissertations with the two exceptions of Bentley's edition, 40, of Hoccleve's *Formulary* and Pryor's edition, 41, of Hoccleve's *Series* as these have entered the critical dialogue. The dissertations by Smalley, 183, and Humphreys, 1311, occasionally referenced in the critical dialogue, are listed without annotation. Critical handbooks are generally, although not exhaustively, excluded: annotations for some are offered as signposts of their times. Historical studies and general cultural discussions of the 15th century that do not significantly refer to the work of my authors are also excluded. Review articles have been selectively included when this seemed useful; in cases of controversy, I have attempted to present more than one review.

Some items of German criticism that are referred to in the English-language critical discussion will be found listed in this bibliography. To have done any less would have misrepresented the great part played by the Germans in the history of the English Chaucerians from the late 19th century to the time of Walter Schirmer. It is not the purpose of the present work, however, to be a guide to German criticism. Schirmer provides an account of early German Lydgate studies, 758, and Mitchell, 204, surveys German criticism about Hoccleve. *A Manual of the Writings in Middle English*, 245, 792, may, of course, be consulted for both Hoccleve and Lydgate. The *New Cambridge Bibliography of English Literature*, 258, 943, 1175, 1227, 1356, deals with criticism in languages other than English for all five of my poets. Tucker, 154, 688, includes a number of critical editions and discussions, particularly by German scholars, that are not included in the present bibliography. Nierenstein and Chapman, 1216, should be sought out for Norton citations in German and French, and some in English, that are not annotated in my study.

I make no attempt to establish the canon for my poets, or to trace the detail of its development, or to reconstruct the complete printing history. These are all specialist pursuits in their own right. Hammond, 30, 454, and the *New Cambridge Bibliography of English Literature*, 258, 943, 1175, 1227, 1356, list a number of printings not annotated here. For all my poets (except Ashby and Norton, because of the simplicity of their printing history) I include an introductory note at the beginning of the section dealing with editions that states the secondary sources on which I have relied in
tracing the early printing record. As stated above, my bias is towards the modern and critically significant.

I do not usually annotate items dealing with works that were once but are not now ascribed to one of the 15th-century Chaucerians. I make some exceptions to this rule when the item seems important to the critical history. For example, Triggs's edition of *The Assembly of Gods*, 444, is included as the last significant ascription of the poem to Lydgate before its exclusion from the canon. In dealing with the early printing history, my annotations necessarily sketch, and only sketch, the interplay of the Chaucer canon with the works of Hoccleve and Lydgate. A much more detailed treatment of this interaction is found in Hammond, 120, 610.

I have not sought out remarks written in the margins of manuscripts and the like, although a few of these that have entered the published critical record are included in the bibliography. Finally, I have not annotated items published exclusively on the Internet as these do not constitute permanent critical records; they also tend to be unmediated.

§
Numbers in bold refer to items in the annotated bibliography; where necessary, page numbers follow in non-bold after a colon, occasionally preceded by a volume number. I have listed works cited without a bold reference number at the end of the introduction.

Introduction

A Short Overview

The poems of Hoccleve and Lydgate were widely available in manuscript to their contemporary and near-contemporary readers. (See Seymour, 256, for Hoccleve, and Pearsall 824, for Lydgate). Reidy’s listing of manuscripts shows that Norton’s Ordinal of Alchemy was also readily at hand for its interested readers (1189: ix–xxi). There is nothing to indicate that Ashby’s work, extant in only three manuscripts, circulated to any significant degree; and there is little evidence to suggest that Hawes’s poems, aside from some excerpts, circulated in manuscript (Edwards, 1366: 90–1). For Hawes, however, there is some evidence for the initial influence of the early printings (Edwards, 1363–8).

The Chaucerians fared badly in the early print culture, with the exception of Lydgate and, to a lesser extent, Hawes. Thynne, 1, prints some of Hoccleve’s work as Chaucer’s in 1532, including the Letter of Cupid which Speght, 2, acknowledges as Hoccleve’s in 1598; and Browne, 3, inserts Jonathas into one of his own works in 1614. Aside from these instances and the subsequent Chaucer editions, Hoccleve is unedited until Mason’s selections, 6, published in 1796. The dates of the extant manuscripts (Seymour, 256), and the fact that his major works are not printed by the early printers, suggests that the number of readers interested in Hoccleve is probably in decline from about the last quarter of the 15th century. There is a number of early Lydgate editions, but even these become very infrequent from the late 16th century and a marked decline in Lydgate’s readership may have begun some years earlier. Some critics (for example, Renoir, 789: 2) see the
publication of Lydgate’s poetry in the second half of the 16th century as evidence of his enduring popularity. I argue later in my introduction that such a view fails to take into account that factors other than a clamouring readership may sometimes drive the 16th-century publication process. Ashby’s poems are not printed until the end of the 19th century. Norton’s Ordinal of Alchemy was not a work written for a broad audience and it remains in the shadows until Maier’s edition of a Latin translation, 1183, in 1618. Ashmole, 1185, provides the first English edition in 1652. I suspect, on the basis of comments by Maier, 1194, and the late date of some of the extant manuscripts (Reidy, 1189: ix–x) that, in spite of a delayed publication, Norton maintains his select readership even in the long interval before the first printed editions of his work. Increasingly, criticism is attracted to the European origins of what it means to be a ‘Chaucerian,’ and all the writers considered here work with European genres that they place in an English context. Only Norton’s work, however, putting aside some chansons based on Lydgate’s verse (Bukofzer, 735; Fallows, 977–8; Tiner, 1125), is exported back to Europe. In his way, Norton is the most successful Chaucerian of them all. Hawes’s poetry starts well, then, after the surprising double publication of the Pastime of Pleasure in 1554, 1247, and 1555, 1248, falls out of print and into almost total obscurity until the 19th century. I speculate later in my introduction on the reasons for the sudden publication of Hawes’s poem in the middle of the 16th century. As it does for Lydgate, my research suggests that publication alone at this time is insufficient proof of an attentive reading public.

A watershed occurs in the late 18th century when the literary estimation of Hoccleve and Lydgate, even among antiquarians, goes into steep decline. This decline is not abated at the end of the century by the support that Warton gives to Lydgate, 552–3, and to Hawes, 1276–7, or by that which Mason gives to Hoccleve, 6. A new nationalistic aesthetic arises that is confident and articulate in defining a vernacular canon. This holds sway for nearly two hundred years and characterizes the English Chaucerians as belonging to an outmoded and culturally barren age.
A revival of interest in the Chaucerians, driven by the rise of English philology, begins in the late 19th century. F.J. Furnivall plays a crucial role in this process. The editorial contribution of the Early English Text Society (EETS), founded by Furnivall, to the study of the English Chaucerians cannot be overstated. The EETS editions allowed, for the first time in centuries, a broadly based dialogue about the English Chaucerians to develop, albeit slowly. Serviceable editions were provided through the EETS to scholars engaged on another Furnivall initiative, the *New English Dictionary* project. As a result, the *OED* impressively cites Hoccleve and Lydgate, in total, about half as often as it does Chaucer.

The scholarly book-length studies of Lydgate by Schirmer, 758, and Pearsall, 818, were seminal in seeing Lydgate, always the leading figure of the English Chaucerians, within his cultural and artistic contexts respectively. Mitchell’s study of Hoccleve, 204, is a significant feature of modern Hoccleve studies that also stimulated subsequent debate. These books enabled much of the modern critical discussion, yet they are also, naturally, products of the Chaucerian critical history. Schirmer’s emphasis on the careful accumulation of factual material, sometimes in preference to broader critical interpretation, is consistent with the German philological legacy; and Pearsall’s characterization of Lydgate as a medieval figure living in Chaucer’s shadow recalls a tone found in earlier English criticism. In addition, both Schirmer and Pearsall are close to an argument that effectively starts with Brie, 689, in 1929 about whether Lydgate belongs to the Renaissance or to the Middle Ages. Renoir, 786, 789, is also a participant in this debate. Mitchell’s dialogue, continued in his other published work on Hoccleve, questioning the veracity of Hoccleve’s autobiographical claims, glances back at earlier critical assessments of Hoccleve as the poet who preserved the Chaucer portrait.

The books by Schirmer, Pearsall, and Mitchell gave a strong initial fillip to the study of their respective authors. Subsequent Lydgate and Hoccleve criticism, with the slow but now steady emergence of modern editions, is becoming even more expansive in its themes and confident in setting out in new directions. Part of this confidence comes from the
consolidation of the factual basis to the critical discussion. Recent publications of biographical and bibliographical guides to Hoccleve and Lydgate by Burrow, 226, and Pearsall, 824, respectively are signs of that consolidation. The general modern interest in manuscript and bibliographical study has certainly benefited Hoccleve and Lydgate studies. Burrow’s recent edition of Hoccleve’s Complaint and Dialogue, 47, which employs information derived from holograph manuscripts to inform the editing of a non-holograph text, is a conspicuous example.

In the broadest sense, one of the major outcomes of recent criticism has been that Hoccleve and Lydgate have emerged more and more as poets in their own right who draw on influences other than just Chaucer. This is nicely shown by the shift in the meaning of the term ‘English Chaucerian.’ It now seems to be coming to denote not a follower of Chaucer as it once did, but a fellow participant in a wider European tradition. In bringing about this change, scholarship is picking up one of its earlier themes, almost ignored when first voiced by Gosse in 1897, 597, who suggested that Lydgate’s debt to the French poets is greater than his debt to Chaucer. (For evidence of the renewed interest in this aspect of the critical dialogue see the work by Phillips, 1131, Calin, 358, Burrow, 228, and Bianco, 1138.) The day might come when it may be wryly said of a Chaucerian, as it was said of Chaucer more than 30 years ago: ‘Sometimes he is thought to have been so much influenced by French writing that it was almost an accident that he wrote in English’ (Brewer 1).

Modern critical outcomes for the other Chaucerians besides Hoccleve and Lydgate have not been so promising. Ashby criticism has benefited from the attention of Ferguson, 1165–66, Kekewich, 1180, Pearsall, 1167–9, and Scattergood, 1171–4; and Ashby’s link to the mirror genre has ensured his work is referenced regularly. Nevertheless, a new edition of the Ashby poems is needed. Reidy’s edition of the Ordinal of Alchemy, 1189, is the major, and almost single, event of recent Norton studies. Norton criticism remains in the
doldrums in spite of the generally favourable modern response to the lively style of the *Ordinal*, and in spite of the scope that exists for considerable academic work on the manuscripts and early printed texts. Unfortunately, as an alchemical text, the *Ordinal* sits outside the mainstream of the modern critical discussion of the English Chaucerians. Nevertheless, it shares a claim to critical attention and offers considerable potential for further study.

Criticism of the work of Hawes has failed to achieve the sense of focus and impetus reached by that of Hoccleve and Lydgate. Edwards's short book on Hawes, *1366*, has not acted to provide the on-going stimulus that was given by the works of Pearsall, Schirmer, and Mitchell.

The situation of Ashby, Norton, and Hawes criticism recalls an earlier phase of the critical dialogue about Hoccleve and Lydgate when the poets were ignored because they were thought to be uninteresting. Middle English criticism has been slow to recognize the plurality of its own subject matter, as Cannon points out in speaking of the dominance of Chaucer studies (1119: 675). Hoccleve and Lydgate became interesting when they were rescued from the periphery of the critical discussion; the same may yet prove true for Ashby, Norton, and Hawes.

§

*Thomas Hoccleve: Beginnings to 1700*

The initial popularity of Hoccleve's work is proven by the great number and variety of surviving manuscripts. Hoccleve's major poem, *Regement of Princes*, survives in 43 manuscripts. (See Seymour, 256, for descriptions and ownership records). Seymour notes, however, that the circulation of Hoccleve's poem may have been limited essentially to the 'court, government, church, universities, and professions' (256: 257). There is no evidence of Hoccleve's influence on other contemporary writers aside from suggestions in Lyndsay's
Ane Dialog betuix Experience and ane Courteour (Kratzman, 283) and Archibald’s The Thre Prestis of Peblis (Lyall, 284). Indeed, the only examples of Hoccleve’s influence at any other time are seen in Browne, 3; and, much later, Wordsworth, at least as suggested by Medcalf, 288. Hoccleve is largely ignored by the early printers. Thynne, 1, prints the Letter of Cupid and some short pieces in his Chaucer edition of 1532. Spéght also prints these works in his Chaucer edition of 1598, 2, (with the acknowledgment of the Letter of Cupid as Hoccleve’s); and they are repeated in subsequent Chaucer editions. Lastly, as previously mentioned, Browne inserts Jonathas into one of his own works in 1614, 3. All but the last of these, however, may be better viewed as phenomena of the early printing history of Chaucer when miscellaneous works are swept into Chaucer editions by enthusiastic editors. (Sewell, 4, writing in 1718, is still adamant that the Letter of Cupid is Chaucer’s.) Hoccleve, in his own right, almost disappears from any meaningful consideration until the late 18th century.

Marzec, 276, suggests that the scribal history of Regement of Princes shows that even in the 15th century scribes were beginning to be confused by Hoccleve’s metrical practice. Marzec specifically cites changes during the 15th century in the pronunciation of final -e, medial vowels, and some verb inflections as the cause for this confusion, and she tentatively suggests that these rapid changes in language in the 15th century might be the source of the ‘traditional denigrating of Hoccleve as a poet’ (50). That it was a partial cause is probably beyond dispute. Chaucer and Lydgate, however, continued to be copied and printed in the 15th and 16th centuries, and Hoccleve is not more philologically obscure than they are.

Renoir claims that Hoccleve’s work did not address the problems of contemporary politics in the way that much of Lydgate’s did, and he links this to the decline of its readership (789: 136). This claim may have some force; if nothing else, Lydgate’s pursuit of patronage is likely to have given his work a higher social profile, and so possibly a longer
life, than Hoccleve's. Yet another slant on the political factor has been put by Lawton who suggests in passing that Regement of Princes was not printed by Caxton because it was too closely associated with the House of Lancaster (321: 787). The Yorkist king, Edward IV, came to the throne in 1461, and ruled until 1470 when he was deposed for a short time, then regained the throne in 1471, and ruled until his death in April 1483. Edward V ruled in name only until he was murdered in August 1483. The last Yorkist king, Richard III, ruled from 1483 until his defeat by the future Henry VII in 1485. When the House of Lancaster had come to power with Henry IV in 1399, John Gower found it expedient to rewrite sections of the Confessio Amantis in order to remove the dedicatory references to Richard II, in which he credits Richard as the initiator of the book, and to present Henry of Lancaster as his sole patron. It is not impossible that similar political motivations could influence a printer later in the century. Nevertheless, in 1477-8, Caxton prints the Book of Curtesye which offers a recommendation that the reader turn to Hoccleve's Regement of Princes; and in 1483, during Yorkist rule, he prints the Confessio Amantis using the manuscript version in which Henry of Lancaster is credited as patron (Macaulay clxviii). These instances show that political constraints alone are not a sure explanation of Caxton's failure to print RP.

Whatever the reason that led to Hoccleve's work not being printed, and it may simply be that the early printers sensed that the tastes of their market were changing, Hoccleve's early manuscript readers were among the few informed critics of his work for more than 300 years. As Furnivall and the others behind the EETS knew, accessible editions were essential to an appreciation of any text, and the critical history of Hoccleve and Lydgate was to demonstrate this many times.

The first hurdle faced by Hoccleve's critical reputation was the introduction of printing in England, and the second was the Reformation. It was inevitable, without a printed edition of his principal works, that the interpretation of his poetry would be subject to vague
generalizations. With the coming of the Reformation, some 16th-century writers, such as John Foxe, present Chaucer as an early Church reformer (Georgianna 56–8), and Chaucer's reformer status was enhanced when he was wrongly credited with the authorship of Jack Upland, The Pilgrim's Tale, and The Plowman's Tale (Spurgeon, 127: 1: xix). Bale, 58, provides some evidence that Hoccleve was touched by a similar process. Bale mythologizes Hoccleve and casts him as part of the venerable past of ancient English writers. He is able to position Hoccleve correctly as disciple of Chaucer, and a major writer of his own time, but wrongly credits Hoccleve as an early Protestant. Bale's error regarding Hoccleve's religion is unlikely to be accidental. He had already cast Chaucer in that role (58: 525–7), and so a reformist tendency in one of his disciples is not surprising. A Carmelite friar who converted to Protestantism, Bale is fiercely anti-Catholic. Fairfield details the Protestant ideology which is everywhere evident behind Bale's view of history (115–16). Bale's concept of history sees the rise of a Protestant faith and the fall of Catholicism as inevitable, and Fairfield notes that the catalogue contains 'numerous wilful inaccuracies' stemming from Bale's desire to make history consistent with his ideology (115). A similar view has been expressed more recently by Hudson, 1129, although Hudson sees additional reasons standing behind Bale's generally favourable treatment of writers in the Chaucerian tradition. These include Bale's approval of the work of the Chaucerians as vernacular translators, the part they played in enhancing English as a literary medium, and the simple fact that they were readily identifiable when most writers of the period were not. In any event, it was not difficult for Bale to change the religious outlook of an almost unpublished writer.

It may be significant that Bale's claim for Hoccleve's religious status is not based on the poet's work, but derives from a misreading of Walsingham's Historia Anglicana, 53. (I annotate Walsingham on the basis of his historical importance even though his 'Oklefe' cannot be the poet.) It may be doubtful that Bale has read any of Hoccleve's work. Whether Bale's error follows from ignorance or design, there were few by his time who
would be able to correct him; and the matter of Hoccleve's religious outlook is not clearly
resolved until Mason's 1796 edition of Hoccleve selections, 6.

Bale's work became a standard reference, and most readers who had any knowledge of
Hoccleve's work, beyond the Letter of Cupid and some ballads, are likely to have derived it
from Bale. Few readers, besides John Stow, 59-60, would have been troubled to read
Hoccleve in manuscript. Stow owned one, and possibly two, copies of the Regement of
Princes (Seymour, 256:295) in addition to the Durham, Univ. Lib., MS Cosin V.iii.9 copy
of Hoccleve's Series for which he provides a transcription of a missing section. (See
Burrow, 47, for the most recent discussion of the editorial standing of Stow's
transcription). It is probable that Stow provided Speght, 2, with the brief quotations from
the Regement that Speght uses to illustrate the high esteem in which Chaucer was held by
his contemporaries. (This probability is present because Stow provides a list of Lydgate's
works for Speght's Chaucer, and it is Stow's influence that leads Speght, as he affirms in
his edition, to print the text of the Siege of Thebes with an acknowledgment of Lydgate's
authorship.)

Pits, 64, showing no first-hand knowledge of Hoccleve's poetry, simply follows Bale's
entry for Hoccleve. On the matter of Hoccleve's supposed heresy, he repeats the error
found in Bale's reading, 58, of Walsingham's Historia Anglicana, 53, although he leaves
the issue open to the 'judgement of others.' Pits's reservations about Hoccleve's 'heresy'
are more likely to follow from his wariness of Bale's religious bias than any knowledge of
Hoccleve's work. As a Catholic, he is less eager than Bale to add to the list of heretics.
William Browne's incorporation of Jonathas into his own work, the Shepheard's Pipe, 3,
in about 1614 is a clear demonstration of a primary knowledge of Hoccleve's work.
Browne has read Jonathas with approval, although he presents Hoccleve a little perversely
as an author of rural idylls. Such a characterization of Hoccleve may seem strange when
Browne owned, and had presumably read, copies of the Series (Durham, Univ. Lib., MS
Cosin V.iii.9), *Letter of Cupid* (Durham, Univ. Lib., MS Cosin V.ii.13), and the *Regement of Princes* (Oxford, Bodleian Lib., MS Ashmole 40). Browne was devoted to the poetic celebration of the countryside, and had antiquarian interests (see Bullen for Browne’s biography), and these factors may have coloured his statements on Hoccleve. Nevertheless, Browne’s informed enthusiasm for Hoccleve is exceptional for its time as Stow’s is for his. (See Edwards, 237, for a discussion of Browne’s engagement with the Hoccleve manuscripts.) Phillips’s note from 1675 is likely to be more typical of the prevailing knowledge about Hoccleve in the 17th century:

Thomas Ocleave, very famous English Poet in his time, which was the Reign of King Henry the Fourth and Henry the Fifth; to which last he Dedicated his Government of a Prince, the chiefly remember’d of what he writ in Poetry and so much the more famous he is by being remember’d to have been the Disciple of the most fam’d Chaucer (65: 233).

It seems improbable that Phillips has much more knowledge of Hoccleve’s work than can be gleaned from Bale (his knowledge of Lydgate seems to be still less, and he does not even refer to Hawes). Phillips’s critical standing was mixed. He had been educated in the classical tradition by his uncle, the poet John Milton; and it is likely to have been Milton who gave his nephew a sense of the importance of English literary tradition. He was also closely associated at different times during his life with court culture. Phillips had written a dictionary in 1662, *A New World of Words*, but the work had brought, not for the first time in his career, charges of plagiarism (Lee 197–9). If Phillips may be taken to represent the state of critical understanding of Hoccleve at this time, as seems to be the case, Hoccleve’s critical fortunes had reached a low ebb. The 1718 publication by Sewell, 4, of a modern verse translation of the *Letter of Cupid*, with Chaucer credited as the author of the original, is further evidence of an unabated decline in any real understanding of Hoccleve’s work.

§
Lydgate: beginnings to 1700

The manuscript record shows the strength of Lydgate’s popularity with his contemporaries. Pearsall, 824, gives the most recent listing of the manuscripts. Edwards, 895, offers corrections to the earlier work of Renoir and Benson, 792. Manuscript study has been identified as an important area for further research for a variety of reasons (see Edwards, 893, and Reimer, 1080). Not least of these reasons is the insight manuscript study gives into the contemporary reception of Lydgate’s work, and it is here that the scribe John Shirley is a conspicuous figure. He is likely to have known Lydgate, and it is through his manuscripts that thirty of Lydgate’s poems have survived (Schirmer, 758: 252). Shirley’s contribution is discussed in some detail by Pearsall (818: 73–8). Connolly, 374, also considers Shirley’s life and work in her book-length study. There is some debate as to Shirley motivation for producing his copies: Edwards, 893, sees commercial factors at work; Green, 958, suggests more altruistic reasons. Other references to Shirley are found in the articles by Hammond, 607–9, 617, Walls, 981, Edwards, 871-2, 876, 887, 899, 902, and Green, 957.

Metham’s mid 15th-century observation, 512, on Lydgate’s ‘halff chongyd Latyne’ and ‘crafty imagynacionys’ is a perceptive and early observation on Lydgate’s aureate language and style. The possibility that Lydgate the literary artist is also Lydgate the Lancastrian propagandist and popularizer is discussed by Fisher, 1098. Fisher argues that Lydgate may have been in the circle of the future Henry V while at Oxford, opening the possibility that Henry V’s patronage of Lydgate was part of a deliberate policy to win over English readers to the legitimacy of Lancastrian rule. This theory is further strengthened by the fact that Lydgate’s work was used to support the English claim to the French throne under Henry VI (for example, see McKenna, 839). Pearsall also sees Lydgate as having a propagandist role (824: 17). Ambrisco and Strohm, 1112, consider parallels between Lydgate’s presentation
in *Troy Book* of literary authority and Lancastrian authority. Lucas, 1014, and Blake, 848, consider a few of the practical characteristics of 15th-century patronage.

There may be a hint in Metham's remark, 512, that Lydgate's language is not always easy to follow. Subsequent commentators, Douglas, 515, Dunbar, 516, and Bradshaw, 520, place Lydgate in the company of Chaucer and Gower as the founding fathers of English poetry, as does Skelton, 517. Skelton, however, in *Phyllip Sparowe*, admits that Lydgate's style may sometimes be found too 'high.' Hawes, 518–19, of course, finds Lydgate’s style very much to his own taste. Feylde's praise of Lydgate in about 1527, 522, might suggest (in the way that the recommendation of a 'classic' tends to) that Lydgate's popular reputation is just past its peak. The praise of Forrest, 525, and Sherry, 527, and a little later, Harvey, 529, sounds formulaic; but Lydgate’s printing record is still fairly strong during this period, and, thirty years after Feylde, Bale, 528, praises Lydgate without reservation. In spite of his own anti-Catholic feelings, and the awkward fact of Lydgate’s vocation as a monk, Bale presents Lydgate, in much the same way as he does Chaucer and Hoccleve, as a figure of national pride. Bale's Lydgate refined the English language and brought home the fruits of European arts and letters. Unable to present Lydgate as a Protestant sympathizer (an approach he adopts for Chaucer and Hoccleve), Bale stresses what is general and acceptable, and overlooks what is specific and objectionable. The overriding characteristics of Bale's Lydgate are his cultural achievements and his Englishness. One may suspect a nationalist bias in Bale's assessment of Lydgate, and it is not possible to know exactly how widely Bale's enthusiasm for Lydgate’s cultural achievements is shared by the second half of the 16th century. Puttenham, 532, is the first critic to question Lydgate's capacity as a translator for original thought. Webbe, 531, writing darkly that Lydgate deals with 'supersticious and odde matters,' seems much more uneasy with Lydgate’s religion than Bale is. Bodenham, 535, excludes Lydgate, as well as Chaucer and Gower, from his anthology on the grounds that their lines are not clearly of ten syllables and cannot be easily excerpted for one- or two-line quotations. Bodenham's
uncertainty about how to scan the early poets is an example of the considerable difficulty posed for readers of the time by the language of the 15th-century texts and its garbled presentation in 16th-century reprintings. An early hint of the problem is given by the Thynne’s famous list of ‘hard words’ in his 1532 Chaucer edition, 1. Braham, 415, in his edition of Troy Book in 1555, complains of the corrupt state of contemporary printed texts; and Heywood, 421, in 1614, finds it necessary to present Troy Book in a modernized adaptation. Changes in language, reading tastes, and religion had inevitably taken their toll on Lydgate’s literary standing. (Not every reference to Lydgate from the period has been annotated for the present bibliography; for example, Lee, 586, lists a scattering of a cursory references that I have omitted.)

Many of Lydgate’s poems were still being printed in the 16th century. The rate of printing drops to almost nothing in the 17th century (see 421–3), aside from the Siege of Thebes which appears in Chaucer editions (417). Nevertheless, the fact of the 16th-century editions is sometimes cited—as it is, for example, by Renoir (789: 2–3) and Schirmer (758:256)—to suggest that Lydgate had an enduring popularity for much of that century. I argue that some of the Lydgate printings in the 16th century are attributable more to the politics of the day and commercial printing practices than to an active readership. These editions may be added to those noted by Neville-Sington, 1140, in her study of the interaction of publishing with politics and religion in the 16th century. As Neville-Sington proves, the early printers are politically astute, and sometimes politically directed, in their choice of texts to print and not to print.

It is difficult to overlook the apparent correlation between the appearance of some 16th-century Lydgate editions and the turbulent events of the time. As Neville-Sington points out, the inaugural printing of Lydgate’s Troy Book, grandly undertaken by Pynson in 1513, at the command of Henry VIII, with the Tudor coat of arms on the title-page, coincides with the beginning of Henry VIII’s first military campaigns (1140: 581–6). Later
in the century, the *Fall of Princes* enjoys an extraordinary revival when it is printed twice around 1554, once by Richard Tottel, 413, and once by John Wayland, 414. These editions come out a year or so into the troubled reign of the Catholic Queen Mary and about the time of Sir Thomas Wyatt’s rebellion against the marriage of Mary to King Philip (1140: 602). The link between personal morality and fate is one of Lydgate’s themes, and Tottel’s title page nicely captures this conjunction:

A Treatise excellent and compendious, shewing and declaring in maner of Tragedye the falles of sondry most notable Princes & Princesses with other Nobles, through the mutabilitie and change of unstedfast Fortune, together with their most detestable and wicked vices.

Wayland’s title page refers to Lydgate’s text ‘wherin may be seen what vices bring menne to destruction, wyth notable warninges howe the like may be auoyded.’ There may be two factors behind the publications of a pre-Reformation poem like the *Fall* in such politically-charged circumstances. The first is that the publication is a statement by the printers that they are politically ‘on-side.’ The statement is all the better because both sides of any conflict would be likely to be sympathetic to Lydgate’s message. The second factor behind publication might be that the printers see a profit to be made from a time of political instability: in uncertain times they are offering the public the reassurance of an English classic which, although not forgotten, is increasingly unread.

It is around the time of the Wayland and Tottel editions of the *Fall* that the first steps occur toward the publication of *A Mirror for Magistrates*. The *Mirror*, as Campbell notes, is conceived by its authors as being more contemporary than the *Fall* and also more broad in that its case-studies extend beyond princes to include the fall of ‘any which might teach useful political lessons’ (736: 55). Tillyard remarks that invocation of Lydgate’s name by the printers of the *Mirror* is evidence of Lydgate’s abiding popularity in the mid-16th century (743: 72). I think it is safer to claim that the *Mirror* is evidence that Lydgate still holds a place at this time as one of the three fathers, along side Gower and Chaucer, of
English poetry. That place, however, does not guarantee a popular readership, and the Mirror is evidence of an author whose work is increasingly encountered, if at all, at second hand. (For later Lydgate modernizations and retellings, see Dart, 423, Sewell 4, and Heywood, 421).

Both Tottt and Wayland held royal patents for the printing of certain categories of material. In Tottt's case, a patent was granted under Edward VI to print law books. The patent was renewed by Mary and, later, by Elizabeth I (Ames, 550: 4:422–3). It is hardly surprising that the political and religious position of the works issued by Tottt shifts markedly between these various patents. Under the reign of Mary, Tottt issues Sir Thomas More's posthumous Dialogue of Comfort in 1553 (550: 4:424–5); in January 1558 he is quick to publish the Passage of Queen Elizabeth, which celebrates the entry of Elizabeth into London for her coronation (550: 4: 431). Wayland shows similar dexterity as he publishes a number of religious works from the time of Henry VIII to the reign of Elizabeth I (550: 3: 517–34). In 1538, he publishes Nicholas Wise's Consolation for Christian People, with its advice on a true reading of scripture and the expulsion of 'Idolatrie'; in 1539, he follows this with the Primer in English set out by Bishop John Hilsey (550: 3: 518). In the first year of Mary's reign, 1553, he obtains a patent to print religious books, and subsequently produces several editions of the Catholic Primer. Printers needed to be flexible, and cautious, in such dangerous times. Ames includes a brief but telling anecdote about one of Wayland's apprentices who was whipped by Dr John Story in 1557 for printing a volume ominously titled the Antichrist. One of Tottt's apprentices seems also to have had some involvement in the matter (550: 3:517). If true, the anecdote shows that the masters seem to exercise greater discretion than their apprentices do.

The Serpent of Division is another example of the influence of politics on publication. It is printed for the first time in 24 years in 1559, 416, the same year in which England became
by law a Protestant country, and at a time when the security of Elizabeth I, who had ascended the throne in 1558, was far from certain (Orwen, 742). (If Stow was involved in the publication—see Ringler, 825—it is, of course, also possible that he may have encouraged the enterprise because of his antiquarian interests, but this does not weaken the social relevance of the text.) The *Serpent of Division* is not printed again until 1590, 419, during the period of the English response to the Spanish Armada of 1588. For the 1590 printing, it is pointedly coupled with *Gorboduc* by Thomas Norton and Thomas Sackville. In this case it is not necessary to speculate about whether or not the publisher has an eye on the circumstances of contemporary England as the title page removes all doubt:

```
Three things brought ruin unto Rome,
that range in Princes to their overthrow:
Avarice, and Pride, with Envies cruel doom,
that wrought their sorrow and their latest woe.
England take heed, such chance to thee may come:
Felix quem faciunt aliena pericula cautum.
```

‘Happy is the person made cautious by the trials of others.’ An address to the reader prefaces the volume and reinforces the message (here the writer is speaking of the *Serpent of Division*):

```
thou wilt finde if thou compare our state with Romes, to be no lesse in danger and dread: I could if I would set downe the whole Conquestes of Julius, but it would small availe, sith it followeth more at large: onlye arme thy minde with patience, heere shalt thou see the authors of ruine, and the gaine selfe-will bringeth, robbing their hartes of all ease and comfort.
```

Such views of the *Serpent* are not new: as MacCracken, 473, points out, the piece may even have been first commissioned from Lydgate as a political pamphlet. Caution is needed in assuming that publication alone is a necessary indication of the continuity of Lydgate’s readership: a printer will opportunistically publish if he thinks the public mood is right to ensure sales. Opportunistic publications can take other forms as well. For example, the limited citation of Lydgate at this time suggests that the *Siege of Thebes* is printed in Chaucer editions on the basis of its relevance to the *Canterbury Tales*, and to swell the
pages of the editions, and not because of any broad interest it commanded with contemporary readers in its own right.

Lydgate's literary influence is another important element in the overall assessment of the poet's standing during the 15th and 16th centuries. The importance of the innovations in form and characterization found in Lydgate's dramatic works to the subsequent development of 15th-century drama has been widely appreciated since Wickham's 1959 study, 805. Davenport, 1010, also explores Lydgate's influence on 15th-century drama, and he discerns in Lydgate's *King Henry VI's Entry into London* and the *Entry of Queen Margaret* a style that was a major influence on the drama of the period. Parry, 989, documents the re-use of Lydgate's pageants for civic purposes into Elizabethan times. Kipling, 1013, Crow, 999, and Gibson, 1005, address specific aspects of the debate about Lydgate's early dramatic influence. Scanlon, 1108, provides a recent statement of the influence of the *Fall of Princes* on the development of Renaissance tragedy. This influence is also considered by Schirmer, 757, but with more emphasis on the *Mirror for Magistrates* as the medium through which it was transmitted. Edwards, 891, traces the influence of the *Fall of Princes*, and he discusses the use of Lydgate as a source by John Hardyng, Gavin Douglas, and, especially, George Cavendish. Edwards also notes, albeit in passing, the dominance of the *Mirror* as an influence on 16th-century drama. Farnham, 726, also sees the *Fall of Princes* as overshadowed by the *Mirror for Magistrates* and the works that followed it. Campbell, 736, discusses the more developed concept of a fall from fortune presented by the *Mirror for Magistrates* when compared to the *Fall of Princes*; and Budra, 1060, and Kelly, 945, explore the competing elements of chance and moral retribution in Lydgate's concept of tragedy. Kelly differs from Budra in that he sees a moral dimension to Lydgate's concept of tragedy that is absent from Boccaccio, and he differs from Scanlon, 1108, in that he sees Lydgate's concept of tragedy as subject to some inconsistency.
Tillyard, 745, argues that Lydgate holds a central place in the ‘English Literary tradition,’ and he credits him with the introduction of the narrative concepts of Petrarch and Boccaccio into England. Tillyard also suggests that Spenser’s *Faerie Queene* and Shakespeare’s *Troilus and Cressida* owe something to Lydgate (on this last point, Palmer, 1016, and Bullough, 834, agree, but Brandes, 677, does not). Merritt, 933, notes that John Pikeryng’s *Horestes* has a number of debts to *Troy Book*. Renoir, 786, sees the influence of the *Serpent of Division* on Sackville and Norton’s *Gorboduc* and Spenser’s *Ruines of Time*. For the 17th century, Day, 664–5, argues for Lydgate’s influence on Milton’s *Il Penseroso* and *Comus*, but her claims are made tentatively. Stein, 1117, explores John Palsgrave’s use in his 1530 French grammar and English-French dictionary of words from the works of Lydgate and Chaucer. Palsgrave provides an interesting foretaste of the role these writers were to serve for subsequent dictionary makers.

Lydgate’s influence is also important in his role as the interpreter of Chaucer for the 15th and 16th centuries. Pearsall, 817–8, 820, 822–4, Windeatt, 1118, and Edwards, 896, discuss Lydgate’s mediation of Chaucer. Spearing, 962, 964–5, accuses Lydgate of distorting and medievalizing Chaucer’s achievement in a way that took another hundred years to repair. Blake, 846–7, examines Lydgate’s influence on Caxton’s views about Chaucer.

Nichols, 698–9, is an early voice for the relevance of Lydgate to the Scottish Chaucerians, and this is a line subsequently pursued by many critics. Both von Hendy, 837, and McDiarmid, 938, for example, note the influence of Lydgate on the *Kingis Quair*. The discussion, however, tends over time increasingly to distinguish the achievement of the Scots from Lydgate, as shown in Zettersten, 992, Finkelstein, 1043, and Mehl, 1032. Stearns, 747, sees possible echoes of Lydgate in Henryson, but finds that, if these echoes exist, then Henryson improves on his source. Pope, 996, finds any comparison between the achievement of Lydgate and Henryson to be ‘cruel.’ Kratzman, 993, argues for
a downward reassessment of the extent of Lydgate's influence on the Scottish Chaucerians, as does Hyde, 779. Ebin, 974–5, agrees that the successors of Lydgate were more successful than he was in the use of the techniques he pioneered. Benson, 918, and King, 1028, offer more mid-range views on the relative achievements of Lydgate and the Scottish Chaucerians. On the basis of the manuscript record, Bawcutt argues that Lydgate's active readership in Scotland extends to the 17th century (1087: 257–8).

Lydgate's influence is significant, as one would expect from the dominant 15th-century English Chaucerian, both on individual writers and in the broader field of defining how Chaucer's achievement was perceived. Direct references to Lydgate by writers in the 16th century, and the printing record of that century, however, suggest that the broader engagement of a reading public with Lydgate's work by the second half of the century was in decline.

Pits's 1619 entry for Lydgate, 539, follows Bale; as a Catholic, Pits would hardly object to Bale's praise of Lydgate. Peacham's reference to Lydgate in 1622, 540, however, as being a writer with 'no great invention of his owne' and whose verse is 'tollerable and smooth,' considering the age in which he wrote, is clear sign that the tide has turned. Peacham offers an early taste of the dismissive criticism that was to come in the 19th century. The antiquary William Browne takes an interest in the Lydgate manuscripts (see Edwards 903, and Hammond, 609), just as he does in the Hoccleve manuscripts; but he is the exception to his time.

A revealing change to the ranking of the major 'ancient' authors takes place during the 17th century. In the 15th and 16th centuries, writers tend to refer to a triumvirate of Geoffrey Chaucer, John Gower, and John Lydgate; by the 17th century Chaucer dominates as the surviving token figure of late medieval verse. Edward Phillips in his *Theatrum Poetarum*
(1675) gives an example of the new order:

True it is that the style of Poetry till Henry the 8th’s time, and partly also within his Reign, may very well appear uncouth strange and unpleasant to those that are affected only with what is familiar and acustom’d to them, not but there were even before those times some that had their Poetical excellencies if well examin’d, and chiefly among the rest Chaucer, who through all the neglect of former ag’d Poets still keeps a name, being by some few admir’d for his real worth, to others not unpleasing for his facetious way, which joyn’d with his old English intertain’s them with a kind of Drollery (542: Preface, n. pag.).

Phillips’s remarks, when compared to Ashby’s commendation of Lydgate in about 1470 as one of the ‘Primier poetes of this nacion,’ 513, is a reminder of the extent to which knowledge of Lydgate has fallen away in the intervening years. At least Phillips’s entry for Lydgate is found in the main body of his catalogue: Hoccleve is relegated to an eight-line summary, based loosely on Bale and Pits, in a supplementary section at the back of the volume.

§

Hoccleve: The 18th century

The 18th century sees two events of specific importance in Hoccleve’s critical history: Warton’s thoughts on Hoccleve, 67, given in his History of English Poetry published in 1774-81; and Mason’s 1796 edition of Hoccleve selections, 6.

Warton spends his life as an academic at Trinity College, Oxford, where, after he completes his Master’s degree, he is elected to a Fellowship in 1751. He is Professor of Poetry for two successive five-year terms from 1757, and Professor of Ancient History from 1785. In 1785 he also becomes Poet Laureate (Johnston 100). The shifting balance between the vernacular and classical traditions is nicely represented by the contrast between the heavy classical bias of Warton’s predecessor as Professor of Poetry, William Hawkins, and Warton’s own primary interest in older vernacular literature (Clark 72–4). Warton’s father had been an ardent Jacobite (Pittock 125). The Jacobite cause is largely
spent after the middle of the 18th century, but his father’s example may contribute to Warton’s sometimes slightly eccentric and unconventional manner, and to his interest in cultural history. Warton combines a passion for history and vernacular literature with a bold pride in English nationalism, and he writes at a time when the academic respectability of older vernacular literature is beginning to be asserted. When Warton begins publishing his history in 1774 he is well placed to express, and to guide, contemporary feeling. His history is to be a decisive event in vernacular literary studies that opens a door to poetry from the time of Chaucer to Elizabeth I, and challenges the ascendancy of classical literature (Clark 24).

Newman observes a ‘magnificent cultural flowering of the period 1750-80’ that includes, among other things: the foundation of the Society of Antiquaries (1751); Samuel Johnson’s dictionary (1755); the opening of the British Museum (1759); the first edition of the Encyclopedia Britannica (1768-71); and the founding of the Royal Academy (1768) (112). It is easy to point to nationalism as a factor behind the rise of a vernacular criticism, but less easy to say what it is that makes nationalism so significant in the second half of the 18th century. It is, after all, present in discussions of English vernacular literature for centuries before Warton, although its characteristics change over time. The Protestant nationalism of Bale, defined by a reaction against Catholicism, is replaced by Warton’s time with something more complex and more conscious of Great Britain as a world power and a conglomerate of internal interests. Much of the new nationalism may have been an expression of pride in the face of French cultural achievements. Linda Colley’s Britons explores the role of military conflict with France in stimulating the emergence of an English and Protestant national identity in opposition to French Catholicism; and Gerald Newman’s The Rise of English Nationalism charts Britain’s love–hate relationship with various facets of French culture. Johnston observes that there is ‘no simple explanation’ as to why interest in older English writing grew so rapidly in the last forty years of the 18th century, although the publication of Percy’s Reliques of Ancient English Poetry, 555, in
1765 had played its part (3). Percy’s collection is an academic undertaking that captures both an academic and a non-academic audience in a way that even Percy had not anticipated (Davis 129ff), but it is Warton’s History of English Poetry (1774-81) that is the most spectacular example of the period’s new interest in English literary history.

As Fairer points out in his introduction to the recent facsimile reprint of Warton’s History, the feature common to the works of writers like Bale, Phillips, and Pits on vernacular writing is that they are all catalogues; and the distinctive feature of Warton’s History is that it is not (5). It not only has a discursive style, but the works it considers are placed within a perspective that is more than chronological. Warton anticipates historicist criticism by placing writers in an evolving cultural context. In the critical history of the English Chaucerians, Warton is the first figure prepared to articulate and defend his judgements, both positive and negative, according to a developed criterion of ‘taste.’ Hoccleve is not an author favoured by Warton. Nevertheless, Warton feels that it is important to tell his readers why this is so; in doing this, he offers the first modern, albeit brief, critical discussion of Hoccleve.

When Warton comes to write about Hoccleve (or Lydgate or Hawes, for that matter) there is little in the way of secondary sources to assist him. Only one scholarly work had been published in the last generation with a significant reference to Hoccleve, and that is Tanner’s Bibliotheca Britannico-Hibernica 66. Tanner was noted for his diligence and learning, and his book shows the truth of this (Douglas 206–7). His antiquarian work grows out of the religious and political controversies of the late 17th century and the intense interest in national history which they sponsored, although Tanner himself stands apart from these controversies (Douglas 200–1). It is not surprising that Tanner draws on Bale, 58, and Pits, 64, for his entry on an obscure author like Hoccleve; what is surprising is the obvious extent of Tanner’s primary research into Hoccleve. He repeats, for example, Pits’s suspicion of Hoccleve’s status as a heretic, but notes that such a suspicion does not
seem to be fully consistent with what Hoccleve says in the prologue to the Regement of Princes; and he demonstrates that he has read further into the poem by references to Hoccleve’s length of service and pay as a clerk of the privy seal. His listing of Hoccleve’s work and manuscripts is also extensive, although perhaps a little disordered, as we might expect, since no editor had sorted through the manuscripts. In short, Tanner provides Warton with at least the beginnings of a sound bibliographic and historical context in which to work.

Warton has a particular concern with the historical context of works he discusses, as he makes clear in his Observations on the Faerie Queene of Spenser (1754):

In reading the works of an author who lived in a remote age, it is necessary, that we should look back upon the customs and manners which prevailed in his age; that we should place ourselves in his circumstances; that so we may be the better enabled to judge and discern how his turn of thinking, and manner of composing were biass’d, influenc’d, and, as it were, tinctur’d, by the very familiar and reigning appearances, which are utterly different from those with which we are at present surrounded (552: 217).

Warton’s sequential approach in his History is a logical extension of this methodology, but it is also a clever device by which he justifies his work to the reader. The work of the past may seem rough, he tells his readers, when compared to the polished efforts of the Augustans; however, it is a valid subject for study because it shows the path taken to reach the present perfection.

This strategy sits just below the surface of the famous introductory remarks to his History:

In an age advanced to the highest degree of refinement .... We look back on the savage condition of our ancestors with the triumph of superiority; we are pleased to mark the steps by which we have been raised from rudeness to elegance; and our reflections on this subject are accompanied with a conscious pride, arising in great measure from a tacit comparison of the infinite disproportion between the feeble efforts of remote ages, and our present improvements in knowledge (67: 1: i).
It is the great irony of Warton’s study that it takes readers back into their past, supposedly in order to throw light on the present, and in so doing, as Fairer remarks in the conclusion to his introduction, points to the future of Romanticism (56).

Warton was not a trained medievalist, and this was a major factor in shaping his work. He says that he includes none of the Old English writers for several reasons, but principally because it was only with the Norman invasion that the English became English and the ‘national character began to dawn’ (8). Warton’s dismissal of Anglo-Saxon studies was not unusual for its time. Earlier in the century, Elstob, 547, a champion of vernacular studies, bitterly complains in the preface to her grammar of the ignorant dismissal of Anglo-Saxon studies. In fact, Warton was very poorly prepared in many ways to write on early English. As René Wellek observes, Warton

apparently knew practically no Anglo-Saxon, and his knowledge of Middle English, though empirically large, was far from accurate or systematic. He was not a good palaeographer or philologist, and the extracts he quoted from manuscripts are marred by many misreadings (175).

In spite of the difficulties of the task, and a strong dislike of Hoccleve’s work as poetry, Warton takes some trouble with his brief discussion of Hoccleve. Warton’s motivation is the belief that Hoccleve’s true importance lies in his support of the refinements that are introduced into English by Chaucer and Gower (67: 2:38). This only superficially recalls Bale’s praise of Hoccleve as someone who, as a follower of Chaucer, illuminated the English language. Bale is prepared to give way completely to nationalism and to religious bias in his praise of an author whom he, quite possibly, has not read. Warton, having read at least some of Hoccleve’s work, is unable to allow nationalism to override his view of good taste, and relegates Hoccleve instead to the position of ‘helper’ in the process of linguistic refinement.

Warton is aware of Browne’s praise of Hoccleve as a translator, and disagrees with it on the ground that Hoccleve does improve on his source (67: 1: Ivii–Ivii). He looks to
Hoccleve for evidence of 'invention and fancy,' finds none, and so concludes that Hoccleve is a 'feeble writer' with a 'coldness' of 'genius' (67: 2: 38). As we see later, the reasons for Warton's dislike of Hoccleve are the mirror image of those behind his approval of Lydgate's work with its more obvious erudition and elaborate descriptions of natural beauty. Warton's subsequent influence among critics in the 19th century, judged by the number of times he is cited, is considerable, and his *History of English Poetry* is re-published in 1824, 1840, and 1871. Warton's influence over Hoccleve's critical reputation is all the greater with little of Hoccleve's work in print. Nevertheless, the service rendered to Hoccleve by Warton has a significance that goes beyond its negative consequences for Hoccleve's immediate critical reputation: Warton inaugurates a critical dialogue.

As a man with an independent fortune (Goodwin 419), George Mason had the freedom to follow intellectual interests slightly outside the mainstream of academic society. His 1796 edition of Hoccleve selections, 6, is scholarly and structured almost on modern lines. Mason is the first writer to note that Hoccleve seems to keep ten syllables to a line by the selective sounding of final -e; he dispels the myth of Hoccleve's supposed heresy; and he points to the substantial interest of Hoccleve's autobiographical references. Within the small scale of his edition, Mason is a far better empirical scholar than Warton is. Nevertheless, Mason's work seems to have met with little or no approval, and disparaging remarks are made of its choice of subject by Ritson, 69. In spite of Mason's support of Hoccleve's work, the dominant aesthetic articulated by Warton and reinforced by Ritson was to hold the day.

Hoccleve's work tests the critical market at the end of the 18th century, through a scholarly edition and the attention of a great scholar, and fails. This was not a promising start to the 19th century, but surprises were in store as critics would later return to Hoccleve as one of the 15th-century 'refiners' of English, a characteristic noted by Warton, and for the interest of his autobiography, a characteristic noted by Mason.

§
Lydgate: The 18th century

Lydgate’s critical reputation fails, as does Hoccleve’s, at the end of the 18th century, but the mechanism of failure differs for the two poets. Tanner’s entry for Lydgate, 549, shows, as does his entry for Hoccleve, 66, a first-hand acquaintance with the relevant manuscripts, life records, and early printing history. His work, and that of Ames, 550, provides Warton, 552–3, with a sound bibliographic base from which to work. Renoir takes the view that Warton is the ‘last representative of an age’ that passively accepts the excellence of ‘anything composed by Lydgate’ (789: 5). But this misrepresents what Warton does. For example, Renoir criticizes Warton for not giving any detailed underpinning to his praise of Lydgate (5–6), yet Warton is much more analytical than Renoir suggests. His judgement of Lydgate is of quite a different kind from that made by earlier critics: Warton has read widely, and then critically evaluated his subject. His comment, for instance, that Lydgate’s natural verbosity has the power to lead both to fluency and to tediousness must be central to any understanding of Lydgate’s poetic (553: 58). Warton devotes over fifty pages of his History to Lydgate and gives him the most thorough consideration he has yet received, and among the very few he was to receive for nearly another hundred years. Although finding Lydgate often verbose, he praises his ornate descriptions, particularly of natural beauty. Warton perceptively notes that Lydgate is at his best with descriptive passages ‘especially where the subject admits a flowery diction’ (553: 58). He shows a reasonable familiarity with several of Lydgate’s works, and admires, in a considered and detailed assessment, Lydgate’s range, erudition, and general clarity. Warton’s warm response, for example, to the opening lines of the Life of Our Lady (553: 57) presages the modern critical response to the poem—see Pearsall (818: 285–90) for an example. One should be sceptical, of course, about the full extent of Warton’s reading. D’Israeli suspects that Warton has used some of the titles of Lydgate’s poems, found in Speght’s Chaucer edition, 420, to good effect (565: 315). The point remains, however, that Warton has at least read a considerable amount of Lydgate’s work with some care.
Yet, in spite of the support of this significant critical voice in the late 18th century, Lydgate’s critical reputation declines sharply in the following century. The reasons for this decline (shadowed by the further decline of Hoccleve’s reputation) are not clear. They are, however, likely to be related, in part, to the regularization of Chaucer’s metre in the last decades of the 18th century. Speght, in his address ‘To the Readers’ for the 1602 edition of Chaucer, blames scribal transmission for apparent defects in Chaucer’s lines. This is a theory dismissed by Dryden who, in 1700, sees Chaucer’s verse as simply having the ‘rude Sweetness of a Scotch Tune,’ 545. By the time Warton is writing his History; however, English criticism is coming to grips with the characteristics of Chaucer’s metre and dispelling the confusion that had arisen about the pronunciation of final -e and about the syllabic stress of French loan words. Gray writes in his notes (c. 1760–1) about both the issues of stress and final -e, 554. Tyrwhitt, however, puts these matters before the public in 1775 with an essay on Chaucer’s language and versification in volume 1 of his edition of Chaucer’s Canterbury Tales. This apparent clarification of Chaucer’s metre creates a standard by which other poets of the period may be judged.

Tyrwhitt’s work may have enabled, as Spurgeon says, the ‘sane and rational study’ of Chaucer’s poetry (636: 1: liv); however, it is likely to have hindered the study of Lydgate and Hoccleve. Before Tyrwhitt, it could be assumed that Lydgate and Hoccleve work closely within Chaucer’s metre: both say as much in a general way, although they concede that they are unable to approach Chaucer’s level of skill. There is even occasional praise in the pre-Tyrwhitt period of Lydgate as metrically superior to Chaucer (see Jacob, 548, and Cibber, 551). One example of such praise is found as late as 1780 in the Encyclopaedia Britannica, 556. Superficially, at least, the verse of Hoccleve and Lydgate does not conform easily to Chaucer’s model. Worse still the prosody of each of the later poets differs from Chaucer’s in different ways. Hoccleve maintains ten-syllables to a line; however, if one imposes a regular iambic pentameter beat on his lines he seems occasionally to stress normally unstressed syllables. Lydgate usually has the right syllables
stressed, although they may be considered poorly judged and unmusical, yet does not strictly keep to a ten syllable line. These variations are likely to imply metrical confusion and ignorance if one has accepted Chaucer’s iambic pentameter as the standard for his time. This of course, was not a necessary conclusion, even for exacting 18th-century critics. In the early 1760s, Gray, 554, who has an early grasp of the metrical issues involved, still shows himself to be a supportive reader of Lydgate. Writing in the immediate wake of Tyrwhitt’s publication, Warton shows some awareness of its implications, but the issue of metre is not a major elements of his critical discussion. For his extracts, Warton marks final -e where it is necessary to the syllable count of the line, and he uses accents to mark as stressed those syllables that would normally be unstressed in Modern English. Warton praises Chaucer for the ‘polish’ and enrichment he brings to English verse by the use of ‘softer cadences, and a more copious and variegated phraseology’ (67: 1: 342); and he says that the poets who followed Chaucer are ‘insensible to his vigour of versification’ (67: 2: 51). Nevertheless, his criticism of the metre of the Chaucerians does not hinder his wider discussion of the characteristics of their work. Conversely, Percy’s pointed criticism of Lydgate in 1765 as ‘dull and prolix,’ 555, shows that an antipathy towards the poet was possible on grounds other than metre.

Ritson’s influential Bibliographica Poetica, 69, 558, posthumously published in 1802, sharply dismisses both Lydgate and Hoccleve, and sets the tone for much of the subsequent criticism. In Ritson’s famous rejection of Lydgate as that ‘voluminous, prosaick, and driveling monk,’ the first and third adjectives refer to length and content, and the noun to religion, but the second adjective, ‘prosaick,’ is almost certainly a barb directed at Lydgate’s perceived metrical incompetence. Prosodically confused and ignorant was the judgement reached by many of Hoccleve’s and Lydgate’s critics in the 19th century. §
It is not until late in the 19th century that reliable editions of Hoccleve and Lydgate become available for scholarly discussion. The Lydgate texts were generally out of print and hard to find. Saintsbury remarks (634: 1: 219) that until the late 19th century it was very difficult to get printed copies of Lydgate’s work, with the exception of the *Siege of Thebes* and a few other short pieces in Chaucer editions, and the minor poems that had been printed by Halliwell, 425, in 1840. (On the issues of the inclusion of works by Hoccleve and Lydgate in the Chaucer canon by the early printers see Skeat, 588, Hammond, 610, and the annotations for the early printings.) Hoccleve’s *Letter of Cupid* is printed as Chaucer’s by Thynne in 1532, 1, together with two minor pieces, and subsequently acknowledged as Hoccleve’s in Speght’s Chaucer edition of 1598, 2; the three poems then appear regularly in Chaucer editions until, and including, that by John Urry in 1721. See Burrow (226: 54) and Hammond (120: 434-6). *La Male Regle* and some Hoccleve ballads are available in Mason’s edition of 1796, 6. The *Mother of God* is printed for the first time in 1801 by Leyden, 7, who ascribes the poem to Chaucer, and subsequently, again as Chaucer’s, by Bell, 8, who prints it in 1854 in volume 1 of his *Annotated Editions of the English Poets* (1854–6). (It is finally ejected from the Chaucer canon and acknowledged as Hoccleve’s in the late 19th century—see Koch, 91–2, Furnivall (13: 1: xxxix–xli), Ross, 103, and Skeat (100: 146–7). Wright, 10, prints the *Regement of Princes* in 1860, but the edition is a poor one. Wright was an enthusiastic editor, but not scholarly. (See Ross’s discussion of Wright’s work).

The anthologist Ellis, 68, writes in 1801 with unintended irony about the difficulty of finding a tolerable extract from Hoccleve’s work that can be printed; and he prints instead some anonymous pieces from the period. His view of Lydgate is not much better; nevertheless, too much of Lydgate’s work had been printed in early editions for it to be ignored entirely by a literary historian. Ellis brings to his work strong views on taste as Warton does, but the tone of the younger critic is more popular and less academic than that
Warton. Warton is prepared to present to the public, at least briefly, what he thinks will not (or should not) appeal to a refined taste, and say why. Ellis first discards what he finds distasteful and then makes his presentation to the public (see Johnson 149–50). In subsequent critical writings in the 19th century, Ellis’s approach is found far more often than Warton’s.

The English Chaucerians are that ‘crowd of worthless and forgotten versifiers,’ as Craik, 87, calls them in 1869. It would be wrong, however, to overstate the 19th-century case against Hoccleve and Lydgate. The second half of the century sees a revival of academic interest in medieval literature, the creation of the EETS, and the beginning of the New English Dictionary project; and the critical record also shows some diversity of opinion. Turner notes that Hoccleve ‘greatly assisted the growth and diffused the popularity of our infant poetry,’ and has not had ‘his just share of reputation’ (71: 367). D’Israeli praises Hoccleve as being a ‘shrewd observer of his own times’ (74: 308); and he also defends Lydgate against the criticism of writers who followed Ritson’s lead (565). But the naysayers are more numerous. Brooke briefly catalogues Hoccleve as a ‘bad versifier of the reign of Henry V’ (89: 51). Courthope is more scientific when he notes that Hoccleve’s verse generally has the right number of syllables, but about ten per cent have an accent falling on a normally weak syllable (106: 338–9). Hoccleve’s difficulty with pure pentameter verse, writes Courthope, ‘shows the tendency of the native Anglo-Saxon element to revolt against those foreign laws of grammar and harmony, which had been imposed on the English language by the cultivated genius of Chaucer’ (106: 340). In other words, Hoccleve was a backward step in the evolution of taste. More damning still is the opinion of Saintsbury: Hoccleve generally lacks ‘any poetical, or even decently rhythmical, effect’; the work of Hoccleve and Lydgate is a ‘lesson of disorganisation, almost of disbandment ... from the prosodic point of view’ (125: 232–3). A hint of a more considered
view of Hoccleve's metre is given by Skeat, 97, in his discussion of Hoccleve's virelays, which shows the poet's capacity to understand the mechanics of a complex metrical form.

Although the critical record of the 19th century is mixed, it is telling that no edition of Hoccleve after that of 1796 appears until 1860, and there are no major editions of Lydgate after the 16th century aside from that by Halliwell in 1840, 425, until the late 19th century. Nevertheless, events are under way in the second half of the 19th century that will prepare the way for the critical renewal of Hoccleve and Lydgate. The New English Dictionary project, later to become the Oxford English Dictionary, commences in 1858 and creates an immediate need for scholarly editions. The EETS is founded in 1864 with a view to publishing and encouraging the study of the numerous unedited or poorly edited early English texts; and the Chaucer Society is started in 1868 to foster Chaucer studies. Hoccleve and Lydgate had not fully caught the crests of the previous waves of antiquarian interest that had swept through England in earlier centuries. For example, they largely peripheral to the antiquarians who write immediately after the Reformation, and to the political and religious disputants of the following century. The overall effect of 18th-century criticism did not spark a sustained consideration of their work. But the Chaucerians are central to the historical and lexicographical study of English under way at the end of the 19th century. The 'refiners' of the English language were about to come into their own, and not a little of the credit must go to F.J. Furnivall.

Furnivall stands with Shirley and Stow as one of the enablers of modern Chaucerian studies. Furnivall has a political and social belief that the study of the English language and its authors should be a necessary part of the development of a modern English national identity. This study was intended to revive the literature of the Middle Ages and a vision a united England, undivided by the class divisions of the Industrial Revolution. (See Benzie and Patterson for discussion of Furnivall's social views.) Others may not always
have shared his opinions, but his role in initiating the EETS, Chaucer Society, and the New English Dictionary Project shows that Furnivall was able to tap into the scholarly currents of his day (Benzie 120–3).

Sometimes the scholarly currents were trickles rather than streams, at least as Furnivall found them. The early reports of the EETS are sprinkled with complaints about a lack of English support, and it is one of the twists of English Chaucerian critical history that the EETS had to rely greatly on the editorial labours of German scholars. The marriage of English and German scholarship was not always happy. Saintsbury is thoroughly exasperated with German editors, whom he regards as tone-deaf (125: 221–222, note). He is convinced that Schick, 442, for example, has failed to appreciate just how bad Lydgate’s metre is. Saintsbury’s opinion of Schick stands in some contrast to that held by Schirmer (758: 260). Yet the EETS was to publish much of Lydgate’s and Hoccleve’s work and so enable further study of their poetry; although the quality of the early editions was variable, these works made the next wave of textual study possible. Furnivall and the other founders of the EETS understood the simple truth that without editions there was no prospect for the serious study of these authors or of their contribution to English.

A number of articles in the last quarter of the 19th century begin to appear, usually in the area of philology, on Hoccleve and Lydgate. Notable contributions are made by Skeat, 15–16, 95–100, who was also working on the New English Dictionary project; and a number of German dissertations and numerous articles are published addressing issues of prosody, syntax, and textual issues (for examples see 91–2, 101–2). Such studies raised the critical profile of Hoccleve and Lydgate. A sign of the importance that was being given to Lydgate is the extensive article that is devoted to him by Lee, 586. Lee’s article admits much of Lydgate’s work is artistically poor, but stresses the importance of his influence on other writers. The article itself is often inaccurate—see Pearsall (824: 49, note 102)—but it
is significant because it is there. The shortness of the entry in the DNB on Hoccleve, 85, might be attributable to Furnivall’s usual haste. The critical prospects for Hoccleve and Lydgate were much more promising at the end of the 19th century than they had been at the end of the 18th century, although that promise proved to be slow in realization.

§

Hoccleve: the modern criticism

The critical enthusiasm for Hoccleve in the late 20th century grew from a slow start. Even as late as 1960 Daiches, 190, is remarkably dour regarding Hoccleve’s literary merits. There are, however, some notable contributions to Hoccleve studies even in the first decades of the century. Snell, 118, gives a sensitive evaluation of Hoccleve in 1905. Kern, 133–6, writes perceptively about the detail of Hoccleve’s verse and spelling conventions in a series of articles around World War I. Kurtz, 140, identifies the source of Hoccleve’s Learn to Die in 1923; Sandison, 143, in 1923 finds the source for Hoccleve’s Balade to the Virgin and Christ; and Gilbert, 151, writes in 1928 on Hoccleve’s use of Jacob de Cessolis’s Chesse Moralised and the Secretum secretorum for the Regement of Princes. Tout, 152–3, contributes hugely to the understanding of Hoccleve’s daily working life. Later in the century his work is consolidated by Brown, 239, Schulze, 166, Reeves, 254–5, Richardson, 316, and, especially, Burrow through his biographical and bibliographical guide to Hoccleve, 226. Burrow also contributes to the understanding of Hoccleve’s autobiographical technique (see, for example, 221). More generally, Hammond’s 1927 anthology is an important event for Hoccleve, 30, Lydgate, 454, and Hawes, 1259, as it brings them closer to the main current of critical debates. Lewis’s brief and selective praise of the Regement of Princes, 157, is still noteworthy; and his view of the stress pattern in Hoccleve’s line, 158, is not inconsistent with the modern position put by Jefferson, 320.
Bennett’s inclusion of Hoccleve’s biography in his *Six Medieval Men and Women*, 163, is an indication of rising interest in the detail of Hoccleve’s biography. Adams’s view of the *Regement of Princes* as a device of Lancastrian propaganda, 177, foreshadows later and wider discussions of the political functions of Lancastrian literature. (See for examples, Fisher, 200, and Pearsall, 211).

Much of the more modern criticism clusters around Hoccleve’s autobiographical references and their factuality; the characteristics of Hoccleve’s metre; the *Regement of Princes* as an example of the ‘mirror for princes’ genre; and the feminist standing, or otherwise, of the *Letter of Cupid*.

Some scholars, including Doob, 250, Thornley, 213, and most noticeably Mitchell, 201–204, argue that many of Hoccleve’s autobiographical references, particularly those referring to his relationship with Chaucer, should be taken as conventional and part of the largely fictional persona constructed by the poet. Burrow, 221, dismisses this argument as an example of the workings of the ‘conventional fallacy,’ which says that because a reference is conventional it is, for that reason, not to be taken at face value. He points to the substantial documentary evidence of overlaps between the social circles of Hoccleve and of Chaucer, details of which are provided in 226. Medcalf, 288, shares Burrow’s view of the factuality of Hoccleve’s description of his illness, and he compares how Wordsworth and Hoccleve use allegory to describe their inner and outer states. Greetham, 308, considers how Hoccleve exploits the literary potential of his persona. Claridge, 332, examines Hoccleve’s supposed illness from the viewpoint of a clinician; and Doob, 250, discusses the medieval view of madness.

The question of Hoccleve’s association with Chaucer has some implications for our view of his prosody. If Hoccleve was close enough to Chaucer to have had the opportunity to hear him reading from his work—a nodding acquaintance would do—it would be difficult to
believe that Hoccleve did not grasp the characteristics of the older poet’s metre. If this were the case, we would be more likely to conclude, as modern critics have, that Hoccleve’s metre is a variation on a familiar theme (see Burrow, 47, 225; Jefferson, 320; Stanley, 331) rather than an ignorant discord as earlier often assumed (Saintsbury, 125). Stanley argues that the effects of Hoccleve’s prosody are best seen within verse-stanzas. The most recent consideration of Hoccleve’s metre is that by Burrow, 47, who builds on the work of Jefferson and Kern, 133–4. These studies all suggest that Hoccleve’s metre is considered and striving for conscious effects.

Modern criticism is expanding our knowledge of the range of influences on which Hoccleve draws. Fisher, 199, refers to connections and similarities between Gower and Hoccleve; and Gower’s influence on Hoccleve has recently been explored further by Blyth, 354, with respect to the echoes of the Confessio Amantis in the Regement of Princes. The existence of French models of pseudo-autobiographical references, contemporary with Hoccleve (Calin, 358; Burrow, 228), are evidence of the sophisticated literary influences under the surface of Hoccleve’s autobiographical content. Further evidence is provided by Rigg’s identification, 238, of the Synonyma of Isidore of Seville as the source for Hoccleve’s Complaint. Burrow, 229, has recently further refined this identification.

The modern consideration of Hoccleve’s use of the mirror genre also embraces issues of his aesthetic values and techniques. Harriss, 311, Scanlon 339–40, and Ferster, 366, seem to capture the modern view of the Regement of Princes when they explore it as being a homogenous composition that encompasses a begging poem and a patronage piece, a work offering counsel to the king, and a politically sponsored document. Lawton, 321, discusses the protective devices used by 15th-century authors as they transmit some of the inherited cultural values of Chaucer through a new, complex, and dangerous world. Strohm, 292–4, considers in detail the effects of Lancastrian political concerns on Hoccleve’s chosen themes. Working from similar premises to Scanlon, Harriss, and Ferster
about the multiple functions of the poet, Torti, 317–18, considers the aesthetic implications of the mirror symbolism for the *Regement of Princes*.

The debate about Hoccleve's *Letter Of Cupid* is a barometer of critical opinion on Hoccleve's capacity for literary subtlety. These debates became possible when critics acknowledged that they were dealing with an art worthy of critical appreciation. D'Israeli, 74, who writes sensitively on both Hoccleve and Lydgate in 1841, sees a wicked wit at work in the *Letter*, yet offers no detailed consideration. The honour, therefore, goes to Minto, 88, in 1874 as the first modern critic to discuss at any length the notion that something like wit may be at work in Hoccleve's poem. Minto's observations sparked no debate, just as D'Israeli's earlier comments had not, and it was still possible for Lounsbury in 1892 to describe *Letter of Cupid* as 'tedious beyond description' (104: 24). Brink (105: 216) and Snell (118: 26) think the poem is a serious defence of women; and even Legouis in 1926 dismisses the *Letter of Cupid* as lacking an imaginative quality (145: 157). Utley notes in 1944 that Hoccleve retains the complex tone and approach of Christine de Pizan's *Epistre au Dieu d'Amours* on which it is based (175: 121). Most recently, in 1991, McLeod, 343, argues that this is indeed the case, and he sees both Hoccleve and Christine's poem as more complex than is normally acknowledged.

Between Utley and McLeod, all critics have acknowledged the complexity of *Letter of Cupid*, but opinions have been split on whether this complexity works to subvert Christine's text or to support it. Mitchell (204: 55), Fleming, 241, Matthews (245: 747), and Green (270: 106), argue, for different reasons, that the poem is, at least taken as a whole, supports the female cause. Green's view that Hoccleve would not have comprehended the criticism that he had taken an antifeminist position is perhaps the strongest portrayal of Hoccleve as the guileless artist. Mahoney, 367, also sees the *Letter*, allowing for some inevitable changes resulting from the translation of the original into
a new context, as supporting Christine. On the other hand, Pearsall (208: 225; 209: 213–14), Bornstein, 266, Spearing (312: 111), and Quinn, 315, argue that the poem uses irony to take it in an antifeminist direction. Torti, 319, sees it as difficult to discern Hoccleve’s attitude towards women because of the irony at work in the Letter; she looks instead to the Series and finds, overall, that Hoccleve is not antifeminist. Spearing takes the view that Hoccleve effectively ‘medievalizes’ Christine’s poem. Similar observations, pointing to Lydgate’s religious and social conservatism in the face of change, are made by other scholars regarding Lydgate’s rewriting of Chaucer in the Siege of Thebes (Ganim, 1020) and on his retelling of the Knight’s Tale in the Fabula duorum mercatorum (Farvolden, 1113). Such observations highlight the ambiguous status of these late medieval, or early Renaissance, writers.

O’Donoghue, r362, in his review of the Hoccleve anthology edited by Batt, 362, appeals for more critical attention to be paid in Hoccleve studies to textual study and less to the traditional biographical issues that have preoccupied scholars. As one reads recent Hoccleve criticism there is every reason to believe that O’Donoghue’s wish is already being met. Hoccleve has become an author with every claim to be studied in his own right; and recent manuscript and editorial work is providing a firm basis for current and future critical analysis.

§

Hoccleve: manuscript study and editions

Criticism of the works of Hoccleve and Lydgate, and the rest of the 15th-century English Chaucerians, has benefited from the revolution in manuscript and bibliographic study in the 20th-century. Manuscript production, illumination, circulation, and affiliation, and the associated questions these raise for editors, are important areas of critical research; they have also been identified by scholars working in the field as having significant scope for further study.
Seymour's examination of the extant manuscripts, 256, shows that Regement of Princes was still popular into the 16th century, with some later antiquarian interest. Most copies are on vellum, but ten paper manuscripts show that cheap copies were available (256: 258). Seymour sees Hoccleve's theme of kingship as consistent with the 'serious' interests of the contemporary readers 'whose developing tastes for historical and serious works largely determined the literary character of the century' (256: 255); and he describes the work's readers as belonging to the circles of 'court, government, university, church and professions' in the south-east of England (256: 257). Seymour, 48, believes, and Bowers, 327, argues in more detail, the theory that San Marino, Huntington lib., MSS HM 711 and HM 744 were once joined as a manuscript anthology of Hoccleve's work. Doyle, 48r, considers that such a connection is unlikely. Burrow seems inclined to see the two manuscripts as being originally a single volume (226: 31). Harris, 298, claims John Mowbray as the original recipient of London, BL, MS Arundel 38 and challenges the traditional claim that this manuscript was the presentation copy made for Henry V when he was the Prince of Wales (see Alexander, 295, for an example of the latter view). Harris's conclusion is accepted by Burrow (226: 18–19).

The company that a work keeps in manuscript is a frequent topic of discussion, and Boyd, 349, raises this with respect to the New Haven, Yale University, Beinecke Lib., MS 493 because of its inclusion of Hoccleve's Series and Lydgate's Dance Macabre. (When speaking of Lydgate, Boffey, 1067, 1071, puts the general case for caution before assuming that the manuscript co-location, at least of short works, is necessarily an interpretative statement.)

Several items are concerned with identifying manuscript artists or noting illustrations in different manuscripts that appear to have been done by the same artist. A number of critics have investigated the influence of the illustrator, Hermann Scheere. Rickett, 184, attributes the presentation miniature in London, BL, MS Arundel 38 to an unknown follower of
Scheere. Rickett notes the apparent verisimilitude of the Chaucer portrait in London, BL, MS Harley 4866, although she does not specifically ascribe the work to the school of Scheere as Mathew (218: 44) does. Seymour claims that the Chaucer portraits in London, BL, MS Harley 4866 and San Marino, Huntington Lib., MS EL 26 C 9 (Ellesmere) may be by a single illustrator who was probably working in London or Westminster (257: 618). He further claims that the presentation miniature in London, BL, MS Arundel 38 is likely to have been made in the same shop as that responsible for the Ellesmere and Harley pieces. He argues that the Arundel artist, influenced by Hermann Scheere was also responsible for a number of other manuscripts, including the Bedford Hours and Psalter, London, BL, MS Add. 42131. Wright, 352, puts the view that the artist responsible for the Harley 4866 Chaucer portrait also worked on some illustrations for the Bedford Psalter-Hours. Wright, 353, also leads the theory that the Bedford Psalter-Hours offers a portrait gallery of Lancastrian authors. Alexander, 295, claims that the illuminator who worked on London, BL, MS Arundel 38 is likely to have been Hermann Scheere or one of his associates; Mathew discounts the possibility that Scheere was directly responsible for the Arundel 38 presentation portrait (218: 43–4).

Much of the modern interest in the Hoccleve manuscripts centres on the holographs, Durham, Univ. Lib., MS Cosin V.iii.9 and the Huntington Library manuscripts, HM 111 and HM 744 that together contain all of Hoccleve poems, with the exception of Regement of Princes, the Complaint and lines 1–252 of the Dialogue. (On the other surviving examples of Hoccleve’s handwriting, the Formulary and his contribution to the Cambridge, Trinity College, MS R.3.2 copy of John Gower’s Conféssio Amantis, see Bentley, 40, and Doyle, 215, respectively.) These manuscripts were finally confirmed as holographs by Schulz, 166, in 1937. There has been debate as to what authority these should hold for editorial purposes, both for the poems they contain and, with respect to the details of authorial style, for those of Hoccleve’s poems they omit. Greetham, 306–7, 309, argues that the idiosyncrasies of Hoccleve’s language, orthography, and metre identified from the
holographs may inform the editing of *Regement of Princes*. This idea is attacked by Bowers, 328, and Machan, 351, who essentially question the historical validity of reconstructing texts that may never have existed in the form in which the editor presents them. The editor currently engaged with *Regement of Princes*, Blyth, 355, takes the side of Greetham, although he seems a little more cautious than Greetham in stating the possibilities of the interventionist editorial approach. The debate, however, has now taken what may be a decisive turn with the publication of Burrow’s 1999 edition of Hoccleve’s *Complaint and Dialogue* for the EETS, 47, which puts the case that the textual reconstruction of non-holograph text on the basis of holograph copies of other texts is editorially acceptable. The edition offers the most recent discussion of the characteristics of Hoccleve’s metre and language for which the holographs are central. On the matter of metre, Burrow (47: xxix) supports the views of Jefferson, 320, and Kern, 133–4.

There are now a number of modern Hoccleve editions and selections. Hammond’s 1927 anthology, *English Verse between Chaucer and Surrey*, 30, 454, 1259, was seminal in opening up 15th-century literature to a wider academic audience. Significant Hoccleve selections have been published recently by Seymour, 48, O’Donoghue, 49, Gray, 50, Pearsall, 52, and, of course, Burrow, 46–7. Fenster and Eral’s edition of the *Letter of Cupid*, 51, which presents both Hoccleve’s source text and its modern English translation, has made the debate about Hoccleve’s translation more accessible to interested readers. An edition of Hoccleve’s *Regement of Princes* by Blyth, 355, is under way.

§

*Lydgate: the modern criticism*

Lydgate criticism took time to develop in the early 20th century, but it established a strong base on which to build. A number of the early references anticipate later areas of inquiry. Collins, 600, begins the 20th-century critical record for Lydgate with a brief, but spirited, defence of Lydgate that both recalls the praise of Warton, 552–3, and presages some recent
criticism. Chambers's brief reference, 604, to the possible role of Lydgate's mumming in the subsequent development of the genre, followed by that of Withington in 1918, 659, is also a taste of an inquiry that was to be pursued further in later years. In the early years of the century Hammond began a series of articles on Lydgate that was to continue for more than three decades. Hammond's articles often anticipate the direction of later modern study, for example, her discussions of patronage, 616, metre, 619, and many others on various aspects of manuscript study. Brown's textual studies touch several times on Lydgate (641–6). Mendenhall, 668, is insightful in his early consideration of Lydgate's aureate language, and Berdan, 669, notes Lydgate's role in the transmission of Chaucer to the 16th-century audience. Brusendorff, 679, provides an early consideration of Lydgate's canon to supplement that by McCracken's, 471, and by the other editors of the period. In 1900, Smith, 599, considers Lydgate as a transitional figure standing between the authors of the Middle Ages and those of the Renaissance. Brie, in 1929, 689, pursues the matter further when he asks whether Lydgate should be considered as a medieval or renaissance writer. In the 19th century, the Chaucerians are often seen as a wall that may be skipped over quickly between the good things of the Middle Ages and the better things of the Renaissance. Brie and Smith redefine the wall as a bridge, and so herald the study of the 15th-century poets as a field worthy in its own right of broad academic consideration.

At about the time Morre, 756, dismisses Hoccleve and Lydgate, Schirmer, 757–8, publishes his seminal work on Lydgate. Schirmer, following Brie, 689, sees the first signs of the Renaissance in Lydgate's work. Renoir, 786, 789, also argues that there are identifiable elements of the Renaissance in Lydgate's work. A strong rebuttal over many years has been made by Pearsall (for examples of his contribution see 818, 820, 822–3). Pearsall's Lydgate is, in effect, an accidental innovator, medieval to his sandals, but obliged to be innovative at the behest of his patrons. Lydgate's medievalizing tendencies have also been explored by others, including Farvolden, 1113, in her study of how Lydgate medievalizes
Chaucer’s *Knight’s Tale* in *Fabula duorum mercantorum*, and Cowgill, 1039, in his examination of Lydgate’s moral reading of the *Canterbury Tales* for the *Siege of Thebes*.

The question of Lydgate’s contribution to the rise of humanism in England has attracted recent attention. Wallace, 1135, suggests that the nature of Lydgate’s patronage arrangements with Duke Humphrey did not allow the poet to write with the freedom that Boccaccio achieved, and so limited his capacity to offer frank advice. Carroll, 1120, is in no doubt that Lydgate is a medieval figure who contributes very little to the advancement of humanism in his homeland.

The *Temple of Glass* has been a popular subject of debate among critics—including Davidoff, 1017–18, Crockett, 1103, Phillips, 1131, Russell, 998, and Spearing, 962—who are interested in the success or otherwise of Lydgate’s aesthetic effects. (The debate here stands somewhat in parallel to that surrounding Hoccleve’s *Letter of Cupid*).

With respect to the *Fall of Princes*, Copeland, 1097, discusses the importance Lydgate and Hawes attach to the study of rhetoric. Ebin, 970–6, also explores Lydgate’s development of a distinctive language and aesthetic. Much of the debate here centres on Lydgate’s artistic relationship with Chaucer, including his appropriation of Chaucer and interpretation of the older poet’s style. In a series of pieces Spearing, 962–5, examines Lydgate’s apparent attempts to assume Chaucer’s position and his possible inability to understand the implications of Chaucer’s work. Watson, 1110, too discusses Lydgate’s attempts, even as he pleads humility, to ‘out-do’ Chaucer. Machan, 1099, finds Lydgate’s concern (borrowed from Chaucer) for the issue of authorial authority to be superficial. Edwards, 896, argues that Lydgate strategically praises Chaucer’s work for the very characteristics he has copied from the older poet. Lerer, 1105, sees Lydgate’s construction of Chaucer as a poet enjoying status and security to be a comment on the political instability and uncertain patronage facing Chaucer’s successors in the 15th-century. In a somewhat related vein, Miskimin,
948, sees Lydgate as attempting, but failing, to achieve Chaucer's artistic self-assurance and control.

The topic of Lydgate's artistic relation to Chaucer is necessarily crucial to discussions of Lydgate's attempt to continue the *Canterbury Tales* in the *Siege of Thebes*. Simpson, 1132, sees Lydgate as engaging with Chaucer in the *Siege of Thebes*—or, the *Destruction of Thebes*, as Simpson would prefer to call it—in a humanistic way, and as offering his readers a dark lesson on the vicissitudes of history. Kline, 1139, presents many insights on the *Siege* as a carefully crafted document in which Lydgate as son defines himself in relation to his reconstruction of Father Chaucer and the Canterbury pilgrimage. Allen, 1086, argues that Lydgate's poem is written with the moral values of both *Troilus and Criseyde* and *The Knight's Tale* in mind. Kohl, 984-5, concentrates on what he sees as a difference in the presentation of Fortune in the *Siege of Thebes* and the *Knight's Tale*, and he argues that this shows a movement from stoicism in the face of misfortune to an acknowledgment of one's moral responsibility. Clogan, 1095-6, reaches a similar conclusion. More generally, Lydgate's concept and presentation of history has been investigated by Benson, 914-17, in a series of papers in which he sees Lydgate's idea of history as essentially borrowed from Chaucer, somewhat simplified and altered. These modifications are made not for fictional ends, as in Chaucer, but in order to highlight the poet's message of moral instruction. Finlayson's comparison, 1114, of the *Gest Hystorical* with *Troy Book* also confirms the moral intent of Lydgate's version.

Winstead, 1111, considers Lydgate's influence on the development of the genre of saints' legends. Other critics also write on Lydgate's religious poetry. Pearsall discusses a range of the religious poems (818: 255–92); Kuczynski, 1115, considers Lydgate's translations from the Psalms; and Hardman, 1124, writes on the *Life of Our Lady*. Woolf, 869, presents Lydgate as a writer in whom we sense the 'disruption of the mediative tradition.'
Lydgate’s reputation as an antifeminist has been considerable since the time of his first readers, as Edwards, 883, and Hammond, 613, note. Utley’s discussion, 746, of the complex forces behind the debate on women is still persuasive. Many of its threads retain currency, after nearly 60 years, in the critical debate, although few would now accept Utley’s emphasis on the part played by the psychology of courtly love. Edwards, 844, sees Lydgate’s antifeminism as being largely directed by the occasion for which he writes. Rogers, 844, finds Lydgate’s writings against women to be products of a rather jaded literary convention. Cowen, 1088, examines the antifeminist treatment of the Medea story in the *Fall of Princes* and *Troy Book*, and Lydgate’s extension of Medea as a figure emblematic of women. Amoils, 1027, considers the *Temple of Glass* as an example of the practicalities of married life in the 15th century; and Boffey, 1070, discusses the extent of Lydgate’s female readership. Farvolden, 1113, looks at the implications of Lydgate’s love triangle for the woman in the *Fabula duorum mercatorum* and finds Lydgate’s vision even more stark than that of Chaucer’s Knight.

A technical appreciation of Lydgate’s metre came earlier in the 20th century than it did for Hoccleve, although it has taken longer for the implications of his technique to be understood. Schick, 442, presents the five basic line-types that Lydgate uses. More recent critics, like Lynn, 983, have stressed the experimental elements of Chaucerian verse. This is not to say that Lydgate’s experiments were always well chosen, but he is generally now viewed more as a failed innovator than as a failed copyist of Chaucer’s metre. Stanley, 1076, argues for Lydgate’s occasional success in the manipulation of larger stanza units. Tiner, 1125, and Carnahan, 1127 show that it is possible for some of Lydgate’s lyrics to be performed as songs, a conclusion that would presumably be welcomed by Southworth, 775–6, and by Robinson, 922.

Pearsall’s *Bio-bibliography*, 824, is a major event in modern Lydgate scholarship that links biographical, critical, and bibliographical studies. It will greatly assist future Lydgate
criticism. The vitality of modern Lydgate studies makes it difficult to predict what directions future criticism will take. On matters of critical interpretation, Lydgate’s religious poetry is still to receive the attention it deserves. A number of interlinked bibliographic and textual issues await critical attention. The Lydgate manuscripts are a vast field that is likely to be of continuing scholarly interest; there are a large number of texts that require re-editing; and the boundaries of the Lydgate canon are still to be clearly settled. (For background to this last issue see MacCracken (471: v-l), Brusendorff, 650, Schirmer (758: 264–86), Reimer, 1079–80, and the discussion below.) There may also be further scope for work on Lydgate’s 16th-century printing history and the commercial and political uses to which the printed editions were put.

§

Lydgate: manuscript study and editions

Keiser, 1090–1, has published on the importance of the manuscript divisions and marginal notations as guides to readers of the Life of Our Lady; and Lawton, 1022, has undertaken a study of the largely utilitarian function of the Troy Book manuscript illustrations. There has also been progress with the identification of scribes and illustrators (see van Buuren-Veenbos, 845, Scott, 866–8, and Alexander, 929). Numerous articles have been published on individual manuscripts, their inter-relationships and textual significance, notably by Edwards. In particular, Edwards has published a number of articles relevant to the Fall of Princes manuscripts (see 871 and its following annotations) and he has pointed to the need for further clarification of the Lydgate canon. Reimer, 1079, too has published on the importance of manuscript study to the settlement of the Lydgate canon. Scott, 867, has published about a manuscript for the Lives of Saints Edmund and Fremund found in Arundel Castle, and the relationship of this to other Lydgate manuscripts. This group of manuscripts suggests insights into the working relationship between a scribe, perhaps in the Suffolk area, and a local association of illustrators. Doyle, 858, reports that the London, BL, MS Harley 2278 copy of the Lives of Saints Edmund and Fremund is the work of
copyists and illustrators who seem to have been working in the region of Bury St Edmunds for at least three decades, occasionally on projects of considerable size. (This matter of a Lydgate scribe or scriptorium is also considered by Bergen, 463, and Edwards, 890, 893, and 899.) Scott further notes, 866, 868, the practice of at least some manuscript workshops of recycling similar manuscript illustrations from one manuscript to another. This practice, she argues, suggests that caution is needed when commenting on the textual significance of manuscript illustrations. Lawton’s study, 1022, leads to a similar direction.

Boffey, 1070, examines the role of Lydgate’s women readers in the circulation of his manuscripts. Meale, 1074, also briefly considers Lydgate’s women readers; and, in 1073, she examines more generally what insights the Lydgate manuscripts give to the social composition of Lydgate’s readership. Seymour, 1024, contributes to the understanding of the textual transmission of the Lives of Saints Edmund and Fremund and Dance Macabre. Boyd, 1093–4, writes on the importance of physical co-location of works by Hoccleve and Lydgate in New Haven, Yale Univ., Beinecke Lib., MS 493 and Oxford, Bodleian Lib., MS Bodley 638. As noted earlier, Boffey, 1067, 1071, puts the general case for caution in these matters. Strohm, 925–7, touches on the possible impact of changes in the audience characteristics for Hoccleve and Lydgate. Audience studies are also applied to the Temple of Glass by Davidoff, 1017. A similar, but more specific approach, is taken by Amoils, 1027, who, in a historicist reading of the Temple of Glass, accepts that the poem probably celebrates the wedding of William Paston and Agnes Bury. This theory is first put by MacCracken, 626. A contrary view is put by Wilson, 953, who favours an earlier composition date for the poem that would pre-date the Paston marriage. Boffey 1067, also finds the Paston connection unlikely.
The influence of the English Court on the selection of works for copying is explored by Doyle, 858, who tentatively suggests that this influence may not have been as great as is often thought.

De Ricci, 638, and Duff, 666, offer bibliographic guides to the early Lydgate prints as part of their research into 15th-century printing, as does, more specifically, Bühler, 704–6, 708–9. Pearsall, 824, conveniently provides a modern listing of the early editions. Blake, 846–7, investigates the possible influence of Lydgate on Caxton with respect to the printer’s Chaucer interpretation and concepts of patronage.

Modern editions of selections, and some longer poems, have been produced, notably by Norton-Smith, 496, Gray 504, Reinecke 505, and Pearsall, 509. The modern genesis of these selections is Hammond’s English Verse between Chaucer and Surrey, 454. Hammond’s choice of texts is not beyond criticism—see Pearsall (818: 9)—but her work paved the way for future anthologists.

There is a danger in an anthology, unless the selection gives some indication of Lydgate’s great range, of misrepresenting his achievement (Reinecke, r496). Nevertheless, the selections are likely to be followed by new editions of the longer poems. An edition of Lydgate’s Life of Our Lady which could bolster the attention given to Lydgate’s religious verse, a previously somewhat neglected topic, is under way by George Keiser. Modern criticism has sometimes tended to follow Bale’s example, 528, and turned a blind eye to Lydgate’s religiosity.

§

*George Ashby*

Ashby’s three poems are preserved in two manuscripts: Cambridge, Trinity College, MS R.3.19 (Prisoner’s Reflections), a manuscript once owned by John Stow, and Cambridge
Univ. Lib., MS Mm.IV.42 (Active Policy of a Prince and Dictes philosophorum). Ashby was not in print until two versions of the Prisoner’s Reflections were published in Anglia, first by Förster, 1142, in 1898, and then (in a heavily emended form) by Holthausen, 1144, in 1921. The only complete edition of Ashby’s three poems is that by Bateson, 1143, in 1899. The manuscript and printing history, taken together with the surviving references, suggest that Ashby’s initial, and later, audience was very restricted.

Tanner, 1145, shows some knowledge of the Ashby’s work, but it seems unlikely that this first-hand knowledge is shared by Ritson, 1146, who largely follows Tanner’s citation. Ritson’s tone is, as usual, crisply accurate, but as Ashby has escaped the kind of attack he makes upon Lydgate, 558, it is probable that he has not read into the Ashby manuscripts. Nevertheless, Ritson is an influential figure in Chaucerian criticism; even after 69 years Hazlitt, 1148, does little more than quote Ritson on Ashby, without acknowledgment.

Förster and Bateson largely agree editorially in their treatment of the Prisoner’s Reflections, and make only minor changes to the manuscript’s punctuation and capitalization. Each offers little in the way of notes to guide the reader. Förster justifies his conservative editorial approach with the observation—his words presage the modern examination of 15th-century Chaucerian metre—that little is known of 15th-century prosody, and what is known is too much influenced by Chaucer (1142: 140). Holthausen’s edition, 1144, is much more interventionist than those by Förster and Bateson. Few would now agree with his fearless approach to emending the text. Holthausen, 1153, briefly outlines his case for a more aggressive editorial policy. He lists amendments to just over 100 lines from Förster’s edition of the Prisoner’s Reflections. Most of these changes, with more besides, were kept in Holthausen’s 1921 text of the poem, 1144. Holthausen presents himself as an editor who alters his text on only a modest scale (1153: 319); in fact, in his text of 350 lines there are more than 30 omissions and 155 additions. It is Holthausen’s underlying premise that Ashby writes in a Chaucerian pentameter; the
irregularities found in the manuscripts are, therefore, the result of scribal carelessness and editorially correctable. Few would now agree with this view. A four-stress line is quite common in the Reflections manuscript. Pearsall, 1168, sees this line as a deliberate aspect of Ashby's metre and one that suggests a return from the artificial conventions of pentameter to a more indigenous, often alliterative, four-stress line. Otway-Ruthven, 1161, writing on the part played by the signet office in royal administration, provides a number of primary source references to Ashby's life and social context. A few more are found in Wedgwood, 1159. Ashby was clerk to Humphrey, Duke of Gloucester, then Clerk of the Signet to Henry VI from 1437, and, lastly, Clerk of the Signet to Margaret of Anjou from about 1446 (1161: 120). Otway-Ruthven provides a summary of some of Ashby's other services to the king (1161: 185). It seems to be at least possible that Ashby's imprisonment was caused by the deposition of Henry VI and Ashby's association with Lancastrian politics. Margaret of Anjou was active in the advancement of the careers of those working for her, and it was under her influence that Ashby became Steward of Warwick in 1446 (Griffiths 258). The appointment of household men to administrative posts outside the immediate court was a means of extending Lancastrian influence (Griffiths 784-5); this policy increases the likelihood that Ashby’s fall and that of the Lancastrians were connected.

Ferguson, 1165–66, argues that the Active Policy of a Prince, although it falls into the familiar mirror genre of the 15th century, heralds the Renaissance by the uniquely practical nature of its advice. Unlike earlier works based on the Secreta secretorum, Ashby offers a political analysis that goes beyond the usual focus on the character of the king. Saintsbury, in 1908, also comments on Ashby's shrewdness (1152). Pearsall, 1168, judges Ashby's observations to be more 'apt and perceptive' than Lydgate's. By contrast, at least with respect to Ashby's views on war, Adams, 1163, finds Ashby's advice 'well-worn,' lacking a true spirit of pacifism, and consistent with an outlook that belongs to the Middle
Ages rather than to the Renaissance. Bornstein, 1176, considers Ashby's advice both 'practical' and 'unmilitaristic.'

Bühler, 1155–8, and Kekewich, 1180, both address the issue of Ashby's sources; however, given Ashby's obvious tendency to borrow from other writers, there might be more research to be done here too, as Kekewich suggests. There is work to be done yet on Ashby's language and style. The studies by Bornstein, 1176, and Boffey, 1181, offer examples of the kind of thematic analysis that can be used to see Ashby with respect to the mainstream of Chaucerian poetry; and Lawton, 1179, shows how Ashby brings together different literary genres to address real world issues. As the Bateson edition is now more than a century old, there is a clear need for a new edition of Ashby's poems, with full notes and a detailed consideration of Ashby's metre, that takes into account the advances that have been made generally in the critical dialogue on the 15th-century English Chaucerians.

§

Thomas Norton

The most convenient discussion of the *Ordinal Of Alchemy* manuscripts and editions is that provided by Reidy, 1189. (See Schuler, 1231, for a supplement to Reidy's list of manuscripts.) Much of the following discussion is based on Reidy. The *Ordinal Of Alchemy* survives in 32 manuscripts. (Reidy knew of 31 and was unable to locate three; the manuscript supplementary to Reidy is provided by Schuler.) Reidy takes as his base texts London, BL, MS Add. 10302 (Latin preface; lines 1–2502 and 2623–82) and London, BL, MS Sloane 1873 (lines 2503–622 and 2683–3102) with variant readings drawn from five other manuscripts: Oxford, Bodleian Lib., MS E. Mus. 63 (S.C. 3652); Edinburgh, Univ. Lib., MS Laing III 164; London, BL, MS Royal 18 B.xxiv; and London, BL, MS Sloane 1198. Descriptions of the seven manuscripts and their relationship to each other are
provided in Reidy’s edition (1189: x–xxvi). Reidy also offers corrections to the lists by Brown-Robbins, 1219, and Robbins-Cutler, 1223.

Reidy supplies a full discussion of the printing history of the Ordinal of Alchemy (1189: xxvi–xxviii). Ashmole, 1185, publishes the first English edition of the Ordinal in 1652. The Ordinal alone is reprinted from Ashmole’s text in a facsimile edition by Holmyard, 1206, in 1928; and Ashmole’s work was reprinted entire in a facsimile edition with an introduction by Debus, 1225.

Norton was first published in Europe. A close Latin translation of the poem was published by Maier, 1183, in Tripus Aureus (Frankfurt, 1618). This version was then reprinted in the second edition of Jennis’s Musaeum Hermeticum, 1186, (Frankfurt, 1677–8), and in volume 2 of Manget’s two-volume Bibliotheca Chemica Curiosa, 1187, (Geneva, 1702). A facsimile edition of the second edition of Musaeum Hermeticum was printed with an introduction by Frick, 1226. Maier’s Latin was translated into German verse by Maisner, 1184, in Chymische Tractat Nortoni eines Engellanders, Credi Mihi seu Ordinale genandt (Frankfurt, 1625). Finally, the Musaeum Hermeticum was translated into English by Waite, 1188.

The printing history of the Ordinal Of Alchemy suggests that it has been valued more often as a technical work on alchemy than as a literary work. The literary praise of Haddon, 1191, in 1567, and of Ascham, 1192, in 1570, is interesting as it runs counter to Bale’s damning assessment of 1559, 1190 It is difficult to know, however, what weight should be given to any of these assessments of the Ordinal. Bale damns the Ordinal, not on the ground of literary taste, but because it deals with alchemy; and Ascham’s comments, although in a literary context, are made in passing when dealing with broader issues of English prosody. Of the three references, Haddon’s is the only one that seems to be informed, but we know nothing of the context in which Haddon writes his poem. The next
literary assessment is given by Hazlitt, 1201, in his 1871 edition of Warton’s *History of English Poetry*. Hazlitt finds the *Ordinal Of Alchemy* ‘totally void of every poetical elegance.’ Saintsbury, 1204, is typically critical of the poem’s irregular metre, and he is incredulous of Ascham’s praise. Holmyard’s approach, 1205, to the *Ordinal* is from the side of the history of chemistry; nevertheless, he responds positively to Norton’s comedy. Read, 1213, shares something of Holmyard’s sympathy.

The most significant events of 20th-century Norton criticism have been the result of empirical research. The importance of the work by Nierenstein and Chapman, 1216, regarding individuals called ‘Thomas Norton’ who were living in Bristol around the time of the composition of the *Ordinal* is only slightly diminished by its flawed conclusion. Their research assists Reidy’s subsequent demonstration, 1222, of Norton’s identity. (Holmyard, 1207–8, is the first to question the soundness of the Nierenstein and Chapman conclusions and to argue for the identification of Norton as Samuel Norton’s great-grandfather; but Reidy’s demonstration of Norton’s identity is more rigorous.) Reidy’s edition of the *Ordinal* remains the central document for any study of Norton’s life and work. The entry for Norton in the *Dictionary of National Biography* by Porter, 1203, is unreliable as it is based on a confusion between Norton and his uncle.

The concealed device within the *Ordinal* that reveals its author’s name as ‘Tomas Norton of Bryseto/ A Parfite Maister ye may hym trowe’ (taking the initial syllables of the preface and the following six chapters) is first discussed in print by Maier, 1183, in his edition of 1618. Samuel Norton, Thomas Norton’s great-grandson, writes his own alchemical poem in 1577, the centenary year of Thomas Norton’s work. Samuel writes of his great-grandfather’s ‘book’ on alchemy, and it appears clear enough that this refers to the *Ordinal*. As Reidy, 1222, points out, by Samuel’s time it seems to be well known that the author of
*Ordinal* was a man called ‘Thomas Norton’ as can be judged from the references in Bale, 1190, Haddon, 1191, and Ascham, 1192.

Thomas Norton was a sometimes fiery participant in local Bristol politics. The evidence for Thomas Norton’s involvement in Bristol affairs comes from E.W.W. Veale’s edition of *The Great Red Book of Bristol* (part 4). Norton was one of the king’s collectors of customs and subsidies for Bristol. He accused the mayor of Bristol, William Spencer, of treason, apparently on the ground that he was abetting the operation of smuggling through Bristol. Spencer made counter allegations that Norton was a well-known local trouble-maker and had plotted against his younger brother in the disposition of their late father’s property.

(Part 3 of the *Great Red Book of Bristol* describes some details associated with the will of Thomas Norton’s father that suggest his father indeed may not have trusted Norton to abide by the terms of the will.) The detail of the final resolution of the dispute is not known, but the story is summarized in *Adams’s Chronicle of Bristol* where it is claimed that the king came down on the side of the Mayor and ‘severely checked’ Norton (Fox 73). Reidy outlines the story in his introduction (1189: xlv–xlvi), and later makes the pithy observation that it would be informative to read a ‘corresponding account of the way of life of that more renowned customs officer, Geoffrey Chaucer, written by a group of wine importers’ (1189: xlix).

Harvey notes, r1189, in her review of Reidy’s edition that his work could have reproduced the illustrations in the manuscripts and early printed editions, and offered more discussion of them. The development and affiliations of the Norton manuscript and printed illustrations are likely to be productive areas for future research, especially given the extent of the manuscript. Norton’s lively style is often commented on, but there has been no analysis of its antecedents and influences, nor has the subsequent influence (if any) of the *Ordinal* been evaluated beyond a reference found in Hawthorne (Swann, 1234). What is
the place of the *Ordinal* in its English and European tradition? Norton was the only one of
the Chaucerians whose work circulated in Europe, but nothing has been published on its
reception there.

§

**Stephen Hawes**

None of Hawes's work survives in manuscript, with the exception of a few fragments. (See
Edwards (1366: 90–1) and Lerer, 1375\(^a\), 1376, regarding the presence of Hawes extracts in
the Wellys anthology). The year 1509 is remarkable in that it sees de Worde publish the
four Hawes poems in first editions: *Pastime of Pleasure, Conversion of Swearers, Example
of Virtue*, and *Joyful Meditation*. Edwards, 1364, (1366: 88–90), suggests, on the basis of
de Worde's printing and editing of Hawes's work, and of his publication of works by
Feylde, 1269, and Copeland, 1270, that de Worde may have been at the centre of a group of
Hawes's readers. Edwards's views on a relationship between de Worde and Hawes have
not been generally accepted (see, for example, Harvey, 1366\(^r\)) although Lerer, 1375\(^a\), 1376,
offers a supporting opinion. Notwithstanding the de Worde editions, evidence that
Hawes's work is widely read in the early 16th century, is not plentiful. There is a small
number of references across Feylde, 1269, Copeland, 1270, Skelton, 1268, and Barclay,
1267 (although the last is conjectural). Some knowledge of Hawes's work is shown by
William Nevill (Edwards, 1365, and Cornelius, 1314) and by William Walter (Edwards,
1367) and by the author of the *Interlude of Youth* (Lancashire, 1370). Later in the century,
Bale, 1287, shows no great knowledge about Hawes (Hudson, 1325). This is in spite of the
fact that, about the time Bale is writing, the *Pastime of Pleasure* is twice printed, by
Wayland, 1247, and by Tottle, 1248, and, a few years later, is drawn upon for the Inner
Temple revels, 1346. The surprising double printing in 1554–5 deserves some comment.
The Tottle and Wayland publication of Hawes's poem occurs many years after the previous
edition of 1517. Only four other editions of Hawes poetry are found after 1517 and before
1554: two of the *Example of Virtue* in 1520 and 1530, 1243, 1245, and two of the
Conversion of Swearers in 1530 and 1551, 1244, 1246. The double printing in 1554–5 of the Pastime of Pleasure parallels the dual publication of the Fall of Princes by Tottie and Wayland in 1555. Taken together, the publication of Lydgate’s Fall of Princes and Hawes’s Pastime of Pleasure twice each within a year is extraordinary. If the printers are politically astute in one instance, they may be so in another.

Hawes’s poem is impeccably Catholic, a product of the reign of Henry VII and pre-Reformation England. It is tempting to see the poem’s publication in a topical light, one specific to Mary, and to suggest that the printers intend their public to see a link between the fictional marriage of Graund Amour to La Bel Pucell and the actual marriage of Philip to Mary in 1554. The Pastime has a marriage theme: La Bel Pucell is a praiseworthy bride whose home is on a faraway, and hostile, island. Her suitor, Grand Amour, must overcome many obstacles in his quest, and he has to travel to his lady’s island home. The poem ends with a call to humanity to take heed of the state of its soul, and with a prayer to another Mary, Mary the Queen of Heaven. The superficial parallels between the fictional and actual marriage are strong, but Hawes’s text is also open to a more figurative reading. At a time when Mary is bringing England back to the Roman Church, the difficult courtship of Grand Amour and La Bel Pucell could be read as an expression of England’s troubled path to religious legitimacy. The carelessness of Tottie’s 1555 edition (Mead, 1260: xxxv) could suggest that Tottie is rushing in order to make the most of an opportunity already seized by Wayland. Printers eager to please, and living in perilous times, could hardly find a better text to print in 1554–5 than the Pastime of Pleasure.

In 1555, Wayland prints a description and celebration, in the form of a letter, of Philip’s arrival in England and subsequent marriage to Mary (Ames, 1275: 3: 525–6). Neville-Sington points to this letter and to other examples from the presses of the time in support of Mary and her marriage (1140: 603). Her citation of earlier publications by Pynson’s press in support of royal marriages shows that these marriages had inspired English printers since
the early 16th century (1140: 579). My suggestion is also not the first of this kind regarding the Pastime of Pleasure. Axton, 1346, argues that the courtship allegory, derived from Pastime of Pleasure, in the Inner Temple revels of 1561 is used with a contemporary eye on the courtship between Robert Dudley and Queen Elizabeth (see James for a related discussion). If Axton is right, the immediate inspiration for this adaptation may come from the Tottle and Wayland printings. If the Tottle and Wayland texts are intended as contemporary commentary, they rely on there being a reasonable knowledge at the time of, at least, the outline of Hawes’s work. In the light of the relative isolation of Hawes editions by this time, however, and the potential for a political motivation behind the publication, it would be dangerous, as it is in the parallel case for Lydgate and the Fall of Princes, to argue too strongly for a vibrant Hawes readership in the second half of the 16th century.

The first modern appraisals of Hawes are given by Warton in 1754, 1276, and in 1778, 1277. Unfortunately, Warton follows Bale’s ascription, 1271, of the Temple of Glass to Hawes, and so he perpetuates an error that is repeated by critics as recently as 1970; however, Warton’s praise of Hawes is broadly based and unambiguous. Warton sees Hawes as one of the few writers of real talent since Chaucer; and he is the first critic to place Hawes as a precursor to Spenser (1276). The parts of Hawes’s work that appeal to Warton are his inventive and allegoric aspects, and the relative smoothness of his verse. Warton is prepared to be bold in advocating Hawes’s case for attention. Percy, 1278, a regular correspondent with Warton, seems to be sympathetic to Warton’s views, and includes Hawes in his Reliques of Ancient English Poetry, 1279. But Warton’s attempt to make space for Hawes in a vernacular canon is not successful.

Ellis, 1280, Campbell, 1283, Craik, 1286, Lounsbury, 1291, and Minto, 1287, are among of a line of 19th-century detractors. The iconoclastic Collins, 1253, is more sympathetic, and makes a stronger attempt to give a balanced appraisal of Hawes’s merits than most critics of the time. Barrett Browning, 1285, is among the strongest of Hawes’s supporters. In the
20th century, Hawes criticism tends to be thematically linked by the idea of Hawes as a transition figure who reworks his medieval models, along the lines articulated by Pearsall, 1266, 1341–2. This theme is seen in several strands of the modern criticism concerning the relationship of Hawes’s work to that of Spenser, the education topos in Hawes, bibliographic issues, and the movement from a medieval to renaissance concept of art.

Warton, 1276, enthusiastically sees Hawes as an artistic precursor to Spenser, but no commentator since has fully shared his view. Modern criticism, when it enters the area of Hawes’s relation to Spenser, tends to ask whether Hawes’s influence can be specifically seen in Spenser’s work. In general, the answer has been that Hawes’s influence is general rather than specific: Hawes’s poetry is seen as the first of a new type which leads, in a general way, to Spenser. Something of this view is put by King, 1361, Pearsall, 1266, and Edwards (1306: 94). But dissenting voices have been heard. Cullen, 1355, sees broad similarities between the Example of Virtue and Pastime of Pleasure, on the one hand, and Spenser’s Legend of Holiness. He also sees a strong likeness in terms of ‘general outline’ between the combined elements of the Example of Virtue and Pastime of Pleasure and the first book of the Faerie Queene. Kaske, 1381, argues the Example of Virtue is indeed a strong candidate as an influence on the Faerie Queene.

The principal commentators in recent years on the issues associated with the printing and circulation of Hawes’s work are Edwards, 1363–8, and Lerer, 1375*, 1376. These critics see an active relationship between the poet and his printer in which the works of the poet are marketed by an advocate printer who is actively engaged in the presentation of the text through the use of appropriate woodcuts. Mukai, 1382, comments on what he sees as the editorial role played by de Worde in his 1530 edition of the Example of Virtue.

A number of critics have addressed Hawes’s treatment of education and the skills needed for the modern Tudor world. Ferguson, 1337, argues that Hawes’s stress on education and
his transitional view of chivalry are an indication of bourgeois practicality that looks to advancement in the new world of the Renaissance. Ferguson does not argue that Hawes is a humanist; instead, he sees Hawes as having access to the ‘raw materials of humanism’ (1337: 210). Hawes’s bourgeois practicality is considered by Stroud, 1358, as part of the evolution of chivalric values. Spearing remarks that Hawes’s favouring of the active over the contemplative life, and the loss of the division between clerk and knight in the schemata he presents, is a step towards the Renaissance (1377: 253–4). Copeland, 1383, moves in a different direction when she asserts that the references to rhetoric in Hawes and Lydgate stress a poetic rather than a civic function. Colin Burrow sees Hawes himself as a victim of the royal policies of the emerging world, 1388.

The debate on Hawes’s concept of education is a subset of that about Hawes’s renaissance credentials. Pearsall, speaking generally of innovation in Hawes, probably expresses a widely held view when he says that he finds in Hawes new ideas, poorly thought through (1342: 267). Howell, 1333, argues that the Pastime of Pleasure should be regarded as the first printed disposition in English of Cicero’s five parts of rhetoric. Lerer, in a more general discussion, also argues for the impact of Ciceronian rhetoric on Hawes’s work. Lerer links this to the difference found in the uses of aureation by Hawes, who sees aureation as a device by which to gain immortality for his work and name, and by Lydgate, who seeks to use beautiful language to change the world (1374). Ebin, 1380, sees a transition at work during the period from a concept of the poet as an ‘enluminer’ to one of ‘vates’: Lydgate is an ‘enluminer’; Hawes moves towards being a ‘vates.’ Howell sees Geoffrey of Vinsauf’s Poetria Nova as the likely inspiration for Hawes’s adaptation of the Ciceronian material. But other critics have debated Hawes’s knowledge of humanist texts. Coogan, 1347, suggests that Hawes may have had some familiarity with Petrarch’s Trionfi; however, Carnicelli, 1349, argues that such influence is likely to be only at second hand through some visual representations of the Trionfi.
The 20th century did not bring the period of critical growth for Hawes that it brought for Hoccleve and Lydgate. Hawes criticism failed to find a clear focus. Of the modern critics, Edwards has published most widely on Hawes, but there has been little vigorous debate about the poet. Editorial work remains to be done. The 1928 edition of the *Pastime of Pleasure*, 1260, was simply a reissue of the de Worde edition that met with mixed reviews, and the reviews of the 1974 edition of Hawes's minor poems, 1263, suggest that there is also space for a further edition of them as well.

§
Works Cited in the Introduction and not Annotated in the Main Bibliography.


§
Hoccleve: Editions

Thomas Hoccleve (c.1367–1426)

Editions


Prints *LC, To the Kynges most Noble Grace, and To the Knights of the Garter* among Chaucer’s works. These poems appear in all Chaucer editions (here only selectively annotated), according to Burrow (226: 54), up to and including John Urry’s of 1721. Speght’s 1598 edition of Chaucer’s *Works,* 2, acknowledges Hoccleve’s authorship of *LC.* Skeat, 96, reclaims *To the Kynges most Noble Grace and To the Knights of the Garter* (as one poem) for Hoccleve in 1888. See Skeat (100: 160–1) and Hammond (120: 434–6) regarding these works and the Chaucer canon.


Includes the three poems by Hoccleve printed by Thynne, 1, in 1532, but *LC* is acknowledged as Hoccleve’s. The *Life of Chaucer* (pages unnumbered) includes citations from Hoccleve’s praise of Chaucer in *RP,* and also refers to Hoccleve’s Chaucer portrait.

Hoccleve: Editions

[Incorporates an adaptation of Jonathas with modern spelling into the first eclogue of the Shepherd's Pipe. As in Hoccleve, the tale is told at the urging of a friend, although it is not presented as a moral exemplum and the concluding prose moralization is omitted. At the end of the tale Browne comments on the author (196–8).] Hoccleve does not draw his inspiration from city life, but from the fields and meadows. His style may lack sophistication, but its sense is sound. Browne acknowledges that this is the first printing of Hoccleve's poem and hints at more to come, if the public wishes, as he has all of Hoccleve's works at hand (198). In spite of the fact that he owned Durham, Univ. Lib., MS Cosin V.iii.9 and Oxford, Bodleian Lib., MS Ashmole 40, Browne publishes no more of Hoccleve's poetry. Edwards, 237, notes that Ashmole 40 shows evidence of Browne's systematic preparation of the text for publication. See Hazlitt's introduction to his edition of Browne, 86.


A modern translation of LC with an introductory verse and preface by Sewell. The strength of the poem is its trueness to nature and balanced presentation (a–a'). Some editors have claimed the poem for Hoccleve, but it is much more likely, on the evidence of Leland's attribution, 57, and some features of style and content, to be Chaucer's work (a'). [This annotation is based on Fenster's reprint (51: 219–37); see Spurgeon where she also annotates Sewell's work and provides details of a reprint in 1720 (127: 1: 347–8, 350–2).]


Prints lines 1958–1972 on the death of Chaucer from RP (31). After Chaucer's death civil disorder brought 'Ignorance' and 'Dulness'; writers were still at work, but 'Tast, Judgment, and Manner were lost' (xi). Cooper has been unable to examine a copy of RP and so
cannot assess Hoccleve’s merit: Hoccleve is ‘highly applauded’ by some and ignored by other critics. Hoccleve preserved the Chaucer portrait for us, and his remarks about Chaucer show tenderness and pathos.


Prints from the Askew MS [later Phillipps 8151, now San Marino, Huntington Lib., MS HM 111]: *LMR; Balade and Song to Somer; Balade to Somer; Balade to King Henry V; Balade to Maister Carpenter; Balade to my gracious Lord of York.* The editor at the auction of Dr Askew’s manuscripts purchased the manuscript on which the edition is based in 1785. Little is known about Hoccleve’s life, and even some of that claimed as known is not consistent with the evidence of the poems (1). Mason’s preface surveys the opinions of Bale, 58, Pits, 64, Tanner, 66, Warton, 67, and Browne, 3. The unsupported assertions made by Pits and Warton should be treated sceptically (2–3). Bale is wrong to say that Hoccleve was a follower of Wyclif (4). The chief reason for the publication of the poems is their interesting autobiographical detail (4–5). Hoccleve’s ‘poetical merit ... has been variously estimated by those that have treated of it’ (6). Warton’s pejorative view of Hoccleve is based on bias and a slender acquaintance with the poet’s work (6–9). [The preface then discusses: ‘Contents of the MS’ (10–17); ‘Language’ (17–22); ‘Glossary’ (22–4); ‘Orthography’ (24); and ‘Versification’ (25–26). The text is printed with footnotes (27–81), and is followed by a glossary (85–113).] It is Hoccleve’s practice not to use final -e at the end of a word if this is necessary to help the syllable count of a line (38). [See Jefferson, 320, and Burrow, 47, for a modern discussion of Hoccleve’s care with his syllable count. Ritson describes the poems selected by Mason for publication as being ‘six of peculiar stupidity’ (69: 63). Watts sees Mason’s efforts to resuscitate Hoccleve’s work as ‘impotent,’ although he concedes the value of the glossary (72: 501). Ellis sees the Mason edition as proof that Hoccleve is a poor poet (68: 262). D’Israeli, 74, and Hazlitt,
are critical of Mason’s chosen selection for publication, but they are not especially dismissive of Hoccleve as a poet. Lounsbury finds the poems published by Mason to be among Hoccleve’s best, although this judgment is based on a low estimation of Hoccleve (104: 24–5).

7. **Leyden, J., ed.** *The Complaynt of Scotland.* Edinburgh, 1801.

Leyden’s introduction includes, under the title *Orisoune to the Haly Virgin* with an ascription to Chaucer, the first printing of *MG* (87–92). *MG* is not in a Chaucer edition until Bell’s in 1855, 8. Koch, 91–2, subsequently excludes *MG* from the Chaucer canon and assigns it to Hoccleve; see also Ross, 103, for further discussion of the debate.


Not sighted. Vol. 1 prints *MG* as Chaucer’s, its first printing in a Chaucer edition; see Leyden, 7, for the first printing of *MG*. Koch, 91–2, subsequently excludes *MG* from the Chaucer canon and assigns it to Hoccleve; see also Ross, 103, for further discussion.


Prints *MG* as a poem to be included in the Chaucer canon. For the eventual assignment of *MG* to Hoccleve, see Koch, 91–2, and Ross, 103.

The first printed edition of *RP*. The preface (v–xv) refers to Hoccleve’s life and works based mainly on the information found in his poems. The edition is taken from London, BL, MS Royal 17 D.vi with reference to ‘some other copies’ (xv). The text (1–196) is followed by brief notes (197–9).


Prints lines 400–511 on the excesses of contemporary costume from the *RP* text in Oxford, Bodleian Lib., MS Laud Misc. 735 (105–8).


Prints *MG*, in a parallel-text format, from Oxford, Bodleian Lib., MS Arch. Selden B.24, Edinburgh, National Lib. of Scotland, MS Advocates 18.2.8, and San Marino, Huntington Lib., MS HM 111 [formerly Phillipps MS 8151] (137–44). Furnivall attributes *MG* to Chaucer, and he dismisses any possibility that ‘poor Hoccleve’ could be its author (137). [Furnivall subsequently retracts this position, see Furnivall (13: xxxix–xl), Koch, 91, and Ross, 103.] The Latin prayer, *O intermerata et in aeternum benedicta*, Hoccleve’s source for the end of *MG*, is also printed (138). See Stokes, 361, for further discussion of Hoccleve’s adaptation of this prayer.

Prints the poems from Phillipps MS 8151 [now San Marino, Huntington Lib., MS HM 111] and Durham, Univ. Lib., MS Cosin V.iii.9 (using John Stow’s transcription for the Complaint and the portion of the Dialogue missing from the Durham manuscript), and LC from Oxford, Bodleian Lib. MS Fairfax 16, with glosses on the page (1–242). [See Gollancz, 26, who prints LC from the holograph manuscript San Marino, Huntington Lib., MS HM 744, formerly Ashburnham MS 133.] These represent all of Hoccleve’s surviving poems with the exception of RP and those listed by Gollancz, 26, in his edition. The Mitchell and Doyle revisions correct a number of errors in Furnivall’s introduction and text, and bring references to the critical dialogue and to Hoccleve’s known life-records up-to-date. Mitchell and Doyle explain their editorial policy in dealing with Furnivall’s text in a note facing page 1; Mitchell also discusses the revision process in a 1983 article, 205. Furnivall’s foreword covers: ‘Hoccleve’s Life and Dated Poems’ (vii–xxx); ‘His Love of Chaucer’ (xxx–xxxiv); ‘His Patrons, Associates, and Character’ (xxxiv–xxxix); ‘Comments on Some of His Poems, His Language and His Metre’ (xxxix–xlvi); and ‘Text-copying, and Thanks to Helpers’ (xlvi–lxix). ‘Addenda and Corrigenda to the Forewords’ are inserted by Doyle and Mitchell (lxix–l). An appendix by R.E.G. Kirk lists ‘Entries About Grants and Payments to Hoccleve, from the Privy-Council, Proceedings, the Patent- and Issue-Rolls, and the Record Office’ (li–lxx). Doyle and Mitchell supplement this in ‘Additions to Furnivall’s Appendix of Hoccleve Documents’ (lxxi–lxxii) and offer some further notes and corrections to the text (lxxiii–iv). Furnivall supplies extracts from Christine de Pizan’s Epistre au Dieu d’Amours (243–48). The Ashburnham and Shirley manuscripts [now San Marino, Huntington Lib., MS HM 744 and Cambridge, Trinity College, MS R.3.20] are collated (249–53); there is also collation for TJW from London, BL, MS Royal 17 D.vi (255–8). Furnivall provides a ‘Glossarial Index’ (259–66), and an
‘Index of Names of Persons and Places’ (267–70). The dedication at the end of Hoccleve’s *Complaint*, from Durham, Univ. Lib., MS Cosin V.III.9 is reproduced (facing 242), as is the Chaucer illustration from London, BL, Harley MS 4866 (xxxiii) and stanzas 10 through 12 from *LD* in the Asburnham MS (facing xxviii). Hoccleve’s ‘chief merit ... is that he was the honourer and pupil of Chaucer’ (xxx). *MG* is the best of Hoccleve’s non-autobiographical poems (xxxix–xl). The source of *LD* is not known (xlv). [See Kurtz, 140, for the source of *LD*.] ‘Hoccleve’s metre is poor. So long as he can count ten syllables by his fingers, he is content’; he ‘constantly’ stresses words which do not normally carry stress (xlii). The Phillipps, Durham, and Ashburnham manuscripts cannot be Hoccleve holographs because of the number of errors that they contain (xlix). Later criticism overturns this view; see Schulz, 166.


Prints from London, BL, MS Egerton 615: *The Epistle of Grace Dieu to the Sick Man; The Charter of Pardon (By Christ); The Pilgrims’ Song (in Honour of the Trinity and the Virgin); The Song of the Angels (with the Pilgrims outside Heaven); The Song of the Angels (inside Heaven); Honour to Jesus (Song of Angels with a Pilgrim); A Lamentation of the Green Tree (the Virgin) Complaining of Losing Her Apple (Jesus); The Recording of Angels’ Song of the Nativity of Our Lady; The Angels’ Song (in Honour of the Virgin Mary); The Angels’ Song in the Feast of the Epiphany of Our Lord; The Angels’ Song on Easter Day; The Song of Graces of All Saints on Easter Day; The Song of Angels and All Other Saints on the Feast of Pentecost; and The Piteous Complaint of the Soul*; and, from London, BL, MS Harley 4866, *RP*. Furnivall outlines some of Hoccleve’s references to his
circumstances and to contemporary ‘political and social questions’ (x–xiii), and he notes the value of these as social history (xiii–xiv). He briefly discusses Hoccleve’s sources (xv–xvii). Furnivall uses London, BL, MS Harley 4866, instead of the manuscript chosen by Wright, 10, London, BL, MS Royal 17 D.vi, because it has the ‘best portrait of Chaucer, and fewer superfluous final es, and some older readings’ (xvii). The minor poems (xxiii–lxii), printed with a glossary (lxiii), are from the prose translation of Guillaume de Deguileville’s *Pelerinage de l’Ame*. Furnivall attributes these to Hoccleve is on the basis of style, spelling, and the occurrence of thwarted stress (xx–xxii). [MacCracken, 123, disagrees in all but one instance. For more recent debate see Seymour (48: xiv), Doyle (217: 16), Burrow (226: 24), and McGerr (338*: xxvi–xxvii).] Hare, 697, claims the prose *Pelerinage* is Lydgate’s, an attribution that is rejected by Schick (442: ci–ciii).] The text of *RP* follows (1–197) with a glossary (199–216). Notes are on the page.


Prints extracts from *RP*, ‘Lament for Chaucer’ and ‘Story of John of Canace,’ (13–22). Skeat takes his text from London, BL, MS 17 D.vi with limited corrections on the basis of London, BL, MS Arundel 38. He includes a brief introduction (13), notes (370–2), and a glossary (477–536).


Prints *LC*, based on Oxford, Bodleian Lib., MS Fairfax 16 (217–32); and *To the Kinges Most Noble Grace* and *To the Lordes and Knightes of the Garter*, based on Phillipps MS
8151 [now San Marino, Huntington Lib., MS HM 111] (233–5). Skeat provides notes to these pieces (499–502) and considers them briefly in his introduction (xl–xlii). A glossary is at the end of the volume (555–603). LC is a ‘defence of women, such as a woman might well make’ (xli). See also Skeat, 99, for further brief reference to Hoccleve.


Ch. 5 prints Poem and Roundel to Somer, and LMR, minus lines 137–160 (56–64). Spelling and punctuation are modernized. Morley provides notes and glosses at the foot of each page. Brief biographical sketches concentrate on Hoccleve’s uncertain income from government employment. RP has an ‘ingenious introduction, written avowedly for presentation to Henry V, as a way of commending to royal attention his own hard case’ (56).


Arnold provides an introduction (124–6) and then prints lines 1958–81, 2073–93, and 2101–7 from RP as examples of Hoccleve’s regard for Chaucer (127–8). The prologue to RP is ‘considerably more interesting than the work itself’ (124).


Richard James (b. 1592–d. 1638) was librarian to Robert Cotton. Grosart’s edition includes the text of James’s transcription (Oxford, Bodleian Lib., MS James 34) of ASJO (139–160). The transcription dates to about 1625 and was apparently intended for
publication. James copies from the same manuscript, San Marino, Huntington Lib., MS HM 111, which Mason, 6, uses for his edition of Hoccleve selections (Ixxii). Mason chose not to print ASJO, and so Grosart's edition is the first printed version of the poem. James's accompanying 'Observations Upon Hoccleve' (161–88) is a religious commentary on ASJO in defence of Oldcastle. Grosart remarks that ASJO has 'no special merit, nothing of genius,' yet it is of interest for the insight it provides into the historical figure behind Shakespeare's Falstaff (Ixxii).


Prints a text edited from Phillipps MS 8151 [now San Marino, Huntington Lib., MS HM 111] (23–37) with an introduction (9–23) and notes (38–42). [Previously this poem had been available only in the Grosart, 19, edition.] Hoccleve is a 'conservative ... and a warm adherent of the old Roman faith' (9). The manuscript contains a number of occasional pieces by Hoccleve, and might be the result of a conscious effort by the poet, or one of his associates, to gather together and preserve some scattered verses (10). See Burrow (226: 31) for a related discussion and further cross-references. Smith considers the career and history of Sir John Oldcastle (10–15). She offers a brief biography of Hoccleve, based on his autobiographical poetry, from which he emerges as a 'lovable character' (16). Hoccleve had been labelled a heretic by Walsingham, 53, but a 'greater mistake was never made by chronicler' (19). [Furnivall notes three transcription errors in Smith's edition (13: xliii).]

Prints extracts of *ASJO*, with interlinking prose summaries for the omitted sections, from London, BL, Add. 33785 (476–84). The manuscript (formerly London, BL, MS Grenville 35) is one of the two transcriptions taken by Richard James of San Marino, Huntington Lib., MS HM 111. [See Grosart, 19, who prints from the other James transcription.] The poem is long and heavy, and resembles a ‘metrical, theological treatise’; nevertheless, ‘parts ... are not wanting in spirit’ (476).


Prints brief extracts from *RP* (27, 29). Hoccleve is worse than Lydgate is and more ‘fossiliferous.’ Most of *RP* is ‘feeble and devoid of fancy,’ but its prologue is of some interest (xxix). The best that can be said for Hoccleve and Lydgate is that they continue the ‘linguistic improvements begun by Chaucer and Gower’ (xxx).


[Not sighted in the 1882 edition where *LC* had been printed from John Urry’s Chaucer edition of 1721.] Prints *LC* (14–31), now revised with reference to Skeat, 16 (iv). There are no notes or glosses; spelling and punctuation have been modernized. The ‘literary historians’ looking at the 15th century fix their attention on court poetry, the ‘weakest feature’ of the period, and they make the ‘case of Hoccleve and Lydgate more pitiful than it need be by cruelly comparing them with Chaucer’ (ix). Hoccleve and Lydgate took from Chaucer all the ‘machinery ... they could carry,’ but were ‘sadly confused’ by the loss of final -e in pronunciation. They tried to use ‘magniloquence’ to cover the failings of their
poetry (xi). When Hoccleve forgets the demands of court poetry, and writes of his youth, his work moves to ‘unwonted vivacity’ (xii). For more of Pollard’s views, see Pollard, 117.


Prints Hoccleve’s tribute to Chaucer from *RP* in modernized English (80–3).


The first printed text of Hoccleve’s poems on *Lady Money* from the Ashburnham manuscript, now San Marino, Huntington Lib., MS HM 744. See Gollancz, 26, for his edition of this manuscript.


Prints *Inuocacio ad patrem; ad filium, Honor et gloria; Ad spiritum sanctum; Ad beatum virginem; Item de beata virgine; Item de beata virgine; The Story of the Monk Who Clad the Virgin by Singing Ave Maria; LC; Balad to King Henry V; and Three Roundels*. The edition is based on the Ashburnham manuscript [now San Marino, Huntington Lib., MS HM 744] which is the best *LC* manuscript [Furnivall, 13, prints *LC* from an inferior text]; the manuscript is also ‘a beautiful specimen of early fifteenth-century writing’ (v). A brief
glossary is at the end of the volume; there are no critical notes, but glosses next to the text provide a modern English summary. Most of Mitchell and Doyle's editorial inventions are made in dealing with Furnivall's material for vol. 1, 13. See Mitchell, 205, for further discussion of the revision process.

-----Review by Kemp Malone, *Modern Language Notes* 42 (1927): 59. Gollancz is to be congratulated on his work: 'Everybody who reads it will particularly enjoy Hoccleve's humorous “Praise of his Lady.”'


A parallel printing of the text of Hoccleve's *The Monk and the Blessed Virgin's Sleeves* (12-21) from Oxford, Christ Church, MS 152 and Ashburnham MS 133 [now San Marino, Huntington Lib., MS HM 744], accompanied by Lydgate's poem, *The Grateful Dead*, as an appendix (22), with a brief glossary (23). Judging from the errors that they contain neither manuscript of Hoccleve's poem is likely to be an autograph. The legend of the Virgin here presented is not known elsewhere in quite this form (viii). Beatty discusses the common elements of the various versions of the legend (ix–x). The two stanzas at the beginning of the Christ Church manuscript that link the poem to Chaucer's *CT* are not by Hoccleve (xi). Chaucer, Hoccleve, and Lydgate favour the poem's stanza form; but Hoccleve's skill in it ranges from 'pedestrian' to 'very bad indeed' (x). See Boyd, 187, for a more up-to-date discussion, which includes reference to the third manuscript of the tale, Cambridge, Trinity College, MS R.3.21, and some views on the autograph status of Huntington HM 744; on this last point see also Schulz, 166.

Prints lines 1961-74, 2077–2107, 4978–4998 from *RP, On Chaucer* (47); and lines 137–76 from *ASJO* (47–8). Hoccleve and Lydgate are of 'historical interest only' (xxi), and neither shows any real understanding of Chaucer’s work (xxi–ii). Rapidly changing pronunciation, especially of final -e, led them to misunderstand Chaucer’s versification (xxii).


Prints lines 421–539 from *RP, Extravagance in Men’s Dress;* lines 281–329 from *RP, Badby’s Heresy;* lines 5090–194 from *RP, Women’s Superiority;* lines 1863–69, 1954–81, 2073–107, and 4978–5012 from *RP, Tributes to Chaucer and Gower* (199–204); *Roundel to Somer the Chancellor* (204); *Balade to My Gracious Lord Of York* (204); *Complaint* (205–6); and lines 121–208 from *LMR,* (206–7). Neilson includes a brief biography and bibliography (430). Hoccleve’s major poems are *LC, LMR, RP,* the *Complaint,* and the *Dialogue.* Hoccleve’s poetry lacks musicality and tends to be ‘mechanical.’ Some of his shorter poems, however, can show ‘spirit, and something like virtuosity.’ The text comes from Furnivall, 13–14 (430).


Prints: *LMR; To Somer; To Carpenter; Three Roundels;* lines 498–826 from *Dialogue;* lines 1954–81, 2073–107, 4978–98 from *RP, In Praise of Chaucer;* and *To Bedford* (60–76). Original manuscript readings are used; punctuation is not modernized. Introductory
sections cover: Hoccleve’s ‘Life and Work’ (53–6); ‘Select Reference List and Bibliography’ (57–60); and notes to the poems (402–9). A glossary is at the end of the volume (553–91). Hoccleve’s autobiographical touches and technical command of dialogue are of interest. His poetry has less of the ‘trappings of convention’ so often found in Lydgate, and it is ‘always livelier and simpler’ (54). He does not reach the occasional heights of Lydgate, nor does he descend to the same depths. Lydgate’s work shows more evidence of Chaucer’s metre than does Hoccleve’s; Hoccleve fails to progress beyond having the correct number of syllables. Similarly, there are more verbal echoes of Chaucer in Lydgate than in Hoccleve. Hoccleve’s command of language, however, especially his use of dialogue in verse, is superior to Lydgate’s. Of the two writers, Lydgate has the better imagination and feel for nature (55–56). The original popularity of RP may have been because of its general subject matter and not because of the quality of Hoccleve’s writing. Hoccleve is ‘very little of a writer, but a good deal of a man’ (56).


Prints lines 421–511 and 533–39 from RP, Fine Feathers (50–3). The text comes from Furnivall, 14. There is limited modernization of spelling and typography; difficult words are glossed at the foot of the page.


Folios 269–274v of the Bannatyne Manuscript, now Edinburgh, National Lib. of Scotland, MS Advocates 1.1.6, provide a text of LC (49–64).
33. **Patterson, Richard Ferrar, ed.** *Six Centuries of English Literature.* Vol 1.
   London: Blackie, 1933. 6 vols.

Prints *Balade to my Lord the Chancellor* (70); and lines 2017–107 and 4978–5019 from *RP* (70–4); with a brief biographical introduction (69–70). The frontispiece reproduces the Chaucer illustration from London, BL, MS Harley 4866. Hoccleve is a 'very mediocre writer, with no poetical gifts, no sense of humour, and no control over his metre' (69).


35. **Robbins, Rossell Hope, ed.** *Secular Lyrics of the XIVth and XVth Centuries.*

Prints *A Dedication for a de regimine principum* from San Marino, Huntington Lib., MS HM 111 (item 98); *An Indigent Author* [*Balade to my Lord the Chancellor*] from San Marino, Huntington Lib., MS HM 111 (item 106); *Praise of His Lady* from San Marino, Huntington Lib., MS HM 744 (item 210). Robbins includes a glossary (291–326).

Prints Richard II Interred in Westminster (1413) from San Marino, Huntington Lib., MS HM 111 (item 40). A glossary is provided for the volume (392–437).


Prints extracts from RP dealing with Chaucer, Hoccleve’s personal circumstances, and contemporary fashion (498–500).


Prints A description of his Ugly Lady based on San Marino, Huntington Lib., MS HM 744, (165). ‘Crude and shocking, this is an exceptional poem among the chiefly didactic poems of Hoccleve’ (337).


Prints The Monk and Our Lady’s Sleeves based on San Marino, Huntington Lib., MS HM 744 (50–5). The notes to the poem summarize its manuscript history and sources (119–22). Of the three surviving manuscripts, HM 744 is preferred as it is a holograph, but Oxford, Christ Church College, MS 152 offers the best text of a revised version of the poem (120).

An edition of London, BL, Add. MS 24,062, otherwise known as Hoccleve's Formulary. The introduction discusses the characteristics of the Formulary and the functions of the privy seal office (i–xxxvi). The Formulary was composed through the years 1423–25 to provide the clerks of the privy seal with examples, nearly all in French but with some in Latin, of the various documents that they might need to prepare (viii). It is possible that the Formulary was 'obsolete almost as soon as it was written' because by 1450 most privy seal documents were written in English (xxv–xvi). With a few exceptions the manuscript has been written in Hoccleve's own hand (v–vi).


An edition based on Durham, Univ. Lib., Cosin V.iii.9 and Stow's transcription for the Complaint and beginning of the Dialogue which have been lost from the Durham manuscript. Collations are given for some of LD from Huntington Lib., MS HM 744. An introduction to the text covers the need for a new edition (1–4), Hoccleve's life records and the autobiographical content of the poems (5–29), his poetic range and relationship to Chaucer (30–54), the manuscript and literary patronage (55–70), and a critical discussion of the poems (71–114). There is also a manuscript description and analysis of scribal abbreviations and punctuation (115–44) and a discussion of Hoccleve's metre (145–63). The text (164–392) is followed by the explanatory notes (393–402), glossary, and bibliography (403–25). The editor preserves scribal punctuation and avoids emendations based on metrical theory (3).

Prints lines 1–14, 78–91, and 99–112 from RP, Anxious Thought; and lines 1961–81 from RP, Lament for Chaucer and Gower. Texts are based on London, BL, MS Royal 17 D. vi and MS Harley 4866 respectively.


Prints lines 145–84 from LMR (37–8). Punctuation is editorial and obsolete letters are replaced. Tydeman provides two notes on Hoccleve’s life and poetry together with notes on the text (169–71) and a glossary (270–9). Hoccleve dies in 1450 (169). [See Brown, 239, for the more likely date of 1426.] Hoccleve is ‘possibly the most seriously underrated poet’ in the anthology (169). The very best of his poetry is ‘personal.’ RP is a ‘vigorous performance’ in which the personalities of Hoccleve and the beggar are balanced against each other. Hoccleve’s character is ‘individual and intriguing’ and matches a style modelled on ‘genuine speech.’ One is left with the ‘impression of a relaxed and accomplished creator working unobtrusively within his accepted limits’ (170).


Prints lines 4978–5019 from RP (509–10).


Prints twelve lyrics (106–118) from Melbourne, Victoria State Lib., MS *096/G94. This manuscript of ‘anonymous English prose adaptations’ of Guillaume de Deguileville’s Pelerinage de Vie Humaine and Pelerinage de l’Ame contains 24 ME poems. Of these
poems, three lyrics, which are ascribed to Hoccleve by Furnivall (14: xx ff) contain unique additional stanzas not found elsewhere. A further nine lyrics are only found in this manuscript of the Pilgrimage poems. The nine lyrics, and additional stanzas in the three other lyrics, may be in ‘Hoccleve’s style’ (105).


A brief biographical and critical discussion (265–6) is followed by lines 1–308 of the Complaint based on Durham, Univ. Lib., MS Cosin V.iii.9 (266–80). Vocabulary and notes are on the page. Hoccleve’s autobiographical references are likely to be factual (266).


Prints the Complaint and Dialogue (1–72). The text is based on that of the holograph Durham, Univ. Lib., MS Cosin V.iii.9, except for the Complaint and lines 1–252 of the Dialogue which are missing from that manuscript. The missing lines are restored from Oxford, Bodleian Lib., MS Selden Supra 53 (this offers a much better text than the Stow transcript that is used by Furnivall, 13, and Pryor, 41), from the four other manuscript sources (Oxford, Bodleian Library, MSS Bodley 221, and Laud misc. 735; Coventry, City Records Office, MS Acc. 325/1, and New Haven, Yale Univ., Beinecke Lib., MS 493), and from our knowledge of Hoccleve’s language, orthography, and metre derived from Cosin V.iii.9 and San Marino, Huntington Lib., MSS HM 111 and 744 (ix–x). The portions of restored text are printed facing the corresponding sections of Selden Supra 53. The
substantive variants for the five non-holograph copies of the *Dialogue* are fully collated (xvii). The introduction (ix–lxx) includes sections dealing with ‘Manuscripts’ (x–xvii), ‘Text and Metre: The Holograph Section’ (xvii–xxxv), ‘Text and Metre: The Non-Holograph Section’ (xxxv–l), ‘Language: Orthography, Morphology, Punctuation’ (l–lv), ‘The Making of the Series’ (lv–lxiii), ‘Treatment of the Texts’ (lxiii–lxv), and ‘Bibliography’ (lxvi–lx). ‘Notes’ (73–109) are followed by three ‘Excursuses’: ‘The Two Holographs of *Learn to Die*’ [a discussion of the variants found in the two holograph versions of *LD*] (111–18); ‘*Tractatus Deflentis Hominis et Amonentis Racionis*’ (119); and ‘Falsing of Coin, *Dialogue* 99–196’ (120–24). A glossary is provided (125–40). Much of Burrow’s introductory material establishes the groundwork for the reconstruction of the lost holograph where the portions of Cosin V.iii.9 that have not survived. The frontispiece offers photographic reproductions of folios 76v and 22r from Selden Supra 53 and Cosin V.iii.9 respectively. It is clearly the case that the Cosin V.iii.9 holograph was not the manuscript source for the five scribal manuscripts; the scribal copies are likely to descend from the same holograph manuscript, now lost, designated as VO. The edition aims to reconstruct VO for the missing sections from the Cosin V.iii.9; it does not appear that Cosin V.iii.9 and VO differed greatly (xviii–xix). There is a ‘close relationship’ between Bodley 221, Laud misc. 735, and Beinecke 493 (xxiii). The common source for the five non-holograph manuscripts is probably a lost scribal copy of VO (xxv). Burrow discusses the characteristics of Hoccleve’s extremely regular metre that are relevant to the editing process (xxviii–xxxv).


Prints *The Complaint of the Virgin; MG; LMR; Balade to Master John Carpenter, Balades to Sir Henry Somer; Three Roundels [Lady Money];* lines 1–122, 967–1022, 1863–2107, 4180–4354, and 4859–5019 from *RP; Two Balades to King Henry V, Balade to Edward,*
Duke of York; Balades to John, Duke of Bedford; More Balades to King Henry V; ASJO; Complaint; lines 526–623, 659–714 from Dialogue; and Jonathas. Seymour provides an ‘Introduction’ (xi–xxxiii); ‘Reference Works’ (xxxiv); ‘A Note on the Texts’ (xxxv–vi); ‘Commentary’ (103–41) and ‘Select Glossary’ (142–51). Oxford, Bodleian Lib., MS Selden supra 53, collated with other manuscripts, furnishes the text of the Complaint. The text for the extracts from RP is based on London, BL, MS Arundel 38. San Marino, Huntington Lib., MSS HM 111 and 744, and Durham, Univ. Lib., MS Cosin V.iii. 9 provide the remaining texts (xxxv). Original spellings are retained. Punctuation is modernized, but with close regard to that in the manuscripts (xxxvi). Seymour summarizes the known details of Hoccleve’s life (xi–xiv): from the Chancery rolls, and from Hoccleve’s own references, one may determine the outline of Hoccleve’s biography with more certainty than is generally the case for other writers of his period. Hoccleve was born about 1368 and entered the privy seal in Easter 1387; he died before 8 May 1426. Brown, 239, gives the ‘most informative account of Hoccleve’s life at the Privy Seal’ (xi). The Complaint of the Virgin in the Deguileville translation is Hoccleve’s; possibly the other 13 poems in the translation are his also as Furnivall (14: xx–xxii) suggests. [See Burrow for a different view (226: 24, note 96); and see Doyle who suggests that Hoccleve may be responsible for the prose translation (217: 16). McGerr rejects both Hoccleve and Lydgate as potential authors of the prose text (338*: xxvi–xxviii).] The poem Heyle be glad that had been put forward as a possible Hoccleve item by MacCracken, 124, is rejected (xiv). [On this point, Burrow agrees (226: 24, note 96).] Hoccleve sees his verse as having a basically ‘stanzaic’ form which eschews ‘both the four-stress and the Chaucerian five-stress couplets’ (xviii); his metre is generally a five-stress line with a pause allowing for the ‘rhythms of natural speech’ (xix). Such pauses are supported by the evidence of manuscript punctuation (xix–xx). [A section of the introduction discusses ‘The influence of Chaucer’ (xxi–xxvii).] Chaucer’s influence is pervasive throughout Hoccleve’s work, and, yet, Hoccleve always ‘misses the subtlety of Chaucer’s touch’ (xxiv). Hoccleve’s major borrowing from Chaucer is his ‘poetic persona.’ This persona is ‘more unified as
well as more simple’ than that of Chaucer, and this follows from the private context in which Hoccleve’s poems were read which ‘necessitated the use of a minor key and an immediate, unsubtle clarity of address’ (xxv). Hoccleve’s ‘affinities’ are less with Chaucer and ‘more with the intensely personal and narrower outlook of the new men, of Dunbar and Skelton’ (xxvi). The works that Hoccleve says he has translated to produce _RP_ are ‘works of reference rather than source material in the conventional sense’ (xxvii). The poem is a ‘serious, lively, and personal expression of a thoughtful man’s views on the times’ (xxix). There are parallels in the literary productions of Hoccleve and Lydgate during the period that they are both actively writing, and this ‘may even have been shaped by a conscious rivalry’ (xxx). A comparison between the two poets is much to Hoccleve’s advantage (xxx–xxxii). During his life Hoccleve enjoyed a modest literary reputation; his ‘collected works’ remained ‘in vogue’ for 25 years after his death. _RP_, however, is Hoccleve’s most popular work—‘among the six most popular poems in the fifteenth century’—and it is studied in Tudor times. More than forty copies of _RP_ survive, most dating from post–1450 (xxxii). In Tudor times, this poem played a part in shaping the ‘national consciousness of the duties of kingship’ (xxxiii). In spite of this popularity, Hoccleve is not included in the later reverential references to John Gower, Geoffrey Chaucer, and John Lydgate (xxxii). Hoccleve was an antiquarian study until the editions of Wright, 10, and Furnivall, 13–14, in the 19th century made his poems ‘accessible.’ Critics in the 20th century have been slow to see Hoccleve’s real merits. Hammond, 30, is a notable exception. More work is needed in studying Hoccleve’s sources. Hoccleve is not a major poet, but he is ‘skilled and thoughtful’ (xxxiii). It is possible that HM 111 and HM 744 were once manuscript (xxxvi). [On this last point see Doyle’s review below for a different opinion; Bowers, 327, argues for the collected works theory; Burrow seems open to the possibility that the two manuscripts were originally a single volume (226: 31). Harris, 298, takes issue with Seymour regarding the identification of family arms in London, BL, MS Arundel 38.]

-----Review by Alasdair A. MacDonald, *English Studies* 65 (1984): 277–9. McDonald covers the Seymour and O’Donoghue, 49, editions together. Seymour places Hoccleve ‘firmly in a historical context’; O’Donoghue aims at a ‘more general reader.’ For this reason, one suspects that Seymour will be the ‘more useful of the two,’ especially in the light of his ‘greater scope’ (278). There are omissions in Seymour’s notes and glosses (278–9). Both of these editions serve the cause of raising Hoccleve’s standing, and they leave us ‘wishing to know more’ (279). See Greetham for a less favourable opinion of O’Donoghue’s edition (307: 61).

-----Review by J. Norton-Smith, *Review of English Studies* NS 35 (1984): 77–8. Seymour’s conservative punctuation of the text is not as useful as it could be, and he offers little precise and detailed analysis of Hoccleve’s poetic language. Hoccleve is a somewhat ‘disturbingly personal and inadequate’ poet (77). Seymour’s glossary has omissions, and his notes, although ‘helpful,’ suffer from a ‘certain narrowness of range’ (78).

-----Review by Bernard O’Donoghue, *Medium Ævum* 53 (1984): 319–21. Seymour’s selections are judicious and his introduction is thoughtful (19–20). The text’s punctuation could have occasionally been made clearer; and sometimes Seymour places Hoccleve a little too much in Chaucer’s shadow (321).

-----Review by A.I. Doyle, *Modern Language Review* 80 (1985): 416–7. The Huntington Library manuscripts HM 111 and HM 744 are unlikely to have come from the same volume because their pages are ruled differently. [Doyle had once thought a shared volume was a possibility (215: 182, note 38); Bowers, 327, argues for the collected works theory.] Seymour tends to undervalue Lydgate in comparison with Hoccleve (416). There are some
errors of fact, and some points of interpretation are open to doubt (416–17).


Prints *Complaint*; extracts from the *Dialogue* including the four stanzas found at the end of TJW; LMR; *Balade to my Gracious Lord of York*; *Ad beatam virginem* [MG]; *To the Duke of Bedford*; *Balade and Rowndel to Somer*; *Three Roundels*; RP including the envoy (minus lines 211–399, 484–595, 631–798, 848–980, 1030–92, 1121–1414, 1534–1848, 1879–1953, 2017–72, 2108–4977, and 5013–5439). Summaries are supplied to bridge omitted lines. There are marginal glosses; punctuation is modernized, and there is some clarification of manuscript orthography. O’Donoghue provides brief notes (100–3) and a short bibliography (103–4). The text of the *Complaint* comes from Oxford, Bodleian Lib., MS Arch Selden Supra 53 because Durham, Univ. Lib., MS Cosin V.iii.9 is incomplete (100). [See Greetham’s comment on this choice below.] An introduction offers a short historical overview of Hoccleve criticism with an emphasis on Hoccleve’s personality and autobiography. It is one of Hoccleve’s strengths that he can engagingly present the ‘circumstances of the unremarkable life of a man in his time, without any inevitable reference to convention or extra-worldly scheme’ (12). This is particularly evident in his description of his recovery from mental illness (12–13). Some of Hoccleve’s themes, such as clerical abuses, kingship, and city life, look forward to Dunbar and Skelton; but Hoccleve’s choice of subject matter is firmly medieval and recalls that made by John Gower. We should relieve Hoccleve of the label ‘Chaucerian’ in order to see him as he really is (15). Hoccleve’s work is the earliest to show the ‘mixed kind of writing that is found up to the early Elizabethans,’ and it combines some of the characteristics associated with the medieval and renaissance periods (16). [Greetham, 307, finds
O'Donoghue’s work to be the ‘least scholarly’ of the ‘best-text’ editions. In particular, O'Donoghue’s choice of non-holograph over holograph manuscript material for a copy-text is a ‘denial of authority with a vengeance’ (63). O'Donoghue’s normalization of some of the orthography of the copy-text is made ‘inconsistently and under false pretences’ (64).

-----Review by Alasdair A. MacDonald, English Studies 65 (1984): 277–79. O'Donoghue is aimed at the general reader, but he does not always provide glosses for words which have either disappeared or changed meaning, and the degree of historical background he offers is less than that found in the Seymour, 48, edition. For further comment, see MacDonald’s review of Seymour, r48.


Prints extracts from LC (49–50); Balade and Roundel to Master Somer (51–2); lines 71–168 and 2073–107 from RP, Hoccleve meets an old Beggar (52–4) and the Lament for Chaucer (55); and extracts from the Complaint (56–8). Gray includes a glossary (509–74). Hoccleve’s writing style is often ‘immediately engaging’ even though his work has been ‘until recently, poorly thought of.’ The poems show some signs of ‘Chaucer’s wit.’ RP is ‘not exactly gripping,’ but it avoids prolixity and heaviness. Most readers now find the poem’s introduction, where the ‘sombre tone of the writing is sometimes very impressive,’ more interesting than the poem itself (48).

Prints a newly edited text of \textit{LC} from San Marino, Huntington Lib., MS HM 744 with a facing Modern English translation (176–203); George Sewell’s 18th-century translation is included as an appendix (224–37). The edition also presents Christine de Pizan’s \textit{Epistre au Dieu d’Amours} with a facing English translation (34–75) in addition to critical and textual commentary (3–158). An introduction to the Hoccleve text includes the topics of ‘Literary influences’ (160–4), ‘Audience’ (164–5), ‘Antifeminism?’ (165–7), ‘Language, Versification, Meter’ (167–71), and ‘Text’ (171–4). Textual notes (204), notes (205–11), glossary (212–5), and a selected bibliography (216–18) are also supplied. The edition preserves the ‘authorial punctuation’ of the Huntington manuscript (vii). Hoccleve’s poem is more ‘adaptation ... than ... translation’ (160). Chaucer is a significant influence on the work (162–3); less obvious influences are Thomas Usk and John Clanvowe (163–4). Like Chaucer’s \textit{Legend of Good Women}, Hoccleve’s poem may be exploiting irony in its treatment of women (166–7). Hoccleve’s intention is to provide a ‘parallel’ to Christine de Pizan’s work for readers who were fluent in both French and English (167). \textit{LC} has the form of a ‘privy seal patent letter’; technically, it is a reply to a petition (167–8). The problem of the poem’s metre has no obvious solution (171).


Prints lines 105–208 from \textit{LMR} (319–22); lines 1–195, 813–68, 932–1050, 2059–2107, and 4978–5019 from \textit{RP} (322–34); lines 1–195 from the \textit{Complaint} (334–39); and lines 1–98 from the \textit{Dialogue} (339–42). Pearsall provides glosses on the page. The text comes from London, BL, MS Arundel 38 and MS Harley 4866; Oxford, Bodleian Lib., Arch.Selden supra 53; and Durham University Lib. MS Cosin V.iii.9. There is a brief biographical sketch of Hoccleve and an introduction to each of the selections. It is possible that Hoccleve and Chaucer knew each other. Hoccleve’s ‘diction and metre are intimately Chaucerian’; his verse also has the ‘conversational’ quality of Chaucer’s informal fluency. Hoccleve’s additions to Chaucer’s manner are an earnestness and ‘edginess’ that form an
‘unexpectedly subtle comic persona.’ He is a ‘much more endearing poet than Lydgate’ (319). Whether or not *RP* was written as a commission from Prince Henry, the prince probably gave some direction to Hoccleve on what to emphasize (322).

§
General References


[Written in Latin in the late 14th or early 15th century. The entry for 1381 contains a reference to someone called ‘Oklefe’ whose beliefs were among those taken up by John Wyclif (450). Whoever this ‘Oklefe’ might be, he could not be Thomas Hoccleve who is, as Mason, 6, points out in 1796, only a boy at the time. Nevertheless, Bale, 58, elaborates on the reference and misreads it, perhaps wilfully in the cause of religious propaganda, as meaning that Thomas Hoccleve followed the beliefs of Wyclif.]


The *Book of Curtesye* was written about 1450, and subsequently printed by Caxton in 1477–8. Lines 351–64 encourage the reading of *RP* with its ‘goodly langage & sentence passyng wyse’ (line 352).

55. **Anonymous.** Annotation to London, BL, MS Royal 17 D.vi.

Not sighted. Seymour quotes a 15th-century annotation, written on a flyleaf of this *RP* manuscript, that praises the moral worth of Hoccleve’s poem. He also provides some other incidental 15th-century citations (256: 257).

In 1490 John de Irlandia inserted a copy of *MG* into Edinburgh, National Lib. of Scotland, MS Advocates 18.2.8, and he there attributed the poem to Chaucer (1: 166–86). See Edwards, 236, on the possible significance of Irlandia’s attribution. Ross suggests that Irlandia made his copy from Oxford, Bodleian Lib., MS Arch. Selden B.24 (103: 386). Irlandia’s copy is first printed by Leyden, 7.


Not sighted; this annotation has been based on the extract found in Spurgeon (127: 3: 13–19). In about 1545, Leland includes *LC* in a list of pieces ascribed to Chaucer. In 1718, Sewell, 4, uses this ascription as evidence against Hoccleve’s authorship of *LC*.


Thomas Hoccleve was a man famous as much because of his learning as of his birth. He sought out the eloquence of the English language, after the fashion of Chaucer, whose disciple he was, and beautified his native language. Besides other studies in the liberal arts, he was devoted to poetry, a craft in which he was polished and eloquent. For this reason he was regarded, after his master, as by no means the meanest illuminator of the native language among the English. Thomas Walsingham says in his *Chronicles* that Hoccleve followed the doctrines of John Wyclif and Berengarius: ‘Occele, the Englishman,’ he
relates, 'followed the teaching of Berengarius that the bread and wine certainly still remain on the altar after being consecrated by the priest.' [Bale's citation is incorrect as Walsingham, 53, actually refers to Wyclif following the doctrines of 'Oklefe' and Berengarius.] He composed various poems and even prose works prettily and neatly in his mother tongue. Hoccleve's many works include: Complaint; Dialogue; TJW; LD [the prose conclusion is also listed as a separate work]; Jonathas; and RP. For many years Hoccleve was a secret disciple of Christ, following the example of Nicodemus, because of his fear of the Papists. Hoccleve was still alive in 1410 during the reign of Henry IV. [In the same volume, in his life of Chaucer, Bale ascribes LC to Chaucer (526) and notes that this proves that Chaucer was alive in 1402 (529).]


In the introductory pages (not numbered) Stow includes Hoccleve in the list of authors consulted in writing the *Summarye*. He subsequently quotes from RP in the text proper on the excessive length of men's sleeves in the early 15th century (folios 252r–252v). Stow's earlier *Summarie of Englyshe Chronicles* (1565) does not refer to Hoccleve. The antiquary owned one, and possibly two, manuscripts of RP, see Seymour (256: 295), in addition to Durham, Univ. Lib., MS Cosin V.iii.9 for which he transcribed missing lines from the *Complaint* and *Dialogue*. See Burrow, 47, and subsequent cross-references, for background on the Stow transcription.


Stow cites Hoccleve in the introductory pages (not numbered) among his list of authors consulted. Stow's reference to Hoccleve in the text proper (519) essentially duplicates that
of 1570. See Stow, 59.


Not sighted; this annotation has been based on the extract found in Spurgeon (127: 1: 157–8). In a discussion of the *Knight's Tale*, Hakluyt quotes the last five lines of *LC*, a poem he ascribes to Chaucer, as evidence that Chaucer was alive in the year 1402 (124). According to Spurgeon, Hakluyt’s remarks are not found in the first edition of the *Navigations* (158).


The Speght edition of Chaucer, 2, should have drawn a clearer distinction between the works genuinely by Chaucer and those that are ‘adulterat.’ *LC* is among the spurious works (69).


Camden quotes from *RP* regarding the excesses of 15th-century costume (196).
64. **Pits, John.** *Relationum Historicarum de rebus Anglicis.* Paris, 1619. 587.

Pits bases his citation for Hoccleve on Bale, 58, but he notes that it cannot be said with certainty that Hoccleve was a heretic.


Hoccleve was 'very famous' during the reigns of Henry IV and V. His most enduring work, *RP*, is dedicated to Henry V. He is well remembered as being the 'Disciple of the most fam'd Chaucer' (*Supplement*, 233).


Tanner's entry for Hoccleve follows the outline of that by Bale, 58, but shows considerable first-hand knowledge of Hoccleve’s work. Thomas Hoccleve was a man famous on account of his learning and not his birth. He sought out the eloquence of the English language, after the fashion of Chaucer and Gower, whose disciple he was, and beautified his native language. He was a scribe for 20 years in the office of the privy seal, and received a salary of 20 marks a year. Humphrey, Duke of Gloucester, whom he celebrates wonderfully in his verse, was his sole patron. He studied law at Chester’s Inn, where Somerset Palace now stands. (In Hoccleve’s time the Inn offered these studies.) ‘The Englishman, Ocklefe,’ says Walsingham, ‘followed the teaching of Berengarius that the bread and wine certainly still remain on the altar after being consecrated by the priest.’ He seems, however, to defend himself from any personal heresy in his book, *Consolatio tibi a sene oblata* [literally, ‘a consolation offered by an old man,’ ie the prologue to *RP*]. He wrote in English, sometimes in prose and sometimes in verse. [Tanner inserts a listing of
Hoccleve manuscripts and major work, and cites his sources for the entry as Bale, 58, and Pits, 64. Mitchell believes that Tanner may be mistaken in saying that Hoccleve studied at Chester’s Inn (204: 126), but see also Bennett (163: 72–9), and Burrow who refers the reader to background material (226: 2, note 5).


Jonathas is a literal translation of a story in the Gesta Romanorum. Hoccleve does not deserve the praise of Browne, 3, for the translation, as he imparts ‘no sort of embellishment to his original’ which he follows even to the extent of copying the prose moralization (1: lvi–lvii). [In a footnote appearing in the 1824 and subsequent editions, Francis Douce notes that Hoccleve follows the English and not the Continental Gesta. Douce speculates that Hoccleve may be the author of the English Gesta. He also notes that the prose moralization of Hoccleve’s translation is ‘quite different’ from its source (1: ccxxx, footnote).] Warton quotes lines 309–311, 337–54, 365–78 from the Tale of Constance (1: lxxiv–lxxxvi). As a poet, Hoccleve is a ‘feeble writer’; even the titles of his poems ‘indicate a coldness of genius; and on the whole promise no gratification to those who seek for invention and fancy.’ His importance lies in the support he gives to the ‘improvements’ that take place in the English language during his time (2: 38). Hoccleve’s most significant poem is RP (2: 39). Warton quotes lines 2038–53 on Aristotle, and lines 1958–74, 2077–2093, and 2101–2107 on Chaucer (2: 41–43); he briefly discusses the Chaucer portrait (2: 43–4). Chaucer, Gower, and Hoccleve did not corrupt the ‘purity of the English language’ by introducing foreign words. Linguistic change was already under way because members of the court are on the Continent for much of the time and exposed to new words. In any case, the new loan words ‘improved the vernacular style’ and ‘enlarged and enriched’ English diction (2: 50). Hoccleve studied law at Chester’s Inn (2: 38). [On this last claim
see Tanner, 66 and subsequent cross-references. Warton's entry on Hoccleve is repeated essentially unchanged in the subsequent editions of 1824, 1840, and 1871.]


The first edition of Ellis's work, published in 1790 in a single volume format, covers poetry from only the reign of Henry VIII and excludes the English Chaucerians. The Mason edition, 6, has 'proved the justice' of Warton's criticism, 67, of Hoccleve as a poor poet (262). The best of Hoccleve's poetry is *Jonathas,* a tale that is printed by Browne, 3. Because it is difficult to find 'a tolerable extract from this writer' (262), two anonymous pieces from the period are offered instead.


Lists the poems of the Hoccleve canon and notes that Mason, 6, had been published 'six of peculiar stupidity' in 1796. Hoccleve worked at the privy-seal, and seems to have been 80 or more when he died around 1454. Therefore, it is quite likely that he and Chaucer were 'personally acquainted' (63). Furnivall, 82, offers some corrections in 1868 to Ritson's statement of the Hoccleve canon; for the modern form of the canon see Burrow, 226.


2 vols.

Lines 195–206 refer to 'Tom OcCLEVE' and his lament for Chaucer.
Hoccleve has not been recognized as one of the key early writers who 'greatly assisted the growth and diffused the popularity of our infant poetry' (367). The poems Mason, 6, choses to print are Hoccleve's 'least interesting' (367, note3). Hoccleve's decision to record his own feelings leads his work to 'one of its highest sources of excellence' (368). Turner prints extracts, 'never before quoted' (368), from the prologue to RP (368–72); Hoccleve's praise and lament for Chaucer (364 and 368, note) and for Gower (368, note) are also referenced.

Brief references. 'HOCCLEVE, or Occleve, Thomas, an ancient English Poet, who scarcely, however, deserves the name.' Mason, 6, published an edition of Hoccleve in 1796: the 'Glossary ... is useful, but the attempt to revive the Poems impotent.'

Brief reference. 'The poetry of Hoccleve is wretchedly bad, abounding with pedantry, and destitute of all grace or spirit'; Lydgate could claim to be a better poet (125).

The Mason, 6, edition of Hoccleve’s poems is ‘limited to the sole purpose of furnishing the personal history of the author’ (305); the poems it contains are Hoccleve’s ‘least interesting’ (305, note). Warton, 67, Ritson, 69, Ellis, 68, and Hallam, 73, offer negative opinions on Hoccleve. Turner, 71, has a more positive and considered view (305–6). Passages from *LMR* illustrate the ‘habits of a dissipated young gentleman in the fourteenth century’ (306). *LC* is critically ignored, yet in *LC* Hoccleve proves that he is capable of mischievous and cutting observations (308–9). Browne, 3, draws on Hoccleve in the *Shepherd’s Pipe*. Hoccleve is ‘uncouth’ to modern readers because at the time he is writing the English language is still coarse. Hoccleve’s request that Picard advise him on writing poetry in the *Ballade to the Duke of York* shows that he had at least some rudimentary critical faculty (309–10). Passages from *RP* demonstrate Hoccleve’s relationship with Chaucer. Hoccleve is a ‘vernacular writer, bare of ornament,’ yet devoted to Chaucer (310); if he had told us more about his master we would read him with ‘better humour’ (311). D’Israeli is a fierce defender of the study of the old vernacular poetry—see his entry for Lydgate, 565.


Quotes Hoccleve on the excesses of 15th-century costume (vol. 1). Shaw prints a colour reproduction from London, BL, MS Arundel 38 of Hoccleve presenting *RP* to Henry V, and an illuminated capital from the same manuscript. Hoccleve’s work is ‘not without merit,’ and has some of Chaucer’s ‘harmony’; but the choice of subject is poor and there is ‘too much of the flatness which characterises the writings of Lydgate.’ The writers of the 16th
century exaggerate the importance of those of the previous century; Browne’s assessment, 3, of Hoccleve is an example (vol. 2).


Brief references. Hoccleve expresses the ‘sincerest enthusiasm’ for Chaucer, but he is a ‘flat and feeble writer.’ Browne, 3, adapted some of Hoccleve’s work, and some has been published in modern times; but, aside from these instances, no ‘public compliment ... has been paid’ to Hoccleve (37).

77. **P.** ‘Chaucer’s Portrait by Occleve.’ *Notes and Queries* 2 (1850): 442.

Is the Chaucer portrait found in all the manuscripts of the *RP*, and has it ever been engraved? Watts’s criticism, 6, of Hoccleve is ‘supercilious.’ Hoccleve’s work is ‘valuable’ for its contemporary references and its 14th-century ‘phraseology,’ even though as poetry it may not be the ‘best in the world.’


Hoccleve studied law like Chaucer and Gower before him, but compared to them his powers are ‘far feebler.’ ‘His original pieces are contemptible, both in subject and in execution’; his best work is the translation of *De regimine principum.* Warton, 67, likens Chaucer to a spring day, and the Chaucerians to the returning winter. (45)

Brief references. Hoccleve's poems are generally didactic, and frequently translations. Marsh repeats Warton's quotation, 67, of *RP* lines 1958–74, Hoccleve's tribute to Chaucer, as he can find 'nothing better worthy of citation from this author' (455).


Brief references. Lydgate is a better poet than Hoccleve, but neither man inherited Chaucer's talent (249–50). [*The Book of the Poets* was published posthumously.]

81. **Trowle, George Makepeace.** *The History of Henry the Fifth.* New York, 1866.

Brief references. Hoccleve is the 'favourite poet' and 'intimate friend' of Henry V; he has a good deal of Chaucer's 'simplicity and quaintness of fancy' (233).

82. **Furnivall, Frederick J.** 'Occleve's Poems.' *Notes and Queries* 37 (1868): 432.

Brief reference correcting three errors in the bibliography of Hoccleve's works offered by Ritson, 69. See Burrow, 226, for the modern statement of the canon.

Brief references. A photograph of the Chaucer illustration from leaf 91 of London, BL, MS Harley 4866 appears opposite the title page; Furnivall describes the portrait mainly in terms of the insights it might offer into Chaucer’s personality (93–4).


[Furnivall’s letter has its own pagination.] It will be about twenty years before all the works of Lydgate and Hoccleve are edited and published by the Early English Text Society; it is, therefore, proposed to establish a Lydgate and Hoccleve society so that the process of publication may be hastened (1). The task is urgent for a number of reasons. Without accurate texts it is not possible to trace the loss of final -e, or to study the changing state of the English language and vocabulary during the 15th century, or to establish the Chaucer canon, or to appreciate the times, ‘individuality and life’ of Lydgate and Hoccleve (2–3). The manuscripts to be printed first are, for Lydgate, London, BL, MSS Harley 1766 and 2278, and, for Hoccleve, the Durham, Univ. Lib., MS Cosin V.iii.9. The need is for 150 members; 20 have ‘already joined’ (4). Furnivall later refers to this letter in 1892: ‘not half’ of the 150 members needed could be found and so the society did not proceed (13: xlviii).

Briefly discusses Hoccleve’s biography and major poems. The Phillipps manuscript [now San Marino, Huntington Lib., MS HM 111] with its copies of LMR, MG, and some ballads, offers Hoccleve’s ‘most interesting work’ (56). Hoccleve does not achieve the moments of humour and verisimilitude, or the expanses of dreariness, that Lydgate does; nevertheless, RP is as ‘poor as it well can be.’ The best of Hoccleve’s output is in his religious poetry, and the best of this is MG. Skeat’s suggestion in his edition of Chaucer’s Minor Poems, (95*: xxxiii–xxxix), that The Cuckoo and the Nightingale and the balade, O leude book, are Hoccleve’s is ‘very doubtful.’ Hoccleve’s poetry may be compared with Lydgate’s (57).


The version of Jonathas preserved in Browne’s *The Shepherd’s Pipe*, 3, is ‘certainly far superior’ to the works printed in 1796 by Mason, 6. It is regrettable that Browne did not print more of Hoccleve’s work (xxxiii).


Hoccleve is among a ‘crowd of worthless and forgotten versifiers’ between Chaucer and Surrey. It is likely that he knew Chaucer, but he learned nothing from him (402). Lydgate is a poor writer, but a better one than Hoccleve (403). Craik gives his secondary sources as being Ritson, 69, and Warton, 67.
88. **Minto, William.** *Characteristics of English Poets from Chaucer to Shirley.*
Edinburgh, 1874. 2nd ed. Edinburgh, 1885.

A section under Chaucer's 'English Successors' is devoted to Hoccleve (70–5). Minto estimates the year of Hoccleve's death, with surprising accuracy, as being 1430. This is likely to be a misprint for 1450, however, as the text subsequently refers to Hoccleve dying at the 'good old age of eighty' (72). See Brown, 239, for 1426 as the likely year of Hoccleve's death. Hoccleve is an 'interesting character, if not an interesting poet'; Warton, 67, was wrong to describe him as 'cold' (71). *LC* is 'full of sly humour and tender feeling' (72). [Minto was one of the earliest critics to hint at the possible irony of this poem. See Pearsall, 208, Bornstein, 266, and Quinn, 315, for modern supporting views; see Brink, 105, for a more traditional approach; and see Fleming, 241, for the view that the poem is not anti-feminist, but does gently mock Christine de Pizan as a literary critic.] *RP* is generally lacking in humour, and now is of relevance only to the history of politics; it expresses the commonplace views of the time (74–5).


Hoccleve is a 'bad versifier of the reign of Henry V' and a disciple of Chaucer. Lydgate is better.


Brief references. ‘When a man’s only merit is a fond idolatry of his master, let him be forgotten.’ Hoccleve is the author of ‘didactic puerilities’ (245).

Ejects *MG* from the Chaucer canon (183–4). See Koch, 92, and Ross, 103, for further discussion.


Part one of this note deals with the authorship of *MG*: on the grounds of manuscript ascription, style, content, and rhyme, Hoccleve is more likely to be the author of *MG* than is Chaucer (104–5).


Brief references. Hoccleve is Chaucer ‘sans eyes, sans ears, sans teeth, sans everything’ (91).


Numerous brief references to Hoccleve’s work and life-records as historical resources to illustrate society under Henry IV; the discussion about the payment of royal annuities is one of the longer allusions to Hoccleve (2: 21–6).
Corrects *L.C.*, line 316, ‘In my legende of natures maie men finde’ to read *martres*.

Not sighted.

The poem, *To the Kings most Noble Grace, and to the Lords and Knights of the Garter*, appears in the Bell *Chaucer* edition, 8, of 1878. On the grounds of style and language it is almost certain to be Hoccleve’s. It was probably written for Henry V’s 1416 celebration of St George’s feast in honour of Emperor Sigismund of Germany.

In line 423 of the *Legend of Good Women* Chaucer says that he wrote ‘virelayes.’ Only two of these have survived. A number of Hoccleve’s ballads are virelays or near virelays. Examples that have previously escaped critical attention are found in Furnivall, 13: ballads 4, 6, 8, 9, 12, 13, 14, and 15. Skeat compares the rhyme pattern of each with respect to the virelay form. ‘We can all guess whence Hoccleve learnt his metres. It seems to me a most interesting fact that, though we have not got many of Chaucer’s eight-line virelays, we now know precisely how they went.’
98. -----. 'Magge, the Good[e] Kow.' The Academy 1 April 1893: 285–6.

Quotes lines 36–49 of the prologue to Jonathas as printed in Furnivall, 13. After some correction for scribal errors, line 38 provides the 'earliest example of the name Mag (Margaret) as applied to a chattering bird' (286).


Frontispiece reproduces the Chaucer illustration from folio 88 of London, BL, Harley MS 4866. Skeat discusses the illustration briefly in the context of other Chaucer references (lxi–lxi). Hoccleve speaks of Chaucer as his teacher: 'if he learnt but little more, he certainly learnt the true method of scansion of his master's lines, and imitates his metres and rimes with great exactness' (lvii–lviii). See Skeat, 16, for the Hoccleve pieces printed in the Chaucerian supplement of Skeat's edition.


Thynne's 1532 Chaucer edition, 1, contains three pieces that are clearly by Hoccleve: LC; and, printed as one poem, To the kinges most noble grace and To the Lорdes and Knightes of the Garter (101). Thynne prints Clanvowe's poem as Of the Cuckoo and the Nightingale; however, the work's title in Oxford, Bodleian Lib., MS Bodley 638 and MS Fairfax 16 is The Boke of Cupide, god of Love. The manuscript title shows that the author is familiar with LC (107). MG is certainly Hoccleve's work in spite of occasional claims to the contrary (146–7). Skeat provides a list showing the additions made to the Chaucer apocrypha by the early editors (159–64).

Not sighted. See Gilbert, 151.


A study of Hoccleve’s use of the infinitive.


Summarizes the case that MG is Hoccleve’s and not Chaucer’s. Until 1880 the poem had been ascribed to Chaucer, although it was not printed in a Chaucer edition before that by Bell, 8 (385–6). [See Koch, 91–2, and Furnivall (12: 137; 13: xxxix-xl).] The Phillipps manuscript [now San Marino, Huntington Lib., MS HM 111] does not ascribe the poem to Chaucer, and the ascription to Chaucer in the other manuscripts is careless. It is unlikely that Chaucer would write two poems ‘so much alike’ as *A.B.C.* and *MG* (386–8). An instance of faulty rhyme might also argue against Chaucer’s authorship (387–8). Three points are in favour of Hoccleve’s authorship: all the other poems in the Phillipps manuscript are his; the instance of faulty rhyme is consistent with his practice elsewhere (388); and the ‘manner and spirit’ of the poem are his (389).
Hoccleve and Chaucer knew each other, and it is only the Chaucer references in Hoccleve's work (or Lydgate's) that merit consideration. Even those readers who like Lydgate dislike Hoccleve. To read Hoccleve demands 'dogged resolution' (23). Nevertheless, Hoccleve's honesty in admitting his own failings deserves our respect. LC is 'tedious beyond description' (24). The six poems published by Mason, 6, in 1796 are among Hoccleve's better work: they show signs of cleverness, and they have a rhythmical control rare for the time and otherwise uncommon in Hoccleve's published poetry (24–5). If MG were indeed by Hoccleve, we would need to raise our estimation of him (25).

Brink provides a brief introductory biography that concentrates on Hoccleve's 'pleasures' and 'pecuniary affairs' (212–14). Essentially, Hoccleve is a 'good, harmless fellow' with enough talent to amuse, but not enough to rise to higher things (215). Hoccleve is better in his representational poetry, working with irony and satire, than in his didactic work. LC and MG are proof of the poet's devotion to women, and they contain some of his best work (216). Hoccleve's reputation is built on RP, an imitation of Egidius de Colomna's De regimine principum that also incorporates elements of the Secretum secretorum and Jacobus de Cessolis's De ludo scacchorum (217). The poem's chief attraction lies in Hoccleve's personal and historical additions, concentrated in his prologue, to the source material (218). Hoccleve's religious orthodoxy leads us to understand 'why the fifteenth century could not possibly produce a work like the Canterbury Tales' (220).
Courthope discusses Hoccleve on pages 333–40. Besides Lydgate, Hoccleve is the ‘only ... considerable English poet in the first half of the fifteenth century’ (333). Courthope then focuses on Hoccleve’s autobiographical poems as being ‘most characteristic’ of the poet’s work. It is likely that the success of _LMR_, with its ‘quaint and novel vein of personal humour,’ influenced the development of Hoccleve’s style (336). The structure of the _Complaint_ and _Dialogue_ is ‘poor’ and not the equal of the _Prologue_ to Chaucer’s _CT_, but it shows enough originality to raise it above the ‘lifeless allegorical machinery of the _Confessio Amantis_’ (337). Hoccleve has just enough talent to find patronage in a time when ‘those who could write the English Language were few, and those who were anxious to read it were many and liberal’ (337–8). Hoccleve’s verses generally have the right number of syllables, but about ten per cent have an accent falling on a normally weak syllable (338–9). The ‘only feature of originality’ in Hoccleve’s verse is its command of rhyme royal as a vehicle for dialogue; in this Hoccleve generally shows a ‘good deal of dramatic energy and vivacity’ (339). Hoccleve’s occasional syntactic difficulty in conforming to pentameter verse reveals the ‘tendency of the native Anglo-Saxon element to revolt against those foreign laws of grammar and harmony’ brought to English by Chaucer (340).


The poets who follow Chaucer are the ‘poets of the decline’ (497). Hoccleve is a rhymer, a ‘public functionary’ with a ‘mania for talking about himself,’ who, nevertheless, offers an insight into medieval London that should be highly regarded for its value to history (501–2). It appears that he is also a drunkard, cowardly, vain, and ‘somewhat ill-natured.’ _RP_ is merely a ‘compilation’ of other writers’ work, assembled for Hoccleve’s self-aggrandizement, in which Hoccleve copies Gower by abusing ‘all classes of society’ (502). His one great merit is the miniature of Chaucer he had put into the margin of one of his manuscripts (502–3).
Hoccleve and Lydgate are the most significant of Chaucer’s followers (166). Wülker briefly discusses Hoccleve’s life and work (169–72). He is not as versatile as Lydgate, but he is a more important poet; and he is better able to capture the characteristics of Chaucer’s work.

Gosse is a ‘frivolous, tame-spirited creature, tainted with insanity.’ Only a ‘brave spirit’ could read through RP to the end and without fatigue. The other poems are ‘long-winded’ and ‘monotonous.’ Hoccleve’s life was ‘unseemly’; he was personally ‘cowardly.’ Nevertheless, his readers are now indulgent toward him because he gave posterity the ‘coloured portrait of Chaucer’ (35).

A description of Hoccleve’s language and pronunciation. Hoccleve’s vowel sounds follow Chaucer’s; and he shows just as much care in achieving pure rhymes as Chaucer does. Burrow says Vollmer’s study in this field is the ‘most substantial’ on Hoccleve to date (47: 1).
An analysis of Hoccleve's metre. Hoccleve's rhymes are pure; he usually maintains ten syllables to a line, but at the cost of a smooth rhythm. Overall, Hoccleve's command of metre is poor (iv-v).


Hoccleve is a 'close and almost slavish imitator' of Chaucer (1). His only merit is that he was Chaucer's student and caused a likeness of Chaucer to be put in one of his manuscripts (32–3). Nevertheless, the criticism of Warton, 67, Hallam, 73, Ritson, 69, and Ellis, 68, is too severe (33–4). Hoccleve's writings about himself have a cultural interest; and in MG he takes 'higher ground' (34). LMR tells us what we know of Hoccleve's life (34–5). His major work is *RP*. Hoccleve's verse shows that the fillip Chaucer gave to 14th-century literature was short-lived (36).


Hoccleve's 'bad-boy confessions,' with the support of Furnivall, 13, may have led him to receive more critical attention than Lydgate, even though Hoccleve's work is more open to criticism than Lydgate's (17). Hoccleve's verse is easy, but 'marred by wanton accentuation' (18). His use of personal references tends to be 'conventional and rhetorical, and of a pattern' (19–20). [This is a view that Smith takes of much of the poetry of the period—see Mitchell, 201–4, Doob, 250, and Thornley, 213, who emphasize Hoccleve's conventional persona, and the questioning of this position by Burrow, 221.]

A discussion of the Chaucer portraits, including the Hoccleve Chaucer portraits in London, BL, MS Harley 4866 and MS Royal 17 D.vi. The Harley example is the only reliable Chaucer portrait (113); the Royal version is ‘ill-drawn by comparison’ (121). Black and white photographs reproduce the Harley (plate 1, facing page 116) and Royal illustrations (plate 2, facing page 120).


Brief references in an iconoclastic discussion of English literary criticism. Jusserand, 107, fails to give proper space to a discussion of Hoccleve (198–9).


Hoccleve is much less of a poet than Lydgate is. He lacks Lydgate’s flair for descriptions of nature, and his command of melodious verse. Hoccleve, however, has more reverence for Chaucer, and a greater understanding of the older writer’s poetic stature, than Lydgate shows; he also has more to tell us about London and other things of ‘general interest’ (192). The ‘compass and subject’ of *RP* make it Hoccleve’s major work, but it is ‘less valuable’ than *LMR* (193).
Adverse social conditions, the loss of final -e in pronunciation, and a lack of ‘fresh inspiration’ caused the 15th-century decay of Chaucerian poetry. It would be better to regard Surrey and Wyatt, not Lydgate, Hoccleve and Hawes, as the successors of Chaucer because they followed his lead in bringing Italian literary forms to England (76). Pollard briefly discusses Hoccleve’s biography (77-8). *RP* is, except for the prologue, ‘tedious and dull’; *TJW* is ‘readable, though poorly told.’ Hoccleve is at his best generally when writing about himself. Pollard quotes lines 177–208 from *LMR*. He possesses ‘only the slightest touch of poetry’ and uses his verse mainly to gain ‘influential friends’ (78). A reproduction is included from London, BL, MS Arundel 38 of Hoccleve presenting *RP* to Henry V (77).

Snell principally discusses Hoccleve on pages 17–32. Hoccleve’s references to himself in his poetry are autobiographical: Smith, 113, is wrong to say that these are likely to be conventional (19). It is not certain that Hoccleve’s verse is as ‘wooden and mechanical’ as we might suppose: contemporary word accents may have been ‘less sharply defined, or, in the case of whole classes of words ... liable to be shifted from one syllable to another.’ Changes were also underway in the pronunciation of final -e, but this factor may have been overstated (23). The most important difference between Chaucer’s versification and Hoccleve’s is the position of the caesura (23–4). *MG* shows that Hoccleve is capable of a ‘noble conception and adequate execution’ (24). *LC* is a ‘chivalrous defence of women’; it comes close to ‘breaking into passages of real eloquence and power,’ but fails (26). *RP* is Hoccleve’s great work, and it is ‘remarkable’ for his ‘championship of Peace’ (27–8).

The prologue to this poem must elevate Hoccleve in the ‘estimation of good judges’ (28): it is psychologically ‘accurate and acute,’ and it shows a very good use of realism (29). Hoccleve is opposed to the Lollards (30–1).

William Browne once owned the Hoccleve manuscript Durham, Univ. Lib., MS Cosin V.iii.9. Although he also owned a number of Lydgate manuscripts, and must have read much of Lydgate’s poetry, the only known example of the influence of the manuscripts in his possession on his own work is with respect to Cosin V.iii.9 (321). See Browne, 3.


Hammond refers to Hoccleve in tracing the development of the Chaucer canon and the inclusion in it of works by other authors. She briefly provides, where applicable, guidance regarding manuscripts, prints and editions, authenticity and title, date, source, and notes. See the entries for *LC* (434–6); *MG* (438–9); *Ploughman’s Tale* [*Legend of the Virgin*] (444); and *To the King’s most noble Grace* and *To the Lords and Knights of the Garter* (459–60).


By comparing the occurrences of nine-syllabled pentameter lines in the works of different authors within a miscellany copied by the same scribe, one may infer which are likely to be the result of scribal, as opposed to authorial, practice (129–32). Hammond lists the nine-syllabled lines that occur in the Oxford, Bodleian Lib., MS Fairfax 16 version of Chaucer’s *Parlement of Foules*, Hoccleve’s *L.C.*, and Lydgate’s *CBK*. She also lists those in the
Ellesmere [Huntington Lib., MS EL 26 C 9] and Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, MS 61 copies of Chaucer’s Second Nun’s Tale (133–51). A further manuscript, the Wentworth Wodehouse translation of *De re rustica*, dating to the second quarter of the 15th century, is metrically pure and free of nine-syllabled lines. This manuscript proves two things: the capacity for metrical regularity had not been lost by the time of its copying; and the existence of such regularity in the time of Chaucer is not a myth. (148–9). Hoccleve keeps to ten syllables, but lacks ‘any real rhythmic sense’; Lydgate understands more of Chaucer’s rhythm than does Hoccleve, but he shows his limitations by repeating line-types that in Chaucer are merely occasional metrical variants (152).


A continuation of the discussion from 121 concerning a scribe who worked on a number of manuscripts containing works by Chaucer, Lydgate, and Hoccleve. Photographic copies of the scribe’s script are reproduced between pages 28 and 29. [Linne R. Mooney (‘More Manuscripts written by a Chaucer Scribe.’ *Chaucer Review* 30 (1996): 401–7) further discusses the work of this scribe but is not here annotated.]


Furnivall, 14, is wrong to claim that the poems in the prose translation of Guillaume de Deguileville’s *Pelerinage de l’Ame* are Hoccleve’s. In fact, metrical analysis rules out all but the seventh [*The Complaint of the Virgin*] of the 14 poems as Hoccleve’s. It is likely that the unknown translator who produced the prose text is responsible for the other poems. [Doyle believes that Hoccleve may be the author of the prose *Pilgrimage of the Soul* (217):
Seymour considers that all of the 14 poems may be Hoccleve’s (48: xiv), a view shared by Furnivall (14: xx–xxii). Burrow (226: 24) disagrees with Seymour’s attribution of all but one of the poems, that identified by MacCracken. Smalley, 183, according to Seymour (48: xiv–xv, note 12), considers the issue without forming a conclusion. Schick excludes the prose translation from the Lydgate canon (442: ci–ciii); Hare, 697, attributes the prose translation to Lydgate. McGerr rejects Hoccleve and Lydgate as potential authors of the prose text (338*: xxvi–xxviii).


Prints from Cambridge, Univ. Lib., Kk.I.6, a ten-stanza, 80-line poem to Mary beginning ‘Heyle! be glad! & Joye withouten ende’ (260–3). The poem is an ‘excellent’ example of its kind and bears favourable comparison with like works by Lydgate (264). On the grounds of rhyme, metre, and subject, the poem may be tentatively attributed to Hoccleve or, at least, to a writer working closely in the ‘manner’ of Hoccleve’s religious poetry (266). See Burrow (226: 24, note 96) and Seymour (48: xiv, note 12) for objections to MacCracken’s attribution.


Hoccleve is of interest to the history of English prosody because of the survival of his poems in holograph (231–2). It is clear that he goes to some trouble to ensure that his lines contain ten syllables; he selectively uses final -e and elision, and arbitrarily makes syllables long or short. In spite of his efforts, his work generally lacks ‘any poetical, or even
decently rhythmical, effect.’ Hoccleve has no ‘sense of humour’ or ‘lightness of manner’ (232). The example that Hoccleve and Lydgate leave for the poets who come after them is a ‘lesson of disorganisation, almost of disbandment ... from the prosodic point of view’ (232-3). See Jefferson, 320, for a different view.


Hoccleve has some merits besides the Chaucer portrait he caused to be put in one of his manuscripts. These include the technical insights of his presumed holograph texts, and the social insights of his autobiography (205–6). Saintsbury briefly discusses Hoccleve’s biography and bibliography (206–7). The main works of interest are *RP, TJW, Jonathas, Complaint* and *Dialogue*, and, best of all, *LD* (207). *LC* and *MG* are also interesting (208). A comparison of Lydgate and Hoccleve shows the strengths and weaknesses of both: Hoccleve is the less burdensome to read, and he is the better storyteller; Lydgate is the more learned, and he is somewhat better skilled in aureate diction (207).


Among other citations, Spurgeon notes: *RP*’s references to Chaucer (1: xiii–xiv; 21–3), and the *Dialogue*’s reference to the Wife of Bath (1: 33); the Beatty edition, 27, of *A new Ploughman’s Tale* (1: 53); the anonymous attribution of *MG* to Chaucer in Oxford, Bodleian Lib., MS Arch. Selden B.24 (1: 64); John de Irlandia’s, quotation from *MG*, 56, and his ascription of the poem to Chaucer (1: 64); William Thynne’s printing, 1, of some
Hoccleve ballades as Chaucer’s (1: 79); Francis Thynne’s opinion, 62, that Speght, 2, had erred in assigning _LC_ to Chaucer (1: 154–5); Hakluyt’s ascription, 61, of _LC_ to Chaucer (1: 157–8); Sewell’s modernization, 4, of _LC_ (1: 347–8, 350–2); the attribution by Philo-Chaucer, 9, and by Furnivall (12: 26–7), of _MG_ to Chaucer, and Mason’s publication, 6, of Hoccleve selections with its ‘passing references’ to Chaucer (1: 498). There is also a number of references to Hoccleve’s Chaucer portrait and its subsequent reproduction.


In _RP_, lines 2087–8, ‘Also who was hyer in philosofye/ To Aristotle in our tunge but thow [Chaucer],’ the word ‘hyer’ does not mean ‘higher,’ but ‘heir’; and in _RP_, line 4347, ‘But or they twynned thens they pekked moode,’ the words ‘pekked moode’ mean ‘grew angry.’


Brief references. Hoccleve’s lines maintain a regular syllable count and correct rhyme. He uses Chaucer’s seven or eight line stanza, but unlike Chaucer he sometimes stresses weak syllables (251–2).


The stress patterns of Hoccleve’s verse are readily found to conform to an iambic pentameter reading when viewed under the ‘rhythm-doctrine.’ This doctrine allows that
when 'verse-accent or ictus stands in conflict with word-accent, it is marked by increased duration of the vocalic element under the ictus, attended, in the majority of cases, but not necessarily, by increase also of pitch.' Hence, a normally short, unstressed syllable may be lengthened in reading, and stressed by an increase in pitch, in order to meet the requirements of its metrical position in the line (119). The 'arsis-thesis variation' involves the repetition of a word or syllable in stressed (arsis) and unstressed (thesis) positions within a line or group of lines to achieve a rhetorical effect. The very existence of this variation argues for the correctness of the rhythm-doctrine reading and its assumption of an iambic pentameter line-form (161). This variation is possibly found in Hoccleve more than any of the other Chaucerians (202). Licklider supplies a number of examples from Hoccleve (202–12); for an attack on his position see Mitchell (204: 97–109) and Hammond (30: 83–4).


Hoccleve has little to contribute to our understanding of his period; his appeal for peace in *RP* simply reflects the general mood of the time (230). When he advises Henry V to rule in 'law and equity' and oppose heresy, he is acting as the 'spokesman of orthodox officialdom.' *ASJO* is interesting for the apparent date of its composition as this seems to coincide with the 'Scrope and Cambridge plot' in which Oldcastle was thought to be involved (231).


A tabulation of the various features of Hoccleve's style.

Kern rejects the suggestion that the Huntington Library manuscripts, HM 111 and HM 744, and the Durham University Library manuscript, Cosin V.iii.9, are in Hoccleve’s hand. [See Schulz, 166, for the modern view that these manuscripts are in fact holograph.] Nevertheless, he sees them as reflecting Hoccleve’s orthography, and so he aims to correct the modern editions of the poet’s work by using a model of Hoccleve’s orthography and metre as found in the edited manuscripts. Burrow praises Kern’s technical knowledge of Hoccleve’s language (47: xxix).


Hoccleve’s line usually contains 10 or 11 syllables.


There is some evidence to suggest 1420 as the date of Hoccleve’s *Dialogue*, but on balance its composition probably lies between March/April and the end of August 1422. [Burrow suggests that the *Dialogue* was substantially complete by ‘early 1421’ (47: lix).]


Suggests that the scribe Offorde mentioned in Hoccleve’s *Balade to Somer* at line 26 may be John Ofort, the writer of a letter describing the marriage of Henry V in France.

Brief references in the course of an early study on the aureate language of the 15th century. The aureate language in Hoccleve's translation of the *Letter of Cupid* and stories from the *Gesta Romanorum* is his own and is not imported from the sources (59–60). In his translation of the *Gesta*, Hoccleve's chosen stanza form 'naturally tempted him to verbosity'; he is a writer for whom 'style means pomp' (60).


Richard II gave Hoccleve a corrody in 1395, but it is likely that Hoccleve commuted this for a cash annuity. The corrody was transferred when Henry IV came to the throne, at Hoccleve's request, to William Flete and William Gedney (59).


Numerous brief references. The *Complaint* is an example of a work written for presentation to a patron: the arrangement of material (chosen to please both the patron and the ladies of the court) and its dedication to Lady Westmorland are cleverly intended to ensure that the book is well received (96–8). Holzknecht lists the grants made to Hoccleve (177–8). It is likely that these grants are in recognition of Hoccleve’s service at the privy seal and not his literary efforts (177).

Furnivall’s marginal summary of the final three stanzas of LD is misleading because it overlooks Hoccleve’s shift from translating Henry Suso’s Horologium sapientiae to translating the ninth lesson for All Hallows’ Day from the Sarum Breviary. This transition begins in the last stanza of Hoccleve’s poem, just before the concluding prose section. Hoccleve follows the lesson closely, although he adds ‘tautological words or phrases (not for the purpose of alliteration)’; this is consistent with his practice in rendering Suso’s Horologium (56–7). From the final sentence of the fourth prose paragraph in Furnivall’s text, Hoccleve seems to depart from his original altogether. The content of the fifth paragraph is likely to be Hoccleve’s own composition. Kurtz concludes with some speculation about the identity of the Breviary text used by Hoccleve (57).
How much praise for the artistic merit of Hoccleve as the translator, and how much is due to the source chapter in the Horologium of Henry Suso? Only lines 1–917 of Hoccleve’s poem are taken from Suso (255). These represent about 79% of Suso’s chapter; Hoccleve rejects the remaining 21%. Of the 79% that is translated, Hoccleve uses about 22.8% more words than the original Latin version, and then adds ‘matter of his own’ that forms 40% of his translation. His translation runs to about 7000 words, slightly more than twice the length of the original’s 3400 words. [In the remainder of the article, Kurtz analyses the nature of Hoccleve’s omissions from, and additions to, Suso’s text.]

Omissions are made almost entirely according to the ‘logical and metrical limits of the stanza’; Hoccleve shows ‘no special care to omit iterative, parallelistic, or tautological phrases’ (256). Hoccleve does, however, omit Suso’s direct criticism of contemporary religious orders (258–9). Many of the Hoccleve’s additions to the original result from difficulties in the translation process, ‘metrical difficulties,’ and the translator’s desire for ‘virtuosic variation’ (259). In general, these additions do not add to the quality of Hoccleve’s poetry or improve on the original, with the exception of those that offer some ‘personal revelation’ from Hoccleve’s life. These personal additions have the effect of humanizing Suso’s original (270); they are ‘by far the most worthy part’ of Hoccleve’s original contribution to the poem (271). When simply rendering Suso’s Latin into English, Hoccleve tends to follow the original fairly closely. The answer to the question put at the start of the present paper is: ‘In quality, if not in quantity, Suso’s contribution is the greater’ (275).
Hoccleve's Balade to the Virgin and Christ, 'As þat I walkid in the monthe of May,' is a translation from a French original provided to the poet by Robert Chichele. Although the source has not survived, a fragment of an Anglo-Norman copy is extant in Cambridge, St John's College, MS G.5 (235). Sandison prints the fragment in a parallel text with Hoccleve's poem (238–45). Robert is the brother of Henry Chichele, Archbishop of Canterbury (236). Sandison discusses Robert Chichele's known life-records (236–8).


Of the 28 RP manuscripts examined only two preserve the Chaucer portrait, London, BL, MS Harley 4866 and Royal 17 D.vi. An 'authoritative' copy of RP does not seem to be extant (14). The illustration has been cut from two manuscripts, London, BL, MS Harley 4826 and MS Arundel 38 (in the second of these a whole leaf has been removed). In the other manuscripts, it has not been inserted by the scribes (14–15). Harley is the better executed of the surviving portraits (16). Hoccleve's personal references to Chaucer are vague as are all similar remarks made by Chaucer's 'literary friends' (28). See Seymour, 256, for modern discussion of the RP manuscripts; and see Seymour, 257, Carlson, 341, Pearsall, 210, and Wright, 352 regarding the Chaucer portraits.

Hoccleve is 'dull indeed.' LC resembles The Legend of Good Women in 'theme'; however, it offers 'reasonings' in place of 'imagination, humour, and life' (156). Hoccleve's principal work is RP: although clearly written and 'sufficiently correctly versified,' it is intellectually and artistically weak in a way that recalls John Gower (157).


Brief references. Legouis restates the comparison between Hoccleve and Gower made above.


Hoccleve is, like Lydgate, politically conservative and a follower of Chaucer; however, Lydgate is more versatile than Hoccleve and more able to catch Chaucer's spirit. Neither Hoccleve nor Lydgate succeed in imitating Chaucer's metre. It is only the human touch of Hoccleve's work, and its sense of the author's dependency and naïveté, that is able to catch the attention of the reader for a moment (144–6).


Several brief references, as part of a more general survey, to the presentation of Fortune in Hoccleve's work.

Summarizes, by reference to *RP*, Hoccleve’s thoughts on the princely virtues (499–502). The influences on Hoccleve are pre-Aristotelian through Jacobus de Cessolis, and Aristotelian through Egidius de Colomna (502–3).


As part of a survey of medieval political tracts, Born summarizes Hoccleve’s advice to the prince in *RP* (120–4).


Aster, 101, has shown that much of Hoccleve’s ‘apparent learning’ in *RP* comes from his principal source, Jacobus de Cessolis’s *Chesse Moralised* (94). Gilbert discusses Aster’s examples of Hoccleve’s use of the *Secretum secretorum*, and provides further examples of Hoccleve’s borrowings from the *Secretum* (94–8).

Tout refers a number of times (mainly in vol. 5) to Hoccleve's work for the technical and personal detail it provides. Hoccleve's marriage was unusual, but not unique, among the clerks of the privy seal. On marriage he lost all chance of the minor Church promotion that might come to a clerk in his office (5: 94–5), and he was forced to leave the common quarters occupied by the privy seal clerks (5: 70). Hoccleve is 'no great poet,' but he is devoted to Chaucer. His work demonstrates that he has a close knowledge of overseas poetry (5: 75). It is likely that the privy seal clerks had assistants because the names of men Hoccleve lists as his colleagues are not found in the usual records concerning the clerks; 'John Prentice' and 'John Arundel' from LMR are examples (5: 80). It is unlikely that the privy seal attracted the most educated men (5: 105–6); and Hoccleve's 'slavish attitude to life' points to a lowly standing (5: 105). Hoccleve is not a typical clerk of the privy seal: he is an example of a clerk who has failed to find advancement. His writing is fluent, but he has a 'limited command of impersonal themes.' He suffers from a number of moral and bodily failings that lead him to be gloomy (5: 107). His complaints regarding the regularity of his pay, however, are justified (5: 108). See Brown, 239, and Burrow, 226, for further and later views on this. Hoccleve and Chaucer would have known each other as poets and as fellows of the 'household, or quasi-household, branch of the civil service.' See Burrow, 221, and Mitchell, 202, regarding the debate on whether Hoccleve knew Chaucer, and regarding the contested veracity of Hoccleve's autobiographical references.


When Hoccleve married he gave up any hope of advancement within the Church; and there was no money to be made through literature (381). For writers such as Chaucer or Hoccleve, 'political service' was vital (381–2). It is certain that had Chaucer been alive in 1410, when Hoccleve dined with Henry Somner, he too would have been one of the 'Court
of Good Company.' We know something more about Hoccleve's career than the 'bare
catalogue' of official records we have for Chaucer (388). Unlike Chaucer, Hoccleve is
always ready to write about himself and his circumstances (388–9). One does not form
a high opinion of Hoccleve as a result of his self-disclosures; yet, he offers valuable
insights into the life of someone of his station and time. Hoccleve's lot was not easy, but
he seems to have been 'zealous' in his duties and sufficiently senior to have an assistant
clerk (389).

154. Tucker, Lena Lucile, and Allen Rogers Benham. 'A Bibliography of Fifteenth
Century Literature.' University of Washington Publications in Language and
Literature 2 (1928): 113–274.

Includes a briefly annotated and selective bibliography of early Hoccleve studies (223–5).


Hoccleve is rather serious, but he is not as dull as he presents himself to be (87–8).

156. Lewis, C.S. 'What Chaucer really did to Il Filostrato.' Essays and Studies 17

Brief references. Hoccleve's praise of Chaucer in RP as the 'mirour of fructuous
entendment' (line 1963) and 'fadir in science' (line 1964) should be considered by those
readers who express surprise that the 15th century copied 'those elements of Chaucer's genius which it enjoyed instead of those which we enjoy' (42).


Brief references. Hoccleve's reflections on 'Thought' at the beginning of *RP* may be influenced by earlier love allegories that consider the 'state of the sleepless lover.' Whether or not this is the case, what results is a 'piece of very powerful writing' that recalls Keats and Aeschylus (238).


Some of the Chaucerian poetry we regard as bad decasyllables may in fact represent an expression of a more native metre, the 15th-century Heroic Line. Lines of verse in this metre have a distinct half-line structure, with the divide marked by a strong mid-line break. Each of the half-lines has between two and three stresses with 'most half-lines hovering between two and three stresses in a manner analogous to the Anglo-Saxon types D and E' (33). This is a line that can sometimes be read mistakenly as a bad decasyllable if one is unaware of its form (34–5). Very little of Hoccleve's verse falls into 15th-century Heroics. This might suggest that Hoccleve has captured something of Chaucer's metre which was lost to many of the Chaucerians, although it is likely that Chaucer himself wrote decasyllables influenced by more native rhythms (37–9). Lydgate, however, is a clear example of a poet working with the Heroic Line (39).

Brief references. Two of Hoccleve’s works are ‘Eucharistic hymns of praise’: *The aungeles song on pask day*; and *The song of graces of alle seintes upon Paske day* (257). These pieces are reverential, and generally vivacious and dramatic. Metrically they show a ‘certain mechanical correctness’ achieved through the stressing of normally unstressed syllables (258).


Brief references, restated in 161, to Hoccleve’s dependence on patronage (16-7).


Hoccleve’s poetry says much about a 'young man about town' of the period and, more importantly, about the problems created by the irregular payment of his government salary. It is the irregular payment of his salary that probably motivates him to write and so earn extra income (113). That patronage is such an issue for Hoccleve shows the dependency of literature at this time on the ‘private generosity of rich patrons’ (113-4). The Chaucerians
have received critical attention to the detriment of the ‘whole body of writers of “non-Chaucerian” verse’ (124). Interest in the ‘chivalric world’ was fostered by Edward III and ‘kept alive by the exploits of Henry V’; this interest maintained a demand for ‘courtly poetry.’ But poets such as Hoccleve are burdened by a ‘crushing weight of tradition,’ and they are unequal to Chaucer (125). Bennett restates some of Hoccleve’s biographical details with an emphasis on Hoccleve’s financial position; it is this position that denies him Chaucer’s affluence or Lydgate’s security (146–8). Hoccleve’s concern for his immediate situation adds interest to his work, which is otherwise shallow (149). His verse is technically weak, but a rich source of ‘social history’ (150). [A bibliography lists the major Hoccleve editions and published criticism (285–6).] Hoccleve’s death dates to 1450 (285); see Brown, r163 and 239, for the correct date of 1426.


Schulz, 166, suggests a date about 1430 for Hoccleve’s death, and not about 1450 as generally thought. The Calendar of Close Rolls supports Schulz’s case. An entry for 18 August 1437 reveals two people being granted a corrody at Southwick Priory where Hoccleve held a corrody by a grant made in 1424. The Priory was not required to provide more than one corrody at a time, therefore, it might be supposed that Hoccleve was dead by ‘not later than the early summer of 1437.’ See Brown, r163 and 239, for the correct date of 1426.


Topics covered include the likely education available to Hoccleve as a child, his limited career opportunities, the importance of patronage to his work, and his devotion to Chaucer. Hoccleve’s poetry is ‘not of a very high order’ (71).


Brief references. Walter Burley’s *Liber de vita et moribus philosophorum* draws heavily on Vincent of Beauvais’s *Speculum historiale*, and is itself influential on subsequent chronicles and other works (443ff.). There are echoes of Burley in at least two stanzas of *RP*, lines 2815–2821 and 3767–3773. These references make it clear that Hoccleve has with him, at the time of writing *RP*, a text belonging to the tradition of Vincent of Beauvais’s work (453–4).


Brief references to *RP* as a work within the *mirror* genre.


Furnivall’s first impression (13: xlix) is that three of the extant manuscripts of Hoccleve’s poems (San Marino, Hunting Library MSS 111 and 744, and Durham, Univ. Lib., MS
Cosin V.iii.9) might be in the poet’s own hand. Subsequently, he changes his mind on the basis of the errors he finds in the manuscripts. In fact, Furnivall himself introduces some of these ‘errors’ into the text; other errors can be explained by the fact that Hoccleve copies his poems up to 20 years after he composes them when his health and eyesight are poor. These points, and the evidence of palaeography (including that provided by Hoccleve’s holograph *Formulary*), make it likely that the manuscripts are in Hoccleve’s hand. Part two of Schulz’s article deals with the date of Hoccleve’s death. Traditionally, this was put at about 1450 on the internal evidence of Hoccleve’s *Balade to the Duke of York*. A date nearer to 1430 is likely, principally because the duke to whom the poem refers is probably Edward Plantagenet (born c. 1373) and not Richard, Edward’s nephew, (born 1411). See Brown, 163 and 239, who further refines the date of Hoccleve’s death to 1426.


Brief references to Hoccleve in order to illustrate the social context of the period. Hoccleve’s marriage cuts him off from promotion. Even if he had remained single and obtained a benefice, however, he would have found himself, because he lacked the necessary ‘professional education’ for a better position, in a village where few parishioners could even read (172).


Webster matches samples of vocabulary taken from Chaucer, Gower, Hoccleve, and Lydgate against *An Holy Medytacion*. The results support the case for Chaucer’s
authorship. [Brown, 643–5, favours Chaucer as the author of *An Holy Medytacion*; Dempster, 724–5, argues against Chaucer’s authorship, and leaves the matter open regarding Lydgate; and Tatlock, 657, inclines to Lydgate’s authorship. Modern scholars have accepted *An Holy Medytacion* into the Lydgate canon; see Schirmer (758: 271) and Pearsall (818: 267).]


Hoccleve is a ‘poor creature at best, and ... no great poet’ (98); yet, his writings allow an insight into the ‘club’ society of London (98–9). He is ‘much less prolific than Lydgate, less scholarly, but less conventional.’ The *Complaint* shows his ‘easy, slipshod style’ (283). *RP* may be ‘dipped into’ for its historical interest (284).


Explores the hypothesis that the Cambridge, Fitzwilliam Museum, MS McClean 181 copy of Chaucer’s *CT* might have been produced by a privy seal clerk working, in part, from a version owned by Hoccleve. There is no proof that a scribe of the privy seal was responsible, or that Hoccleve had a copy of Chaucer’s poem; however, the early ownership of the manuscript has links to the privy seal, and it is very likely that Hoccleve owned a copy of *CT* (168–9).

In discussing other examples of poetry satirizing women in the 15th century, Robbins gives the text of an early example from Hoccleve, *La commendacion de ma dame*, a double roundel taken from San Marino, Huntington Lib., MS HM 744. Satires on the idea of ‘women as the root of all evil’ were made, in all probability, to vary a theme that had exhausted its ‘more obvious possibilities’ (418).


The Findern Anthology [Cambridge, Univ. Lib., MS Ff.i.6] contains, among other items, *LC* (611). Chaucer, Gower, Hoccleve, and Lydgate appear to have been the only major poets of the 15th century aside from Langland (611–12). Robbins describes the manuscript’s contents and provides historical background on the Findern family.

173. -----, and John L. Cutler. *Supplement to the Index of Middle English Verse.*


Provides some minor references on occurrences of mottoes in the Cambridge, Univ. Lib., MS Hh.iv.11 copy of *RP*. Item 1704.5 notes manuscripts containing extracts from the *LC* (it mistakenly refers to Cambridge, Univ. Lib., MS Hh.14.11).
174. **Brown, Carleton, and Rossell Hope Robbins.** *The Index of Middle English Verse.*
   New York: Columbia UP, 1943.

A manuscript listing and brief publishing history. Seymour, 256, supplements the Brown-Robbins list of Hoccleve manuscripts, as does Edwards, 233, who offers an additional manuscript for RP. Mitchell, 207, provides some minor corrections to Seymour.

175. **Utley, Francis Lee.** *The Crooked Rib: An Analytical Index to the Argument about Women in English and Scots Literature to the End of the Year 1568.* Columbus, OH: Ohio State UP, 1944.

Item 28 refers to the Dialogue. The Series as a whole requires further textual study to see if it has a hidden ‘underlying unity’ (110); however, it is clearly an attempt at a ‘palinode’ for Hoccleve’s previous writings against women. [Utley is a little concerned that Hoccleve seems to include LC among these writings, a poem that Utley sees as essentially consistent with its feminist source.] The Series shows that Hoccleve is familiar with Chaucer’s Marriage Group and *Legend of Good Women* (111). Item 49 refers to LC: Hoccleve keeps Christine de Pizan’s ‘tone and mood’ in the context of a very free translation (121). Item 235 refers to the third part of the roundel on Lady Money as a ‘parody of the courtly love poem’ (219). See 746 for a more general discussion of Utley’s views on the debate about women.

Brief references. Hoccleve's ASJO is possibly one of the 'most telling of the replies which were written by orthodox writers to Lollard preachers' (103). Hoccleve's arguments are based on theology, but incorporate a highly effective appeal to nationalism (104).


Adams argues that the lack of a rigorous medieval pacifism puts the later pacifist thinking of the renaissance humanists in a 'truer perspective and more striking relief' (446). [For Adams's opinion on Ashby, see 1163.] *RP* is 'fairly typical of fifteenth-century laments against war'; many of its notions are 'medieval commonplaces' (441). Hoccleve is not motivated by a 'consistent Christian or philosophic pacifism'; he simply reflects current court policy through what amounts to 'literary propaganda' (442-3). Hoccleve demonstrates this by his about face in *ASJO* when he praises the pursuit of war; this poem, in which Hoccleve looks back to 'knighthood's golden age,' also attests to the decay of chivalry (443). [For a later view that places Hoccleve and the other 15th-century Chaucerians as the inheritors of a genuine pacifism from Chaucer, see Lawton (321: 780-2).]


The extent of the Hoccleve corpus is as yet undefined because the first printers did not print most of the poems. Hoccleve's most significant work is *RP* followed by *TJW*, *Jonathas*, and *LD*; this last piece is the 'most dignified and the most poetical' of them all. *LMR* is
a description of Hoccleve’s long, but ‘not very violent dissipation.’ Other poems ‘do not call for enumeration.’ Hoccleve talks about himself, and this is his principal source of interest: it makes him invigorating, in spite of his ‘technical shortcomings.’ [Probably with Lydgate in mind, Sampson says that he finds Hoccleve’s style preferable to a confrontation with ‘extensive moral commonplaces expressed without mitigation of earnestness’ (85). Most of the 1946 entry is repeated in the revised edition of 1970.]


The verse of the 15th century generally does not break ‘new ground,’ but it continues the pattern established in the previous century (288). Baugh provides a brief biographical sketch based on Hoccleve’s poetry, and outlines the small extent of the poet’s work (297–8). In spite of Hoccleve’s limitations, ‘his complete frankness, his many personal revelations, and his frequent references to current events make his verse almost always interesting’ (298).


Brief references in a discussion of relevance to Hoccleve’s historical context. Evidence from England and abroad supports the validity of Hoccleve’s complaint about the lack of benefices for educated men (175).

Brief references. Chaucer draws on his experiences of city life; of the English Chaucerians, the same is possibly true only for Hoccleve (659). Hoccleve possesses a ‘weaker but more sympathetic character’ than Lydgate does. He does not have Lydgate’s range, yet he more successfully conveys a ‘poet’s personality’ (660).


Hoccleve and Lydgate ignore the ‘saving graces of traditional song,’ and produce instead ‘tedious metrical exercises.’ They conform as ‘servilely to accepted literary style as to religious dogma.’ Hoccleve is important now only for his record of Chaucer (134). Reflecting the taste of his time, Hoccleve overlooks the ‘muscularity’ of Chaucer’s verse in favour of its rhetorical qualities (135). His secular lyrics are ‘ uninspired by any commendable motives,’ and they include ‘servile petitions’; his religious lyrics better reflect his small talent, and the hymns to the Virgin are his best. Humour is rare in Hoccleve (135). Although Hoccleve keeps a syllable count, his metrical stress does not always reflect word accent (136).


Not sighted. Discusses the attribution of 14 poems in the ME prose translation of Guillaume de Deguileville *Pelerinage de l’Ame.* See Burrow (226: 24, note 96) and


The Chaucer portrait in London, BL, MS Harley 4866 anticipates the Renaissance in England; it is ‘remarkable’ for its ‘suggestiveness of an individual man.’ The miniature of Hoccleve presenting his work to Prince Henry in London, BL, MS Arundel 38 is likely to be meant as a portrait of the two men (185). The miniatures are shown in black and white on plates 169b and 169c, where Rickert attributes the Arundel miniature to an unidentified follower of Hermann Scheere. See Seymour, 256, Alexander, 295, and Wright, 352–3, for related discussions.


Puts an alternative theory to the scansion of Chaucerian verse by stress and syllable count as iambic pentameter. Southworth argues that lines should be read rhythmically with regard to the duration of syllables, in the manner of musical notation, as in classical Greek or Latin. The constant pronunciation of final –e is not supported by the manuscript evidence and is unnecessary. [On this last point, see Burrow, 47, and Jefferson, 320, for the dissenting modern view.] It is ‘unrealistic’ to assume that Hoccleve did not understand Chaucer’s metre (71). A number of Hoccleve’s poems can be shown to read better rhythmically than metrically (74–8). Hoccleve understands the more superficial aspects of Chaucer’s musicality; what he fails to grasp is its ‘vitality’ and finer points (78).


*The Monk and the Blessed Virgin’s Sleeves* occurs in three manuscripts: San Marino, Huntington Lib., MS HM 744; Cambridge, Trinity College, MS R.3.21; and Oxford, Christ Church, MS 152 (116–17). The last of these manuscripts has Chaucer’s *CT* with Hoccleve’s poem inserted as *The Ploughman’s Tale*, presumably as a substitution for the spurious tale concerning a debate between a griffin and a pelican that is found in some early printed editions of Chaucer (120–1). There are a number of medieval stories about Our Lady’s Psalter, the forerunner of the rosary (118–19). It is possible that Hoccleve knew of these stories because one is found in a manuscript probably used by Chaucer for source material in the *Tale of Sir Thopas* (120). Caution is needed regarding Schulz’s claim, 166, that Huntington Lib., MS HM 744 is in Hoccleve’s own hand, and one would like to see more evidence before accepting his hypothesis as fact (121–2). Hoccleve’s poem is a ‘charming and graceful miracle of the Virgin.... [and] an outstanding example of an old story made into a work of art’ (122).

Warsaw: Polish Scientific, 1956
Brief references to *LMR, RP,* and *ASJO.* Hoccleve’s poetry is ‘conventional enough,’ yet interesting for its autobiographical detail (293).


Brief references. The Devonshire Manuscript, London, BL, MS Add. 17492, is not only collection of early Tudor poems; it also contains, among other things, extracts from *LC.*


Brief references. Hoccleve and Lydgate are the ‘best known of Chaucer’s followers in England ... yet they seem to belong to a different age.’ The work of each lacks ‘poetic merit’; Hoccleve’s poetry is the ‘more interesting’ of the two because of its ‘realistic and autobiographical touches.’ *LMR* is at times ‘fairly vivid.’ Hoccleve’s long works are ‘mechanical and tedious’; his religious and instructional pieces are of ‘little value as literature.’ The technical aspect of Hoccleve’s verse is ‘extraordinarily unaccomplished,’ and he relies simply on having the correct number of syllables with no regard for stress (129).

Hoccleve, like Lydgate and Gower, is able to extol the virtues of peace and then urge war. In \textit{RP} he counsels peace, but later in \textit{ASJO} he shows the ‘authentic language of chivalry’ when required to do so by ‘royal policy’ (176). It is better to see these various utterances as propaganda than as indicative of cultural trends (176–7). Nevertheless, \textit{RP}, in spite of a surface appearance of ‘classical lore and Christian moralism,’ has a clear underlying chivalric assumption that the king is also a knight. It is one of the few pieces in English from the period that shows originality in handling the \textit{mirror} genre.


Brief references. \textit{RP} is mainly taken up with the ‘uncontested generalities’ of the \textit{mirror} genre as it is found in 15th-century England; nevertheless, Hoccleve’s poem offers a few original remarks that refer specifically to the English context (88–9). These include the topics of ‘public finance, the administration of justice, and the problem of peace.’ Hoccleve’s comments on these matters show that, although Hoccleve is a ‘hack-writer and time-server,’ he is able to look at society in a realistic way and to ‘interpret the function of unsolicited written counsel to some extent in a practical light’ (89). Ferguson is more impressed with Ashby, see 1166.


Not sighted.

Brief references. *RP* takes its philosophical position from the *Secreta secretorum* and from Egidius de Colomna’s *De regimine principum*; it takes its exempla from, in the main, Jacobus de Cessolis’ *Game of Chess*. Hoccleve offers the ethical teaching of the source material according to a ‘fresh ... presentation of his own.’ The discussion of his personal problems in the prologue might be, as a parallel usage in the *Secreta* suggests, an ‘indication of the symbolic status of Kingship in the poetic mind’ (95). Under this interpretation, the ‘chaos and harmony in the individual soul, and that in a monarchy, can ... be suggestively juxtaposed’ (95–6). [The notes to the article provide a summary of the *Sirr-ul-Asrār* (100–3) and a list of the English language versions (103–5).]


Brief references. Hoccleve’s main attraction is the autobiographical content of his work: ‘There is something pleasantly unpretentious, though undistinguished, about the down-to-earth poetry’ (261).

Brief references. Seven manuscripts in Oxford's Bodleian Library, now catalogued separately, were part of a single vernacular manuscript in the 15th century. One of these, MS Rawlinson poetry 35 contains, among other items, Lydgate's *Dietary*; another, MS Rawlinson poetry 168, contains *RP*.


Brief references in a discussion of the work and influence of Hermann Scheere. Folio 37 of the *RP* manuscript, London, B.L., Arundel MS 38 shows traces of Scheere's style (195–6). [See Rickert, 184, and Alexander, 295.] Oxford, Bodleian Lib., MS Rawlinson C. 446, a *ST* manuscript, is likely to be from the Johannes atelier (200).


Summarizes Hoccleve's basic biography, and offers a favourable assessment of his narrative and autobiographical poetry: 'On the whole ... not a bad specimen of a poet!' (10).

Brief references to Hoccleve in a discussion of Gower's life-records. In 1392 Hoccleve goes surety for one of the clerks in the privy seal, Guy de Rouclif. Gower also has dealings with de Rouclif (62). This life-record is omitted from Furnivall, 85 and 13. Hoccleve refers to Gower in RP, and there are parallels between the two poets' views of kingship. It is likely that Hoccleve knew Chaucer and Gower (63). See Blyth, 354, for further exploration of Hoccleve's debt to Gower.


Brief references as the author explores the hypothesis that the sudden increase in literary works written in English after 1400 is the result of a deliberate government policy to win over English citizens to support the doubtful legality of the Lancastrian succession. Henry IV's 'benefactions' to Hoccleve, Chaucer, and Gower are evidence of his support for the English poets (1171). Hoccleve's acknowledgment of the role played by Prince Henry as his patron, and Chaucer as his master, is part of a Lancastrian program to establish English as the national language (1177–8).


On the basis of three references in RP and that poem's manuscript illustration of Chaucer, many critics have assumed that Hoccleve knew Chaucer well. Nevertheless, Hoccleve's references to Chaucer are vague and do not clearly indicate a close acquaintance. Even the famous lines on Chaucer's wish to instruct the dull-witted Hoccleve (RP, 2077–9) could refer merely to Hoccleve's own efforts to learn from Chaucer's books. Hoccleve's
comment on the Chaucer illustration suggests only that he had seen the poet. The two men 'moved in widely different social spheres' (12). See Ingram, 248, and Brown, 239, who argue that Hoccleve’s social circle is wider than Mitchell concedes; and see Reeves, 254, for evidence of the breadth of social connections made possible by literary patronage.


Mitchell’s article considers the autobiographical content of LMR, RP, Complaint and Dialogue. The autobiographical detail Hoccleve provides has a ‘degree of individuality unparalleled in Middle English poetry’ (269). Some of the supposed facts Hoccleve offers about himself may be exaggerations or statements of artistic convention. Official records do not seem to support Hoccleve’s cries of poverty, and it is strange that there is no mention of Hoccleve’s period of mental illness outside his own poetry (270–1). Whether it is true or not, the poet has a way of presenting his autobiography in a way that makes it appear ‘genuine’ (276). [See Burrow, 221 and 226, Seymour, r204, and Robinson, 243, for other views on the veracity of Hoccleve’s personal references.] Ashby, Bokenham, Chaucer, and Lydgate also make autobiographical references; however, Hoccleve’s are more extensive (283). Hoccleve’s autobiographical passages enliven his text by their ‘realism, individuality and apparent sincerity’ (284).

Quotes lines 1958–74, 2077–107 from *RP* for Hoccleve’s tributes to Chaucer, and suggests that these do not necessarily prove a close acquaintance between the two poets. The tributes to Chaucer are rhetorical in their construction, and a close examination of their form shows how Hoccleve achieves the ‘impression of deep, personal grief’ (279). See Mitchell, 201 and 204.

204. ———. *Thomas Hoccleve: A Study in Early Fifteenth-Century English Poetic.*


Ch. 1: ‘The Autobiographical Element’ (1–19). Some of Hoccleve’s autobiographical details may be questionable, but even so they are exceptional for their extent, detail, and apparent self-revelation. The prologue to *RP*, and *Complaint*, do not have a ‘well-defined organization’ (15). [For different views, see Burrow, 221 and 226, on the veracity of Hoccleve’s personal references, and see Scanlon on the structure of *RP*, 339–40, and Mills on the structure of the *Complaint*, 368.]

Ch. 2: ‘Themes and Genres’ (20–56). The genres of Hoccleve’s poetry are ‘highly representative of fifteenth-century taste’ (20); examples of these include the courtly, didactic, political, religious, narrative, and begging poem genres. Many of Hoccleve’s recurrent themes are common in medieval literature, for example youth, age, and fortune. Nevertheless, some his themes on political and social issues, such as heresy and the status of women, seem to be heartfelt. *LC* shows a playful wit, but Hoccleve is a writer with a ‘strongly feminist bias’ (55). [For a more sceptical view of Hoccleve’s ‘feminism’ see Bornstein, 263.] Hoccleve seems to have introduced some genres into English, such as the instructive manual for a prince, the *ars moriendi*, and the satirical panegyric for a lady.
Ch. 3: ‘Style’ (57–74). Mitchell analyses Hoccleve’s style in terms of its use of the devices of medieval rhetoric. His poems are not ‘subtle’ and they lack an ‘elaborate, premeditated organic design’; his use of metaphor and imagery is ‘unsophisticated, mechanical, and typically medieval’ (60). Contrary to criticism by Kurtz, Hoccleve’s frequent use of word pairs, for example ‘outrage and offence,’ is a ‘conventional means of literary embellishment’ for a medieval writer (70). Hoccleve’s diction is ‘much closer to Chaucer than Lydgate’ (72). He uses ‘words of Romance derivation’ in his poetry, but they are not ‘strange, overly dulcet, or laboriously artificial’ (72). In comparison with Lydgate, his style is ‘plain’ and his syntax much more tight (73).

Ch. 4: ‘Handling of Sources’ (75–96). Mitchell considers Hoccleve’s approach to translation in RP, LC, TJW, and Jonathas. Hoccleve’s sometimes loose approach is in keeping with medieval practice; however, he displays ‘individuality and unusual skill’ is his adaptation of the ‘direct discourse’ of his source material. This is one of his best accomplishments (96).

Ch. 5: ‘Meter’ (97–109). Hoccleve’s metre is poor only if one forces his verse to conform to the fixed stress pattern of iambic decasyllables. To apply such a pattern frequently leads to an untenable scansion. Licklider, is an extreme proponent of this approach, but one who typifies the views of many late 19th- and early 20th-century critics. Mitchell offers examples of the same lines under different scansion techniques: Licklider’s use of a fixed stress pattern for the pentameter line; Schick’s line-types; Brooks’s and Warren’s method that allows metrical substitution and inversion; and Southworth’s theory of rhythmic reading. A comparison of these approaches shows that it is only Licklider’s system that finds Hoccleve’s command of metre to be poor. Therefore, the condemnation of Hoccleve’s metrical skill is a ‘value judgment’ that follows from an ‘absurd theory of English pentameter line structure’ (109).
Ch 6: ‘Hoccleve and Chaucer’ (110–23). Mitchell discusses the surviving RP Chaucer portraits. It is doubtful that Hoccleve knew Chaucer personally. Hoccleve’s indebtedness to Chaucer is not great, but it can be seen in some aspects of his metre (121). Hoccleve’s use of dialogue may show Chaucer’s influence. Mitchell concludes his study with an annotated Hoccleve bibliography (125–45).

——Review by M.C. Seymour, Review of English Studies NS 20 (1969): 482–85. Mitchell’s work would have benefited from a closer consideration both of the manuscript evidence and of the poet’s historical context (483). The argument that Hoccleve did not know Chaucer is unconvincing, and Hoccleve’s debt to Chaucer is greater than Mitchell concedes. Mitchell’s most useful chapter is on Hoccleve’s metre (484). Seymour also makes some minor additions to Mitchell’s bibliography.


Discusses the changes made by Mitchell and Doyle in their 1970 revision of the Furnivall, 13, and Gollancz, 26, editions of Hoccleve’s Minor Poems. The revision updates the Hoccleve life-records, includes references to modern criticism, and corrects many hundreds of errors in the manuscript readings (9–15). Gollancz and Furnivall follow different editorial practices, but both men make many errors.

206. [Withdrawn.]  

An annotated survey of Hoccleve bibliography to supplement that found in Mitchell, 204. Matthews, 245, is useful, particularly for manuscript information, but he mistakenly refers to TJW and Jonathas as ‘translations from the continental Gesta Romanorum.’ The date suggested by Matthews for Hoccleve’s death, about 1437, is likely to be too late (50). See Brown, 163 and 239, regarding the date of Hoccleve’s death. Some minor corrections are offered to Seymour, 256 (51).


Pearsall discusses Hoccleve mainly on pages 203–22. Unlike Lydgate’s practice of expressing life-experiences in terms of ‘literary formulae,’ Hoccleve’s references to himself are life-like and recall ‘Chaucer’s wry self-mocking irony’ (223). Hoccleve has a straightforward style without aureation. His metre is regular, but an ‘over-careful attention to the syllable-count ... often results in wrenched stress.’ The Series is a ‘highly original experiment in framing’; the Complaint and Dialogue are Hoccleve ‘at his best’ (224). LC demonstrates that Hoccleve can ‘laugh at women as well as himself’; although his use of irony lacks Chaucer’s sharpness, it is ‘delicate enough to make Lydgate look monkish’ (225).

Hoccleve is even less of a court poet than Lydgate; nevertheless, one of his early poems, *LC*, is written in response to the fashion of the French court. Hoccleve’s approach is to turn the argument of Christine de Pizan against herself (213–14). Hoccleve’s efforts to obtain substantial court patronage are unsuccessful (216); he does not have the patronage enjoyed by Lydgate (236). Pearsall briefly overviews Hoccleve’s work (236–8). The success of *RP* indicates that the reading public wanted a translation of the poem’s sources; Hoccleve himself had ‘little influence or fame’ (237). Hoccleve’s gift lies in the dramatic sense he sometimes displays, as in the prologue to *RP* (237) and in *LMR* (238). He is part of a ‘sensible and unostentatious verse-tradition’ that is corrupted by Lydgate (239).


References to Hoccleve are mainly clustered in Appendix I (285–305) which deals with the Chaucer portraits. The portrait of Chaucer in the *RP* manuscript, London, BL, MS Harley 4866, is probably the oldest after that found in the Ellesmere manuscript, San Marino, Huntington Lib., MS EL 26 C 9 (285). Hoccleve’s “‘iconization’ of Chaucer is audacious,” but the level of innovation Hoccleve shows is also ‘quite extraordinary.’ Hoccleve’s claim for the portrait as an accurate representation of Chaucer is very unusual for its time (287). Pearsall briefly discusses the earlier tradition of European and English portraiture (287–8). Despite a few other examples, Hoccleve’s Chaucer portrait may be fairly said to represent the beginning of portraiture in England (288). Pearsall then overviews the remaining Chaucer portrait in other *RP* manuscripts (289–91). The Chaucer portrait found in Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, MS 61, a manuscript which gives a text of *Troilus and Criseyde*, is ‘definitely reminiscent’ of that in London, BL, MS Harley 4866 (291). McGregor’s claim, 271, however, that the two portraits have a ‘common interest in representing Chaucer as a wise counsellor of princes’ is unconvincing (344, note 9).
RP serves Prince Henry’s political interests with references carefully matched to the prince’s political situation at the time of the poem’s composition. Hoccleve’s famous Chaucer portrait is also part of a message about ‘kingly self-representation’ (386). Hoccleve’s poem dates to 1411 (388). Prince Henry is politically very active at this time, and it is important to him that he is perceived to be thoughtful and stable (388–9). Hoccleve’s self-representation as a man motivated to write by his poor circumstances is a ploy to avoid being seen as a ‘mouthpiece’ for the prince (389). RP is quite deliberate in its support of the legitimacy of the Lancastrian succession; that it does this in the vernacular is part of its popular approach (390). It is possible that the prince encourages Hoccleve to write RP, although the encouragement may be of a general nature and communicated through intermediaries (393–4). RP is consistent with the prince’s general fostering of the use of English (397–8). What little information there is regarding the recipients of the early manuscripts of the poem points to a ‘concerted attempt on the prince’s part to cement relationships with possibly doubtful friends’ (396). Pearsall discusses the significance of Hoccleve’s references to Chaucer and use of the Chaucer portrait (398–408). RP constructs Chaucer as a ‘poet counsellor ... the great founder of the national literary tradition embodied now in Hoccleve’s service to the prince’ (401). The Chaucer portrait is a ‘direct rebuke’ to Lollardy and its opposition to the use of images (405). Hoccleve presents himself as a simple, truthful person in his interactions with the Old Man at the beginning of the poem. This is intended to show that he is no mere flatterer of the prince (408–9). The truthfulness of Hoccleve’s autobiographical references is an important aspect of his self-representation (409).

Brief references. Caxton’s description of Chaucer as ‘first foundeur’ may have its ultimate source in line 4978 of *RP* where Chaucer is described as ‘the first fyndere of our faire langage.’ Hoccleve’s expression soon became commonplace (27).


The penitential lyric was an influential genre; its ‘literary potentiality’ came mainly from its innate ‘autobiographical tendency’ (295). Hoccleve does not have the social status enjoyed by Chaucer; his work shows the conservatism and seriousness of the middle class that suits the penitential genre (295–6). *LMR* displays a new ‘personal’ colour and introspection that anticipates the Renaissance: it is an example of how influential the penitential lyric could be on the ‘poetry of personal revelation.’ *LMR*’s parody and transcendence of the genre is ‘remarkable’ (296). In a close reading of *LMR* that occupies the remainder of the article, Thornley considers Hoccleve’s poem both as a work within the tradition of the penitential lyric and as a work that parodies that tradition. She discusses the features of the genre, such as the use of the first person address, lament for wasted youth, and reference to the Seven Deadly Sins. Hoccleve does not ‘confess grandly’ to his sins, as is usual in this genre, and his apparent reluctance to do so adds to the poem’s realism and anticipates the ‘anti-hero’ (316). *LMR* exploits the traditions of the begging poem and the ‘parody of Christianity apparent in certain conventions of courtly love.’ The fact that it also parodies the penitential lyric proves that the conventions of that genre must have been well known to Hoccleve’s audience (321).

Coventry, City Records Office, MS Accession 325/1, which dates between 1450 and 1475, had been lost for the first half of the 20th century. It has now been found (22). Doyle describes the manuscript (22–6). The figure pictured on f. 1r is unlikely to be Chaucer, Hoccleve or Lydgate; in light of the presence of RP at the beginning of the manuscript, it may be intended to represent Aristotle or Egidius de Colomna. RP is on folios 1r to 40r, and the Series is on folios 40r to 70r followed by Lydgate’s DM. These Hoccleve and Lydgate items are in the same order as found in Oxford, Bodleian Lib., MS Selden supra 53. This ordering also holds true for Oxford, Bodleian Lib., MS 221 and MS Laud Misc. 735, except that RP is there placed last (24). Lydgate’s ST is on folios 137r to 167v (25). It seems that those responsible for the compilation of the manuscript were able to use Hoccleve and Lydgate exemplars that were similar to, or possibly the same as, those from the scriptorium, based in Bury St Edmunds or London, that was known for its reliable copies of works by these authors (25–6). The remainder of the article provides transcriptions of the Chaucer material, and discusses the manuscript’s affiliation to the ‘Bradshaw’ group of Chaucer manuscripts.


References to Hoccleve in a discussion of the importance of Cambridge, Trinity College, MS R.3.2 (a copy of John Gower’s *Confessio Amantis*) as a guide to the working relationships between early 15th-century scribes. Hoccleve is one of five scribes who
together produced the Trinity manuscript (182–5). [Folios 83v, from the Trinity manuscript, and 95, from Durham, Univ. Lib., MS Cosin V.iii.9 are reproduced as examples of Hoccleve’s hand (183–4).] Hoccleve’s handwriting in the Trinity manuscript is closest to that found in the envoi to Durham manuscript; there are only very minor differences between the two (182, 185). [The authors suggest that San Marino, Huntington Lib., MSS HM 111 and HM 744 may once have been a single volume (182, note 38). This view is also put by Bowers, 327, and by Seymour, 48, but Doyle subsequently rejects the idea, r48. Burrow seems inclined to see the two manuscripts as being originally a single volume (226: 31).] Hoccleve’s dedication of a poem on the Virgin (see poem 6 in Gollancz, 26) to Thomas Marleburgh, a man who was active in the book trade, shows that he has at least one connection to the industry. There is no reason to think that Marleburgh or one of Hoccleve’s patrons commissioned the Trinity Confessio Amantis (198). The Trinity manuscript suggests that stationers sometimes used professional scribes, from different backgrounds, who were not normally engaged in book production (198–9).


Some references to Hoccleve and Lydgate manuscripts in a preliminary consideration of whether or not there might be grounds for saying that the English Court had a ‘uniquely distinguishable influence ... on the character of book-production in English’ (181). Doyle very tentatively suggests that such an influence might not have been present. Hoccleve’s autograph poems have dedications to a variety of figures including a merchant, town clerk, and members and associates of the court. The London, BL, MS Arundel 38 copy of RP has the appearance of being a presentation copy, but it is not certain whether its cost was borne by the author or by his patron (172). See Green, 269, for a related discussion.
Hoccleve translates the verse *Complaint of the Virgin*, an extract from Guillaume de Deguileville *Pelerinage de l'Ame*, for Joan Bohun; it is possible that the English prose version of Deguileville's *Pelerinage* is another example of Hoccleve's work for Joan (16). [Burrow does not make this assertion, and he accepts only one of the 14 poems in the translation as Hoccleve's (226:24); Seymour believes Hoccleve may be the author of all 14 poems (48: xiv), as Furnivall, (14: xx–xxii), suggests and MacCracken, 123, disputes. Schick excludes the prose translation from the Lydgate canon (442: ci–ciii); and Hare, 697, attributes the translation to Lydgate. McGerr, 338*, rejects both Hoccleve and Lydgate as potential authors of the prose text.]


Most of Mathew's Hoccleve references are in Ch. 6, 'Thomas Usk and Thomas Hoccleve' (53–61). England in the late 14th century has the 'greatest vernacular literature in Europe,' and Hoccleve is a part of this. English vernacular writers at this time are dependent principally on the 'Court and the haute bourgeoisie of London' (53). The novelty of Hoccleve's poetry in the English literature of its time comes from its autobiographical content and from Hoccleve's 'sense of his own weakness' which is made more acute by his 'consciousness of the filth around him.' Judged on the basis of the number of surviving manuscripts, *RP* is Hoccleve's only poem to have wide popularity with a contemporary audience. Like much of his work, it has since been criticized 'too harshly' (57). *RP* is an 'accomplished' poem with the 'smooth style' that is sought-after in this period; it has an 'occasional strong line and a cluster of concise classical anecdotes' (57–8). Hoccleve's learnedness, shared with Thomas Usk, is typical of the 'new literary movement of the international court culture' (58). Plate 13, opposite page 76, reproduces the presentation miniature from London, BL, MS Arundel 38: the miniature is not by Hermann Scheere, although it is very likely to have come from his shop (43–4). The missing Chaucer portrait
in Arundel 38 was by Scheere; a copy of the missing portrait might be that found in London, BL, MS Harley 4866 (44).


Quotes lines 1961–74, 2080–90 and 4978–84 from *R*P (41–2). There is a ‘strong element of convention’ in the praise offered by Hoccleve and other early writers to Chaucer for his ‘rhetorical artifice and his ornate ... diction’; however, Chaucer’s creation of the ‘English poetic manner’ is indeed an ‘unprecedented achievement in the vernacular’ (35).


Brief references. *TJW* and *Jonathas* are ‘well-managed narrative pieces,’ but they seem ‘remote and fantastic’ next to the autobiographical *Complaint* and *Dialogue*. These autobiographical poems with their ‘strong ... sense of the sober, distressing realities of everyday life’ show a revival of interest in the ‘voir dit,’ or ‘true story,’ style originally used by Guillaume de Machaut and Jean Froissart (51). Hoccleve’s *Series* could be seen as the ‘formal equivalent of a manuscript miscellany,’ written at a time when it is becoming fashionable for some vernacular authors to present their work in the form of a ‘book’ with a serial structure. This poses the question, is the *Series* one work or many? (61).


Hoccleve is a somewhat uneven writer, but one who, at his best, shows a ‘lively intelligence and a command of English verse’ beyond his own claims of limited ability
It is wrong for the schools of Historical, New, and Formalist criticism to dismiss as fictional, or irrelevant, the apparently personal declarations of medieval autobiographical writing. What a poet has to say is not necessarily fictional because it is conventional. It is not surprising that Hoccleve uses conventions in *LMR* taken from penitential lyrics because this was 'how people thought about themselves' (396). The circumstances of Hoccleve's life that can be determined from historical records agree with the description in his poetry. Burrow takes issue with Mitchell, 201–4, Doob, 250, and Thornley, 213, for their view of the conventional—and so likely to be fictional—nature of Hoccleve's autobiographical references: their approach is an example of the 'conventional fallacy.' The autobiographical references of Hoccleve's poetry are an important element of its meaning.


Brief references. Hoccleve is the 'most consistent exponent' of the petitionary complaint using autobiographical references. These references lend this 'interesting and underrated writer' much of his appeal (41). Hoccleve's financial dependence on the king and nobles encourages the artistic individuality needed to capture their attention and remind them of his 'continuing existence' (42). Like Chaucer and Gower, Hoccleve is a medieval 'man of letters' and somewhat removed from the 'native literary heritage' of the 'minstrel entertainers' (54).
Critics do not allow Hoccleve his due credit: although a better writer than Lydgate, he has been in the shadow of the 'massive bulk of Lydgate's work.' The Series is the 'boldest and most interesting' of Hoccleve's poems (259). An analysis of the structure of the Series stresses its self-referential and reflexive quality (260–67). The poem is a part of Hoccleve's recovery from mental illness and a demonstration that that recovery has taken place (260). In the Series 'books are part of life' (270). The poet presents himself both as a reader and as a writer concerned with how his work will be accepted (267). His extreme concern with the readers' response to his poetry may be partly a result of his illness (268); nevertheless, the Series shows a progression from 'solitary alienation' to the adaptation of a more appropriate 'social role' for its author (268). [Burrow discusses this transition (268–70).] Hoccleve's desire for acceptance leads him to volunteer 'to speak of the common good' and this has somewhat alienated his readers, in spite of his 'real literary talent' (270).

Some medieval poetic works rely on their physical presentation to achieve their full effect (230); Hoccleve's Series is such a work (241–5). Durham, Univ. Lib., MS Cosin MS V.iii.9, a possible Hoccleve holograph, suggests the 'intimacy of a medieval reader's encounter' with an author. The Series deals with the 'processes of its own making'; it is the 'most elaborately reflexive or self-referential book' from this period (242). Such a book encourages the 'reader to feel as if he were looking over the poet's shoulder.' The
Series belongs to the most organized and efficient period of manuscript book production; Hoccleve was able to influence the accurate scribal transmission of its complex structure (245).


Some of Hoccleve’s work, such as LC and his Marian poems, are close enough to Chaucer’s style to have been mistaken as his, but most of Hoccleve’s poetry ‘creates a very different impression’ (55). Chaucer was able to recreate unfamiliar situations imaginatively; by comparison, Hoccleve is unimaginative. Hoccleve has ‘his own distinctive strength as a poet of the non-imaginary worlds of public and private life.’ Recent criticism has shown more interest in this ‘unChaucerian Hoccleve’ (56). Nevertheless, Hoccleve is a follower of Chaucer in his concern for the syllable count of his verse. Jefferson, 320, shows that Hoccleve attended to the details of syllable counting to the extent that he ‘consistently employed variant forms of words in order to ensure that his lines should not “fayle in a sillable”’ (58). Jefferson’s work proves that the final -e is syllabic in Hoccleve’s poetry: ‘Can it have been otherwise in the master [Chaucer]?’ (60, note 18). Hoccleve learned from Chaucer the art of stanzaic verse and in the ‘majority of his works ... employs long ballade stanzas, most often rhyme royal but sometimes eight- or nine-line stanzas’ (58). Although not Chaucer’s equal, Hoccleve handles stanzaic composition well and, with his use of rhyme royal, shows an ‘enhanced awareness of the ample potentialities of English verse’ (59).
A discussion of Hoccleve’s life and work (1–32) accompanied by a listing of the life-records (33–49), manuscripts and major printed editions (50–5), and select criticism (56–60). The veracity of Hoccleve’s references to his personal circumstances is not ‘above suspicion’; however, these references do contribute to a ‘literary biography of some substance’ (1). Burrow then presents Hoccleve’s known biography by cross-referencing the literary and historical material with current critical thought. Hoccleve’s social status was somewhat above that of an ordinary clerk, and well below that of Chaucer (6–7). It may be true that Hoccleve was not worse off financially than many others in the government service of his time; but, by the same token, many of his peers would have agreed with his complaint about a lack of money (8–9). It is likely that Hoccleve knew Chaucer (10–11). The poet’s mental illness probably dates to 1414 (22). Hoccleve’s Complaint of the Virgin, a translation of an extract from Guillaume de Deguileville’s Pelerinage de l’Ame, is found in the prose translation of Deguileville’s work; however, Hoccleve could not have been the author of the other poems found in the prose pilgrimage (24). [Seymour disagrees (48: xiv–xv, note12).] It may be the case that San Marino, Huntington Lib., MS HM 111 and MS HM 744 were once a single manuscript of Hoccleve’s collected poems (31). [On this last point see Seymour, 48, Doyle, 48, and Bowers, 327.]

Hoccleve’s birth ‘most probably’ dates to 1367 or 1366; his nervous collapse occurred in 1414. In late 1419 he started work on the Complaint; the Dialogue was written in 1420, and its postscript written in 1421 while Hoccleve was composing the Series (372).
Considers the work of Guillaume de Machaut, Jean Froissart, Oton de Grandson, Eustache Deschamps, Christine de Pizan, and Alain Chartier as potential influences on Hoccleve. Hoccleve was at ease with the French language (35–6); three of his poems (LC, Complaint of the Virgin, and Balade to the Virgin and Christ) have French origins (36–7). In some ways it may better to see Hoccleve as an ‘English Deschamps than as a latter-day Chaucer.’ It is not always possible, however, to tell when his inspiration comes directly from the French writers and when it comes from the French via Chaucer (38). Metre provides an example of this last point (38–40). Hoccleve’s creation of his own anthologies is consistent with the practice of Middle French writers (40–2). Nevertheless, one needs to be cautious as it cannot be certain that contemporary readers would have recognized Hoccleve’s holographs as such (42). The Series is closer to the concept of the French dit than it is to Chaucer’s CT (43–5). [Burrow compares some of Hoccleve’s shorter poems to rondeaux and balades by Deschamps (45–9).] Further research into the relationship between Hoccleve’s work and the Middle French writers could be ‘pursued with profit’ (49). See Calin, 358.


Rigg, 238, identifies Hoccleve’s source for the Complaint as Isidore of Seville’s Synonyma. In fact, Hoccleve uses an abbreviated version of the Synonyma. Oxford, Bodleian Lib., MS Bodley 110 provides a shortened version of the Synonyma that is very similar to Hoccleve’s copy (424). Burrow discusses the close parallels between Hoccleve’s text and source.
(425–7). It possible that Hoccleve found his source in a manuscript miscellany (428).


Describes the partial Hoccleve manuscript, Melbourne, Victoria State Library, MS *096/G94 (364–8).


Brief references. Modern neglect of Hoccleve is not ‘altogether unjustified.’ *RP* is ‘fluent but uninspired,’ and very didactic. Hoccleve’s real, if limited, ability is seen in the introduction to *RP*, where he talks about his own life, and in some of the shorter pieces, such as *LC* which has style and finesse and keeps ‘something of the impassioned tone’ of its source (320). Hoccleve’s only ‘genuinely witty poem’ is the address to Master Somer (321).


On the flyleaf of Cambridge, Fitzwilliam Museum, MS McLean 182 are 14 lines of didactic verse referring to the Troy legend; the *Index of Middle English Verse* finds these to be in a style similar to Hoccleve’s. The reference to Hoccleve is an ‘over-particularization’
because the piece's rhetorical technique is frequently found elsewhere in the manuscript, and verse does not show Hoccleve's care for 'metrical regularity' (247).


New Haven, Yale Univ., Beinecke Lib., MS 493 gives a complete text for RP and some other Hoccleve poems. The contents of this manuscript are the same as three manuscripts at Oxford's Bodleian Library: Laud Misc. 735, Arch Selden supra 53, and Bodley 221. It also shares some of the features of Durham Univ., MS Cosin V.iii.9, and Coventry, City Records Office, MS Accession 325/1. The connection of the Yale manuscript with this 'distinct group of Hoccleve manuscripts' might be useful in clarifying some aspects of RP's transmission. Edwards provides a brief description of the manuscript.


Brief references. Browne's modernization, 3, of Hoccleve's *Jonathas* shows the two 'contradictory tendencies' indicative of ME editing in the 17th century. These are a consciousness of the 'linguistic distance' between the editor's day and that of the text, which leads to editorial modernizations; and a 'desire for textual accuracy—or, at least, completeness.' Browne did not publish more of Hoccleve's work; however, a Hoccleve manuscript that was in his possession, Oxford, Bodleian Lib., MS Ashmole 40, shows clear signs that he was preparing the text for publication (36).

The Chaucer portrait in Philadelphia, Rosenbach Foundation, MS 1083/30 [Edwards incorrectly lists this as ‘1083/10’] is likely to have been copied from the portrait in London, BL, Harley MS 4866, at the instigation of John Murray, early in the 18th century.


A discussion of Oxford, Bodleian Lib., MS Arch. Selden B.24 and its role in the Scottish literary culture of the late middle ages. *MG* is ascribed in the Selden manuscript to Chaucer, as it is in John Ireland’s *Meroure of Wisdom* (Edinburgh, National Lib. of Scotland, MS Advocates 18.2.8). Such an attribution to Chaucer may be part of a ‘Scottish misappropriation of Chaucerian identity’ (60). [On this last point see Edwards, 901.]


Discusses Browne’s ownership of three manuscripts containing works by Hoccleve: Durham, Univ. Lib., MS Cosin V.iii.9 (*Series*), Durham, Univ. Lib., MS Cosin V.ii.13 (*LC*), and Oxford, Bodleian Lib., MS Ashmole 40 (*RP*). Browne’s annotations on the last of these manuscripts attest to the seriousness of his approach to editing Hoccleve. His interest in Hoccleve, aside from that shown by Camden, 63, and James, [see Gosart, 19],
stands alone in the 17th century (443–5). Edwards lists other manuscripts known to have been owned by Browne (445–7).


Identifies the *Synonyma* by Isidore of Seville as the book Hoccleve refers to in his *Complaint* (lines 309–315, 372–5), and argues that Isidore’s work may have influenced Hoccleve to organize the *Complaint* along the lines of a *consolatio*. The Latin quotations that are found with Hoccleve’s texts in all the manuscripts show that Hoccleve is using Isidore’s *Synonyma* (566–7). Rigg lists parallel passages in the two works (567–70). After line 371, Hoccleve’s direct use of the *Synonyma* ceases, but the *Synonyma*’s influence is still seen more broadly in Hoccleve’s formulation of the ‘pattern of suffering, purgation, and divine justice’ in the *Complaint* (570). Traces of this influence include: Hoccleve’s belief that ‘physical and mental disease … [are] … a punishment for sins, and … a sign of divine testing’; his friends’ desertion following his recovery from illness, and their lingering prejudices against him (571); his reluctance to speak out against the injustice he suffers; and his admissions that he has come close to despair (572). Hoccleve’s storyline about a book coming into his hands which he then adapts to his ‘own purposes, as a comfort to himself and other wretched men,’ also comes from Isidore (573). These parallels do not necessarily weaken the claim that Hoccleve’s poem is autobiographical: Hoccleve’s experiences might form the core of his work, and it could be that he then adapts the *Synonyma* to fit that core (573–4). See Burrow, 229, for a discussion that further refines the identification of Hoccleve’s source.

Examines the life records of three privy seal clerks, Thomas Hoccleve, Robert Frye, and John Prophete. Hoccleve’s early career is little documented; it is likely that his background was ‘humble and obscure’ with English as his first language. He may have attended a ‘‘business’’ college’ before receiving his initial on-the-job training at the privy seal (263). Hoccleve’s *Formulary* (London, BL, MS Additional 24062) is the ‘best guide to the range of business’ conducted at the privy seal (261). None of the letters in it is written in English (264). Hoccleve’s corrodies, granted in 1395, was one of a number left vacant at the death of William Gambon. Gambon’s corrodies were actively sought after by a number of officials within days of his death in January 1392; this was to be expected given the uncertain nature of an official’s pay (268–9). Hoccleve was not a major poet, however, he was familiar with European writing, and he was known to the court. He has a position of ‘some importance’ in English literary history (270). He had retired from the privy seal by 4 March 1426; he died soon after this date and before 8 May 1426 when his corrodies at Southwick Priory was granted to another (270, note). [See Green, 267, on the date of Hoccleve’s death which tends to confirm Brown’s suggestion of 1426.] One cannot be certain how much of Hoccleve’s autobiographical detail to believe because, in spite of his intellectual talents, he was somewhat ‘unbalanced.’ Most of what Hoccleve says is true regarding his work, accommodation, annuity, and health. Nevertheless, Hoccleve ‘exaggerated his woes, particularly his financial worries.’ It seems that he was paid more regularly than the other privy seal clerks, although his poems seeking money could refer to ‘terms when he was not paid’ (271). Hoccleve was not a typical clerk in the privy seal, nevertheless he is likely to echo the ‘common complaints of the men at the bottom of the administrative ladder’ (271–2).

Brief references. Lydgate and Hoccleve are clearer in their praise of Chaucer’s language than in their praise of his verse (104–5). They belong to a period that admires the ‘aptness, freshness, conciseness, and polish’ of Chaucer’s use of language (105). Lydgate, unlike Hoccleve, correctly sees the distinctiveness of Chaucer’s metre. The subtleness of Chaucer’s use of final -e is not apparent to Hoccleve and Lydgate (115). See Jefferson, 320, and Burrow (47: xxviii–xxxv) for a different view regarding Hoccleve.


Hoccleve’s reordering and omission of some of Christine de Pizan’s material from *LC* could not lead one to conclude that he is working to achieve an anti-feminist effect (22–4). A more considered examination suggests that the target of Hoccleve’s gentle mockery is specifically Christine herself, not because of her sex but because of the faulty literary criticism she displays in *L’Epistre au Dieu d’Amours* (26). Fleming then discusses the literary background to the ‘Quarrel’ over the *Roman de la Rose* (26–9). On the basis of its composition date and, more significantly, Hoccleve’s two important additions to its source, *LC* is very likely to be a product of the quarrel over the *Roman de la Rose* (29). Hoccleve neutralizes Christine’s poem as a polemic by means of minor additions to his translation (30). In the first of these additions, Hoccleve cites Chaucer’s *Legend of Good Women* (30–2). In the second of his additions, he points out the limitations of Christine’s understanding of the mechanics and meaning of allegorical poetry (32–7).

Only the third part of this article (301–2), by David Farley-Hills, concerns Hoccleve. 
Hoccleve’s poem of three nine-line stanzas in which he offers RP to the Duke of Bedford is found in Huntington Lib., MS HM 111 and London, BL, MS Royal 17 D.xviii. The last two stanzas of the poem refer to a ‘master Massy’ in the duke’s household and ask for his consideration of the new work. Massy, a man known to his contemporaries as being skilled in rhetoric, may be the Pearl poet. See the reply by Turville-Petre and Wilson, 262, and the subsequent response by Farley-Hills, 260; see also Peterson, 251–3, and Vantuono, 263–4.


A number of references in an argument that Chaucer’s verse was not written as iambic pentameter. Robinson maintains a better reading of Chaucer is produced by being sensitive to sound and speech rhythms, and to manuscript punctuation, and by avoiding a mechanical approach to final –e. Hoccleve is the ‘most interesting’ of the Chaucerians, and the one closest to Chaucer. He uses Chaucer’s metre, as Chaucer never did, for ‘intimately self-communing poetry’ (190). The most striking thing about him is how he learnt from Chaucer to ‘express his own quite different, lesser, but real sensibility’ (191). Hoccleve’s metre is not as straightforward as Mitchell, 204, argues: it can be ‘very far’ from a recognizable iambic pentameter (192). In his less successful lines, he gives the impression of being ‘too much of a metrical specialist’ (193). Yet Hoccleve took his metre from Chaucer, although he sometimes reduced ‘Chaucer’s manner to mannerism’ (194). Robinson discusses examples of parallels between Chaucer and Hoccleve (194–5). No poet does the speech of ‘domestic situations’ better than Hoccleve (196–7). It is
"temperament," and not "technique," that separates him from Chaucer. Hoccleve's expressions of feeling are very unusual in a medieval poet. Mitchell's concern about the veracity of the allegedly autobiographical passages, 201-4, is beside the point as what matters is whether these passages seem convincing to the reader. If the references are indeed false, then Hoccleve is a 'great liar' (197). His sincerity does seem 'dubious' in some of the lines on heresy and politics (198-9).


Hoccleve is the first poet of note after Chaucer to write verse in the form of a rondeau (35). His *Chanson to Somer* is an example of a roundel, although the refrain is not written out in full (35-6). Structurally, this roundel is the same as those by Chaucer. This may mean that Hoccleve knows Chaucer's roundels, or he may know the French writers who influence Chaucer, or both (36).


Briefly outlines Hoccleve's biography, suggesting 1437 as the date of his death (746-7). [See Brown, 239, for 1426 as the more likely date]. Matthews lists Hoccleve's poems with a short synopsis and discussion of each. *LC* is a 'free adaptation' that keeps the 'spirit of the original' (747). [See Bornstein, 266, for the view that Hoccleve's version differs significantly from Christine de Pizan's original.] *RP* is 'repetitive and often rambling';
however, its 'melancholy autobiography' gives it interest (749). [See Scanlon, 339-40, for another opinion of this poem’s structural merits.] LD is among Hoccleve’s ‘most effective poems’ (751); and MG is his ‘most eloquent and moving’ (752). Hoccleve is a poor poet who deals with a limited number of subjects (754-5). He generally uses clear diction, avoids rhetorical excess, and shows a particularly good command of dialogue. Hoccleve maintains a ten-syllable line, occasionally by the use of syntactic contrivances; he often stresses syllables normally unstressed (755). [See Jefferson, 320, and Burrow, (47: xxviii–xxxv), for a more positive assessment of Hoccleve’s metrical practice.] Hoccleve is a poor poet who benefited little from Chaucer’s example; he remains of interest because of his use of contemporary and personal allusion (755-6). A bibliography of Hoccleve manuscripts, editions, and critical studies concludes the essay (903-8). [Mitchell, (207: 50), offers some comment on Matthew’s essay.]


Provides a diplomatic transcription of Hoccleve’s three roundels on Lady Money, accompanied by photographs of the relevant folios from San Marino, Huntington Lib., MS HM 744 and by a brief discussion of the characteristics of Hoccleve’s handwriting. See Petti, 272.

A number of brief, illustrative references to Hoccleve in a discussion of mirror-imagery in medieval and renaissance texts.


The will of Guy de Rouclif, dated 3 December 1392, left to Hoccleve some money and a book. Guy de Rouclif was Hoccleve’s senior in the privy seal office; he had a successful career with connections to many prominent people, including John Gower. The will suggests that Hoccleve’s literary interests were known to his colleague, and opens the possibility that Hoccleve could have met Gower, or even Chaucer, through the agency of de Rouclif. See Fisher, 199, regarding de Rouclif.


Brief references. The *Miracle of the Virgin* was introduced into the *CT* manuscript, Oxford, Christ Church, MS 152, by the addition of a spurious prologue, to become *The Plowman’s Tale*. This may have been done as a result of the scribe’s own volition or at the initiative of a patron. In any event, the tale was ‘subsequently rewarded with oblivion’ (174). Wawn then discusses the second spurious *Plowman’s Tale* not by Hoccleve.

Doob examines medieval views of madness; Ch. 5 (208–31) is devoted to Hoccleve. Hoccleve demonstrates a sound knowledge of madness in medical, religious, and scientific terms. Madness is caused by sin and cured by confession to ‘God and Mary as spiritual and physical physicians’ (211). Doob examines the link between morality, illness, and confession in *TJW, LMR, RP, Complaint,* and *Dialogue.* Much of Hoccleve’s supposed autobiography can be ‘interpreted as examples of literary borrowing or convention’ (227); and it may be that Hoccleve uses madness as a ‘metaphor’ to describe a variety of bodily, spiritual, and social states (229). [Smith, 113, Thornley, 213, and Mitchell, 201–4, offer supporting views of Hoccleve’s conventionality; Burrow, 221, emphasizes the poet’s use of genuinely autobiographical material; and Mills, 368, explores the way Hoccleve challenges reader expectations by the manipulation of conventional forms.]


Brief references in a consideration of the known facts concerning a man who might be the Pearl poet. Hoccleve’s poem referring to Massy is found in only two manuscripts: in an envoy to London, BL, MS Royal 17 D.xviii; and, with a heading in French, in San Marino, Huntington Lib., MS HM 111. These instances inform us that Massy was a talented poet who had some association with John of Lancaster, son of Henry IV (257–8).

Brief reference in an argument in support of Massey as the author of both *Pearl* and *St Erkenwald*. The latter poem may date from about 1386. This early date might seem to inhibit any possible connection between the *Pearl* poet and the Massy to whom Hoccleve refers (53). The poem date, however, may date to after 1386; and, even if 1386 is right, it simply means that the poet is about 64 years old at the time of Hoccleve's reference in 1414. See Peterson, 253, and subsequent cross-reference.


This article is substantially a reply to an article by Turville-Petre and Wilson, 262. Turville-Petre is wrong to claim that Hoccleve's 'maistir Massy' is one of the poet's patrons and not a writer (50–1). [Turville-Petre argues the 'maistir Massy' poem is a begging poem, and draws a parallel between it and a second poem Hoccleve writes to another patron called Picard.] Picard himself is more likely to be a musician than a patron, and there is some evidence as to his identity (51–2).


Outlines the role of the privy seal and the known details of Hoccleve's bureaucratic life and political views. Hoccleve never rises above the level of an ordinary clerk in the privy seal; nevertheless, he has a number of influential patrons. [Reeves looks in detail at the payments made to Hoccleve in the course of his employment at the privy seal (206–9).] These payments were sometimes late, but they should have been 'quite enough to satisfy his needs.' Hoccleve dies in about 1437 (209). [See Brown, 239, who dates Hoccleve's
death to 1426. ] Reeves discusses Hoccleve’s political and social attitudes, and briefly considers RP as a political work. RP is ‘largely derivative’ (210). Nevertheless, although it is not the equal of earlier treatises, it does have ‘flashes of genuine concern for the English throne and for Christendom in general’ (212).


Hoccleve’s poems are not ‘literary masterpieces’; yet, the social views they contain should be valued because very few other examples have survived from the medieval laity (187). Reeves summarizes Hoccleve’s views on a number of social matters, including the Church, counterfeiting, extravagances in dress, the role of women, marriage, justice, social order, economics, and government. Hoccleve’s opinions do not form a ‘sophisticated social and economic philosophy,’ although they are likely to have been shared by a number of his readers (199).


Based on the number of surviving manuscripts, RP was the fifth most popular ME poem. Its theme of kingship was of great contemporary interest, and to this Hoccleve adds a clear and interesting presentation (255). Hoccleve actively fosters his book’s circulation by giving copies to patrons. It is possible that London, BL, MS Harley 4866 is one of the presentation copies (256); it was possibly intended for the Duke of York or the Duke of Bedford (269). [On this last point, Burrow disagrees (226:18).] Such copies would have probably cost more than 10 shillings to produce in 1412 (256). The poem’s readership,
although strong, is likely to have been limited mainly to the 'circles of court, government, church, universities, and professions.' Most of the surviving manuscripts were produced during the reigns of Henry V and Henry VI, but there is evidence of a readership 'well into the 16th century,' and of later antiquarian interest (257). Seymour details the location, or last known location, of 43 extant manuscripts (259–60), and he provides manuscript descriptions (261–93) and a list of previous owners (294–5). [Edwards, 233, 1978 adds New Haven, Yale Univ., Beinecke Lib., MS 493 to the list of RP manuscripts. Green, 268, identifies some further RP fragments. Marzec, 277, builds a manuscript stemma that suggests a number of lost copies. Greetham, 306–7, and Burrow, 47, 226, discuss a number of significant manuscript issues. Harris, 298, takes issue with Seymour regarding the identification of family arms in London, BL, MS Arundel 38.]


The portraits of Chaucer found in London, BL, MS Harley 4866 and the Ellesmere manuscript, San Marino, Huntington Lib., MS EL 26 C 9, are so similar that they may be by the same artist. A common artist for the two illustrations is made more likely by the 'imitation of the illumination of the Ellesmere manuscript' in another RP manuscript, London, BL, MS Arundel 38. Further evidence for the common artist theory comes from similarities of 'style and execution' between the Harley Chaucer portrait and the Arundel portrait of Hoccleve and Prince Henry: 'one can readily assume that all three manuscripts were illuminated in one atelier in London or Westminster' (618). It is likely that the Ellesmere and Harley Chaucer portraits are 'independent copies, by one artist, of a panel portrait painted in Chaucer's last years.' It is uncertain whether the Chaucer portraits in Philadelphia, Rosenbach Foundation, MS 1083/30 [Seymour incorrectly lists this manuscript as '1083/10'] and London, BL, Royal 17 D.vi were taken from Harley or a lost
Seymour describes the two surviving presentation portraits of Hoccleve and Prince Henry in London, BL, Arundel 38 and Royal 17 D.vi (622–3). Arundel is much the better portrait of the two, and was done by an artist, influenced by the work of Hermann Scheere, whose ‘output contains some of the finest historical portraiture in late medieval English illuminated manuscripts.’ This artist’s work includes, among other things, the Bedford Book of Hours and Psalter, London, BL, MS Add. 42131 [Seymour incorrectly lists this manuscript as ‘Add. 12131’ (622).] There are photographs of the relevant manuscript illustrations (619–20). See also Wright, 352–3.


Provides a selected listing, sometimes with brief annotations, of editions and criticism about the five poets included in the present bibliography in addition to several Chaucerians that are excluded.


References to Hoccleve’s work, principally *RP*, as an example of social criticism. Hoccleve’s autobiographical references are likely to be factual on the evidence of the realism of their presentation. Like Langland, Hoccleve shows an ability to look at himself from a critical distance. This ability is indicative of a society that is in the process of raising its consciousness of socio-political realities. Hoccleve’s support for the Lancastrians
HOCCLEVE: GENERAL REFERENCES

reflects a desire for the social order that comes with a strong monarchy. *ASJO* is an expression of Henry V's religious conservatism. A number of contemporary political concerns are also found in *RP*. Although still tied to an older, personal view of society, Hoccleve and Langland show the way to the humanist reform literature of the early 16th century.


A reply to Turville-Petre and Wilson, 262. The arguments for the identification of Massey as a writer do not rely solely on the interpretation of the lines 'For rethorik hath hid fro me the keye/ Of his tresor.' Nevertheless, one should note that the words 'his tresor' are more likely to refer to Massey than to rhetoric because the gender of the latter is usually feminine. Hoccleve's description of Massey's intelligence as 'fructuous' is significant: this adjective was connected to the idea of the '“fruit” or “doctrine” (intentio/entente) of a literary work i.e. ... it was used as a technical critical term.' Therefore, the use of 'fructuous' suggests that Massey was involved with literary work. See Nolan, 242, Peterson, 251-3, and Vantuono, 263-4.


Brief references to *LC* in the context of the Chaucer apocrypha (245–6). Hoccleve's authorship of *LC* is identified by Speght, 2, in 1598 (252).

The article is in two parts: only the first part, by Turville-Petre, refers to Hoccleve (129–33). Turville-Petre provides a summary, which includes the views of Farley-Hills, 242, of the critical debate on the identification of Massey (129–30). There is nothing in Hoccleve’s epistle to John of Lancaster to suggest that Massey is a poet, and the lines ‘For rethorik hath hid fro me the keye/ Of his tresor’ refer not to Massey’s supposed ‘treasury of rhetoric’ but to the treasury of Rhetoric itself that has been denied to Hoccleve. Massey is William Massy, John of Lancaster’s ‘Receiver-general and General Attorney’; it is because of Massey’s role in John’s finances that Hoccleve refers to him (130). Hoccleve’s reference to William Massey, therefore, throws no light on the John Massey who has been claimed as the author of *Pearl* and *St Erkenwald*. There are parallels between Hoccleve’s poem and another of his begging poems, the epistle to Edward, Duke of York, with its references to ‘Maister Picard’ (132). The author supplies biographical background for William Massey (130–2) with some details for Picard (132-3). See the reply by Farley-Hills, 260.


Brief references. Two folios of the Cotton manuscript each have marginalia that appear to be the name ‘J. Macy.’ It is possible that these identify the *Pearl* poet. Hoccleve praises ‘maister Massy’ in a poem written about 1411–14. For the *Pearl* poet to have been Hoccleve’s Massy he would need to have lived another 25 years after he had written *Pearl* (542, note 20). See Vantuono, 264.

Brief references. A reply to Peterson's criticisms, 253, regarding Vantuono's theory about the identity of the Pearl poet. Vantuono summarizes the critical debate on the poet's identity, and he includes several incidental references to Hoccleve.


Brief references. Medieval Latin works in the mirror genre are often 'abstract and divorced from reality,' but vernacular versions frequently offer 'vivid pictures' of the political and social realities of medieval life (77). As a vernacular mirror, *RP* is best when Hoccleve departs from his sources and addresses the 'life of his time' (81). Bornstein briefly lists the social and political problems that Hoccleve catalogues (81–2). Hoccleve's attitude towards war is contradictory as he 'favours the ideal of a warrior king ... yet, he criticizes the destruction and social dislocation caused by war and wishes for peace' (81).

266. ———. 'Anti-Feminism in Thomas Hoccleve's Translation of Christine de Pizan's Epistre au Dieu d'Amours.' *English Language Notes* 19 (1981): 7–14.

Christine de Pizan's poem is a serious defence of women; Hoccleve's adaptation is not. Hoccleve is playing 'anti-feminist games' (14). He alters the spirit and letter of the original by additions and omissions, and by the exaggeration of Cupid's support for women.
'Christine’s poem has the tone of the French court, whereas Hoccleve’s version has the tone of the English tavern' (8).


New evidence from the accounts of the Keeper of the Great Wardrobe tends to confirm Brown’s suggestion, 239, of 1426 as the year of Hoccleve’s death, and implies that Hoccleve remained at the privy seal until his death when he was replaced by Richard Prior (14).


London, BL, MS Harley 5977, fragment 90 and MS Rawlinson D. 913, f. 63 are from the same manuscript of *RP*. They are probably affiliated to other *RP* manuscripts at the Bodleian Library: Ashmole 40, Bodley 221, Laud Misc. 735, and Selden supra 53 (37). The British Library manuscripts, however, are likely to derive from an ‘earlier stage in the development of this interesting sub-group’ (39). Green reproduces a photograph of MS Harley 5977, fragment 90 (38). Folios 71–112 of London, BL, MS Harley 372, containing the last two-fifths of *RP*, is another work produced by the London scribe first identified by Hammond, 622, as being responsible for a number of surviving manuscripts (39–41). A photograph of folio 103 of the manuscript is reproduced (40).

A number of generally brief references to Hoccleve during an argument that the royal court is more important than the new middle class in setting the mainstream literary tastes of 15th-century England. [See Doyle, 216, for a related discussion]. Some of Hoccleve’s writing against the Lollards may have followed solely from a sense of personal conviction (183–4); however, it is possible that ASJO was a commission for Henry V (184–6).


Brief references in a consideration of the character of the courts of love in the later middle ages. Hoccleve has every reason to be genuinely puzzled by the criticism of LC as antifeminist. It is likely that he is simply an ‘outsider’ who is the victim of a joke that he cannot ‘fully understand’ (106). It is also possible that his remarks in the Dialogue are simply a contrivance to introduce TJW. The Dialogue at lines 703–6 may hint at the relationship between Humphrey, Duke of Gloucester, and Jacqueline of Hainault (107).


RP manuscripts London, BL, MS Harley 4866 and MS Royal 17 D.vi each contain a miniature of Chaucer. Criticism has tended to focus on whether the Chaucer miniatures may be taken to be life-like, but the illustrations are more important to a discussion about how Chaucer was perceived by Hoccleve. Hoccleve’s poem is about the ‘proper conduct of
kingship' (340), and in this context Chaucer is the 'perfect philosopher' (341). Chaucer is to Prince Henry what Aristotle is to Alexander the Great. Hoccleve's ambition in RP is to recreate this 'ideal relationship between ruler and philosophical guide' (343). Chaucer embodies the perfect ruler and the supreme artist, and so he represents an ideal to be aspired to by both Prince Henry and Hoccleve (345). The presentation miniature in London, BL, MS Arundel 38 shows Hoccleve kneeling before Prince Henry in the 'conventional' portrayal of the relationship between writer and monarch (343); by contrast, Hoccleve intends that the image of Chaucer should be revered as one would revere the 'image of a saint' (344). [On this last claim, see Pearsall, (210: 344, note 9), for a dissenting view.]


Provides a photograph and transcription of San Marino, Huntington Lib., MS HM 111, f. 16v (the end of ASJO and start of LMR), and includes a description of the handwriting and punctuation. Hoccleve's script is a 'fairly compact, neat and fluent book-hand form of 15th-century secretary' (55). See Croft, 246.


A computer-based metrical analysis of a sample of lines from Chaucer, Hoccleve, Lydgate, Dunbar, and Skelton using the system devised by Morris Halle and Samuel Jay Keyser. The results challenge the assumption [see, for example, Hammond, 121] that the poets after
Chaucer simply used line-forms more frequently that were found as occasional variants in Chaucer. In fact, the later poets took these line-forms 'beyond what seems to have been Chaucer's own preference, and went ahead to add new possibilities for which Chaucer's verse contained ... no suggestion at all' (118).


A brief synopsis of Marcia Smith Marzec's conference paper delivered at the fourth Saint Louis conference on manuscript studies. There is a need for a new edition of *RP*, and an editorial team under the direction of M.C. Seymour has been formed.


A brief synopsis of Marcia Smith Marzec's conference paper delivered at the eighth Saint Louis conference on manuscript studies. Because of the number of surviving copies produced in a uniform dialect over a century, Hoccleve's poem is a 'mine of information on 15th-century language change, vocabulary, and metrical practices.'


The *RP* manuscripts offer insights into the changing language and metre of the 15th century because they are numerous, in a uniform dialect, and span the century. As *RP* became
more widely popular, the manuscripts move toward the use of paper in preference to vellum, less decoration, and a 'more rapid cursive hand' instead of anglicana formata (41). Some later manuscripts demonstrate that scribal emendations follow from a misreading of archaic words or a replacement of these words with more current expressions. The most notable of these is Cambridge, Univ. Lib., MS Hh.iv.II (42–5). A comparison between early manuscripts, likely to have been produced under Hoccleve's supervision, and later examples is revealing: the poetic pronunciation of final -e, allowed in certain circumstances in Hoccleve's time, is not continued later in the century; the -is and -es genitive and plural inflexions continue to be sounded as separate syllables, although medial vowels are not; some verb inflections are shortened; and later scribes tend to insist on 10-syllable lines and eschew headless lines or 'metrical inversion and substitution' (48–50).

Changes in diction and the way verse syllables are pronounced leads to a misunderstanding of Hoccleve's poetry that may be the start of the decline of his reputation as a poet in the latter part of the 15th century (50).


The surviving 43 RP manuscripts all date from the 15th century and almost all are written in a dialect of the southeast midlands (269). Many of the manuscripts seem to have been produced in scriptoria using more than one exemplar, and this limits the effectiveness of the transmission of scribal errors as a guide to building the manuscript stemma. [Appendix A on page 279 offers a possible affiliation of the surviving manuscripts based on a sample of 829 lines of English text.] An analysis of the Latin marginalia provides some evidence to support the stemma based on the English text sample, although generally for relationships that were already clear (270). The glosses, however, do give some new insights into the production of the manuscripts. As demand for the poem grows, the
manuscripts tend to show single scribes doing both the English text and Latin glosses; by contrast, the early presentation manuscripts show a more specialized approach in which copying of the text and gloss is done by different scribes (270 ff.). There would have been no fewer than five copies of RP prepared for patrons (270-1). The stemma shows that the extant copies made for partons do not derive from a single author copy. The patron copies, although effectively concurrent, seem to represent 'at least three generations of copying' from the two originals responsible for all the surviving manuscripts (271). One may cautiously use the glosses as a guide to stemmatic analysis in some circumstances (271–81). The real importance, however, of the marginal glosses is that they offer information about which scribes or rubricators worked on the manuscripts. This information throws light on the occurrence of 'identical variants in the English texts in otherwise unrelated manuscripts or scribal emendation of presumably incorrigible variants' (281).


A black and white photographic facsimile of Oxford, Bodleian Lib., MS Fairfax 16, with f. 14v reproduced in colour as plate 1. Among other works, the manuscript contains two items by Hoccleve: LC (folios 40r-47r); and Ballade to Henry V for Money (folios 198v-199r). Norton-Smith’s introduction provides a manuscript description.


Brief references. Lines 145-9 of AS/JO are an example of the censure directed at women who contribute to the ‘contemporary questioning of faith and scripture’ (443).

Brief references. The ‘personification-metaphor’ is a combination of verbs and inanimate nouns where the ‘metaphoric use of the verb or verb-phrase animates ... the noun or noun-phrase which governs the verb’ (289). Hoccleve employs this device more often than Chaucer does (291).


Society in the Middle Ages saw madness as a consequence of sin, and it did not encourage the kind of rational analysis that Hoccleve undertakes (99–101). Hoccleve implies that his insanity was a ‘formative element in the personality he depicts as his own’ (101); he seems to adapt the accepted description of madness to reflect his own position (102–9). Boethius, and Isidore of Seville’s Synonyma, influence Hoccleve’s description of his illness and its consequences (104–8). His self-analysis may seem slight, but for his time it is ‘remarkable’ (107). Nevertheless, an ‘assumption of sin’ may still be detected in Hoccleve’s ‘tentative efforts to understand a troubled mind’ (109). See Claridge, 332, and Doob, 250, for further discussions of Hoccleve’s madness.


Brief references. Mason, 6, makes his first criticisms of Dr Johnson in his edition of Hoccleve selections published in 1796.

Brief references. *RP* might be the only English influence, albeit minor, on David Lindsay’s *Ane Dialog betuix Experience and ane Courteour* (20–1). Lindsay’s work, *The Buke of the Monarche*, avoids ‘tonal variation in the interest of moral persuasion,’ and in this way it has more shared ground with the works of Hoccleve and Lydgate than it does with those of William Dunbar and Gavin Douglas (258).


The story of the pardoned murderer in *The Three Prestis of Peblis* is taken from *RP*, lines 3123–64 (262–4).


Brief references. *RP* lines 2675–88, dealing with the punishment of a false judge and with the warning given to his son, are an example of flaying used to punish ‘judicial treason’ (194).

Notes that de Irlandia's, *The Meroure of Wysdome*, 56, written in 1490, includes a copy of Hoccleve's *MG* that is ascribed to Chaucer probably because of similarities of 'theme and tone ... language and metre' (295).


Brief references to Hoccleve in an argument that 14th-century English literature shows an increasing concern for improving the moral behaviour of those in power that reflects the rise of the 'public voice' of the literate middle class.


A discussion of Hoccleve that turns on the relationship between the poet's 'inner' consciousness and 'outer' reality (123–40). The 'sheer quantity of verifiable detail' in his poetry suggests that Hoccleve's personal references are likely to be factual (125). It is possible that Hoccleve suffered from manic-depression (129–30). Wordsworth’s *Resolution and Independence* may have been influenced by the prologue to *RP*. Medcalf compares aspects of the two poems (135–140). Wordsworth and Hoccleve each use allegory to describe their inner and outer states. Hoccleve perceives his inner thoughts as being near, actual, and 'thingish,' and so his allegory is lightly carried. In Wordsworth the inner and outer processes are divided by a sense of alienation, and consequently the use of allegory is more conscious. Partly because of this difference, humour comes more easily to Hoccleve than to Wordsworth. Hoccleve maintains the typically medieval union of 'inner'
and ‘outer’; nevertheless, by the standard of his time, he is unusually absorbed by his inner mental processes.


Brief references in a discussion of the likely date for Christine de Pizan’s meeting with the Earl of Salisbury. The *Epistre au Dieu d’Amours* was known to the English before Hoccleve translated it in 1402. It is likely that Hoccleve used the presentation copy that had been given to Salisbury; or, possibly, the copy may have been sent straight to Henry IV (136).


Brief references. Durham, Univ. Lib., MS Cosin V.iii.9 and Huntington Lib., MS HM 744, contain dedications to different patrons. Huntington Lib., MS HM 111 has ‘poems written for several different dedicatees.’ These instances may suggest that Hoccleve was ‘touting’ for patrons (239).

Brief references to Lydgate and Hoccleve in an argument that the Chaucer tradition was not ‘exhausted’ at the death of Chaucer: what was lost, instead, was the capacity to appreciate Chaucer’s work because of the dispersal of his primary audience and the arrival of a new social context. Chaucer seems to write for his ‘circle’ at court; only infrequently does he address those who are clearly socially superior to him (16–17). Lydgate and Hoccleve, living at the outer edge of the circle enjoyed by Chaucer, frequently write for their social superiors in the hope of profit or advancement. It is possible that the poetry of Lydgate and Hoccleve would have benefited if they, like Chaucer, had written for a close and supportive audience (17–18).


References to Hoccleve (47–54) in a discussion of the historical context of Lancastrian insecurities with respect to political and religious heresies, and the consequent emphasis of Lancastrian government on orthodoxy. There is a parallel, which runs on themes of reality and illusion, between Hoccleve’s psychological situation and the political plight of his Lancastrian rulers (47–8). Hoccleve’s discussion of counterfeiting turns on ideas about the importance of truth and substance in public life (48–50); and it is a link between false appearances and treason that is the genesis of Hoccleve’s criticism of the Lollards (50–2). It is inevitable that even a poet conscientiously engaged in the Lancastrian cause will inadvertently raise politically ambiguous and sensitive matters (52). A further example is found in Hoccleve’s discussion of the Chaucer portrait and the notion of legitimate artistic
succession (52–4). [The Hoccleve material here is substantially incorporated into the following item, Strohm, 293; see Strohm, 294, for further development of the theme of Lancastrian orthodoxy.]


[The present item restates passages relevant to Hoccleve (141–8) that are annotated in 292; further Hoccleve material is substantially restated or further developed in 294 and has been annotated there.]


[In part, a restatement and further development of material from 292–3 with an additional perspective on the sense in which Hoccleve is a court poet and on the range of his work.] Hoccleve is not a court poet in the meaning of one who lives within the court and enjoys its steady remuneration for creative writing (640); yet, much of his work may be seen as courtly on the ground that the court acts as its ‘imaginative stimulus and emotional aspiration’ (641). The Lancastrians are many faceted, yet they have an abiding self-interest in the use literature; and the Lancastrian ‘literary enterprise’ is particularly absorbed with the theme of ‘legitimation’ (643). It is while Hoccleve is writing in the period 1409/10–15, for a patron who is initially Prince Henry and then becomes Henry V, that he has the status of something like a poet laureate (643–4). *RP* is key to this period. The personal concerns that Hoccleve expresses in the prologue to *RP* seem to be distinct from the ‘impersonal
sections of advice' found later in the work. In fact, these apparently disparate components are thematically related in two ways: firstly, by Hoccleve’s habit of discussing ‘general issues’ through the medium of his own situation; and, secondly, by the abiding concerns, which include legitimacy, truth, and orthodoxy, that accompany Lancastrian government (644). For example, the emphasis in *RP* on genealogy is directly related to the problem of Lancastrian legitimacy. Hoccleve’s approach is to praise the line of Prince Henry’s more distant forbears, and to discreetly overlook Henry IV’s actions in seizing the throne (644–5). Hoccleve’s citations of Chaucer have a private dimension in that they are certainly an act of ‘personal aggrandizement.’ More generally, Chaucer’s vernacular inheritance of an older tradition serves as a reinforcing parallel to the Lancastrian inheritance of political power (645). *RP*’s lines on religious orthodoxy, in which the Lancastrians are cast as the nation’s defenders against the Lollardy, constitute another thread of the legitimacy theme. When Hoccleve’s work from the years 1413 to 1416 touches on politics it frequently repeats the Lancastrian call for religious and political orthodoxy, and warns of the consequences for those who ignore the call (645–7). Orthodoxy is used by the Lancastrians as a ‘bridle’ (646). *RP* invokes orthodoxy by reference to heresy through the juxtaposition of ‘superfluity, excess and false display … and the solidity and inner integrity of a legitimate claim’ (647). Hoccleve’s criticism of extravagant fashion, Oldcastle’s lack of manliness, and flattery are examples of this invocation (647–8). Hoccleve’s apparently autobiographical voice has a political side in that the poet presents himself as a living example of the dangers of excess and a lack of strong governance (649). Concerns about reality and falsity underlie *RP*’s passages on counterfeiting (649–50). Hoccleve has many ‘narrative voices’ (650). These may have their psychological source in his work as a scribe who copies a variety of documents, but the sensitivities of the Lancastrians are also a likely cause (650–1). Lawton’s analysis of the role of dullness in Lancastrian poetry, 321, is astute; however, to it may be added an acknowledgment of the ‘morass of embarrassing half-acknowledgements and debilitating self-contradictions’ into which even the most loyal Lancastrian poets are plunged (660).

The London, BL, MS Arundel 38 copy of RP is probably the dedication copy. The illuminator is likely to have been Hermann Scheerre or one of his associates (148–9). Plate 7 between pages 148 and 149 reproduces folio 37 of the Arundel MS with the miniature of Hoccleve presenting his book to Prince Henry.


The 15th century sees the legitimation of a new type of literary truth. The works of Hoccleve and Lydgate are full of ‘metafictional elements’ that show these authors possess a ‘sophisticated self-reflexion and a modern awareness of the possible truth of fiction’ (120).


An analysis of Hoccleve work from the point of view of its original function with an emphasis on its sociological content. It is because Hoccleve writes for the patronage of a specific audience about specific events that he did not have a lasting or broad influence on those poets who followed him: his poems are occasional pieces shaped by the expectations and requirements of his audience.
298. **Harris, Kate.** 'The Patron of British Library MS Arundel 38.' *Notes and Queries* 229 (1984): 462–3.

Critics have thought that London, BL, MS Arundel 38 is the *RP* presentation copy given to the Prince of Wales, later Henry V, because of the coat of arms, taken to be Henry's, on f. 1r, and the presentation miniature on f. 37r. Two other coats of arms appearing on folios 37r and 71r prove this assumption to be false. Seymour wrongly identifies these arms (256: 264 and 48: xxxvi): they are actually those of John Mowbray, second Duke of Norfolk (462). Although the manuscript is not the presentation version, it is very probably a 'closely contemporary copy.' London, BL, MS Harley 4866, was formally regarded as a close copy of Arundel, but, in the light of the findings on the Arundel manuscript, this notion 'could probably bear further examination' (463).


A stanza from *LD*, lines 365–71, appears in the San Marino, Huntington Lib., MS HM 144 copy of extracts from Chaucer's *CT* (199).


*RP*’s association of chastity with good kingship may seem contrived, but the poem argues for a necessary connection between the two (19). The king wins the respect that his office
is due by means of 'virtuous conduct, publicly witnessed' (20). The private virtue of chastity is, therefore, central to the king's public political role (22ff).


Brief references to Hoccleve's *Praise of his Lady* as possibly the first parody written in the 15th century (209).


The third part of Hoccleve's triple roundel to Lady Money is ME's oldest surviving 'ironic portrait' in the lyric form (10). In the description of his lady, Hoccleve employs 'displacement, antithesis, and exaggeration.' The yellowness that would normally be a sign of beauty in a lady's hair is used to describe his lady's forehead; and her forehead is narrow, the antithesis of the usual standard for beauty. A conventional beauty would have grey eyes and a rosy complexion, not a face as red as coral with jet black eyes. The lady sings like a 'papejay,' and this recalls the bestiaries' image of the parrot as a 'big-tongued, talkative, stubborn, and treacherous bird.' The poem is a criticism of money, and the love of money, in which Hoccleve exploits the connection made in the Middle Ages between 'physical ugliness and moral wickedness, especially in fictional characters' (11).
Bloom provides a paragraph introducing his critical selections. RP is 'generally considered a tedious but significant tribute to Chaucer' (228). He then prints pages 211–18 from Doob, 250 (1: 228–30), and pages 133–40 from Medcalf, 288 (1: 230–3). Bloom provides selected publication details for Hoccleve's poems (11: 6394–5).

In the *Poetria Nova* (Bk 1, lines 43–7) Geoffrey of Vinsauf compares writers and architects as both must plan their work (287). Chaucer makes use of this passage in *Troilus and Criseyde* (Bk 1, lines 1065–9) for a general statement about the importance of prudence in decision making (287–8). It seems that Vinsauf's allusion, detached from its original context, became a 'commonplace moral exemplum.' In the *Dialogue*, lines 638–44, Hoccleve offers a looser restatement than Chaucer does of the same text from Vinsauf. In spite of his apparent regard for Chaucer, Hoccleve seems not to have written his version on the basis of Chaucer's (288). One of Hoccleve's own marginal glosses shows that he knew at least a little of Vinsauf's original. In spite of this acquaintance, he still leans towards an interpretation of Vinsauf's image as a general statement about prudence, albeit with a 'literary connotation' (288).
Brief references. During the Middle Ages writers attacking the king’s administration, or the power of the Church and nobles, tend to excuse the king by saying that evils are perpetrated without his knowledge. The topos of the ‘King’s Ignorance’ could be little more than a veiled warning to the king that he should listen to the voice of the common people. Hoccleve expresses the idea of the ‘King’s Ignorance’ in RP lines 2528–32 (121–2).


The editors of medieval, biblical, and classical works have paid more attention to mapping the ‘transmission of these texts than to investigating the likely auctorial patterns of usage—particularly with regard to accidentals’ (121). They have done this because, unlike the editors of modern works, they are dealing with copies several times removed from a document showing auctorial intention with respect to matters of spelling, punctuation, or capitalization (122). RP does not exist in holograph, but many of Hoccleve’s other poems do, and a computer study of the accidentals of the holograph poems may inform the editorial restoration of the accidentals of RP (123–4). Greetham outlines the ‘normalisation model,’ and he provides examples of how it is to be applied (131–50). The edition that will result is a combination of the ‘selection of a “base-text” for substantives’ and a ‘“copy-text” for accidentals.’ The paradox of this process is that the accidentals of the base-text for RP are normalized by reference to a different copy-text, and yet the resultant text is ‘closer to auctorial intentions’ than either copy-text or base-text separately could produce (150). See Bowers, 328, and Machan, 351, for opposing views; and, for supporting views, see Blyth, 355, who is editing RP by this method, and Burrow, 47, who applies this method in editing the *Complaint* and *Dialogue*. 
A discussion of the theoretical and practical issues, particularly with respect to the treatment of accidentals, that confront a proposed edition of RP. Greetham summarizes the various possible types of edition: photographic facsimile, diplomatic transcript etc. The preferred option is a ‘marriage of two orthodoxies’ that uses the ‘stemmatic (for substantives) and the … copy-text (for accidentals)’ (65). A manuscript stemma is illustrated for RP (66–7). Greetham then outlines the theoretical and practical issues of his proposed approach (72–86). See Greetham, 306.

Criticism has long seen Chaucer’s persona as a literary device, yet has tended to take Hoccleve at face value, even though his “discipleship” topos is a common rhetorical technique. The autobiographical elements of Hoccleve’s poetry are more than a device to initiate action or unify the text (as do parallel instances in Chaucer’s work), but constitute the actual subject of the poetry (244). The prologue to RP and the poem proper appear disassociated; in fact, the two parts are held together by ‘deft cross-referencing’ between terms, including ‘muk, conceyt, melancholye, and thoght.’ Through these terms there is a ‘consistent reflection of the self in the world and the world in the self’ (245). But to appreciate the unity that Hoccleve achieves one needs to see his persona more broadly in terms of his other work, especially the Series. Hoccleve’s ‘thoght’ becomes synonymous with anxiety and ‘intellectual illness’ (246), and in the Series Hoccleve’s poems become a ‘primary subject for narrative as well as psychological analysis’ (247). Each element of the Series relates, often with a note of irony, to its author’s concerns regarding his fitness to write (250). This rhetorical device, taken from Chaucer, becomes an obsession in
Hoccleve's hands: the paradox he presents is that he writes to tell us that madness prevents him from writing (250–1).


An introduction to reprints from two previous articles, 306 (129–65), and 307 (165–97). The introduction offers some background to, and reflective comment upon, the two papers concerned. Greetham accepts the criticism of Bowers, 328, and Machan, 351 (125–6); nevertheless, it would have been 'editorially dishonest' to have disregarded the information on accidentals contained in the holograph manuscripts of Hoccleve's other poems (126). Blyth, 355, makes the right decision when he decides to edit *RP* 'under basically the principles espoused' in 306 and 307 (127).


An introduction to a reprint of 308 (291–307) that gives some background to the circumstances of the presentation of the original paper.

A number of references, taken mainly from *RP*, that illustrate Henry V’s approach to kingship by drawing parallels between the texts and Henry’s political practices. *RP* is an example of the patronage given under the Lancastrians for works of ‘political advice,’ and it shows the encouragement offered by the Lancastrians to the writing of works in English that deal with ‘serious political and philosophical themes’ (8). The composition of *RP*, as of Lydgate’s *TB*, corresponds to a time when Henry, as prince, was taking a close interest in government (9).


Discusses Hoccleve’s *LMR* with brief references to some of his other poems (110–120). *LC* ‘medievalizes’ Christine de Pizan’s original by making it antifeminist (111). *LMR* shows how a Chaucerian could truly learn from Chaucer’s model (110). Spearing considers Hoccleve’s blend of autobiography with the genres of the begging poem and the confessional (111–18). The technique behind Hoccleve’s personal revelations may be taken from the way Chaucer’s pilgrims ‘reveal and expose themselves unguardedly’ (114). Hoccleve’s digressions are ‘carefully planned’ and they are placed with Chaucer’s skill (118). Despite its concern with private matters, *LMR* shows signs of the growing public role of poetry in advising a lord how to govern (118–19). Hoccleve’s work represents an alternative Chaucerian road to that of Lydgate, but it was the one not taken by subsequent writers (119–20).

Brief references to Hoccleve in an argument that the Chaucerians thought of the
decasyllabic line in terms of two half lines. See Wright, 1041, for further details.

234-45.

Hoccleve's use of a realistic Chaucer portrait is new for his time. Krochalis briefly
summarizes the history of author portraits from classical to medieval times (235-7). The
churches become 'increasingly crowded with effigies' in the 14th and 15th centuries (237),
but to merit such a memorial one has to be 'very holy, very powerful, or very rich,' and this
usually excludes poets (238). Westminster Abbey has a number of examples of medieval
effigies on royal tombs (238-9). Chaucer's concept of immortality for writers is about the
survival of their books; Hoccleve and Lydgate differ from Chaucer in this (241).
Hoccleve's method of 'sanctifying' Chaucer's work, and Chaucer himself, is to put
Chaucer in a place previously kept apart for the 'holy, the powerful, and the rich: the
physical building of the Church' (241).


Hoccleve's adaptation of Christine de Pizan's Epistre au Dieu d'Amours is occasionally
free, especially in the inclusion of 'more risqué elements into the first half of the poem' (7).
The poem's tone sometimes appears to be a 'faithful imitation and at times a parody' of the
original (8). Much of Hoccleve's presentation of Cupid in LC works to the effect that
Cupid is shown to be a 'buffoon.' This does not entirely undermine Christine de Pizan's
work, but it makes it difficult to take her 'erstwhile mouthpiece ... seriously' (9).

Hoccleve’s authorial voice is ‘one of the most meticulously constructed, endearing, and human’ in ME (313). To understand his persona, it is necessary to see Hoccleve in the social context of a privy seal clerk. Contrary to the impression given by Hoccleve’s ‘name-dropping’ of the rich and famous, his day’s activities are part of the corporate and varied life of the clerks: his life-experience is not one of isolation. Hoccleve’s focus on what he perceives to be his isolation shows a ‘psychological and poetic truth, not a literal one’ (314). The privy seal did not offer many career opportunities to its overworked staff, and those it did were not taken up by Hoccleve (315–19). Several of his peers are more successful than he is in obtaining advancement (320–1). In terms of his career, Hoccleve is just what he says he is: a ‘bungler, misfit, and perpetual also-ran’ (321). See Burrow for a dissenting view on this last point (226: 6).


See Torti, 318, where this material is substantially restated.


Ch. 3, ‘Specular Narrative: Hoccleve’s *Regement of Princes*’ provides a close reading of *RP* with a particular emphasis on the mirror theme (87–106). It is a ‘mirror metaphor’ that allows Hoccleve to blend the personal and public aspects of the poem: the prologue mirrors
Hoccleve’s circumstances for Prince Henry as a ruler; the body of the poem is the mirror of the ‘good ruler’ held up for Hoccleve as a subject (89). Torti discusses how Hoccleve uses structure and language to bring these two aspects together. A consideration of the structure of the two parts of the poem reveals two common characteristics: these are the ‘ordo’ of how topics are dealt with; and an ‘affinity’ between Hoccleve’s circumstances and those of Prince Henry (91). The poem generally has the structure of a dream vision, but without the dream (93). Hoccleve plays on circular structural features in the text (95ff).


*LC* lightly treats courtly themes with considerable irony; this makes it difficult to establish its author’s attitude to women (265–6). The *Series* is a better source for finding Hoccleve’s attitude to women (266). The coupling together of *TJW* and *Jonathas*, two stories that are very different in their presentation of women, raises thematic and structural issues that only close reading can resolve (268). Such a reading shows Hoccleve’s views on women are ‘more open and more varied’ than one meets in Lydgate’s work. Elements of antifeminism are ‘inevitable,’ but so is some ‘tribute to the status women had won for themselves.’ It is this tribute which forms the more lasting impression (273).


A study of Hoccleve’s metrical practice is aided by the fact that we have three holograph manuscripts: Durham, Univ. Lib., Cosin V.iii.9; and the San Marino, Huntington Lib., MS,
HM 111 and MS HM 744. Feminine rhymes are discounted as extra-metrical. In the holograph manuscripts thirty-five percent of lines do not contain an internal final -e and hence pose no problems regarding the pronunciation of final -e. About ninety-eight percent of these lines have ten syllables. ‘Hoccleve’s use of final -e is extremely regular’ (97). There is ‘no historical or etymological reason’ that would lead one to believe that Hoccleve does not pronounce final -e (98). The fact that Hoccleve almost always rhymes a word ending with -e with another word ending in -e argues that the termination is pronounced. Hoccleve makes consistent choices to achieve a ten-syllable line; this also argues for the pronunciation of final -e. These choices involve: ‘optional elision of unstressed vowels’ (99); ‘optional use of pleonastic pat’ (99-100); ‘variation in the form of adverbs’ (100); and ‘varying forms of verbal inflexion’ (101-3). Further evidence is provided to support the pronunciation of final -e by cases where an ‘optional final -e is used ... to provide an additional syllable.’ This class includes: ‘varying forms of verbal inflexion’ (103); ‘variation in the form of adverbs and conjunctions’; and ‘variation in the inflexion of adjectives, possessive pronouns, etc.’ (105). Can Hoccleve’s verse be said to have a recurrent four- or five-beat pattern? The syllable count of his lines seems to be more important to Hoccleve than the number of beats within each line. Although the five-beat line is common, a number of lines ‘teeter on the brink of the four-beat.’ The evidence for the belief that the overall effect is intended to be an iambic line structure is not conclusive (109). See Burrow, 47, and Stanley, 331, for generally supporting views.

are seeking to recapture Chaucer's access to the 'public world' (762–4). Hoccleve's self-professed 'dullness' is a shield for his excursions into current affairs, and it is indeed needed by a man employed by the public purse with no substantial private income of his own (763–4). Hoccleve's strategy is the trendsetter for the literary 'dullness of the fifteenth century' (764). The role of the 15th-century poet is to be ordinary, to be a person who is in tune with the concerns of all and so able to speak the truth on behalf of all. Poets in the 15th-century do not claim a special status. The boundaries that we might normally place between literature and society and history do not apply in 15th-century England: the writing of the period is best seen as a 'culture' (771). It is a mistake to see such writing as a mere exercise in style without social context or importance (774). *RP* may be 'more topical ... than is commonly allowed' (776). There is evidence in the poem that Hoccleve sides, perhaps opportunistically, with young Prince Henry's faction over that of his father, Henry IV (776–7). The Chaucerians continue Chaucer's moral tradition in advocating peace; however, their heart-felt advocacy is conducted under a 'uniquely inauspicious set of circumstances' (781). Caxton did not print *RP* because it was 'too Lancastrian' (787).

Three factors made the public frankness of the 15th-century Chaucerians possible: firstly, the protection offered by the persona of the 'foole sage'; secondly, and more importantly, the fact that poet and patron share the 'same concerns and a similar, Boethian, frame of reference' (789); and lastly, a renaissance-style collaboration between poets and patrons that sees the former confer on the latter 'fame in return for attention to ... moral lessons' (791). In the terminology of Jürgen Habermas, the 15th-century poets are at work on the construction of a 'public sphere parallel to and connected with the structures of power' that will enable the achievements of the Elizabethans (793–4). See Strohm, 294, for a related discussion.

In general, the Middle Ages gives no importance to the literary expression of ‘personal sorrows or joys’, consequently the period lacks the ‘literary techniques’ needed for the modern autobiographical portrayal of character. Hoccleve’s autobiographical passages are exceptional and ‘experimental’ (115). Early medieval texts tend to portray character in terms of the action of allegorized moral values (115–16). *LMR* largely reflects the older style of character presentation, although it has a few examples of the narrative discussion of the subject-author that constitute modern autobiographical technique (117–19). *RP*, however, shows fully the modern autobiographical approach (119–21). The *Complaint* has examples of both traditional character description and later autobiographical narrative (121–4).


*RP* is a begging poem that incorporates autobiographical elements and instruction for Prince Henry (63). The old man with whom Hoccleve speaks is likely to represent Chaucer (70).


In addition to poems by Chaucer, Oxford, Bodleian Lib., MS Digby 181 contains several Chaucerian pieces, including *LC*. The manuscript is composed of seven quires and not
nine as previously thought (605). The fact that Digby is missing its first folio with ten stanzas of LC might provide an insight into why the LC manuscripts known as the ‘Oxford Group’ (Bodleian Lib. MSS, Fairfax 16, Bodley 638, Tanner 346, and Digby 181) have misplaced stanzas in groups of ten (610).


See Boffey, 1066 for annotation.


Several references to Hoccleve’s verse, including MG and the ballades to Somer and Carpenter, as evidence of the knowledge and influence of Chaucer’s lyrics in the early years of the 15th century.


Three manuscripts contain holograph copies of Hoccleve’s poetry: San Marino, Huntington Lib., MS HM 744 and MS HM 111; and Durham, Univ. Lib., MS Cosin V.iii.9. It can be shown that the two Huntington manuscripts were originally a single ‘collected poems’ that predated the Durham manuscript (27). [Doyle once held a similar view, but now disagrees]
with the 'collected works' hypothesis, r48. Burrow seems inclined to see the two manuscripts as being originally a single volume (226: 31).] The Huntington manuscripts, even if one does not accept them as a single production, prove that Hoccleve had ‘expanded the concept of vernacular authorship by attempting to impose control over his own textual tradition’ (28).


San Marino, Huntington Lib., MS HM 744 contains 672 lines of LD; Durham, University Lib., MS Cosin V.iii.9 has the poem’s complete text. A comparison of the two versions suggests that they do not share a common source; it also reveals a great many differences between the texts, some substantive, and some relating to orthography or punctuation (437–8). As the manuscripts are in Hoccleve’s hand they allow some of the basic notions of ME textual studies to be examined, including: the assumed ‘monogenous descent’ of a text; the reliability of an authorial manuscript in determining substantive and accidental readings; the legitimacy of an author’s supposed intended reading as the ‘goal of editorial reconstruction’; the ‘status of authorial versions’ for works in multiple copies; and the part played by ‘publication in fixing the work’s formal and social context’ (438). Bowers discusses each these issues in the context of modern editorial scholarship (439–68). The Hoccleve texts show that the poet, when copying his own work, is not tied to either ‘exact replication or radical revision.’ He may engage in a variety of changes that might subsequently be judged as ‘annoyingly scribal’ (447). There are significant substantive differences, and inconsistencies in accidentals, between the two manuscripts (447–56). The validity of postulating final authorial intentions as an editorial guide seems to be challenged deeply by the evidence of the Hoccleve holographs (456–8). It is possible for an editor to produce a useable text, in the face of differing authorial versions, by the
application of established editorial techniques (459–62). The dual publication of LD presents us with an example of two quite different formal and social contexts, each with authorial endorsement, for the same work (462–8). See Burrow (47: 111–18) for further discussion of the textual issues raised by the LD holograph copies.


Offers descriptions, including the known past ownership details, of the Huntington Library’s Hoccleve manuscripts: EL 26 A 13 (35–9); HM 111 (144–7); HM 135 (180–1); HM 744 (247–51); and also of HM 144 which contains a snatch of verse from LD identified by Harris, 299 (197–203). See Seymour, 256, for descriptions of these and other Hoccleve manuscripts, and Edwards, 233, regarding the Yale copy of RP.


The rustiness of the ‘blade’ worn at the Reeve’s side in Chaucer’s CT carries certain connotations. These include ideas of age, corruption, lechery, blood, malignancy, disease, ugliness, envy, and moral decay. In this context, lines 323–6 of the Dialogue provide an ‘interesting example of the breaking of concord couched in terms of images of disease and rust’ (308).

Some of Hoccleve's apparent metrical irregularities are, in fact, skilful and interesting variants when seen as part of the larger stanza-units in which they occur. Hoccleve's practice with larger line-units is partly influenced by that found in Chaucer's poetry, particularly *Troilus*. Stanley provides a brief overview of the historical milestones in the understanding of Chaucer's metre, and the necessary limits to which that understanding is subject (11–15). Furnivall's condemnation of Hoccleve's metre is based on an excessive expectation of regularity and, in at least one instance, on John Stow's faulty transcription (15). Stanley then considers Hoccleve's prosody, and the overall 'tune' of his verse, on the basis of samples from the holographs of the *Invocacio ad Patrem*, *Ad Filium honor et gloria*, *Ad Spiritum Sanctum*, and the *Three Roundels*. In the first of these poems, final -e is regularly sounded, with frequent feminine rhymes, and this can result in a twelve-syllable line; final -e is also elided, but elision does not take place across a caesura. Hoccleve's verse is 'basically regular', although with some variations; Hoccleve's use of a virgule is not relevant to his scansion (17). Further consideration of this poem and the remaining examples suggests the presence of a number of technical devices used to good effect including half-stress, elision between the end of one line and the beginning of the next to enhance enjambment, trochees for special emphasis, the selective use of variant spellings, and the use of the caesura for dramatic effect. Stanley acknowledges and praises the work of Mitchell, 204, and Jefferson, 320. See Burrow, 47, for further discussion of Hoccleve's prosody.


An analysis of Hoccleve's mental illness from the perspective of clinical psychiatry; Hoccleve is discussed with Margery Kempe in Ch. 3, 'Mediaeval Madness' (49–70). Hoccleve's verse is an 'autobiographical outlet'; for the poet to discuss his illness, had it
not already been common knowledge, would have been ‘professional suicide’ (62). *RP*, *Complaint*, and *Dialogue* provide insights into the poet’s illness (63–7). Hoccleve displays a long-standing concern with money (63). The old man in the prologue to *RP* embodies Hoccleve’s anxiety (64). A clinical analysis of Hoccleve’s description of his illness suggests that he suffers from depression (69–70). [Burrow (47: lxii, note 108) describes this study as the ‘most elaborate attempt at a modern diagnosis’ of Hoccleve’s mental illness.]


A consideration of Hoccleve as a capable, independent, and innovative poet, who, after the death of Chaucer, introduces a number new themes, drawn from personal and public life, into English poetry.


Briefly discusses Hoccleve’s work. Hoccleve joins the debate over the *Roman de la Rose* with *LC*, a poem which both mocks and supports Christine de Pizan (170–1). The early 15th century sees a break with the ideals of courtly love and a move towards the modern concept of marriage based on love and trust. Hoccleve’s remarks in *RP* on marriage and women are evidence of this transition (170–3).
Hoccleve’s presentation of his autobiography deserves close attention as it is at the ‘forefront of fifteenth-century English lyric poetry’ (310). What is important is not the autobiography’s ‘historical basis,’ but the characteristics of the ‘autobiographical voice’ that the author constructs through style, theme, and image (301).

Not sighted.

A consideration of RP in its ‘petitionary context’ and of the psychological aspect of its internal relationships. The poem explores the nature of the power relationship between the prince and the petitioner. Revealing ambiguities are suggested within this relationship by the ‘elaborate web of echoes and implications’ found between the prologue and the body of the poem (164). RP is unusual within the mirror genre in that it concentrates on the body of the petitioner instead of the body of the prince (166). The prologue shows that problems of Hoccleve’s body have their source in the irregularity of his income from the prince, but the poem proper is in praise of the prince: this leads to a ‘startling discrepancy which ... might seem to incite charges of insincerity; and yet that insincerity, it would seem, is itself meant to entertain’ (167). An analysis of the relationship of the prologue and the
remainder of the poem from the perspective of psychology shows the homage of RP to the prince is ‘double-edged.’ The petition is a game that works, finally, to reinforce royal authority; however, the game also shows signs of ‘ressentiment’ (179). The poem’s ‘conflicts and contradictions’ are indicative of a ‘specific historical moment’ in the changing structure of society (180).


Brief references. RP is evidence of a lack of support among the literate class for the continuation of the Hundred Years War, and of a challenge to the notion that the king had an unquestionable right to fight the war (176–7).


Brief references to Hoccleve and Lydgate in a discussion of the authorship of the ME prose version of Guillaume de Deguileville’s *Pelerinage de l’Ame.* Neither Hoccleve nor Lydgate is likely to have been the author (xxvi–xxviii).

Modern critics have not been interested in the ‘ideology of kingship’ and consequently RP has become a ‘forgotten masterpiece’ (216). At Hoccleve’s time, the contemporary institutions of kingship and secular writing are in a state of flux, and both strive to define a secular tradition outside of the bounds set by the Church. In the person of the monarch ‘secular writers found a single, central source of authority analogous to the figure of God in ecclesiastical discourse and yet fully secular’ (217). The king provides patronage to poets who, in turn, express a vernacular ‘legitimation’ of royal authority (225-6). RP is an early example of this relationship, in which the references to Chaucer add a further ‘moral authority’ to support Henry IV’s position (226). [See Krochalis, 314, on Hoccleve’s moral elevation of Chaucer.] Hoccleve skilfully mixes the characteristics of the Fürstenspiegel and begging poem: the former presents the ideal of a secure king who acts on wise counsel, and the latter assumes a monarch with the power to grant favours by an act of royal will (229–33). Scanlon provides a reading of the poem in terms of the interaction of these two genres; see Scanlon, 340, for a later development of this approach.


It is not a ‘resurgence of piety’ that leads Hoccleve and Lydgate to put aside the anti-clerical position that is often found in Chaucer and Gower. Instead, one needs to look to the Lancastrians and their concern with Lollardy, their need to seek the support of the Church to bolster their hold on the throne, and their patronage of vernacular poetry (298). [Scanlon discusses RP primarily from a political perspective (299–322).] Hoccleve’s construction of his autobiography is a product of ‘social and ideological’ factors (300). RP
brings together a begging poem and a Fürstenspiegel in a way that exploits the inherent tension between the two. The poem is ‘sponsored’ by Henry V in order to ‘confirm his legitimacy’ (301). Hoccleve confirms the king’s legitimacy by taking it as ‘already settled’ and by referring to the king’s royal descent (301–2). The poet invokes Henry V and Chaucer as political and poetic authorities who transcend Fortune (302). The beggar in RP stands in relation to Hoccleve as Hoccleve stands in relation to Henry V (303). Scanlon shows how Hoccleve’s narrative appeal to the king serves to show the mutually beneficial interdependence of the king and his subjects.


The Chaucer portrait that Hoccleve inserts into the original RP manuscripts is likely to be true to life as it is in Hoccleve’s interests to be associated with Chaucer (283). Carlson reproduces the Chaucer portraits from Ellesmere [San Marino, Huntington Lib., MS EL 26 C 9] and Philadelphia, Rosenbach Foundation, MS 1083/30 (284–5). It is improbable that the Ellesmere portrait is taken from one of the RP examples as it seems that these postdate Ellesmere (286). The Chaucer miniature in London, BL, MS Harley 4866 is likely to be the closest in appearance to that in the presentation copy for Prince Henry, and it may be evidence of Ellesmere’s verisimilitude (286ff).

A discussion, with an emphasis on the Medea story, of the tradition of featuring women in medieval exempla that stands behind Chaucer’s *Legend of Good Women*. Hoccleve sees the similarity between Christine de Pizan’s *Epistre au Dieu d’Amours* and the prologue to *The Legend of Good Women* (61). He appreciates, as Chaucer does, the problems of an ‘audience determined to misunderstand’; however, whereas Chaucer’s *Legend of Good Women* is highly problematic, Hoccleve’s *T JW* is an ‘unexceptionable example of wifely virtue’ (62). Even so, Hoccleve concludes with a tale from the *Gesta Romanorum* about a young student led astray by a prostitute, and so he provides an example of a bad woman; in doing this, it is probable that he is influenced by the ‘rhetorical strategies of *The Legend of Good Women*’ (63).


Takes issue with the range of views expressed by Mitchell, 204, Bornstein, 266, and Fleming, 241, on the relationship between *LC* and Christine de Pizan’s *Epistre au Dieu d’Amours*. Each of the earlier commentators do not pay enough attention to Christine’s use of humour, organization, and character (11–12). *LC* offers an important insight into the reception of Christine’s work by an ‘educated clerk’ (11). Hoccleve’s translation, although a substantial reworking of its original, is still a defence of women. It redefines rather than subverts its source, possibly under the influence of the example of Chaucer’s *Legend of Good Women* (12). [The remainder of the essay considers the detail of Hoccleve’s changes.] What Hoccleve has done is exchange the sophisticated ethical structure of Christine’s work, with its emphasis on a broadly based concept of ‘civil service and moral rectitude,’ for one more narrowly focused on the idea of the ‘virtuous woman’ (14).
Hoccleve omits Christine’s significant linking of misogyny with deceit (14–16). Hoccleve’s changes work to produce a ‘quite acceptable medieval defense of women’s honor’ based on chastity; Christine, however, had raised her poem above the conventional issues of sexuality (16). The overall difference in approach between the two writers is reflected in their respective treatments of Cupid, Eve, and Mary (18–20). Hoccleve’s fails to reproduce the wit, art, and unity of his source (20–1). It may be that Hoccleve misunderstands Christine’s work, or he may be uncomfortable with her ‘boldness.’ Critics who think, however, that Hoccleve mocks Christine’s ‘literary judgements’ or ‘feminist ideas’ give him too much credit and Christine not enough (21–2).


Hoccleve’s literary efforts seem to be directed at improving both his mental well being and his financial situation (106–7). San Marino, Huntington Library MSS HM 111 and HM 744 are probably produced by Hoccleve ‘on spec’ in the hope of reward from one patron or another. Hoccleve’s patrons outside the nobility may see their patronage as a status symbol (107). In considering those of Hoccleve’s poems that seem to have been copied most often it is notable that they are found in manuscripts with Chaucer and Lydgate pieces and other attributed works: the original readers of these collections know their preferred writers ‘by name.’ The Series in Durham, Univ. Lib., MS Cosin V.iii.9 is found in other manuscripts with RP; this leads to ‘miscellanies’ with a core of Hoccleve’s poetry supplemented by other works, for example, Lydgate’s DM (108). It is likely that the London, BL, MS Arundel 38 and MS Harley 4866 copies of RP were both prepared as presentation copies; the Arundel copy was possibly intended for Prince Henry (109). It might be that Hoccleve uses junior scribes from the privy seal office to assist in producing copies of his work; London, BL, MS Royal 17 D.xviii could have been produced in this way (109–10). The
fact that the number of years given by Hoccleve as the term he has spent in the privy seal office differs between some copies of RP may be evidence of authorial supervision of the scribes over a period of time (110). See Harris, 298, on London, BL, MS Arundel 38 as a possible presentation copy; see Marzec, 277, for further discussion of the RP presentation copies; and see Seymour (48:127) for his view that London, BL, MS Harley 4866 is a likely presentation copy for either the Duke of York or the Duke of Bedford—a point that Burrow disputes (226: 18, note 71).


The Series, except for the Dialogue where the use of conversation helps to bring a sense of reality, is concerned with issues of textuality and composition. This characteristic of the Dialogue is strategic because Hoccleve intends this part of the Series to stand apart from the surrounding text as evidence that the narrator-poet is sane (17–22). The ‘story of the Series’s own composition is ... the story of a poet negotiating a new relationship with his audience’ (22). The human interaction and conversation of the Dialogue is intended to be both a demonstration of Hoccleve’s sanity and a means of achieving mental health for the poet. The social participation presented in the Dialogue is a reaction against the ‘humble, solitary resignation’ of the Complaint and the traditions of the Psalms and consolation literature (25). In this way the Dialogue subverts the convention of solitary reflection that lies behind the complaint tradition, and it replaces this convention with one that stresses the social dependency of personality (25–6).
Hoccleve presents himself in *RP* as 'Nobody's man' who speaks without the support of a political patron or 'literary tradition.' Instead, he uses 'apparently innocuous discursive traditions' to present his interests (153). [Simpson discusses the place of Boethian philosophy in the poem (159–69).] The prologue to *RP* shows a movement from 'private complaint' to 'public address' (167). Boethian philosophy is represented as a passive course of last resort for which Hoccleve is not yet ready; nevertheless, Hoccleve uses Boethius to allow him to speak on his own behalf (167–9). Hoccleve's use of Boethius is a 'ploy' before he turns to Aristotle as the 'voice for political action' (169). On the face of it, Aristotle's advice to kings does not seem to offer help to a downtrodden bureaucrat like Hoccleve (169–70). Hoccleve, however, uses the 'ostensibly impersonal voice of the *speculum principis*' to win over the king by demonstrating that a 'king's welfare depends intimately on that of his subjects' (170).


Brief references to Hoccleve and Lydgate. See Allmand, 1092, for annotation.


See Boyd, 1093, for annotation.

The physical presentation of Hoccleve’s Series and Lydgate’s DM in New Haven, Yale Univ., Beinecke Lib., MS 493 provides clues as to how they are understood as social and political texts by medieval readers. The manuscript presents these two poems with RP; this suggests that the group is perceived as thematically related.


Chaucer provides a model for 15th-century vernacular authors of the use of ‘textual authority’ in vernacular texts. Textual authority may not be a significant issue for Hoccleve as a great portion of his work is ‘contemporary and topical,’ but he occasionally shows that he is very aware of it (282). For example, the Friend in the Series speaks in the person of ‘literary tradition or textual authority.’ Hoccleve presents the writing of the Series as the outcome of a ‘dialectic’ between Hoccleve and the Friend, that is between the poet and his literary authorities (282–3). The Series is a much better example than RP of Hoccleve’s exploration of the issue of textual authority (284). The Chaucer portrait is an interesting example of Hoccleve’s independence in the context of his textual tradition; however, Hoccleve does little to explore its potential (284–5). Nevertheless, although Lydgate refers much more often to the superficial aspects of textual authority than Hoccleve does, it is Hoccleve who shows the greater concern for the underlying issues (285).
A number of generally brief references to Hoccleve in a discussion of issues surrounding the editing and interpretation of ME texts. Hoccleve is ambivalent regarding the ‘issue of literary authority’ (120–1). [In general, Machan sees it as typical of the period that writers failed to explore the issues of vernacular literary authority that had been raised by Chaucer—see Machan, 1099–1100, and 1182.] Hoccleve’s use of the Chaucer portrait is striking evidence of Chaucer’s ‘status ... as an individual poet’ who holds vernacular authority for some writers of the period. Hoccleve, however, does little to exploit the potential symbolism of the portrait (121). Greetham’s proposed approach to the editing of RP, 306–7, using the holograph manuscripts as a guide to authorial orthography, is open to question on the ground of the assumption of consistency that underlies it (63–4). See Greetham, 309, for a reply to Machan.


Two images of an old man in London, BL, MS Add. 42131 (the Bedford Psalter-Hours) are the same as the Chaucer portrait in the London, BL, MS Harley 4866 copy of RP. All were drawn by the same artist (199). A portrait of Hoccleve appears in the Bedford manuscript on each of folios 118, 199, and 206; the last two show Hoccleve as an older man (199–200). The presentation of the portrait on folio 206 hints that Hoccleve is seen as the ‘new Gower for a new age’ (200). A portrait of Lydgate does not appear in the manuscript and this suggests that the Duke of Bedford is unaware of him at this time. See Wright, 353, for some revisions to this position; see also Seymour, 357.

British Lib., Add. MS 42131 (the Bedford-Psalter Hours) has at least 22 author portraits. The settings for the portraits suggest that Lancastrian authors are noted not just for their writings but also for their acknowledgment of the 'dignity of the royal house' (267). Hoccleve, whose portrait is on folio 118, is a clear supporter of the Lancastrians (268); Lydgate, who is portrayed twice, has undertaken work at the command of Henry V (268–9). Wright reproduces the Hoccleve portrait from folio 118 with the Lydgate portrait from folio 70 (269). The portrait on folio 74 of Henry V [reproduced on page 273] ‘closely compares’ with that in the London, BL, MS Arundel 38 copy of RP (280).


In *RP*, Hoccleve briefly refers to the death of his ‘maister,’ John Gower (349–50). There are a number of links between these two artists. Hoccleve is familiar with at least part of the *Confessio Amantis* because he worked as a scribe on one of its manuscripts, Cambridge, Trinity College, MS R.3.2; in *RP* he follows the vernacular genre of a ‘mirror for a prince’ that Gower had introduced in Bk 7 of the *Confessio Amantis*; he adopts Gower’s ‘plain’ style’ for *RP*; and his construction of the final part of *RP*, dealing with peace, parallels Gower’s *In Praise of Peace* (350–1). In particular, there is a further structural parallel between *RP* and the *Confessio Amantis* that reveals some important differences between the two works. In the *Confessio Amantis*, we find a juxtaposition of the interaction between Amans and Genius with the ‘moral-political themes of the prologue and seventh
book.’ This stands in parallel to the juxtaposition in *RP* of the prologue with the ‘didactic treatise’ that follows it (351). Close inspection, however, shows Hoccleve, because of his more marginalized social position, to be much more aware than Gower is of the ‘world of daily social and political abuse and deception’ (358). On this last point, see Lawton, 321, for his view of the plight of the 15th-century Chaucerians, and Scanlon, 340, who contrasts Hoccleve and Gower.


Blyth is editing *RP.* Furnivall has been criticized for choosing London, BL, MS Harley 4866 as his base text; it is true that his edition has faults, but these tend to come from Furnivall’s own editorial practices (11–13). It is not necessarily the case that a new edition to replace Furnivall’s must be rigorously collated with all the surviving manuscripts: a complete collation would be unwieldy and of little practical use (14–15). The proposed new edition will give a privileged position to London, BL, MS Harley 4866 and Arundel 38, correcting them ‘where they evidently err,’ and drawing on the evidence of Hoccleve’s authorial practice in the holograph manuscripts (16). The suggestion [see Greetham, 306–7 and 309] that Hoccleve’s holograph poems be used to settle authorial usage in the editing of the non-holograph *RP* is open to criticism: the holographs were written ‘up to 10 years’ after *RP* and show an authorial usage that is not entirely consistent (21). [See Bowers, 328, and Burrow, 47, for further discussion.] Nevertheless, Hoccleve was still very consistent in matters of authorial usage, and a selective approach to the information provided by the holographs in reconstructing a text for *RP* is not only possible, but valuable and necessary (22–8).

356. **Von Nolcken, Christina.** ‘“O, why ne had y lerned for to die?” *Lerne for to Dye* and the Author’s Death in Thomas Hoccleve’s *Series.*’ *Essays in Medieval Studies* 10 (1993): 27–51.

Burrow’s analysis, 223, of Hoccleve’s *Series* shows how the autobiographical elements act as a cohesive force in the work. A chapter, dealing with the ‘Learn to Die’ theme, in Henry Suso’s *Horologium sapientiae* reveals another cohesive aspect of Hoccleve’s work (28–9). Suso’s text had become well known in England after about 1375 (29). Von Nolcken outlines the action of Suso’s work (29–30). The importance of the influence of the texts predating the *Series* in the *learn to die* genre has not been sufficiently considered (30–1). Hoccleve intends that we should read his work with Suso’s in mind (32–3). Nolcken provides a close reading of the *Series* along these lines (33–42). Such a reading of the *Series* shows that it is unified by a ‘narrative treating its author’s own preparation for death.’ This aspect of the work may have been more obvious to its medieval audience than to its modern readers; in the five non-holograph manuscripts in which the *Series* is found, it is followed significantly by Lydgate’s *DM* (42).

An examination of *TJW*, Jonathas, and Hoccleve's remarks in the *Dialogue* about the offence he had caused to women by *LC*, shows that the *Series* is an 'antifeminist continuation' of *LC* (145). There are 'mischievous' parallels between *LC* and *TJW* (148), just as there are between *TJW* and *Jonathas* (149–50). Hoccleve's use of Thomas as a persona puts some good-humoured distance between himself and the anti-feminism of his work (152–3).


Discusses Hoccleve, principally on pages 399–418, in a broader argument for the French influence on English literature in the period 1100–1420. Hoccleve, more than Lydgate, is an 'exciting and creative poet in the secular courtly tradition' (399). It is unwise to accept his autobiographical references at face value; they are more properly interpreted as fictional devices based on French models (399–400). Hoccleve's work is strikingly influenced by French authors (401). Bornstein, 266, is wrong to suggest that *LC* is an antifeminist version of its source (401–2); Fleming, 241, rightly says that *LC* is an adaptation that preserves the spirit of its original (402). Calin discusses the French antecedents of *Complaint of the Virgin, MG, Lady Money*, and the dinner invitation to Somer (403–5). *LMR* is a parody not only of the English penitential genre, but also of courtly French models (405–7). A French version of the *Secreta secretorum* might be the source for *RP*; *RP* might also draw 'inspiration' from Guillaume de Machaut's *Confort d'Ami* (407–8). The prologue to *RP* uses the tradition of *dit amoureux* (408). The stance of the narrator in the *Remonstrance against Oldcastle* also parallels French models (411–12). The *Series* is Hoccleve's courtly 'masterwork' (412). Hoccleve's circumstances as narrator in the *Series* appears to be modelled on those found in Machaut's *Jugement dou Roy de Navarre*; the concept for Hoccleve's Friend comes from Jean de Meun's *Roman de*
la Rose, and may also borrow from Machaut’s Confort d’Ami (415). The Series is the ‘most literary and intertextual’ of Hoccleve’s works (416). Hoccleve’s apology in the Series for LC closely follows the structure of Machaut’s Jugement dou Roy de Navarre (417). Hoccleve is ‘one of the last flowerings of the Chaucerian, courtly, French literary revolution’ (418). See Burrow, 228, for a related discussion.


Hoccleve’s poetic persona of a man concerned with trivialities and inadequate in worldly matters comes from Chaucer (64). This persona develops an added edge in the hands of the 15th-century Chaucerian because of the socially insecure position of the bureaucratic class. This insecurity creates a tension between the lowly and anonymous role of the clerk and the necessity to petition for the means needed to sustain life. In Hoccleve’s transformation of the Chaucerian persona, the ‘class experience of financial anxiety provided the impetus and the bureaucratic instrument of the petition provided the form’ (67). Hoccleve’s occasional use of his initials following letters in the Formulary is a kind of ‘bureaucratic hide-and-seek,’ playing with anonymity and identity (69).


The development of an increasingly secular English bureaucracy during the 14th century influences Hoccleve’s self-representation in the Formulary and LMR; it also explains Hoccleve’s development of the authorial persona he found in the works of Chaucer. The
financial insecurity of the privy seal clerks led to a dependence on petitions for assistance. These petitions had to be cast in a way that would not offend, and this tension, in turn, shaped the form of Hoccleve's autobiographical poetry.


Lines 99–140 of *MG* draw on a popular Latin poem, *O intermerata et in aeternum benedicta*. Stokes prints the relevant passages from *MG* and the Latin piece (78–9). 'Hoccleve intensifies and individualizes the central images of the famous prayer' (77). Sandison, 143, establishes the French source of the *Balade to the Virgin and Christ*; however, the Anglo-Norman version he identifies is missing its final forty lines (79). Stokes prints the missing lines, based on London, BL, MS Royal 20 B.iii, facing Hoccleve's text (82–3). Hoccleve alters his source material considerably (80).


A collection of essays. See Blyth, 355, Batt, 363, Ellis, 365, and Mills, 368, for annotations.

———Review by Bernard O'Donoghue, *Modern Language Review* 94 (1999): 157–8. Hoccleve studies have been too long focused on the writer's biographical details (157). Batt's volume is 'welcome as the first collection of critical essays devoted exclusively to Hoccleve' (157–8). Nevertheless, the collection's range is a little narrow: Chaucer is
presented as Hoccleve's single source of artistic effects, with no mention of Gower; and
more could have been written regarding 'Hoccleve's stylistic idiosyncrasies.' What is
needed, aside from new editions that are underway, is a shift of critical emphasis from the
contextual to the textual (158). See r355 and r368 for more of O'Donoghue's comments.

363. ——. 'Hoccleve and... Feminism? Negotiating Meaning in The Regiment of Princes.'
Essays on Thomas Hoccleve. Ed. Catherine Batt. Westfield Publications in
55–84.

A reading that aims to 'account for the timbre' of lines 5090–194 from RP concerning
women (56). The influence of Chaucer is central to a reading of the passage with its links
to culture, literature, and politics.

364. Bragg, Lois. 'Chaucer's Monogram and the "Hoccleve Portrait" tradition.'

Chaucer's hand positions in his portrait in London, BL, MS Harley 4866 spell 'GC' in the
finger alphabet. This instance predates the next example of the finger alphabet by 180
years (127). The out-sized rosary that Chaucer holds in the portrait, partly to achieve the
necessary shape of hand for the letter 'C,' is also a witticism that plays on the name of the
London street where commercial book production was conducted, Paternoster Row (127–
8). It is doubtful that the Chaucer portrait is life-like, just as it is doubtful that Hoccleve
had a close association with Chaucer, because Chaucer was away from London from 1386
until the last few years of his life (129–30). The Ellesmere [Huntington Lib., MS EL 26 C
9] Chaucer on horseback is a crude adaptation of the Harley Chaucer portrait (133–5). Bragg also discusses other Chaucer illustrations that are taken to be based on the Harley portrait (135–8).


Addresses the issue of whether or not Hoccleve is successful in capturing the ‘wit’ of Christine de Pizan’s text (31). Ellis discusses Christine de Pizan’s approach to tackling anti-feminism (31–40). Hoccleve uses roughly half of Christine’s text in his translation, and he adds a considerable amount of his own material. He also alters the sequencing of some of the original text. On balance these changes are likely to be conscious decisions rather than accidents ascribable to the copy text or to the scribal process (40–2). Hoccleve seems to view himself as a ‘compilator—if not as an *auctor*’ in the way he rearranges Christine’s text (42); but these rearrangements have little effect on the meaning of the original (43). Hoccleve’s additions to his original, however, show him working as a ‘commentator’ (44). The additions tend to simplify, dilute, and even challenge, some of the arguments of the *Epistre au Dieu d’Amours*. Hoccleve’s translation ultimately endorses Christine’s antifeminism, although it weakens the logic of her case (44–52). See Mahoney 367, for a related discussion.

Ch. 8 (137–59) discusses the importance of historical context to a number of works, including *RP,* in the *mirror* genre. Hoccleve’s apparent references to his personal situation should not be seen as divided from his political observations; the two cannot be separated (137–8). Hoccleve’s requests for the payment of his annuity deliberately parallel aspects of Prince Henry’s financial policy within the government of Henry IV (142–7). In this reading, it does not matter whether Hoccleve’s autobiographical references are real or invented, as the purpose they serve remains the same (147). Hoccleve’s stress on the humility of his situation is part of his strategic self-presentation: he addresses the all-powerful on the behalf of the powerless (147–8). Hoccleve’s social position is not quite as humble as he pretends (148–9); and he is not as young as he makes out (149). *RP* is clear about the dangers that await advisers, but it also carries a warning, sometimes assertively put, for princes who fail to heed advice (150–9). *RP* does more than lend legitimacy to the Lancastrians as it also confirms its author’s right to be an adviser on behalf of the people (158–9). In the difficult relationship between adviser and prince both parties must be bound by the ‘discipline of advice’ (159).


Discussion of Hoccleve’s *LC* (409–21) in an examination of ME renderings of Christine de Pizan’s *Epistre au Dieu d’Amours* and the male response to her female voice. *LC* is faithful to Christine’s original, and where there are differences between the two works these are generally because of differences in the social context of the authors. *LC* is
somewhat more vigorous and less aristocratic than its source, but this follows from Hoccleve's environment (411–2). The voice of Christine, as a female author, is subtly overheard in the persona of Cupid in a way that asserts a female perspective (413–15). This subtlety is necessarily lost when Hoccleve assumes the authorial voice. This does not mean, however, that Hoccleve indulges in irony at the expense of women (415). The apology in the *Series* for *LC* is based on Chaucer's in the Prologue to the *Legend of Good Women*; it is simply a fictional advice that is not to be taken at face value (418–20. See Ellis, 365, for a related discussion.


A close reading of the *Series* that explores the theme of the poet's public and private existence. Hoccleve shows that he 'loses himself as he seeks to satisfy demands from his readers that are contradictory and encounters interpretations that are mistaken.' His intention is to 'conform' to the norms of society and literature in order to be readmitted into 'his former social circles'; and, yet, in spite of his attempted conformity, he remains an outcast (86). In the *Complaint*, Hoccleve manipulates reader 'expectations' (87). For example, it begins in a conventional, meditative tone, and then its register becomes much more pressing and emotive as the poet shows that his 'complaint' is to be taken in the sense of 'grievance rather than lament' (87–90). This tactical manipulation is part of a considered strategy (90–1). In *LMR* and the *Series*, Hoccleve stresses the 'enduring social consequences' of his former illness; the *Complaint* both celebrates his recovery and chides his friends for their failure to readmit him into their society (91). The readers of Hoccleve's work are cast in the *Series* as 'destabilizing devices': they misread both the poet and his work, each of which emerges as socially constructed (93–4). Books are
conspicuous in the *Series* as tokens that are socially exchanged (101–2). Thomas in the
*Complaint* has some concerns regarding the sincerity of the language of social intercourse,
and these concerns are thematically linked to his outburst against counterfeiters (102–4).
The ‘borrowed book,’ identified as Isidore of Seville’s *Synonyma*, also has significance for
the *Complaint*’s theme of social interactions (105–6). It may be that the *Complaint* is
thematically closer to the *House of Fame* than to the *Canterbury Tales* (107).

study is ‘highly enlightening’ and shows signs of the more detailed textual analysis that is
needed of Hoccleve’s work (158).

369. Partridge, Stephen. ‘A Newly Identified Manuscript by the Scribe of the New
College *Canterbury Tales*.’ *English Manuscript Studies 1100–1700* 6 (1996):
229–36.

The same scribe wrote the Oxford, New College, MS 314 copy of *CT* and the Oxford,
Bodleian Lib., MS Dugdale 45 copy of *RP*. Partridge addresses the scribe’s ‘handwriting,
materials, decoration, and language,’ in order to foster the identification of other examples
of his work, and he considers the respective situation of the two Oxford manuscripts in
their ‘textual traditions’ (229). The scribe’s language may show a ‘Southern or Kentish’
influence (231). Both manuscripts most probably date to the middle of the 15th century, or
the latter part of the period 1425 to 1450 (233). The Dugdale manuscript does not give an
important text for *RP*, but Marzec (277: 271) argues that, along with London, BL, MS
Royal 17 D.xvii, it may preserve a version the lost presentation copy for the Duke of
Bedford (233–4).

A discussion of Hoccleve's presentation of his madness in the *Complaint* and *Dialogue*.


There is a 'remarkable similarity' between references to mermaids in Chaucer's *Nun's Priest's Tale*, lines 3267–72, and in Hoccleve's *RP*, lines 233–64 (86). Hoccleve makes mention in his mermaid passage of Robert Holcot's *Super sapientiam Salomonis*; Holcot's work is thought to be one of Chaucer's sources for the *Nun's Priest's Tale* (87).


There may be similarities between the personal circumstances of Hoccleve and Langland (83–4). Hoccleve's complaints about the drudgery of a scribe's life are 'conventional' and may not be autobiographically based; nevertheless, his need for patrons is real (84–5). There are parallels between Hoccleve's self-presentation, his 'bibliographic ego,' and that of Langland (85, 90). An important cohort of the readership for Hoccleve, as for other
writers active around 1400, was that of the 'civil servants and scriveners' (113). Hoccleve’s place in the initial audience for Langland’s work is part of the evidence of Langland’s connection with London’s ‘literary circles’ (117–8). See Kerby-Fulton and Justice, 373.


Brief references to Hoccleve in an argument, based on the Langland texts, that the ‘vernacular literary culture’ is first nurtured by civil servants (59). Hoccleve is well positioned as a bureaucrat and scribe to be familiar with his ‘audience and its poets’ (60). He is a collaborator with a notable Langland scribe on a Gower manuscript [Cambridge, Trinity College, MS R.3.2 (581)] (64). Hoccleve and Thomas Usk may be influenced by Langland in their ‘peculiarly and overtly personal style of authorial self-defence.’ If is true that Langland is a legal scribe then it is a vocation that he shares with both Hoccleve and Usk. All three of these writers make wide use of legal terms in their work (73). It is likely that Hoccleve had the ‘opportunity’ to read the Langland C-text (74).


Brief references to Hoccleve in a discussion of Shirley’s life, work, and manuscripts. A chapter is given to a discussion of Cambridge, Trinity College, MS R.3.20, which contains a text of $LC$, and its affiliates (69–101).

Canterbury Cathedral Archive, Register O, contains nine stanzas of *LMR* (178). The text is carefully written in a hand dating to the period 1420–30 (178–9). The extract is the only evidence that anyone besides John Bale knew of *LMR* before Mason’s printing of the poem, 6, in 1796. The manuscript stanzas have been edited to produce a ‘freestanding general balade on the need for moderation in youth’ (179). Variants are listed (179–80). As an example of the reception of Hoccleve’s ‘idiosyncratic poem’ the balade is ‘unique’ (180).


Oxford, Bodleian Lib., MS Rawlinson C. 813 (the ‘Welles Anthology’) dates to the years between 1523 and 1533–4. Item 10 in the anthology is a short poem that begins ‘Musing uppon the mutabilite.’ The poem is an example of a recycling of the *de casibus* genre that had been initially popularized in England by Lydgate in the previous century (493–4). *RP* is, however, a specific and significant influence on the poem’s ‘mood.... tone and vocabulary of contagious insecurity’ (497). The poem combines the *de casibus* genre with the ‘diction and sense of political malaise’ found at the beginning of *RP* in a way that would strike home to a 16th-century audience (498).
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Editions

I base my list of early Lydgate printings, to item 421, on Pearsall, 824, and on the editors cited in the annotations. I make no attempt to independently reconstruct the early printing history. I include the name of the printer in the citation for ease of indexing for the editions to 1590, with the exception of items 409 and 415–17 where there is evidence of an editor at work. The familiar modern titles of Lydgate’s poems are used for simplicity. On the early prints, see also de Ricci, 638, and Duff, 666. I provide some cross-referencing below to bibliographic descriptions, but only when the printer and publication date readily distinguish the editions. The apocryphal Assembly of Gods is represented by its first printing, de Worde’s edition of about 1498, 389, which ascribes the work to Lydgate, and by Triggs’s edition of 1896, 444, which is issued shortly before Sieper expels the Assembly from the Lydgate canon in 1903 (458: vi).


Not sighted. See Duff (666: 72).


Not sighted. See Duff (666: 73).
379. **Caxton, William. Stans Puer ad Mensam.** London, [1477?].

Not sighted. See Duff (666: 76).


See Schick for a description of the edition (442: xxv–xxvi). Schick suggests ‘about the year 1478’ as the printing date (442: xxv); Pearsall suggests ‘?1477’ (824: 79). See also the facsimile print of 1905, 459, and Duff (666: 76).

381. **Caxton, William. Churl and the Bird.** London, [1478?].

Not sighted. See Duff (666: 72).

382. **Caxton, William. Horse, Goose, and Sheep.** London, [1478?].

Not sighted. See Duff (666: 73)


Not sighted. An English prose translation of Guillaume de Deguileville’s *Pelerinage de l’Ame* that is ascribed to Lydgate by Hare, 697. This attribution is rejected by Schick (442: ci–ciii) and by McGerr, 338⁴, and discussed briefly by Schirmer (758: 122). See Doyle, 217, for cross-references to the debate regarding Hoccleve’s authorship.


385. **Pynson, Richard.** *Churl and the Bird.* [London, 1493].

Not sighted. See Duff (666: 72).

386. **Pynson, Richard.** *Fall of Princes.* London, 1494.

Not sighted. See Bergen for a description of the edition (467: 109–115); see also Ames (555: 2: 404–5). Bergen (467: 106) considers Pynson's edition to be second in quality, among the early printed versions, only to that of Tottle, 413.

387. **Pynson, Richard.** *Churl and the Bird.* London, [1497?]

Not sighted. The date of '1497' is suggested by Pearsall (824: 84).

388. **Worde, Wynkyn de.** *Siege of Thebes.* London, [1497?].

   London, [1498?].

Not sighted. See Ekwall (470: 60) and Schick (442: xxvi–xxvii) for a description of the edition. Schick suggests a date of about 1498 (xxvi). Sieper, 458, removes the *Assembly* from the Lydgate canon in 1903. Editions of the *Assembly* subsequent to de Worde’s first edition are not here annotated until Triggs’s edition of 1896 (444).

390. **Worde, Wynkyn de.** *Horse, Goose, and Sheep.* London, 1500.

Not sighted. See Duff for a description of the volume (666:74) and Bühler, 709, for a related bibliographic discussion.

391. **Worde, Wynkyn de.** *Temple of Glass.* London, [1500?].


Not sighted. See Schick for a description of the edition (442: xxix). Pearsall suggests the publication date of 1503 (824: 79); Schick suggests a date ‘between 1498 and 1500’ (xxix).
393. **Worde, Wynkyn de.** *Temple of Glass.* London, [1506?].

Not sighted. Wynkyn de Worde’s third printing of *TG.* See Schick for a description of the edition (442: xxvii–xxviii). Pearsall suggests the publication date of ‘?1506’ (824: 79); Schick puts forward a date of ‘not long after 1500’ (xxviii).

394. **Chepman, Walter, and Andrew Myllar.** *Complaint of the Black Knight.*

Edinburgh, 1508.

Printed as Chaucer’s under the title *The Maying or Disport of Chaucer.* See Edwards, 901, for related bibliographic discussion, and Beattie, 488, for a facsimile edition and further commentary.

395. **Chepman, Walter, and Andrew Myllar.** *Rhyme without Accord.* Edinburgh, 1508.

Printed as a ‘balade’ without attribution of authorship, the poem begins ‘Thingis in kynde desyris thingis lyke.’ See Beattie, 488, for a facsimile edition.

396. **Worde, Wynkyn de.** *Churl and the Bird.* London, 1510?

Not sighted.
LYDGATE: EDITIONS


Not sighted. The *Proverbs* include extracts from *FP*. See Bergen for a description of the edition (467: 123–4). Pearsall suggests the date of about '1510(?)' (824: 72). De Worde produces a second edition in 1519 or 1520—see de Worde, 400.


See the 1957 facsimile edition by Starnes, 489.


Not sighted. See Bergen for a description of the edition (467: 54–59). Neville-Sington, 1140, provides a discussion of the possible political motivations behind the Pynson edition. Bergen describes the text as 'excellent' and one certainly taken from an 'early MS' (59).


Not sighted. Printed by Wynkyn de Worde for the second time. The *Proverbs* include extracts from *FP*. See Bergen for a description (467: 123–4). Bergen says the edition dates from 1519 (123); Pearsall suggests '1520?' (824: 72).


Not sighted.


Not sighted. Extant only in a fragment. The suggested publication dates, 1521–35?, simply reflect the period during which Treverys ran his press. See Ringler, 825, for further bibliographic discussion.


Not sighted.


Not sighted. See Schick for a description of the edition (442: xxx). According to Schick, the text is taken from de Worde’s third print of the poem. Pearsall suggests the date of ‘?1529’ (824: 79).
407. **Worde, Wynkyn de.** *Complaint of the Black Knight.* London, [1531?].

Not sighted.


*CBK* is included among Chaucer’s works, with some minor Lydgate pieces. It appears in the subsequent Chaucer editions as Chaucer’s until Skeat removes it for his 1878 revision [not annotated] of Bell’s *Chaucer*, 8. See Hammond (610: 142) and Pearsall (824: 68) for the printing history of *CBK*.

410. **Hertford, John.** *Lives of Saints Alban and Amphibal.* St Albans, 1534.


411. **Redman, Robert.** *Serpent of Division.* [London], c. 1535.

Printed with no attribution of author.

Not sighted.

413. **Tottle, Richard.** *Fall of Princes and Dance Macabre.* London, 1554.

For descriptions of the edition see Bergen (467: 117–20), Warren (480: 107), and Ames (550: 4: 425–6). Bergen finds Tottle’s version to be ‘by far the best’ of the early editions (106).

414. **Wayland, John.** *Fall of Princes.* London, [1554?].

See Bergen for a description of the edition (467: 120–23); and see Jackson, 711, and Campbell, 736, for a discussion of the significance of Wayland’s edition in the context of the subsequent publication of the *Mirror for Magistrates.*


Not sighted. Printed by Thomas Marshe, but with corrections to the text by Robert Braham. In his preface Braham claims that the text of TB given in Pynson’s edition of 1513 is like that of Chaucer’s work before William Thynne corrects it, corrupt and misunderstood. See Bergen for a description of the edition and discussion of Robert Braham’s preface (467: 59–67). Bergen finds Braham’s claims for the accuracy of his textual interventions, and his supposed use of various source texts for his edition, pretentious and exaggerated. He concludes that Braham produced, perhaps, the ‘poorest’ *TB* text in either manuscript or print (61). Bergen prints the text of Braham’s preface (62–5).

Printed by Owen Rogers, edited by ‘I.S.’ ‘I.S.’ is possibly John Stow; see Ringler, 825, for a bibliographic discussion.


Printed by Edward Allde for John Perrin, together with Thomas Norton’s *Gorboduc*. A prefatory address to the reader likens the condition of England to that of Rome and warns of the dangers of civil unrest. See Ringler, 825.

Reprints ST from the 1561 edition. ST subsequently appears in later Chaucer editions not here annotated. See Pearsall (824: 79). A listing, provided by John Stow, shows Lydgate’s known surviving works (394–5). The Life of Chaucer (pages unnumbered) at the front of the volume includes quotations from Lydgate’s LOL and FP.


Not sighted. A modernization of TB. See Bergen for a description of the edition, and discussion of Heywood’s treatment of his source (463: 67–84). Bergen’s view is that in spite of numerous changes and additions by Heywood, the resultant poem can still be regarded as Lydgate’s ‘so far as its general contents are concerned’ (67).


Prints the Churl and the Bird as an anonymous piece under the title, Hermes Bird (213–26), and extracts from the Book of the Governaunce of Kynges and Princes regarding alchemy (397–403). See Bowers, 713, regarding a manuscript that has a text of the Churl and the Bird very similar to Ashmole’s version.


A modernized verse translation is offered as the language of the original has led it to be neglected. In his preface, Dart provides some evaluation of CBK. The poem is a fine example of love poetry, and it displays excellent design and thoughtfulness. It could be said that some of the descriptive passages are too long, but they are a ‘glorious fault, and a beautiful extravagance’ (n. pag.)

Quotes a brief extract from the end of *FP*. The civil disorder that came after Chaucer’s death brought with it ‘Ignorance’ and ‘Dulness’; writers were still at work, but ‘Tast, Judgment, and Manner were lost’ (xi). Many writers praise Lydgate even to the extent of comparison with Chaucer: ‘I must, either, confess my own want of Penetration, or beg leave to dissent from his Admirers’ (30).


Prints *The Entry of Henry the Sixth into London after his Coronation in France; On the Mutability of Human Affairs; Advice to an Old Gentleman who Wished for a Young Wife; Ballad on the Forked Head-dresses of Ladies; Lydgate’s Application to the Duke of Gloucester for Money; The Ballad of Jack Hare; The Inconsistency of Men’s Actions; A Satirical Ballad on the Times; A Call to Devotion; The Legend of Dan Joos; Rules for Preserving Health; The Moral of the Legend of Dido; Legend of Wulfrike, a Priest of Wiltshire; Legend of a Monk of Paris; On the Instability of Human Affairs; Devotions of the Fowls; On Moderation; A Poem against Idleness, and the History of Sardanapalus; The Procession at the Feast of Corpus Christi; London Lackpenny; The Tale of the Lady Prioress and her Three Suitors; Moral of the Fable of the Horse, the Goose, and the Sheep; On the Wretchedness of Worldly Affairs; Bycorne and Chichevache; The Legend of St. Austin at Compton; Advice to Tittle-tattlers; A Poem against Self-Love; The Order of Fools; As Straight as a Ram’s Horn; The Concord of Company; St. Ursula and the Eleven Thousand Virgins; The Chorle and the Bird; On the Mutability of Human Affairs; A Satirical Description of his Lady; A Prayer to St. Leonard, made at York; The Deserts of Thewish Millers and Bakers; Measure is Treasure; Ballad on Presenting an Eagle to the King and Queen on the Day of their Marriage; The Triumph of Virtue; A Lover’s
Complaint, A Ditty upon Improvement, Thank God for all Things; Make Amends; Testament. The editor provides an introduction (v–xi) and notes (265–71).


Prints a brief extract from the Canace episode of *FP* with a short introduction (15–16). ‘[Thomas] Gray has pointed out the beauties in this writer which had eluded the research, or the taste, of former critics’; see Gray, 554. The Canace passage is possibly Lydgate at his best (15). [Campbell’s *Essay on English Poetry*, 566, is used as the introduction to the above edition (xxix–xc).]


Lydgate is a well-travelled polymath. Humphrey, Duke of Gloucester, is Lydgate’s ‘great patron.’ Lydgate’s chief merit is ‘versatility’ (46), as Warton, 553, attests (46–7). He is the first British poet for whom there is evidence that he works on commission. His main poems, *FP*, *ST*, and *TB*, are based on the work of others. Lydgate’s style is often verbose, but usually clear and descriptive (47). Gilfillan provides extracts from the Canace and Macareus episode of *FP* (47–9), and from *London Lickpenny* (49–51), with some glosses at the foot of the page.


Prints *Stans puer ad mensam domini* (24–8) with a brief introduction (23–4).


Prints *London Lickpenny* (24–7) and lines 1065–1419 from *ST* (28–40) using London, BL, MS Harley 367 and Arundel 119 as the respective manuscript texts. Skeat includes a brief introduction. Lydgate is remarkable for the ‘great ease, fluency, and extent of his writings.’ He is too prolix, but ‘generally pleasing’ (23).


Prints as Lydgate’s: *CBK* (245–65), *The Flour of Curtesye* (266–74); *A Balade in Commendation of Our Lady* (275–80); *To My Soverain Lady* (281–4); *Ballad of Good Counsel* (285–90); *Beware of Doubleness* (291–4); *A Balade: Warning Men to Beware of Deceitful Women* (295–6); *Three Sayings* (297–7). Skeat also prints, and assigns to Lydgate: *A Goodly Balade* (405–7); and *Go Forth King* (408). Skeat’s introduction (ix–lxxxiv) focuses on the evidence for each piece’s authorship; he provides notes (451–554) and a glossary (555–603). See also vol. 1, 587, for further references.

Prints *On the Departing of Thomas Chaucer* from London, BL, Add. MS 16,165 (381–3). It is most unlikely that the ‘Thomas Chaucer’ referred to by Lydgate is the son of Geoffrey Chaucer. Part of the reasoning for this claim is that Lydgate would not let the connection pass unnoted (381). [This conclusion is open to doubt: see Pearsall (824: 20) and Ruud, 681.]


Prints some fragmentary works.


[The use of a star following some page numbers in this annotation follows Furnivall’s practice.] The introduction, notes, glossary and indexes are by Katharine B. Locock; the text, ‘Forewords’ and ‘Afterwords’ are by F.J. Furnivall. The introduction (ix*-lxxvii*) addresses the possible relation of Deguileville’s *Pelerinage de Vie Humaine* to the *Romance of the Rose* (ix*-xii*); the different versions of the poem (xii*-xvii*); the relation of Deguileville’s two versions to one another (xvii*-xxxi*); Lydgate’s metre (xxxi*-xl*); Lydgate’s language and style (xli*-lii*); Lydgate and Bunyan (liii*-lxii*);
bibliography of manuscripts and printed editions (lxiii*-lxvi*); the manuscripts of Lydgate’s poem (lxvii*-lxix*); biographical information on Guillaume de Deguileville (lxx*-lxxi*); and a table of contents for the poem (lxiii*–lxxvii*). Furnivall’s ‘Forewords’ and ‘Afterwords’ are then printed numbered v–xii and xiii–xvi, respectively. The text of the poem (1–665) is followed by notes (667–94), glossary (695–723), index (725–34), and an index of names (735–6). It is possible that Deguileville knew Jean de Meun personally (xi*): the influence of the Romance of the Rose on the Pelerinage de Vie Humaine is seen in the composition of its allegory and allegorical figures, and the breadth of its references and ‘liberal opinions’ (xii*). The Pelerinage de Vie Humaine exists in three French versions, two recensions by Deguileville, and a prose translation by Jean Gallopes (xii*–xiii*). There are several English prose versions, but the most important English version is Lydgate’s verse translation of the second recension. Lydgate’s expansion of the 18,123 lines of his source to 24,832 lines in translation mainly follows from the amplification of detail and the use of ‘literary devices’ rather than ‘important additions to the matter’ (xiii*). Lydgate essentially follows Chaucer’s pronunciation of final -e but ‘allowed himself more liberty’ (xxxiv*). Alliteration, although common, is ‘employed with considerable self-restraint’ (xxxv*). Elision is frequent, especially when to is followed by a word beginning with a vowel or unstressed h (xxxv*–xxxvi*).

A comparison between Lydgate’s translations from French and his other works shows that he is more likely to use English words of French origin in the French translations; a study of Chaucer produces a similar conclusion (xli*–xliii*). Lydgate is quite prolix, fond of circumlocution and conventional phraseology (xliv*–xlIX*). Lydgate’s use of parallelisms recalls the Psalms (xlix*–l*). Some of the stylistic weaknesses of his poem have their source in the French original (1*–li*). On balance, it is unlikely that Bunyan’s Pilgrim’s Progress was influenced by PLM (liii*–lxii*). The text is based on London, BL, MS Cotton Vitellius C.xiii, MS Cotton Tiberius A.vii, and MS Stowe 952 (lxvii*–lxix*).

Not sighted. See Lauritis for a description of the edition (492: 54).


Ch. 5 contains *London Lickpenny; and Bicorn and Chichevche* (53–6). Spelling and punctuation have been modernized; there are notes and glosses at the foot of each page.


Arnold provides an introduction (114–18) and extracts from *London Lickpenny, Dietary,* and *FP* (119–23). The stimulus for Lydgate's work seems to be the examples of Chaucer and the contemporary French poets, including Christine de Pizan, Guillaume de Machault, and Oton de Grandson (114). The prologue to *ST* has interest, but not the poem that follows it (115). Lydgate's verse in *TB* and *ST,* and many of his shorter poems, is 'extremely rough.' Lydgate seems to see his line, after the manner of alliterative poetry, as falling into two halves with two accents in each half (116). The selections from Lydgate presented by Halliwell, 425, are 'not uninteresting' (117).

Not sighted in the 1882 edition. Prints *London Lickpenny* based on the 1882 edition of the text. There are no notes or glosses; spelling and punctuation have been modernized. The ‘literary historians’ looking at the 15th century fix their attention on court poetry, the ‘weakest feature’ of the period, and make the ‘case of Hoccleve and Lydgate more pitiful than it need be by cruelly comparing them with Chaucer’ (ix). Hoccleve and Lydgate took from Chaucer all the ‘machinery ... they could carry,’ but were ‘sadly confused’ by the loss of final -e in pronunciation. They tired to use ‘magniloquence’ to cover the failings of their poetry (xi). *London Lickpenny* shows that Lydgate could write well when he was less conscious of the demands of patrons and his own concept of the role of the poet (xii).


Prints *London Lickpenny* in modernised English (113–17).


Prints the text of *AF* from London, BL, MS Harley 2251 (1–24). Sauerstein indicates changes to manuscript readings in footnotes.


Prints the text of *AF* based on Cambridge, Trinity College, MS R.3.19 with reference to London, BL, MS Harley 2251.

A introduction (xi–clx) includes the description of manuscripts and previous editions (xvi–xxx), genealogy of the texts (xxx–xlix), criticism of the texts [relationships of the manuscripts] (xlix–liv), metre (liv–lxiii), language (lxiii–lxiv), authorship (lxiv–lxv), chronology of Lydgate's writings (lxv–lxvii), sources (lxvii–cxvi), style (cxvi–cxvii), concluding remarks (cxvii–clxx), and a discussion of the authorship of the Compleynt and Duodecim Abusiones (clxx–clxxv). The text of TG (1–57) is followed by that for the Compleynt (59–67), and Duodecim Abusiones (68). Schick provides notes (69–126), glossary (127–132), list of proper names (133), and addenda with some additional notes (135–6). The text is taken from Oxford, Bodleian Lib., MS Tanner 346 (lxx). Schick gives a description of the Tanner manuscript (xvii–xviii). The manuscript dates to about 1400. Six other manuscripts survive with six prints, one of the latter is a fragment (xvii). Schick discusses the five common line types of Lydgate's metre (liv–lx). [See Stanley, 1076, for a later consideration of Lydgate's metre, and for some comment on Schick.] Lydgate's metre is an adaptation of Chaucer's (liv). Lydgate's rhymes, generally 'pure and skilfully handled,' follow Chaucer's practice (lx): Schick notes differences between the poets' usages (lx–lxiii). It seems that Lydgate sounds final -e almost as Chaucer did, but, because the question is not 'absolutely certain,' changes to the manuscript have not been made on that assumption (lxiii). Lydgate uses more modern words than Chaucer does, often taken from French and Latin; however, his phonology and inflexions tend to follow Chaucer's (lxiii). Lydgate's authorship of TG is certain. The tradition that the poem was written by Stephen Hawes has no foundation, but relied on the repetition of the error by a number of early bibliographies (lxv–lxvii). Schick reviews the available details of Lydgate's life in the context of the chronology of his work (lxvii–lxvii). It is not possible to establish whether or nor Lydgate knew Chaucer (xcici–xcii). Lydgate is not the author of the English prose version of Guillaume de Deguileville's Pelerinage de l'Ame (ci–ciii). [Hare, 697,
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It is not possible to fix the date for the composition of TG; 1403 may be likely (cxiii–cxv). Lydgate’s learning is wide, not deep (cxv). Schick considers the characteristics of the dream vision (cxviii–cxxiii). TG shows some resemblances to the Hous of Fame and Parlement of Foules (cxxiii–cxxv), as well as to the Boke of the Duchesse and Legend of Good Women (cxxv–cxxvi). Of Lydgate’s own poems written after TG, CBK and the Flour of Curtesie, are the closest to it (cxxvii–cxviii); of poems written by other poets, the Court of Love and Kingis Quair are most like TG (cxxix–cxxxii). Lydgate’s generally uses the same style in this poem as in his other works (cxxxiv); nonetheless, it is in this ‘vitiated, overwrought style that he is at his best’ (cxxxv). Schick surveys the praise of Lydgate by later writers (cxlii–cxliv), and he discusses the inadequacies of Ritson’s bibliography of Lydgate’s works (cxlvi–cxlvi). Lydgate deserves neither the best of the praise offered to him, nor the worst (clvi–clvii). The Compleynt is not by Lydgate (clvii–clix); the Duodecim Abusiones is likely to be his work (clx–clx).


Steele briefly considers the poem’s textual history and influence, the lives of Lydgate and Burgh, and the metre and other characteristics of the poem (vii–xxi). He provides four Appendices: Documents relating to Lydgate (xxiii–xxx), Lydgate’s The IX Properties of Wine (xxx), Burgh’s Poem in Praise of Lydgate (xxxx–xxxxii), and stanzas 140–3 and 328–31 from London, BL, MS Add. 14408 (xxxx–xxxxiv). The text of the poem (1–86) is followed by notes (86–118) and a glossary (119–22). London, BL, MS Sloane 2464 provides the text for the edition because the manuscript is an early one, dating to c. 1450, and provides a full and carefully presented version of the poem (xiv). Schick’s introduction to his edition of TG (442: xi–clx) is ‘indispensable to every reader of Lydgate,’ but it is at its weakest in its discussion of metre (xviii).

An introduction (vii–lxxvi) addresses the manuscripts and prints (vii–x); title, authorship, and date (x–xiv); metre (xiv–xx); rhyme (xxi–xxx); rhyme and final -e (xxx–xxxiv); language (xxxv–xxxvii); and literary analysis and literary studies (xxxvii–lxxvi). The poem’s text (1–61) is followed by notes (62–94), catalogues of various names (95–105), and a glossary (106–116). The edition uses the text from Cambridge, Trinity College, MS R.3.19 with ‘very few emendations’ (vii). A tentative date for the poem, based on the grounds of style and metre, is sometime after 1412, possibly the early 1420s (xii–xiv). The poem’s metre is very irregular, and, when its author’s other work is considered, this is likely to Lydgate’s fault rather than the scribe’s (xiv). Triggs discusses the main line-types, together with the influence of the older alliterative tradition (xv–xx). Lydgate’s rhymes are ‘generally pure’ (xxi), and alliteration in the poem is notable (xxix–xxx). Triggs supplies an index to the rhymes (xii–xxix). The evidence of metre suggests that ‘final -e is quite generally mute’ (xxx). An examination of Lydgate’s literary techniques and devices shows that these generally reflect the conventions of his time (xxxvii–lxxvi). As a work of art, the poem is one of the ‘monuments of the bad taste that accompanies a low literary culture’ (xli). The *Assembly of Gods* expresses Lydgate’s scorn of the material world and fear of death (xliii–l). [Sieper, 458, subsequently removes the *Assembly of Gods* from the Lydgate canon.]


On the basis of language, metre, and style, Lydgate, and not Chaucer, must be the author of *CBK*. In his introduction, Krausser discusses the poem’s printing history, authorship, date
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(c. 1402–3), style, and manuscripts (211–248). The text of the poem (248–78) is followed by notes (278–89).


London Lickpenny is known from two manuscripts: London, BL, MS Harley 367, which comprises pieces copied by John Stow or scribes contemporary, or nearly contemporary, with him; and MS Harley 542 which is also contemporary with Stow and mostly in his handwriting. Hammond briefly describes the manuscripts and their printing history (404–7). The two manuscripts represent different recensions of the poem: Harley 367 is derived from Harley 542 (407–8). The previous attribution of the poem to Lydgate is based on its manuscript heading in Harley 367, on remarks by John Stow in his Survey of London, 534, and on a printing history that has traditionally accepted Lydgate’s authorship. This evidence is unconvincing; the style of the poem is quite unlike Lydgate’s (409).
[MacCracken excludes London Lickpenny from the Lydgate canon (471: xlvii), as does Schirmer (758: 278) and Pearsall (818: 218).] Hammond prints parallel texts of the two versions of the poem with footnotes on scribal emendations to the manuscripts (410–19).


Cambridge, Trinity College, MS R.3.20 is a folio paper manuscript of about 373 pages. Once owned by John Shirley, and later owned by John Stow, it contains a number of Lydgate’s pieces; Hammond lists these (364–5). In particular, the manuscript text includes a mumming that, according to its heading, was performed before the king at Hertford. This king may be Henry IV, V, or VI. Hammond prints the text of the mumming with its
manuscript marginalia (367–74). See Holthausen, 670, who offers corrections to Hammond’s readings, and Green, 956, for a modern discussion of the poem’s historical context.


Prints the Departing of Thomas Chaucer from London, BL, MS Add. 16165, a manuscript formerly owned by Lydgate’s contemporary, John Shirley (333–6). Style and language suggest Lydgate’s authorship; a manuscript heading in Shirley’s handwriting also ascribes the poem to Lydgate (333). Hammond discusses some details of the life of Thomas Chaucer (332–3).


Lydgate’s poetry provides examples of commissioned and spontaneous works intended for Humphrey, Duke of Gloucester. In particular, two poems provide insights into Gloucester’s private life: one celebrates the duke’s marriage to Jacqueline of Hainault; and another tactfully censures him for his subsequent affair with Eleanor Cobham. Hammond discusses the immediate historical background to these events (382–5). From the available manuscripts of the two poems she chooses Cambridge, Trinity College, MS R.3.20 as the most reliable for publication. Hammond prints the text of the poem on Gloucester’s marriage (387–93) followed by that censuring him for his infidelity (393–7).
Lydgate: Editions


London, BL, MS Add. 16165, copied by John Shirley, contains pieces that are nearly all by Chaucer or Lydgate. The poem edited here is unusual among Lydgate’s work for its relative spontaneity and coherence; its form is also unusual. These factors hint that ‘novel influences were at work upon Lydgate’ (193). Evidence from Lydgate’s other poems indicates that he may write occasional amorous pieces at a patron’s request. Hammond prints the poem’s text (194–6).


Prints the Life of St. George (13–21) from Oxford, Bodleian Lib., MS Bodley 686, and the Falls of Seven Princes [based on FP] (23–5) from Cambridge, Trinity College, MS R.3.20. For the tapestry or painting that accompanied the Life of St. George, the artist simply may have chosen to incorporate ‘such portions of the narrative as he could reproduce’ and to leave out the remainder (21).


ST derives ultimately from the French Roman de Thèbes and closely imitates Chaucer; its prologue is an ‘even more painful’ imitation of Chaucer (361). [See Renoir, 784, for further discussion and cross-references on Lydgate’s sources.] Hammond discusses the poem’s manuscript and printing history (362–3). She prints the text of the prologue, based on London, BL, MS Arundel 119, with footnotes indicating departures from the manuscript (363–8). Not all the manuscript copies have been collated. Hammond provides some notes.
on specific lines (368–75). The medieval reader sought out the ‘sentence’ of literature, not
the abstract beauties prized by moderns; an example of this is found among the marginal
notations in Speght’s *Chaucer* of 1602 (370–1). Some words in Lydgate predate the
earliest occurrences cited in the *New English Dictionary*, and illustrate Lydgate’s
introduction of French words into English (375).


Before a recent fire at Lille, Hammond took a transcription of a French text, held at the city
library, belonging to the *Dance of Death* genre. This text seems closer to Lydgate’s
English version that any other she has seen. As a consequence of the fire, her copy may be
the last record of the manuscript’s text. [The transcript is published in Hammond (454:
426).]


Prints, each with a separate introduction: *The Churl and the Bird, Horns Away, Bycorne
and Chichevache; Prologue to ST, DM* (and its French text); *Epithalamium for Gloucester,
Letter to Gloucester*; and extracts from *FP*. Hammond’s overall introduction to her
Lydgate selections briefly covers, among other things, the poet’s biography, canon, style,
metre, language, artistic relationship to Chaucer, critical reception, and printing history
(77–98); a select bibliography lists criticism, works on the extent of the canon, and editions
(98–101). There is a glossary (553–91) and notes at the end of the volume. Original
manuscript readings are used; punctuation is not modernized. There are problems at the
boundaries of the Lydgate canon: the entry in the *Dictionary of National Biography* [see
Lee, 586] is ‘entirely uncritical’; and MacCracken’s reliance on ‘personal judgment,’ 471,
spoils his statement on the canon (79). Lydgate has moments of beauty, but his work is marred by many faults that include inappropriate digressions, wordiness, lack of structure, repetition, and poor metre (79–83). Schick’s discussion of Lydgate’s metre, 442, fails because it takes no account of rhythm within a line, or of rhythmical units larger than single lines, or of the relationship between rhythm and ‘poetic content’ (83). Licklider’s efforts to justify Lydgate’s metre, 130, are a failure (83–4). Lydgate seems to have taken the idea of a headless line from the occasional instances found in Chaucer. He thinks in terms of half-limes, so it is natural that he should also apply the headless-line approach to the second half of his line structure and, therefore, omit an unstressed syllable after the mid-line pause (84–5). Lydgate’s major contribution to English language and literature lies in his choice of vocabulary. His decisions regarding verse-form and subject are also ‘noteworthy’; and he stands as an example of the values of his time (87). Lydgate tends to repeat his new words in formulae, sometimes for the sake of rhyme (88–9). He borrows this practice from Chaucer, although he employs it without the older poet’s skilfulness (89–90). Lydgate’s allusions to Chaucer writings are proof of his acquaintance with the poet’s work (90–2). Ovid is the only significant classical influence on Lydgate (92–3); Lydgate has little knowledge of Boethius, Dante, or Petrarch (93–4). Lydgate is ‘mechanical’ in the employment of what he has read, and he never forgets that he is a monk (94–5). His fondness for children seems genuine; that he both praises and mocks women is consistent with his religious vocation (95). Lydgate’s dull perceptions and his use of stereotypes mar his presentation of images from nature 95–6). ‘Nearly all of his work is lifeless’ (96). Hammond then briefly surveys Lydgate’s critical legacy and printing history (96–8). Collins, 600, is excessive in his praise of Lydgate (97–8). [Hammond’s scholarly introductions to the individual Lydgate poems in her anthology are not annotated here.]

Prints the text of Lydgate’s *Guy of Warwick* (197–213) from Cambridge, MA, Harvard Univ., Houghton Lib., MS English 530 (a manuscript copied by John Shirley), followed by notes (213–14) and a list of variants from the Leiden, Univ. Lib., Vossius MS Germ.Gall.Q.9 (214–20). Similarities between the Leiden manuscript and London, BL, MS Lansdowne 699 suggest the ‘possible existence of a kind of canon of Lydgate’s shorter pieces’ (178). There are strong parallels of content and ordering between the two manuscripts (188–9). Robinson describes the Harvard manuscript (178–186), with folios 10\(^v\) and 39\(^v\) reproduced between pages 180 and 181; he also describes the Leiden manuscript (186–94).


An introduction (xi–xlvi) covers the poem’s title (xi), description of the manuscripts (xii–xvii), genealogy and criticism of the texts (xvii–xix), metre (xx–xxvi), language (xxvi–xxxiii), authorship (xxxiv–xxxvi), date (xxxvi–xxxviii), sources (xxxviii–xlvi) and concluding remarks (xlvi). The text of the first poem (1–15), based on London, BL, MS Cotton Caligula A.ii, is followed by the text of the second (16–28), based on BL, MS Harley 2251. The notes (29–75) are followed by a list of abbreviations (77–8), glossary (79–83), and list of proper names (84). The metre and language of these poems is consistent with Lydgate’s usual practice (xx–xxxiii); he is certainly the author of both poems (xxxiv–xxxvi). The version found in MS Cotton Caligula A.ii dates to the latter half of 1446 (xxxvi–xxxviii); the date of the second version is uncertain (xxxviii). Both
poems derive from a short Latin poem by John Peckham, Philomela; Lydgate's version in Cotton Caligula A.ii follows the Latin original more closely, particularly with regard to its structure (xxxviii-xli). Lydgate's additions demonstrate his detailed knowledge of the Bible (xli-xliv). He follows his original less closely for the version found in Harley 2251, and his work is again heavily indebted to the Bible (xliv-xlvi).


The introduction (xi–xx) supplies a description of the poem's two manuscripts, Oxford, Bodleian Lib., Fairfax 16 (xi–xiii), and London, BL, MS Add. 29,729 (xiii–xviii), and discusses the relationship between the two (xviii–xx). The poem's text follows (1–184), with a glossary (185–96), list of proper names (197–8) and an appendix giving specimen passages from Échecs Amoureux (199–203). Line 1180 is missing from MS Fairfax 16, but 16 further missing lines have been copied into the margin from another manuscript; these additional lines seem to be in John Shirley's handwriting (xi–xii). John Stow owned Add. 29,729. The manuscript consists of poems that are either written by Lydgate or are somehow connected to him: it is a crucial document for Lydgate studies (xiii). Sieper provides a synopsis of its contents (xiv–xviii). Changes in handwriting show that the manuscript was copied out alternately by Stow and by his assistants (xviii). As to the relation of the two manuscripts for this poem, there is 'no doubt' that the text of Add. 29,729 is taken from Fairfax 16 (xviii). The copying process was textually accurate, but Stow's orthography is 'far from being what we might call conservative' (xix); Sieper discusses details of this orthography (xix–xx).
Six chapters cover: authorship, title and date (1–9); structure of the verse (9–20); inflexions (20–40); rhyme (40–3); Lydgate’s style (43–59); and the poem’s source (59–76). These are followed by notes to the poem (77–132). On the basis of style, Lydgate could not have written Assembly of Gods, notwithstanding Triggs’s edition of the poem, 444, as one of Lydgate’s (vi). There is no doubt that Lydgate was the author of RS, but the title is from John Stow (4). On the basis of style, and some other evidence, the poem may be dated to not later than 1412 (5–9). Lydgate’s use of a four-beat line in this poem ‘offers no occasion for severe criticism’ (18); this judgement carries over to PLM (18–19). Schick’s observations on the characteristics of Lydgate’s five-beat line, 442, also hold good for the poet’s four-beat line (19–20). Because Lydgate’s practice changed over time it is necessary to reconsider the use of final -e in each of his works (20). In rhyme-vowels Lydgate marks ‘no difference between open and close sounds’ (40). Lydgate shows a ‘considerable advance beyond Chaucer’ in dropping the final -e from Romance words, and even, in this poem, from words of non-Romance origin (41). He shows more disregard for final -e in this poem than in his earlier works (42). Lydgate’s style is marked by repetition, prolixity, stopgap expressions, and a looseness of syntax (43–59). Some of these traits are occasionally found in Chaucer, but Lydgate uses them without discrimination (49–50). Lydgate’s source for RS was the Early-French romance Les Échecs amoureux (59).


Prints The Grateful Dead, as an appendix (22).

A facsimile of Caxton's 1477 (?) edition, 380, taken from a copy in the Cambridge University Library.


[Pagination is continuous from part 1.] Prints the text of Bk 3 (395–561) with manuscript variants at the foot of the page, and marginal summaries by F.J. Furnivall.

[Pagination is continuous from part 2.] Prints the text of Bks 4 and 5 (563–879) with manuscript variants at the foot of the page, and marginal summaries by F.J. Furnivall.


Contains a bibliographical introduction (1–91), notes on Guido della Colonna with extracts from Guido and comments on Lydgate’s treatment of the same material (93–210), notes on Lydgate’s text (211–26), glossary (227–547), and an index (549–72). The edition is based on London, BL, MS Cotton Augustus A.iv, as it is one of the oldest, best, and most complete of the manuscripts (4). Nineteen manuscripts of *TB* survive (1). Bergen describes these (1–54) and the printed editions by Pynson, 399, (54–9), Marshe [see Braham, 415], (59–67), and Heywood, 421, (67–84). He discusses the relationships between the manuscripts and prints (84–91). The eleven later manuscripts, belonging to the period 1470–1500, have a common source: all but two seem to have been copied from the same original; and all but three seem to be the work of one scribe (84). The four earliest manuscripts were written between 1420 and 1435 in ‘much the same type of book-hand and decorated by the same English school of illuminators.’ It is possible that they were produced in the same scriptorium, perhaps Bury St Edmunds (87). [See Doyle, 857–8, and Edwards, 890, 893, and 899, and Scott, 867, for further references to a Lydgate scriptorium.]

An introductory note (ix–xxvii) is followed by a discussion of the poem’s metre (xxviii–xlvi), Boccaccio’s and Laurence’s prefaces (xlvi–lxvi), and the text of Bk 1 (1–199) and Bk 2 (200–328). The text is based on Oxford, Bodleian Lib., MS Bodley 263 collated with London, BL, MS Royal 18 D.iv and MS Harley 1245; reference is also made to MS Royal 18 B.xxxi, and MS Harley 4203, among others (xxiii). It is likely that FP was started shortly after May 1431 and finished in 1438 or 1439 (ix–x). Bergen discusses, as background, Boccaccio’s *De casibus virorum illustrium*, and Laurence de Premierfait’s two translations. Lydgate paraphrases the second of Premierfait’s translations as *FP* (x–xx). Lydgate’s changes to his source are ameliorated by his use of ‘verse instead of prose, his echoes of Chaucer, and the occasional intrusion of his by no means unsympathetic personality.’ Lydgate’s version is much better than Laurence’s (xvii). Bergen compares the ‘spirit’ of Boccaccio and Laurence (xvii–xx). Lydgate is different from them both. He takes the role of counsellor to his rulers: he writes as a ‘man of the world, an aristocrat and courtier.’ Lydgate omits Boccaccio’s criticism of the clerics, and he chooses not to criticize the failings of his patron, Humphrey, Duke of Gloucester; nevertheless, he stands up for the ‘domestic virtues’ (xx). Lydgate leaves much to be desired as a writer; his work reflects the poor tastes of his society (xxi–xxii). Bergen surveys the stories covered in Lydgate’s poem (xxiv–xxvii). Lydgate’s command of metre is much better than has generally been recognised in modern times (xxviii–xxix). Part of the cause for modern censure has been the inaccurate transmission of the text by scribes who did not understand the pronunciation of final -e, and who also omitted prefixes, suffixes, articles, prepositions, and conjunctions (xxix). Further problems were caused by the false ascription of poems to Lydgate, such as the *Assembly of Gods*, because of our ignorance of the distinguishing traits of his style (xxix–xxx). Bergen discusses the line-types found in the poem (xxx–xxxiv), and the interaction of pronunciation and metre as a guide to emending the manuscript text (xxxiv–xlvi).
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---Review by Eleanor Prescott Hammond, *Anglia* 36 (1925): 15–20. *FP* is not ‘Lydgate at his best’ (17), but the poem has a ‘really great linguistic value as well as an important position among English literary types’ (18).


Prints the text of Bks 3 (329–472), 4 (473–584), and 5 (585–673). [Pagination is continuous from the first part of Bergen’s edition.]


Prints the text of Bks 6 (675–773), 7 (775–821), 8 (823–918), 9 (918–1022); followed by Greneacre’s *Envoy on Bochas* (1023) and *DM* (1025–1044). [Pagination is continuous from part 2 of Bergen’s edition.]


[Pagination begins afresh in part 4 of Bergen’s edition.] A bibliographical introduction (1–136) discusses the relations of the manuscripts and prints (3–9), describes the surviving manuscripts (11–105) and prints (106–24). Bergen also discusses the various French, German, Italian, and Spanish editions of Boccaccio’s and Laurence’s work (125–36). Bergen provides extracts from Boccaccio’s and Laurence’s work with some commentary.
(137–397) to allow access to source material not readily available and to reveal ‘how Lydgate and to a lesser extent Laurence handled his original’ (137). An appendix (399–403) gives the text of the chapter on Messalina, Caligula, and Tiberius from Ziegler’s German translation. Notes to Lydgate’s version (405–14) are followed by a glossary (415–504) and an index to names (505–29). Thirty surviving manuscripts of the poem are known; Oxford, Bodleian Lib., MS Bodley 263 is the basis for this edition because it is one of the oldest; in addition, ‘no other manuscript is more clearly and carefully written and free from copyists’ blunders’ (3). None of the surviving manuscripts seems to have been copied from Lydgate’s original or a direct copy of it; it would seem that the text was issued, complete, in a large number of manuscripts of which only a few now survive (4).


Prints London Lickpenny (48–9) and lines 1101–80 from ST (49–50) with glosses on the page. Lydgate, like Hoccleve, is of historical interest only’ (xxi), and neither shows any real understanding of Chaucer’s work (xxi–ii). Rapidly changing pronunciation, especially of final -e, led them to misunderstand Chaucer’s versification (xxii).


A ‘Temporary Preface’ (v–viii) is followed by a list of manuscripts and early editions (ix–x) and by the text of the poem (1–193). Lydgate’s principal source is the Roman de edipus, a prose version of the Roman de Thèbes (vi). Koeppel, 583, finds the source to be another prose version of the Roman de Thèbes, the Hystoire de Thèbes, but he had not had the
opportunity to see the *Roman de edipus*. [See also Renoir, 788, and Schlauch, 855, regarding Lydgate’s source.] He treats his source with considerable freedom; what is best in his version is likely to be his own work (vi–vii). Lydgate probably starts writing the poem in late 1420 and finishes well before 31 August 1420 (vii). The traditional criticism of the poem’s metre is based on poorly printed early editions: in fact, the metre is consistent with Lydgate’s usual practice (vii–viii). The best manuscript of the poem, London, BL, MS Arundel 119, is collated with the other manuscripts and used as the basis of this edition (viii).


Ekwall provides the introductory material to Erdmann’s text, 469, of *ST*. Ch. 1 deals with the general matters of the poem’s title, frame, contents, sources, and date (1–10). A discussion of Lydgate’s sources (ch. 2, 10–22) is followed by chapters on language (22–31), metre (32–5), and a description of the manuscripts and printed editions (36–61) and their genealogy (62–94). Notes to the poem (95–135) are followed by rhyme-lists (137–60) and glossary (161–209). The volume concludes with an appendix, which discusses a manuscript overlooked in the preparation of the edition, Oxford, Christ Church, MS 152, and a list of errata (211–20).

Lydgate: Editions

Discusses the contents of the Lydgate canon (v–l); and provides an index to the canon, including the manuscripts, as well as cross-references to Hawes, 518–19, Bale, 528, Tanner, 549, and Ritson, 558, (li–lviii). The text of Lydgate’s minor religious poems then follows (1–377). The three guides to settling the Lydgate canon are: the naming of Lydgate as author within a poem; contemporary scribal attribution; and rhyme, metre, and style. The last of these is not totally reliable, but can be of use in the absence of the other two indicators (v). Style may be especially helpful in establishing Lydgate’s authorship of the religious poems of his old age: his imitators would be unlikely to copy Lydgate’s language because of the ‘rapidly changing state of the tongue’ (vi). [Hammond finds MacCracken’s approach to canon formation to be too subjective (454: 79).] Lydgate’s use of rhyme is precise and modelled on Chaucer; MacCracken notes unusual characteristics (vi–viii). His metre follows Chaucer’s, but uses more unaccented syllables. Lydgate pursues a metrically ‘even flow’ and simple structure: these two goals lead Lydgate into ‘redundancy and exceeding looseness of grammatical form, but … never … into unmelodious measures’ (viii). Lydgate’s style encompasses a wide range of subjects, yet almost never sinks to the obscene (ix); it is heavily influenced by Chaucer (ix–x). His religious poetry recalls Pearl and Quia amore langueo. Lydgate is not more repetitious than other ‘monkish poets.’ He shows a consistent and characteristic use of rhyme-tags (x). MacCracken lists the poems of the canon with references to the manuscripts and printed editions (xi–xxxi). He lists those works he rejects from the canon with citations to the earlier views of such critics as Stow, 417, Pits, 539, Tanner, 549, and Ritson, 558 (xxx–l). Among those pieces rejected are Quia amore langueo (xxx), The Nightingale (xxxiii–xxxiv), Court of Sapience (xxxiv–xxxv), Assembly of Gods (xxxv–xxxvi), London Lickpenny (xlvii), Court of Love, Flower and Leaf, and Ye and the Herte (l). MacCracken prints the text of his edition with marginal summaries, and manuscript variations at the foot of the page (1–377).

Two ballades, As ofte as syghes ben in herte trewe and Compleynt for Lac of Sight, are printed for the first time (323–7) from a manuscript dating from the early 15th century, Oxford, Bodleian Lib., MS Tanner 346. Their style strongly suggests that they are by Lydgate (323). [See MacCracken, 629–32, for other articles in the ‘Lydgatiana’ series.]


An ‘Introductory Note’ (1–44) is followed by ‘Manuscripts and Prints’ (45–7), the text of SD (49–67), notes (69–71), and glossary (73–5). The text is taken from Cambridge, Fitzwilliam Museum, MS McClean 182. It is the fear of social disorder that follows the death of Henry V in 1422 that drives the Duke of Gloucester to commission Lydgate to write SD (1). SD is one of England’s ‘earliest political pamphlets.’ Lydgate’s prose reads clearly, although it is ‘tangled’ and lacks ‘proportion’ (2). The poem dates to 1422 (4–5). Most of the remainder of the introduction is given to a discussion of Lydgate’s sources. See the review by Atkins below for a dissenting view regarding the date of the poem; Pearsall agrees with MacCracken’s date (824: 23–4).

——Review by J.W.H. Atkins, Modern Language Review 7 (1912): 253–4. Lydgate’s prose lacks ‘artistic merits,’ but it is of interest for giving ME literature’s ‘most extensive treatment of Julius Caesar’, and for its use of source material. MacCracken’s research on sources is notably thorough (253). The editor’s only significant error is to assign a composition date of 1422 when the evidence argues for 1400 (253–4).

[Pagination is continuous from vol. 1.] MacCracken provides the text for Lydgate’s minor secular poems with marginal summaries (379–847); he prints manuscript variants at the foot of each page.

———Review by Curt F. Bühler, Review of English Studies 12 (1936): 236–8. MacCracken’s work ‘appears to fill adequately its intended purpose’ (238). The editor, however, seems not to have researched the additional manuscript copies of Lydgate’s poems discovered in the years since part one of his work was published (237).


Prints Churl and the Bird (208–13); an extract from TG (213–16); lines 479–768, from Bk 2 of TB, New Troy (216–19); Bycorne and Chichevache (220–1); Dietary (221–2); On Women’s Horns (222–3); Murning at Hertford (223–7); Legend of Dan Joos (227–9). The editors provide a brief biography and bibliography (430–1). In recent times, Lydgate has been ‘unduly depreciated’ because of a lack of good texts (430). Stylistically he is ‘long-winded,’ but he can show ‘liveliness and even grace’ (431).


Prints the Dietary (176–92).
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Edinburgh, National Lib. of Scotland, MS Advocates 1.1.6 (Bannatyne Manuscript) has some fragments from Lydgate’s poems: extracts from LOL are found on folios 25r–6v (2: 60–3), and from other Lydgate pieces on folios 73r–4r (2: 178–80) and 79 (2: 199–201); extracts from CBK are found on folios 281r–3r (4: 81–7).


Exeter, City Record Office, Misc. Rolls 59 contains a fragment of Lydgate’s poem on St Edmund. The text has a ‘close relationship’ to that found in London, BL, MS Harley 2278 (324). Clarke prints the text of the fragment (326–8).


The text is based on the Ellesmere [Huntington Lib., MS EL 26 C 9] and London, BL, MS Lansdowne 699. The frontispiece is a photograph of f. 41b of Lansdowne 699. The introduction (ix–xxxii) discusses the tradition of the Danse Macabré (ix–xxi), Lydgate’s
involvement (xxi–xxiv), and the manuscript relationships for his poem (xxiv–xxx). The text of Lydgate’s version (2–77) is followed by: a French text (appendix I, 79–96), taken from London, BL, Add. 38858; a list of wall paintings of the Danse Macabre story (appendix II, 97–8); a discussion of the word ‘macabre’ (appendix III, 98–100); some examples of the end of the Danse Macabre tradition (appendix IV, 100–7); and a list of English printed editions of DM (appendix V, 107–9). Notes (110–14) and glossary (115–18) conclude the volume. The emotional outlook responsible for the Dance of Death tradition was ‘morbid’ and fearful (ix). [See Pearsall, 821, for a different view of Lydgate’s ‘morbidity’ in this poem.] Lydgate begins work on his poem on 28 July, probably in the year 1426, and possibly while living in Paris. He may have written with the encouragement of Jankin Carpenter (xxiii). The word ‘macabre’ is most likely connected to the biblical Macchabaeus (99).


Prints London Lickpenny (76–7), and lines 1–176 from ST (77–81); with a brief biographical introduction (74–5). Lydgate is a ‘journeyman rather than a poet’; but when compared to his contemporaries ‘he is, perhaps, the best of a bad lot’ (75).


Not sighted.

Prints the text of the *Rules of Health* from London, BL, MS Lansdowne 699 with collations from several other sources (52–6).

484. -----. ‘Lydgate’s *Horse, Sheep and Goose* and Huntington MS. HM 144.’ *Modern Language Notes* 55 (1940): 563–70.

The version of *HGS* in San Marino, Huntington Lib., MS HM 144 has not been used in the various critical editions of the poem. It contains seven stanzas found only in this manuscript and the early printed editions, and an additional one not found either in the other manuscripts or in the early prints. It is likely the manuscript text, except for the eighth additional stanza, was copied from Caxton’s first edition of the poem, 378 (564–6). Bühler prints the additional eight stanzas (566–8). Bühler discusses the occurrence of some of these in other works (568–9). See Bühler, 1156, regarding occurrences of the eighth stanza.


Prints the text of the lyrics beginning ‘O Hevenly sterre, most Comfortable of lyght’ (206–8) and ‘Thow hevenly quene, of grace owre loode sterre’ (208–10) from Manchester, Chetham Lib., MS 6709. The first of these is printed for the first time; the second is printed for the first time from the Chetham manuscript. Brown supplies brief notes (335).
A modern verse translation of Lydgate's *SPMD*.


Prints lines 1–314 from *TG* in modern English prose (352–6).


Chepman and Myllar printed two of Lydgate's works in 1508: *Rhyme without Accord* as an anonymous 'balade,' and *CBK*, as Chaucer's, under the title *The Maying or Disport of Chaucer*. [See Chepman and Myllar, 394.] Beattie provides some bibliographic background (x–xi and xii–xiii respectively), followed by a photographic reproduction of the Chepman and Myllar texts (49–51 and 109–133).


A facsimile reproduction of the Pynson edition of 1511 (1–88), with a brief introduction and bibliography (v–xx). The text is the unique surviving fair copy held in the Huntington Library, San Marino; another copy exists, although damaged, in the library of the Duke of
Devonshire (vi). The Pynson edition contains ‘many variations’ from the edition by Steele, 443, and the more complete manuscript versions (vii, xiv–xv). Knowledge of Pynson’s edition seems almost to disappear among later editors (viii–ix). Pynson’s title page says that the book was produced at the command of Sir Charles Somerset (xi). Starnes provides an outline of Somerset’s biographical details (xi–xii). See Steele, 590–1, for earlier discussion of the 1511 edition.


Prints extracts from FP, A Balade in Commendation of Our Lady, Dietary, and extracts from the Secrees of Olde Philisoffres (501–8).


An introduction (1–20) addresses the poem’s authorship (1–3), date (4–10), manuscripts (11–16), stemma (17) and text on which it is based (18–20). This is followed by discussion of the manuscripts and prints (21–56), sources (57–182), metre (183–207), and style (208–37). A list of manuscript abbreviations (238–9) is followed by the text (240–669), notes (670–722), and glossary (723–42). Durham, Univ. Lib., MS Cosin V.ii.16, which dates to about 1450 or possibly a little earlier, supplies the text (18). The frontispiece is a slightly blurred black and white photograph from the Durham manuscript of Bk 5, lines 99–132. The poem’s editors tentatively date the work to 1421–2 (4–10). See the reviews below for comment on this dating.

-----Review by Janette Richardson, Speculum 37 (1962): 454–6. The editors are to be praised for making the text available (454). The case for the later than generally accepted date for the poem’s composition is ‘convincing if, of necessity, conjectural.’ The editors’ discussion of the poem’s sources is particularly useful for shedding lights on Lydgate’s approach to composition. The poem’s text, however, is difficult to follow because the editors have not plainly shown where substitutions have been made from other manuscripts (455).

-----Review by W.F. Bolton, JEGP 61 (1962): 165–8. The text is welcome and useful but must be read with ‘caution’ (168). Klinefelter’s attempt to judge the time taken for the composition of the poem from internal references is on shaky ground (166). There are numerous editorial errors and inconsistencies.

-----Review by Norman Davis, Review of English Studies 14 (1963). The edition is ‘extremely disappointing.’ Some information on the manuscripts and sources is ‘useful’; but ‘nearly everything to do with the language, style, and metre of the poem is sadly inadequate, and mistakes and printer’s errors are frequent and often gross’ (182). The commentary has some merit; however, it is not extensive enough (185). The glossary is the
worst failing of the edition (185–6).

----- Review by J. Norton-Smith, *English Studies* 45 (1964): 55–8. There is a great deal of inconsistency and repetition between the editors. The treatment of the sources is useful; nevertheless, it is ‘far too long, repetitious and overpresented’ (55). The editors provide little literary evaluation of the work, which is better described as a ‘devotional poem’ than a ‘Vita’ (56–7). On the matter of the poem’s date, a post-1434 composition may be more likely (57). The edition is marred by errors (57–8); however, the publication of the text is welcome (58). For further peer review see Keiser, 1090.


Prints *The Duplicity of Women* (189–91) and *Transient as a Rose* (191–3) with notes (343–345) and glosses at the foot of the page. These lyrics show a ‘remarkable facility for shapeless rambling and for the multiplication of conventional examples of a conventional theme, which is the basic rhetorical device’ (343). Some of Lydgate’s lines seem to look back to the traditions of alliterative verse; they can be more easily read as two half-lines each with two stresses (34–5).


Prints *The Legend of Dan Joos* based on Cambridge, Trinity College, MS R.3.21 (56–60). The notes to the poem summarize its manuscript history, place within the Lydgate canon, and sources (122–4).

Prints a lyric from Cambridge, Trinity College, MS 600, beginning ‘Fresh lusty beautee joyned wyth gentilesse’ (116–17). There are notes at the foot of the page with a glossary (177–83).


Prints Letter to Gloucester; On the Departing of Thomas Chaucer; Balade Sente to the Shirrefs Dyner; lines 3655–82 from Bk 3 of FP, An Exclamationou of the Deth of Alcibiades; A Tale of Froward Maymond; lines 479–710 from Bk 2 of TB, The Rebuilding of Troy; As a Mydsomer Rose; A Balade in Commendation of Our Lady; lines 519–903 from Bk 2 of LOL, A Defence of Holy Church; A Complaynt of a Loveres Lyfe; TG. An introduction (ix–xii) is followed by a biographical and textual note (xiii–xv), select bibliography (xvi), the text of the poems (1–112), abbreviations used in the notes (113), notes (114–91), appendix on aureate diction (192–5) and glossary (196–202). The frontispiece is a black and white photograph of a miniature on folio 1a of Harley 4826 showing Lydgate and a pilgrim presenting *PLM* to Thomas Montacute, Earl of Salisbury. Lydgate brings a realism to his work that reflects the secular influence of the English monasteries during the years 1413–51. This was a period when the temporal and religious systems sat side by side, but they were ‘unable to sustain the medieval ideal of a unified society.’ The wonder, encyclopedic range, and inquiring nature of Chaucer’s dream convention becomes a matter-of-fact realism in Lydgate’s hands (ix). Lydgate’s writing is uneven; the imaginative element of his work suffers because of the ‘mechanical application of rhetorical discipline’ (x). His best work is in his shorter occasional pieces (x–xi). Lydgate’s contributions to English literature include the mumming poem, aureate diction,
making accessible Boccaccio’s *De casibus*, and the role of *TB* in shaping the Elizabethan understanding of the Troy myth. *PLM* is ‘unattractive by the literary standards of any age.’ Lydgate has four important styles: the first he models closely on Chaucer’s works, including the *Complaint unto Pity*, *Anelida*, and *Troilus*; the second is a ‘flat explanatory style’ that he takes from the *Monk’s Tale*; the third, which he displays as his career progresses, is a ‘cryptic style’ that is full of ‘headless lines, trochaic rhythms, and epigrammatic jerkiness”; and the fourth is his Latinate syntax (xi). Lydgate constantly experiments with style: verbal meanings are expanded; scientific terms are adopted; and aureate diction is used, especially in religious verse (xi–xii). His stylistic efforts fail because they are ‘indiscriminating’ (xii).

——Review by Derek Pearsall, *Medium Aevum* 36 (1967): 287–9. Lydgate is presented in this edition as a ‘skilful and knowledgeable writer of polite occasional verse,’ but it is a pity that his longer secular poems, such as *TB* and *FP*, are not represented by more extensive extracts. The notes to the text are excellent. The problems associated with Lydgate’s metre have been smoothed over by editorial intervention in a way that is ‘happy, if not totally convincing’ (288).

——Review by George F. Reinecke, *Speculum* 43 (1968): 519–22. The edition concentrates on a Lydgate that is ‘young,’ ‘brief,’ and ‘secular.’ Editorial interventions tend toward a ‘regularization of the meter and normalization of the text’ (520). This may leave the ‘purist uncomfortable.’ The notes are ‘generous and on the whole most satisfactory’ (521). There may still be a need for a future edition to offer a better representation of the longer poems, religious lyrics, and narratives (522).

Prints extracts from *Like a Midsummer Rose,* London, BL, MS Harley 2255; *Froward Maymond,* Oxford, Bodleian Lib., MS Laud misc. 683; and lines 3387–442 from Bk 9 of *FP,* *From the Epilogue to ‘The Fall of Princes,’* London, BL, MS Harley 1766.


Prints extracts from *CBK* (25–7); *LOL* (28–9); *Beware of Doubleness* (30–3); and *DM* (33–6). Punctuation is editorial, and obsolete letters have been replaced. Tydeman offers two notes on Lydgate’s life and poetry together with textual notes (161–8). He also provides a glossary (270–9). Lydgate follows ‘Chaucer’s rhythmic patterns with ruthless fidelity,’ and too inflexibly. He uses line patterns as standards that Chaucer had used only as variants, and he has no understanding of Chaucer’s careful variation of the pause within a line (9). Among Lydgate’s poetry there is ‘much accomplished and satisfying verse.’ When he sometimes seems ‘prolix’ in a work like *TB,* one must remember that he is relating a detailed history, with a moral purpose, and demonstrating his command of rhetoric. His use of aureate terms conceals what was thought to be the ‘naked shame’ of native English prose and may be similar to Milton’s use of Latinisms in *Paradise Lost* (162).


A facsimile of William Caxton’s print, taken from the copy in the Bodleian library.
Lydgate: Editions


Prints lines 66–193 of ST with glossary and notes on the page (511–14).


The introduction (3–78) covers: 'Description of Manuscripts' (3–10); 'Prints and Editions' (11–12); 'Classification of Manuscripts' (13–21); 'Authorship and Date of the Poem' (22–5); 'Origin and Development of the Legend' (26–44); 'Lydgate's sources and a summary of the poem' (45–59); 'Lydgate's chronological error' (60–3), and 'Literary Style' (64–78). The edition is based on London, BL, MS Lansdowne 699. The year 1439 is a likely composition date for Lydgate's poem (25). Lydgate's sources were the *Interpretatio Guilielmi* and the *Tractatus de nobilitate*, *Vita et matirio sanctorum Albani et Amphibali* with the *Vita secundi ojfae* of Matthew Paris and Bede's *Historia ecclesiastica* (45).


-----Review by A.S.G. Edwards, *English Studies* 57 (1976): 369–71. Lydgate's poem is a 'tired piece of hack-work' (369). The editor is not up to date with critical readings of the poem (369–70). There are worrying errors in the bibliography and text (370–1). The introduction is generally 'workmanlike.' The notes tend to be 'perfunctory'; the
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‘transcription, collation and emendation’ of the text seem to have been made ‘conscientiously.’ The edition is ‘serviceable,’ but not ‘definitive’ (371).

—Review by Alain Renoir, *Speculum* 52 (1977): 397–400. The work ‘offers everything we have the right to ask from a critical edition’ (398). It may be the ‘definitive edition’ (400).


Prints *Mumming at Hertford* (204–9) and *Mumming at Bishopswood* (210–13). Lydgate’s mummings are evidence of the dramatic treatment of ‘classical mythology’ and ‘secular domestic comedy’ a century before the reign of Elizabeth I (197).


A brief biographical and critical discussion (280–1) is followed by a freshly edited text of *As a Midsummer Rose* based on London, BL, MS Harley 2255 (281–8). Notes and vocabulary are on the page. Pearsall’s view of Lydgate as a medieval poet, 818 and 823, is more convincing than the transitional model put forward by Schirmer, 757–8, and Renoir, 786 and 789.

LYDGEATE: EDITIONS

Prints *On the Departing of Thomas Chaucer* (60–2); from *SD, Julius Caesar Crosses the Rubicon* (62–4); from Bk 1 of *FP, The Letter of Compleynt of Canace* (64–8); and extracts from *DM* (69–70). Gray provides a brief introduction (59–60), notes (431–433), and a glossary (509–74). Lydgate was ‘deeply influential’ on English and Scottish writers. He can be ‘dull and prolix,’ but he is always interested in matters of style; and, at times, he writes with feeling. *TG* and *TB* are excluded from the anthology only for reasons of space (59). Untouched by the ‘new humanism of Italy,’ Lydgate belongs to the ‘older stream’ of medieval humanism (60).


The introduction (ix–xlvii) covers: ‘The Manuscripts’ (x–xviii); ‘The Legend of Saint Alban’ (xviii–xxiv); ‘Direct Sources’ (xxiv–xxxiv); ‘Versificiation, Stanzaic Punctuation and Language’ (xxxiv–xxxvii); ‘Remarks on the Treatment of the Text’ (xxxvii–xxxviii); and ‘Notes’ (xxxviii–xlvi). Reinecke provides a bibliography (xlix–lix), followed by his text, with notes on the page (1–209). An appendix lists differences between the present edition and that of 1534, and discusses some of the latter’s unusual textual features (199–209). Reinecke offers ‘Explanatory Notes’ (210–68), ‘Glossary’ (269–314), and an ‘Index of Proper Names’ (315–24). Lydgate’s poem is a ‘fairly close versification of the know prose sources,’ interlaced with extra material—some representing Lydgate’s own work but most not—primarily intended to add ‘solemnity, rhetorical emphasis, and ... moral instruction.’ The present edition is based on London, BL, MS Lansdowne 699 (x). It is likely that Lydgate’s primary source, now lost, was a Latin prose ‘conflation’ of two of the extant versions of the St Albun story (xxxiii). See McLeod, 994, for a related discussion.

Not sighted. A facsimile of the 1476 [or 1477?] Caxton print of *SPMD*, 379, with introductory material and a facing modern English translation.


Prints the text of the prologue to *ST* (13–18) from London, BL, MS Arundel 119, folios 1a to 4a, with notes (19–22), and glossary (197–200). Bowers sees a Lancastrian political agenda, facilitated in part by Thomas Chaucer, behind the works of Hoccleve and Lydgate. This agenda aims to support the legitimacy of the Lancastrian regime and oppose the Lollards (1–5, 11–12). For related discussions, see Pearsall (824:17), Fisher, 1098, and Patterson, 1106.


Not sighted. A translation and commentary.


Prints lines 7036–85 from *TB* (344); lines 1–176 from the prologue to *ST* (345–9); lines 1667–1806 from Bk 3 of *LOL* (350–3); lines 1–40, 217–64, 329–60, 377–92, 465–560,
577–92, and 609–72 from DM (354–62); lines 6882–951 and 7008–42 from Bk 1, and lines 3921–41 from Bk 2, of FP (362–5); the Letter to Gloucester (366–7); and lines 874–97 from Lydgate’s Testament (368). Pearsall provides a brief biographical sketch of Lydgate (343). Each extract has an introduction. Glosses are given on the page. The text is based on London, BL, MS Cotton Augustus A.iv; London, BL, MS Arundel 119; Durham University Lib., MS Cosin V.ii.16; Oxford, Bodleian Lib., MS Arch. Selden supra 53; Oxford, Bodleian Lib., MS Bodley 263; London, BL, MS Harley 2255; and London, BL, MS Harley 218. Pearsall lists the variants for his edition (669). Lydgate has a number of stylistic and metrical faults, and the ‘comparison with Chaucer … is inevitably painful’; nevertheless, he is capable of moments of ‘stateliness’, ‘neatness,’ or ‘rhapsody.’ His chief interest is as a representative of English thought and literature in the late middle ages (343).
**General References**


Burgh's poem dates to the early 1440s. Burgh praises Lydgate as a poet who has outshone the ancients, and he desires to meet him and become his apprentice.

511. **Bokenham, Osbern.** *The Leuys o/Seyntys.* 1443–7?

Not sighted; excerpted in vol.1 of Spurgeon (636: 46). Lydgate, 'Wych lyuyth yet/ lest he deyed late,' is placed by Bokenham alongside the 'fresh rethoryens,' Gower and Chaucer.


Metham's unique manuscript dates to about 1449. Lines 2192–8 of *The Romance of Amoryus and Cleopes* refer to Lydgate (80–1). Lydgate, like Chaucer, is now dead; his work employs rhetoric and 'halff chongyd Latyne' with poetic conceits and 'craffty imagynacionys off thingys fantastyk' (80). See Hyde, 779, regarding Lydgate's use of Latin, and see Craig, 660, for further comments on Metham.

According to Scattergood, 1172, Ashby’s poem dates to about 1463. Gower, Chaucer, and Lydgate are the ‘Primier poetes’ of England and they did much to embellish the English language (13).


Irlandia’s work was written in 1490. Near the end of Ch. 18 in Bk 2, Irlandia refers favourably to Lydgate and places him in the company of Gower and Chaucer as a writer who shows that it is possible to use the vernacular when speaking of theological matters (1: 164).


Part 2 of *The Palice of Honour*, dating to about 1501, places Lydgate third in the company of Chaucer, Gower, Kennedy, Dunbar, 516, and Quintine (36).

Dates to about 1508. Lines 262–70 of *The Golden Targe*, which immediately follow Dunbar’s praise of Chaucer in lines 253–61, describe Lydgate and Gower as aureate writers who illuminate a language that had been bare of rhetoric (37).


Skelton refers to Lydgate in two poems, *Phyllyp Sparowe* and *A Ryght Delectable Trayse upon a goodly Garlandle or Chapelet of Laurell*. Scattergood dates the section of *Phyllyp Sparowe* that contains the reference to Lydgate to before 1505 (405). Scattergood argues that Skelton began to ‘assemble’ the *Garlandle or Chapelet of Laurell*, using material he had written earlier, from about 1495, and continued to work on it until he published it in 1523. *Phyllyp Sparowe*, lines 804–12: Lydgate writes in an elevated style, and it is difficult to know his meaning, but no one can write better than he does in this way; yet some say he writes in too high a style and find this to be a fault (91–2). *Garlandle or Chapelet of Laurell*, lines 390–441, 1101: Chaucer, Gower, and Lydgate are the great founders of English verse (323–4).


Hawes’s work dates to the early 16th century (first published in 1509, see de Worde, 1239) and frequently defers to the memory of Lydgate. Lydgate is a better poet than me and was
the ‘floure of eloquence’ in the reign of Henry V; he wraps the truth of his work in fine language (lines 26–35). I have followed his example in presenting tales which carry a moral (lines 43–9). My master Lydgate purified the English language with his rhetoric; in his works you will find eloquence and truth; his name will long endure (lines 1163–76). Lydgate wrote Ballade in Commendation of Oure Ladye, LSEF, FP, Churl and the Bird, Court of Sapience, TB, and TG. May God rest his soul! Since his death we have not seen his equal (lines 1338–85). I am not expert in poetry, but I will always use my work to praise Lydgate, to show his greatness, if only by contrast to myself (lines 1395–1407). May God give me the grace to follow the example of Lydgate in writing books of moral virtue (lines 5810–16).


Hawes’s minor poems praise Lydgate’s memory at several points. EV, dated by Gluck and Morgan to 1503–4 (xv), and first published by de Worde in 1509, 1237, includes Lydgate in the company of Chaucer and Gower (lines 21–8 and 2109–20). There are similar references in CS (lines 22–8) and CL (lines 21–6), both published for the first time by de Worde, in 1509 and c. 1515 respectively—see de Worde, 1236 and 1241.


Bradshaw’s poem was completed in about 1513, and published by Richard Pynson in 1521. In stanza 284 of his poem Bradshaw seeks pardon for his work from Chaucer, Lydgate ‘sentencious’, Barclay, and Skelton.
Rastell laments that no English writers have taken pains to elevate English as a literary language except Gower, Chaucer, and Lydgate who ‘adoumyd our tong/ Whose noble famys through the world be sprong’ (A.i). Through the work of these three writers, however, English has been so ‘amplyfyed’ that English translations may be produced equal to those done in any other language (A.i.b). Rastell is quoted in Spurgeon (636: 1: 73).

Utley notes that Feylde’s poem may have been written between 1530 and 1535, but certainly belongs to the period 1509–35 (746: 266). The apparent reference to Hawes’s death, however, dates the poem to after 1523. Lines 19–21 of Feylde’s prologue refer to Lydgate: ‘But Lydgates workes are fruytefull and sentencyous/ Who of his bokes redde the fyne/ He wyll hym call a famus rethorycye.’

Copeland’s poem is the introduction to Wynkyn de Worde’s 1530 edition of Chaucer’s *Parliament of Fowls*. Quotations from it are in Spurgeon (636: 1: 76–7) and in Ames (550: 2: 279–80.) The second stanza of Copeland’s poem briefly praises the memory of Chaucer and his followers, Lydgate and Hawes.

Lyndsay places Lydgate in the company of Chaucer and Gower (prologue, lines 11–14).

525. **Forrest, William.** *The History of Grisild the Second.* c. 1545.

Not sighted; quoted in vol.1 of Spurgeon (636: 86–7). Forrest laments in the prologue to his manuscript that he cannot resurrect the style of Gower, Chaucer, and Lydgate.


Not sighted; this annotation has been based on the Leland extract found in Spurgeon (636: 3: 13–19). Leland includes *CBK* in a list of works ascribed to Chaucer.

527. **Sherry, Richard.** *A Treatise of Schemes and Tropes.* London, [1550].

Brief references. Page Aii^\textsuperscript{b} commends Gower, Chaucer, and Lydgate as writers who show the potential elegance of English as a literary language.
John Lydgate was born in Suffolk and he was a monk at the monastery of St Edmunds Bury. He stood out easily, if I may speak without inciting criticism, as the leading figure of all the poets of his time in England. He was a man of such eloquence and learning (I am never able to praise him enough) that he was able, even in so rude a time, to achieve a high level of refinement. I have learned that, after passing through the universities of England, he travelled to France and Italy in order to learn their languages. When he had mastered this discourse, he returned home from Padua and Lutetia. He had many disciples from the sons of the nobility whom he assisted a great deal by his readings and writings. Just as he was very knowledgable in all the arts and polite learning, to which he had applied himself since the time of his youth, so he cultivated, loved, and taught poetry, the delight of the ear and spirit, even more than his other studies. He decided to compose for himself, in various metres, that type of verse which Dante in Italy, Allanus in France, and Chaucer in England had so elegantly composed. Thereafter he always strove wonderfully to polish the English language. After Chaucer, whom I have mentioned, he was clearly the greatest light of English verse. Lydgate translated, elegantly, delightfully, and agreeably, in verse as in prose, many works from Italian and French into our vernacular, and he aptly fashioned many other works from his own genius. On the basis of various authorities it can be said with certainty that he wrote the following: [Bale lists 35 works—see Schirmer, 757, who corrects Bale’s list and MacCracken, 471, for modern statements of the canon]. He translated the following from Boccaccio and other authors: [eight works are listed]. He produced tragedies and comedies and other pleasant things. I say nothing here about his Latin verse, or other things that he wrote in prose. He lived until he was sixty in the year 1440 in the reign of Henry VI. Dying at Bury, he was buried there, among his order, with...
this epitaph: 'Dead in this world, but living in heaven, here lies Lydgate buried in an urn, he was once celebrated in Britain because of the fame of his poetry.' [In the same volume, in his life of Chaucer, Bale ascribes \textit{CBK} to Chaucer (526).]


530. \textbf{Lawson, Thomas.} \textit{Orchet.} 1581.

Not sighted; the relevant text from Lawson's manuscript is quoted in Brydges (561: 29) and in Spurgeon (636: 1: 120–1). Lydgate's 'wordye praise and everlastynge meade, / Thoo he war a mounke at the abbay late Bury, / Myghte be in equale prase with maister Chawcer truly.' [In the lines that follow this extract Lawson compares Lydgate very favourably with Chaucer and Gower.]


Brief references. In his day, Lydgate was compared to Chaucer in style and metre; however, because he dealt with 'supersticious and odde matters,' he is held in a lower
estimation now, even though he handled these matters well (32).


Published posthumously and possibly written in the 1570s. Brief references. Lydgate is ranked third, after Chaucer and Gower, among those of the ‘first age’ of English poets (60–1). Lydgate is a ‘translatour onely and no deuiser of that which he wrate, but one that wrate in good verse’ (62). A modern poet must be careful to select a cultivated and shared form of the language for his vernacular verse: the language of Lydgate and the older poets is not suitable because it is no longer in use (144–5).


Meres refers to the conventional trilogy of Chaucer, Gower, and Lydgate (279). He is quoted in vol.1 of Spurgeon (636: 159).


Stow draws on his knowledge of the Lydgate manuscripts for several brief references to the poet’s work, and he quotes from the poems at 1: 99 and 1: 117. Lydgate’s *London Lickpenny* is proof that Eastcheap was known for its cooks (1: 217). St Paul’s cathedral
used Lydgate’s translation from the French version of DM to accompany a painting in its
cloister on the Dance of Death theme (1: 327). John Shirley collected and transcribed the
works of Chaucer and Lydgate, among other writers, and preserved them for ‘posterity’;
Stow has seen the Shirley manuscripts and owns some of them (2: 24).


Chaucer, Gower, and Lydgate are excluded from the anthology for two reasons. Firstly, the
collection is limited to lines of ten syllable lines, and ‘it was not knowne how their forme
would agree with these.’ Secondly, their style does not readily allow for the brief extracts
used in the collection (235).

536. **Freeman, Thomas.** *Rubbe, and a Great Cast*. London, 1614.

Freeman’s book is divided into two parts, the second of which is entitled ‘Runne, and
a Great Cast. The Second Bowle.’ Each of the two parts has a separately numbered
sequence of epigrams. Epigram 14 in the second part of Freeman’s work praises the
contribution of Gower, Chaucer, and Lydgate to the store of knowledge in England.
Quoted in Spurgeon (636: 1: 188).


Jonson’s masque was first performed in 1615. The spirits of Chaucer, Gower, Lydgate, and
Spenser are summoned to attend ‘upon the age that shall your names new nourish’ (425).
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Jonson’s illustrative examples of grammatical usage include a total of 14 quotations from FP.


Pits’s entry generally follows that by Bale, 528.


Brief references. Peacham incorrectly ascribes Piers Plowman to Lydgate. Most of Lydgate’s work is translation as he had ‘no great inuention of his owne.’ His verse is ‘tollerable and smooth,’ considering the age in which he wrote (95).


Cokain’s poem, To Mr. Humphry C. on his Poem entitled Loves Hawking Bag, includes Lydgate along with Chaucer, Gower, and Spenser in a list of great classical writers (105). Cokain is quoted in Spurgeon (636: 1: 236).
Brief references. Lydgate was a monk who had travelled in Italy and France. He was well regarded for his compositions in prose and verse.

Wharton’s appendix appears, with its own title page and separately paginated, at the end of vol. 1 of William Cave’s *Scriptorium Ecclesiasticorum Historia Literaria* (2 vols. London, 1688-98.) Wharton essentially follows Bale, 528, but includes references, in addition to several manuscript works, to a number of Lydgate’s poems that had been printed in the 16th and 17th centuries. Wharton cites his sources as Bale, 528, and Pits, 539.

Stephen Hawes was able to recite large amounts of poetry from memory, particularly from works by Lydgate—a poet whom he regarded as comparable to Chaucer.

Chaucer’s verse has a certain music to it, as is apparent if one compares it with that of Gower or Lydgate. Speght’s notion, however, that Chaucer maintains ten syllables to a line
is absurd as such a practice was unknown in Chaucer’s time (224–5). [Speght’s opinion is stated in the address ‘To the Readers’ for his 1602 Chaucer edition. Not here annotated.]


Favourably compares Lydgate with Chaucer: Lydgate’s metre is more smooth, and Chaucer’s verse less intelligible (130–1).


Brief references. Elstob quotes a Lydgate passage as evidence of the use of monosyllables in English poetry of quality. ‘Tho’ the Verse is somewhat antiquated, yet the Example ought not to be despised by our modern Criticks, especially those who have any Respect for Chaucer’ (xix).


Lydgate produced many English and Latin works, and ‘justly acquired the Reputation of the best Author of the Age …; and if Chaucer’s Works had greater Learning, Lydgate’s were Superior for Language. His Poetry is so pure, and so easie, that one might mistake him for a Modern writer’ (93). Giles quotes from Heywood’s Life and Death of Hector, 421, and from the epitaph given in Bale, 528 (93–4).

The narrative body of Tanner’s entry for Lydgate is based on Bale, 528, but Tanner supplements Bale with very substantial references to the Lydgate manuscripts, life records, and early printing history. Tanner is able to cite documentary sources for the dates of Lydgate’s admission as an acolyte, subsequent ordination as a sub-deacon and deacon, and letters dimissory prior to becoming a priest (489). Pearsall subsequently prints these documents, and others (824: 53–5). Tanner gives the sources for his citation as Bale, 528, Pits, 539, and Wharton, 543 (493).


Describes a number of the early Lydgate editions.


A brief biography and evaluation, taken mainly from Pits, 539, and Bale, 528 (23–25). As a versifier, Lydgate ‘far excelled’ Chaucer (23). *ST* and *TB* are examples of the smoothness of his verse (24–5).
Lydgate’s main poems, *FP* and *ST*, would classify him as a ‘legendary’ poet, although the *FP* does contain a number of ‘visions’ (228–9). *TG* and *DM* are vision poems (229–31). Lydgate was praised by the ‘old English poets’ (231); nevertheless, he lacks animation (232). He is the earliest English poet one can read ‘without hesitation and difficulty’ (232).

Warton offers a sustained discussion of Lydgate’s work (2: 51–100) in addition to a number of other references scattered in his *History*. Chaucer was an English spring followed by winter (51). [Warton then follows Bale’s discussion of Lydgate’s achievements.] Lydgate was educated briefly at Oxford, and then travelled in France and Italy; he was easy in ‘every mode of composition.’ His contribution to the development of the English language follows the lead of Gower, Chaucer, and Hoccleve (52). The opening lines of *LOL* are ‘harmonious and elegant,’ and they recall the ‘eloquence’ of Cicero, Petrarch, and Chaucer (57). Lydgate is ‘naturally verbose and diffuse’: this can lend him ‘clearness and ... fluency,’ but it can also make him ‘tedious and languid.’ He is at his best with descriptive passages, ‘especially where the subject admits a flowery diction’; but he has no pathos or animation (58). His most important poems are *FP*, *ST*, and *TB* (61). *FP* is effectively a series of tragedies within a dramatic plan ‘partly suggested by the pageants of the times’ (63). Some passages of dialogue and description are very effective, notably the appearance of Fortune (63–6). Lydgate seems to wish to rival Chaucer in the ‘structure and modulation of his style’ (70). *ST* was first printed with Chaucer’s works by William Thynne in 1561 (71–2). Lydgate’s sources were Guido della Colonna, Statius, and Seneca (74). *ST* is the ‘Thebaid of a troubadour’ with the classical tale dressed in ‘feudal manners’ (78). *TB*, first printed by Pynson in 1513, 399, translates Guido della Colonna’s *Historia Trojana* (81–2).
It is unlikely that Lydgate knew Homer in the Greek (84). *TB* is full of 'descriptions of rural beauty, formed by a selection of very poetical and picturesque circumstances, and cloathed in the most perspicuous and musical numbers' (85). Lydgate's description of Trojan theatre is likely not to be based on the characteristics of medieval theatre, but probably represents what Lydgate thinks ancient theatre was like (95). Lydgate's 'gallantry' is shown in *TB* where he suppresses the satirical treatment of women found in his source (96). [The entry is repeated in the 1824, 1840, and 1871 editions.]


According to vol.1 of Spurgeon (636: 418), Gray's remarks are likely to have been written c. 1760-1; they were first published in 1814. Gray briefly discusses Lydgate's life and circumstances (387-91). *FP* is a 'paraphrase' of the French original (391). Lydgate's fondness for elaboration of detail is a reflection of the taste of the time, and one must see it in that light (392). In spite of Dryden's criticism, 545, of the metre of Lydgate's day, it is likely that some of the verses are 'uniform ... when rightly pronounced' according to a French accent (393, note.). Slurring of some syllables may have also taken place (394, note.). Final -e may have been pronounced or not according to poetic license (395, note.). Lydgate is not an artist of Chaucer's calibre, but he is closer to him than are John Gower or Thomas Hoccleve. Lydgate's 'choice of expression,' and the 'smoothness' of his poetry, is much better than that found in Gower or Hoccleve (397). Lydgate can aspire to tenderness (397-401). One of his 'principal beauties' is a 'kind of majesty' (401). Lydgate seems to be more 'serious' than Chaucer is, yet he does indulge in satire when it comes to the subject of women and, occasionally, the religious orders (402-8). Lydgate may be now
almost forgotten; however, his work remained popular for more than a hundred years following his death (409).


Brief references. The verse romances of the Middle Ages are ‘far more spirited and entertaining than the tedious allegories of Gower, or the dull and prolix legends of Lydgate’ (ix).


Not sighted; excerpted in vol. 1 of Spurgeon (636: 459). Lydgate’s verse is smoother, and his language is more modern, than Chaucer’s is. [According to Spurgeon, the article remains in subsequent editions of the *Britannica* up to and including that of 1842 (452).]


The first edition of Ellis’s work, published in 1790 in a single volume format, covers poetry from the reign of Henry VIII, and excludes any reference to the English Chaucerians. Lydgate is the ‘most tolerable’ of the English writers immediately following Chaucer (276); he enjoyed great contemporary popularity, but modern critics have been much less favourable (276–7). Percy, 555, and Ritson, 558, are among examples of the generally
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hostile view of modern readers. Warton, 552–3, however, thinks Lydgate is worth studying with ‘much attention’ (277). Ellis quotes passages from Warton (277–9). Lydgate’s most popular works were ST, FP, and TB (279); but only TB (280) has attractive features for modern readers (281). Ellis quotes and discusses passages from Lydgate (281–98). Lydgate does not offer ‘much liveliness of fancy or brilliancy of expression’ (290), and it is not possible to justify the ‘original popularity’ of TB (297).


Ritson attempts to give a complete listing of Lydgate’s work, but admits that this is an impossible task because he cannot access all the material scattered across the country or be certain of Lydgate’s canon. [See Schirmer, 757, and MacCracken, 471, for modern statements of the canon.] Lydgate is a ‘voluminous, prosaick, and driveling monk’ (87). Lydgate’s productions are hardly worth the effort of listing as they are merely ‘typographical’ curiosities or of occasional interest because of some fine manuscript illuminations (88).


An incidental reference to Lydgate among Coleridge’s notes for January 1804: the merits of the poet [Samuel] Daniel are ‘much above’ those of Gower and Lydgate and ‘much below’ those of Chaucer (entry number 1835, folios 66 and 66†).
Coleridge remarks in this note dating from the period 1810–19, first published in 1836, that he has not seen the 1513 edition of TB, [Pynson, 399]. He regrets that Alexander Chalmers did not print the known Lydgate manuscripts instead of those for the ‘almost worthless’ John Gower (808–9). [Chalmers was the editor of The Works of the English Poets. London, 1810. In Chalmers’s anthology, Chaucer and Gower are the only poets included before Skelton.]

Lawson’s praise of Lydgate in his Orchet of 1581 and his favourable comparison of Lydgate with Chaucer, 530, ‘reflects small credit on his taste: nor does his own production reflect more’ (29).

Lydgate’s work has been more often ‘abused than read.’ The poet can be dull, but he also produced many lines of interest for their social history, beauty, or the ‘vigor and harmony’ of the verse. In the last of these he exceeds Chaucer; at times, he even comes close to the older poet in matters of ‘higher merit’ (372). Turner quotes from the Testament (373–4) and ST (375–8).
Prints sections from Lydgate’s *A Poem upon the Wars of King Henry V in France* and *The Coming of the King Out of France* that deal with the pageants on London Bridge (227–9, 239–47). The extracts from Lydgate are only a ‘little less beautiful than Chaucer’s immortal Tales’ (239). Thomson also prints extracts from Lydgate’s pageant on the arrival of Queen Margaret in London on 28 May 1445 (276–77). Ritson’s criticism of Lydgate, 558, is very unjust (277–8); Warton, 552–3, is much fairer in acknowledging Lydgate’s strengths and weaknesses (278).

**564. Hallam, Henry. *Introduction to the Literature of Europe.* Vol. 1. London, 1837.**


Hoccleve is a very bad poet; Lydgate is somewhat better (125). Gray, 554, praises Lydgate more than Warton, 552–3, or Ellis, 557, do, or most would do (125–6). Lydgate is probably less intellectually able than Gower, but he has ‘more of the minor qualities of a poet’; however, he is too diffuse and lacks the judgement to abbreviate his sources. He may have been more appealing if he had written about his own times, perhaps in satire, instead of the ‘fate of princes’ (126).


Although a monk, Lydgate travelled widely (312) and produced a great range of works (312–13). Ritson’s harsh criticism, 558, reveals his own anti-clerical bias (313–4). Percy, 555, and Ellis, 557, follow Ritson like dogs barking after another who happens only to be
baying at the moon. Turner, 562, is right to say that Lydgate is less often read than dismissed; Hallam, 564, is quite wrong to slight Gray’s favourable judgement, 554, of Lydgate. Warton, 552–3, is captivated by a vision of Lydgate as a ‘Gothic monk’ (314). Hallam’s dismissal, 564, of ST and TB fails to take into account the tastes of the time for which they were written (315–6). The ‘hasty judgements’ of past critics should be set aside. Coleridge, 560, notably speaks in Lydgate’s support (317), however, Gray, 554, offers some of the most informed comments on Lydgate (317). D’Israeli discusses Gray’s views (317–20). Lydgate is wordy, but ‘clear and fluent’ (320); his faults are the faults of his time (321). The English must not forget their old poets, for it is through them that access is found to England’s ‘genius ... and the eternal truth of authentic nature’ (321–2). The old poets should be sought out by their modern counterparts for they are the marble on which ‘many a noble column has been raised’ (322).


Brief references. ‘Lydgate is altogether the most respectable versifier of the fifteenth century’ (37). It is likely that FP ‘suggested ... the idea’ for the *Mirror for Magistrates* (38). See Campbell’s excerpts, 426, from FP.


A note pointing to the lack of reliable biographical information on Lydgate and soliciting new facts from the readers of *Notes and Queries.*
Chaucer borrows `continually` from Lydgate, among others (113).


Asks whether a poem of Lydgate’s in honour of the Virgin has been printed or where it may be found in manuscript.


Brief reference. Notes that *TB* was based on the work of Guido della Colonna, and in turn is used by Shakespeare for *Troilus and Cressida*.


Brief references. Lydgate’s work is of `moderate merit.` It is very desirable that his poetry be edited as it would contribute to the study of English philology (464). The language of *ST* appears `antiquated` because the poem is written in imitation of Chaucer; in general, Lydgate’s language is even more modern than that of Spenser. Lydgate’s metre is usually `very smooth`; what irregularities it has are because of the loss of final –e in pronunciation (465).
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*The Book of the Poets was published posthumously.* Brief references. Lydgate is a better poet than Hoccleve is, but neither man inherits Chaucer’s talent (249–50). Lydgate has been ‘much overrated by the critics.’ It is true that he is a generally competent writer who improved English as a literary language, but his ‘flashes of genius’ are not sustained (250). *TG, Piers Plowman, The House of Fame,* and *Hawes’s PP,* are the four marble columns that support Spenser’s *Faerie Queen* (252).


Lists a selection of Lydgate’s works (including the apocryphal *Court of Sapience*) and their early prints, and refers readers to Ritson, 558, and some of the Chaucer editions, for a more extensive listing.


Brief references. Lydgate is verbose, unimaginative and artistically weak; nevertheless, he is a ‘considerably livelier and more expert writer than Occleve’ (403).
It will be about twenty years before all the works of Lydgate and Hoccleve are edited and published by the Early English Text Society; if a Lydgate and Hoccleve Society were established it would hasten the process (1). Publication is urgent for a number of reasons: without accurate texts it is not possible to trace the loss of final -e; to study the changing state of the English language and vocabulary during the 15th century; to establish the Chaucer canon; or to appreciate the times and ‘individuality and life’ of Lydgate and Hoccleve (2–3). Lydgate was once highly praised (3–4). The manuscripts to be printed first are, for Lydgate, London, BL, MS Harley 1766 and 2278, and, for Hoccleve, Durham, Univ. Lib., MS Cosin V.ii.13. 150 members are needed, and 20 have already joined (4). [Furnivall later refers to this letter in his ‘Forewords’ to vol. 1 of Hoccleve’s works, 13: ‘not half’ of the 150 members needed could be found, and so the society did not proceed (xlviii).]


Reply to Hall, 578. Style and manuscript attribution show beyond dispute that *CBK* is Lydgate’s.

The first of several articles by Hall in this issue of *Notes and Queries* arguing for Chaucer’s authorship of some minor poems, including *CBK*, but principally the *Court of Love*. See Hall, 578.


Hall claims *CBK* for Chaucer on the ‘ground of manifest resemblance in title and construction’ to his other works (109). See Furnivall’s reply, 576.

579. **Minto, William.** *Characteristics of English Poets from Chaucer to Shirley.*

   Edinburgh, 1874. 2nd ed. Edinburgh, 1885.

Minto devotes a section under Chaucer’s ‘English Successors’ to Lydgate (75–81); he relies heavily on Warton, 552–3. Lydgate is a ‘professional poet’ rather than a religious writer (75). He writes with ease, but shallowly (76). Chaucer had exhausted the field, and Lydgate lacks the ‘genius’ needed to open up a new one (77). He frequently lapses into verbosity (78). ‘Tragic poetry’ is not his particular strength, although his efforts are adequate (79).


Some borrowings seem to show that Lydgate is familiar with the late 14th-century Scottish translation of Guido della Colonna’s *Historia destructionis Troiana* (xlvi–l).

581. S. ‘Lydgate’s “Fall of Princes.”’ *Notes and Queries* 5th Series 3 (1875): 46.

A ‘splendidly illuminated’ vellum manuscript, Glasgow, Hunterian Museum, MS 5, contains Lydgate’s *FP*. The text is given of memoranda written under the colophon referring to several Norfolk families: ‘Calthorpe,’ ‘Rookewoode,’ ‘Lumner,’ and ‘Yeluerton’ (46).


Lydgate is a ‘more worthy follower of Chaucer [than Hoccleve].’


Lydgate’s main source for *ST* is the *Ystoire de Thèbes*. See Renoir, 784, for further cross-references.

Lounsbury makes a number of dismissive references to Lydgate’s works in a discussion of the Chaucer canon, Lydgate’s references to Chaucer, and Lydgate’s artistic inferiority to Chaucer. If Thomas Chaucer was the son of Geoffrey, it is odd that Lydgate does not say so (1: 109–10). Lydgate is an important source of information on the contents of the Chaucer canon (1: 419–22, 423, 425 ff.). Some of Lydgate’s poems were printed in the early Chaucer editions, notably *ST* (1: 438, 441, 445, 447 ff.). Lydgate not infrequently uses ‘do’ and ‘did’ with the infinitive form of a verb to form the present and past tense. This practice, which first became common in the Midland dialect during the 15th century, can be used as a test for whether Chaucer’s authorship of a disputed poem is unlikely (1: 500–1). [See Royster, 654-5, for further discussion.] The reverential references Lydgate and Hoccleve make to Chaucer are the only parts of their work that ‘deserve much attention’ (3: 23).


Establishes that Lydgate was made prior at Hatfield Regis in 1423. See Pearsall, 824, for the current list of Lydgate life records.
LYDGATE: GENERAL REFERENCES

    Sidney Lee. 1885–1900.

[Pearsall describes the *DNB* entry for Lydgate as an ‘Augean stable of misinformation’
(824: 49, note 102.)] Lee discusses Lydgate’s life records drawing on Bale, Lydgate’s
poetry, and other sources (306–9). Lydgate knew Geoffrey and Thomas Chaucer (306).
His knowledge of classical literature is likely to be largely at second hand. In the two
hundred years following his death, Lydgate was regarded as the equal of Gower and second
only to Chaucer (309). He is praised by Burg, 510, Bradshaw, 517, Bokenham, 511, Ashby,
513, Feyld, 522, Hawes, 519–20, Skelton, 518, Dunbar, 516, Douglas, 515, Lyndsay, 524,
and many others extending through to the 19th century (309–10). His fame was at its
height with the Elizabethans; modern critics have been ‘less generous’ (310). Lydgate has
‘little or no poetic imagination’; his narratives are ‘tedious,’ ‘unreadable’ and, as works of
literature, ‘worthless’ (310). His best works are the shorter pieces (310–11). He says that
he takes no trouble with his metre, but in fact he usually does (311). Lee lists and discusses
Lydgate’s major poems, mainly in terms of the surviving manuscripts and early editions
(311–16). This listing includes the *Court of Sapience* and the *Assembly of Gods,* later
excluded from the Lydgate canon: see Spindler, 685, on the former, and Rudolph, 639, on
the latter. [Pearsall, 814–24, provides a modern statement of Lydgate’s life and
achievement.]

    1894. 7 Vols. 1894–97.

Lydgate’s use of quotations from Fragment A of the *Romaunt of the Rose* in *CBK*, written in about 1402, clinches the identification of Chaucer as the author of the Fragment A (72–4). Six poems printed as Chaucer’s in Thynne’s edition of 1532 are certainly by Lydgate: *The Flour of Curtesye; CBK; A Ballad in Commendation of our Lady; To my Soverain Lady; Go forth, King, and A Ballad of Good Counsel* (102–6). Two other poems are probably by Lydgate: *A goodlie balade of Chaucer* (109); and *A Praise of Women* (111–12). The 1561 edition with Stow’s additions has several poems in Lydgate’s style or using scraps of his work, and one, *A balade, warnyng men to be ware of deceitptfull women*, that is likely to be by Lydgate (117–125). Stow includes *ST* as an appendix, but he refers to it as Lydgate’s (118). Speght’s edition of 1598 contains a ballad that is very probably Lydgate’s (138–9). Skeat provides a list showing the additions made to the Chaucer apocrypha by the early editors (159–64).


A Lydgate manuscript has been recently acquired by the British Museum (London, BL, MS Add. 34360) that was once owned by John Stow. Steele briefly summarizes the contents of the manuscript and notes some of its similarities to other manuscripts.


In 1894 Steele published what was thought to be the first printed edition of the *Secrees of Old Philisoffres*, a title suggested by Furnivall. He announces here, however, that he has
found an edition from 1511, previously undetected because Lydgate’s name is missing from the title page. See Steele, 591, and Starnes, 489, who prints a facsimile of the 1511 edition.


A continuation of 590. An inspection of the 1511 edition shows that it is shorter than Steele’s edition [Steele notes the omitted stanzas]; its versification has also been amended in line with 16th-century ‘taste.’ It was printed from a manuscript that shared a variant with London, BL, MS 14,408.


Lydgate is a better poet than Hoccleve, but he lacks both Hoccleve’s developed ‘taste’ and a clear notion of the ‘ideal of style’ he wishes to achieve (221). His ‘worldly fables’ suffer from excessive moralizing (222). Brink’s theme is that Lydgate as an artist is torn between the roles of ‘poet and the monk’ (223). Lydgate never understands the musicality of Chaucer’s metre or gains Chaucer’s command of diction (223–4). Brink provides a brief discussion of the Lydgate corpus (224–34). *TB* is often satisfying in terms of its metre and style: Lydgate sensitively handles matters of nature and psychology, and shows an ability for graphic description (225). *ST* shows Lydgate ‘almost as Chaucer’s ape’ (226). *FP* was a creatively undemanding exercise, yet it uses Lydgate’s descriptive talents well; it is one of the best of his poems (227–8). In his occasional poems, Lydgate makes the mistake of rarely changing his ‘metre and tone to suit the subject’ (229). *The Churl and the Bird*
shows Lydgate ‘perhaps in his best light’ (230). LOL is frequently insipid and dull for lengthy passages; nevertheless, it has ‘at least some attractive features’ (232).


Courthope provides a brief outline of Lydgate’s life (321–5) in which he wrongly credits Lydgate with the authorship of the *Assembly of Gods* (322). [See Rudolph, 639, for the exclusion of the *Assembly* from the Lydgate canon.] Lydgate’s work has no value except to show the ‘fluctuations of poetical taste’ during his time (325). ST illustrates the limited nature of Lydgate’s talent (325–6). Lydgate’s work is at its ‘most agreeable’ when the poet writes about himself; *London Lickpenny* and the *Testament* offer insights into Lydgate’s personality and circumstances (326). A study of Lydgate’s failure to sustain Chaucer’s method of versification is very informative (326–33). Chaucer’s approach to prosody was ‘scientific,’ but ‘artificial’ (326); it was not understood by those who came after him (327). Courthope does not accept that Lydgate’s verse is ‘built on a regular principle’ (328), as its characteristics are better explained by Lydgate’s artistic defects and by the loss of final –e (328–33).


There is a scattering of references to Lydgate throughout Jusserand’s history, but essentially Jusserand dismisses him in vol. 1. The 15th century was one of decline and lacked literary innovation (495–7). If the Early English Text Society succeeds in publishing Lydgate’s
work it will be ‘proof of unparalleled endurance’ (498). Lydgate writes at length in many
genres, but his output is derivative and his metre is loose (498–501).


Briefly discusses Lydgate’s life and work (166–9). Lydgate and Hoccleve are the most
significant of Chaucer’s followers. Lydgate’s earlier poems show originality; his later
poems are more imitative of Chaucer, and lack spirit and intelligence.


Schick summarizes the action of *RS* and then concludes that Lydgate is its author on the
basis of the poem’s traditional attribution, satire on women, and some aspects of usage
(135–49). The fact that it is more interesting, and in a better metre, than Lydgate’s usual
work does not argue against his authorship (149). Lydgate’s source is an unpublished
French poem, *Échecs Amoureux* (151).

597. **Gosse, Edmund.** *A Short History of Modern English Literature.* London, 1897.

Brief references. Lydgate is a better writer than Hoccleve is, but this is ‘no great praise.’
He owes much more to the 14th-century romantic poets of France, whom he follows very
closely, than to Chaucer (35). *FP* was the best liked of his longer poems; it now provides
a demonstration of the way the English language was developing at the time. Lydgate is
sometimes ‘diffusely picturesque’ (36). His work suffers from being unstructured and
lacking in melody; but he can display a sense of real humanity, and a selection could be
made that would show him speaking of some ‘very gentle and gracious things.’ Lydgate writes in a ‘period of retrogression and decay’ (37).


Rey considers the issue of whether or not Lydgate’s *Order of Fools* influences Skelton’s *Bowge of Courte*. He finds, even though Skelton praises Lydgate’s poetry, that the influence of the Lydgate piece is not present (23–30). Skelton’s representation of the seven vices is the work of a ‘satirist who is at the same time an artist, whilst the “Order of Fools” is that of a moralist, and of a moralist only’ (30).


Smith briefly surveys the Lydgate canon (7–9). *TG* is probably the best of Lydgate’s poems; and the versification of *FP* may show Lydgate at his ‘least jarring.’ The two directions of ‘intellectual energy’ in the later Middle Ages are represented by the presentation in the *Roman de la Rose* of ‘allegorical dreaming of Chivalrous love’ and satire about contemporary life. *TG* takes the path of allegory and chivalry (9). The emphasis Lydgate generally places on chivalry relates to his concern to protect the status of the ‘chiefest and fairest’ of all women, the Virgin Mary (11). In *CBK*, Lydgate comes closest to Chaucer’s technical control (12). Some of Lydgate’s technical failings are interesting examples of an unsuccessful attempt to imitate French versification (13). To Lydgate, and to the other 15th-century poets, death is a grim and threatening ‘spectre.’
This conception stands between that of the early Middle Ages, in which death is represented by images of decay, and that of the Renaissance, in which death is discussed in a mood of melancholy fatefulness (14–16).


Brief references to Lydgate in an iconoclastic discussion of literary criticism. Collins takes issue with Saintsbury’s hostile criticism of Lydgate. [See 634–5 for samples of Saintsbury’s views.] Saintsbury is clearly ignorant of Lydgate’s work. Lydgate is a ‘poet of fine genius’ who frequently produces examples of ‘exquisite beauty’; he is particularly strong in his ‘descriptions of nature’ and ‘powers of pathos’; and, when writing at the height of his ability, he is ‘one of the most musical of poets’ (98). Gray, 554, and Warton, 552–3, are right to praise Lydgate (98–9). Jusserand, 594, fails to appreciate Lydgate’s beauties (198–9). [Hammond finds Collins excessive in his praise (454: 97–8).]


Brief references. Oxford, Bodleian Lib., MS Laud Misc. 595 contains an unpublished verse version of the Troy story that has escaped much critical notice (1). For a time the poem had been ascribed to Lydgate (2). It is possible that the poem was preserved because it was thought to be by Lydgate; but it may also have survived on the strength of its own merits (2–3).

Lydgate is probably the author of Fragment B of the *Romance of the Rose*. The evidence for this involves the obvious similarities between this poem and Lydgate’s other work, and parallels in the use of rhyme and vocabulary and language.


Brief references. Prints extracts from *LSEF* (62–3); a miniature from London, BL, MS Harley 2278 is reproduced facing page 62.


Brief references. Lydgate’s inclusion of verses in his mummings is probably a factor in the subsequent development of the mumming as a literary form (1: 396–7). It is unlikely that Lydgate is the author of the *Ludus Coventriae* (2: 145).


Neither Hoccleve nor Lydgate come close to the talent of Chaucer, but there is often a musical quality to Lydgate’s work that is overlooked by critics (185–6). It is true that Lydgate’s versification is ‘liable to be incorrect.’ He is particularly good when describing nature (186). The Lydgate poems that most show the influence of Chaucer are *TG*, *The Flower of Curtesie*, and *CBK*. Many of his poems are written under patronage; the ‘most important’ of these are *TB*, *LOI*, and *FP* (187).

London Lickpenny is the single piece of evidence to show that Lydgate is able to match the attractiveness of ‘Hoccleve’s reminiscences.’ To discuss his other poems is a ‘waste of space’ (79).


Brief references to Lydgate in a discussion mainly of the Shirley manuscript, London, BL, MS Add. 16165 and two brief Chaucer poems that it contains. John Shirley occupies a very important place in Lydgate studies: he provides incidental information regarding Lydgate, whom he seems to know personally; and some of Lydgate’s work would have been lost without Shirley’s copies (36).


A discussion principally of parallels between the contents and handwriting of London, BL, MS Harley 2251 and London, BL, MS Adds. 34360. Portions of these two manuscripts have been copied from a common source, perhaps a lost Shirley codex that now only survives as a fragment included in London, BL, MS Harley 78 (25–6). It is possible that London, BL, MS Harley 2251 and MS Adds. 34360, and Cambridge, Trinity College, MS R.3.19 and MS R.3.21 were all copied in the same scriptorium at about the same time, which must have been not before the reign of Edward IV. London, BL, MS Harley 2251, MS Harley 2255, and MS Adds. 34360 are of limited textual value (27). Hammond appends
some notes to this article in "Some Notes and Additions to "Two British Museum Manuscripts etc." which appears in the same Anglia volume (143–4).


Describes the contents of the Shirley manuscript, Oxford, Bodleian Lib., MS Ashmole 59, and notes parallels between this and other Shirley manuscripts, including London, BL, MS Add. 16165 and MS Harley 2251, and Cambridge, Trinity College, MS R.3.20. William Browne once owned the Ashmole 59 manuscript in addition to: Oxford, Bodleian Lib., MS Ashmole 45; London, BL, MS Add. 34360, MS Lansdowne 699 and MS Stowe 952; and Durham, Univ. Lib., MS Cosin V.ii.15 and 16, and MS Cosin V.iii.9. As all of these manuscripts, with the exception of the Hoccleveian Durham, Univ. Lib., MS Cosin V.iii.9, deal with Lydgate texts. Browne must have read much of Lydgate’s poetry. The only known example, however, of the influence of the manuscripts in Browne’s possession on his own work is with respect to the Hoccleve manuscript (321). See Browne, 3, and subsequent cross-references, regarding Hoccleve; and see Connolly, 1136, for a discussion of the Shirley manuscripts.


Hammond refers to Lydgate a number of times, principally in tracing the development of the Chaucer canon. Hammond briefly provides, where applicable, guidance regarding manuscripts, editions, authenticity, titles, dates, and sources. See her entries for the Assembly of Gods (407–8) [Hammond acknowledges that the ascription to Lydgate’s is not certain], CBK (413–5), Flower of Courtesy (424–5), Sayings (454–5), ST (456–7), Utter thy Language (461), and Wicked Tongue (462–3).

Brief references. *DM* is a translation of the French text accompanying a fresco in the Church of the Innocents in Paris. The word ‘macabre’ may have come from the name of a French cleric.


Brief references. Examines the possible place of two Latin texts in the development of the *Dance of Death* tradition.


Quotes the text of a poem from Oxford, Bodleian Lib., MS Fairfax 16 that censures Lydgate for his views on women (75–6). It is possible that the offending passages were from Bk 1 of *FP*: in London, BL, MS Harley 2251 these carry such marginal annotations as ‘Be pees I bidde yow’ and ‘Ye wil be shent’ etc (75). See Edwards, 883, for a related discussion.


Supplementing Koeppel, 583, Hammond identifies the ‘prudent Carnotence’ of *FP* as John of Salisbury, Bishop of Chartres. The prologue to Bk 4 of *FP* borrows from Salisbury’s *Polycraticus*; the prologue to Bk 3 uses one of Salisbury’s phrases. A copy of one of Salisbury’s books is known to have been in the library at Bury St Edmunds. Hammond draws on a reference in *FP* to elucidate the phase ‘shippes hoppesteres’ from line 1159 of the *Knight’s Tale* (92).

Lydgate’s imitation of Chaucer in *ST* is ‘painful,’ especially in his prologue (361). Hammond prints the text of the prologue from London, BL, MS Arundel 119 (363–8) with critical and textual notes (368–75). She briefly discusses Lydgate’s extensive use of French loan words (375).


The relationship of authors to their patrons is an important factor in shaping their work. The ‘praise and begging’ references in *FP* provide examples of Lydgate’s relationship to Humphrey, Duke of Gloucester (121). Lydgate may have sent the envoy to Bk 3, Ch. 18, to Gloucester with an extract of his work (124). Hammond prints Lydgate’s *Letter to Gloucester* from London, BL, MS Harley 2255 (125–6); she then discusses the poem’s metaphorical references to coins and medicine, and its use of proverbs (127–8). Hammond also prints the prologue to Bk 3, *Thanks to Gloucester* (129–32); the *Thanks* may be the ‘afterpiece’ to the *Letter to Gloucester* (122). The self-deprecation that Lydgate shows in thanking Gloucester is frequently found in his works, and is ‘probably for the most part conventional’ (132). The envoy to Bk 3, Ch. 18, is printed by Hammond from Oxford, Bodleian Lib., MS Bodley 263 (133–4). Internal evidence from *FP* may date the poem to between ‘May 1431 and the New Year of 1432’ (136).
When Stow assembles what is now known as London, BL, MS Add. 29729, he copies material from a number of sources. One of these sources is a Shirley manuscript, Cambridge, Trinity College, MS R.3.20. Stow copies a verse index, 104 lines of brief couplets that constitute the *Kalundare*, from the beginning of this manuscript. The Trinity manuscript is now missing its first 13 gatherings, and its *Kalundare* is consequently lost. Stow’s copy of the *Kalundare* preserves a reference to a prose version of the *PLM*. This raises the possibility that Lydgate may have prepared two versions of his translation, one in verse, and one, now lost, in prose. See Walls, 981, and Green, 957, for related discussions.

London, BL, MS Lansdowne 699 and Lincoln Cathedral Lib., MS C.5.4 include the *Churl and the Bird, St Austin at Compton*, and *DM* in the same order. The two texts of the last poem have the ‘closest possible relation.’ The handwriting and page layouts of the two manuscripts are very similar, and this suggests that the manuscripts are the work of a single scribe. The Lincoln Cathedral manuscript is mutilated, and so it was not possible to compare the two remaining poems with the Lansdowne manuscript, but it is very likely that they would share the same source. The Lansdowne manuscript is already known to be related closely to Leiden, Univ. Lib., Vossius MS Germ.Gall.Q.9 (250). It is likely that the version of *DM* in the Vossius manuscript is the same as that in the Lansdowne manuscript. All of these copies of *DM* represent a group based on liberal variations subsequently made to Lydgate’s poem (251).
By comparing the occurrences of nine-syllabled pentameter lines in the works of different authors within a miscellany copied by the same scribe, one may infer which are likely to be the result of scribal, as opposed to authorial, practice (129–32). Hammond lists the nine-syllabled lines that occur in the Oxford, Bodleian Lib., MS Fairfax 16 version of Chaucer’s *Parlement of Foules*, Hoccleve’s *LC*, and Lydgate’s *CBK*, and in the Ellesmere [Huntington Lib., MS EL 26 C 9] and Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, MS 61 copies of Chaucer’s *Second Nun’s Tale* (133–51). A further manuscript, the Wentworth Wodehouse translation of *De re rustica*, dating to the second quarter of the 15th century, is metrically pure and free of nine-syllabled lines. This manuscript proves two things: the capacity for metrical regularity had not been lost by the time of its copying; and the inferred existence of such regularity in the time of Chaucer is not a myth. (148–9). It appears that a copyist who works on London, BL, MS Harley 2251 and MS Add. 34360, (extracts from *FP*), also works on Cambridge, Trinity College, MS R.3.21, London, BL, MS Royal 17 D.xv (*CT*), London, Royal College of Physicians, MS 13 (*CT*), and, possibly, London, BL, MS Arundel 59 (*Secrees of Old Philisoffres*) (130). Hoccleve keeps to ten syllables, but lacks ‘any real rhythmic sense.’ Lydgate understands more of Chaucer’s rhythm than does Hoccleve, but shows his limitations by repeating line-types that in Chaucer are merely metrical variants. The nine-syllabled line in Lydgate is not caused by a confusion in the pronunciation of final –e: it is a ‘reflection of his mentality’ that is vital to our understanding of the time (152). See Hammond, 622, for further discussion of the ‘Hammond scribe.’

---

Lydgate does not generally show the knowledge of Boethius that one would expect. When discussing Boethius in Bk 8 of FP he does not trouble to use all the detail of his French source. Nevertheless, at one point in the Fabula duorum mercatorum (lines 743–46) he does echo in vigorous verse some lines from the Consolatio. How much knowledge of Boethius this actually shows is unknown.


Bk 2 of FP, lines 974–1337, tells the story of Lucretia. Lydgate paraphrases, at the request of Humphrey, Duke of Gloucester, a Latin text by Linus Colucius Pierius, also known as Coluccio Salutati (49). It is likely that Humphrey provides Lydgate with access to the Latin work. Although Lydgate pads his version with ‘generalities and repetition,’ he is heavily indebted to the original (50). Hammond prints parallel extracts from the Latin and English versions (51–6). Humphrey’s likely interaction with Lydgate suggests that the duke is ‘no mean critic of letters’ (57).


A continuation of the discussion from Hammond, 619, concerning a scribe who seems to have worked on a number of manuscripts containing works by Chaucer, Lydgate, or Hoccleve. Hammond prints photographic copies of the scribe’s script between pages 28 and 29. [Linne R. Mooney further discusses the work of this scribe in ‘More Manuscripts written by a Chaucer Scribe.’ Chaucer Review 30 (1996): 401–7. (Not annotated). See also Boffey, 1066, for a brief reference.]
There is no reason to dismiss as wholly fictitious Lydgate's account of his early life in the Testament (33–4). It is unlikely Lydgate travelled in Europe (35). [See Pearsall, 824, for the known details of Lydgate's life.] Lydgate, unlike Hoccleve who has the better technique of the two, seems to leave work at the stage of a first draft (35–6). He is a dedicated imitator of Chaucer (36). TB is a poor vehicle for Lydgate's talent (38); CBK is a much better choice (39). Lydgate is verbose and ungainly (40). The prologue to ST starkly shows the limits of his ability to copy Chaucer (41–2); FP is better. Lydgate has a talent for 'picturesque description' and 'pathos' (43). Many of Lydgate's short poems are successful (44). *London Lickpenny* shows wit (45).

Although it is not conclusive, the evidence of metre, style, and subject strongly suggest that Lydgate wrote *The Flower and the Leaf.* See Pearsall, 815, for a different view.

Lydgate is a 'self-appointed poet-laureate' and responsible for some of the 'worst lines of poetry that have ever been produced' (390). Vickers briefly mentions Lydgate's works for Gloucester (390–3). Lydgate's praise of the duke's literary interests is apparently sincere (392–3).

Argues that *TG* may celebrate the marriage of William Paston and Agnes Berry. See Boffey, 1067, and Wilson, 953, for a dissenting view; Amoils, 1027, accepts the Paston theory as being likely.


The *Ballade in Despite of the Flemynge* should be added to the Lydgate canon on the basis of number of stylistic points. [Schirmer includes this work in his statement of the canon (758: 267.)]


Lydgate uses John Carpenter’s letter describing the entry of Henry VI into London in 1432 as a source for the detail of his poem. It is quite probable that Carpenter’s letter is written to Lydgate. There is no certain evidence that Lydgate devised the king’s pageant. See Wickham, 805, and Crow, 999, for further discussion of the pageant.


Lydgate produces a considerable amount of verse to accompany illustrations of various kinds. Shortly after his death, an ‘anonymous imitator’ writes *The Life of Holy Job* to


An English verse translation of the Three Kings of Cologne, completed in the first half of the 15th century and based on Latin sources, may show the influence of Lydgate in its use of rhyme royal, structural divisions, and free-style translation. It is, however, much more concise than Lydgate’s ‘discursive renderings’ (50). MacCracken prints the text (51–68).


Prints a number of short poems from Cambridge, Trinity College, MS R.3.21 that are incorrectly attributed to Lydgate by John Stow.


Prints the text of 14 anonymous poems that show the influence of Lydgate.


Responds to Atkins, r473, about revising the composition date for SD. There are no good grounds upon which to revise the previously stipulated date of 1422.
That the Elizabethans choose to print Lydgate is an example of 'yeoman's service,' and their praise is grounded on a lack of regard for 'real poetic music.' Gray's commendation of Lydgate, 554, in the 18th century may be based on a reading that does not extend far beyond *FP*; and Coleridge's good opinion, 560, may simply be based on Gray's. Hawes praises Lydgate because the two men share the same faults (219). Dunbar's regard for Lydgate, 516, is that of a 'foreigner' (220). In general, the early Lydgate commentators had an undeveloped 'critical sense' (221). Saintsbury is hostile towards editors who either attempt to regularize overly Lydgate's verse by means of a selective critical text, or to suggest that the classification of Lydgate's line-types somehow shows him to be a better poet than he is (222–4). Lydgate is best in comic pieces (224), and *London Lickpenny* is the best of these (225). The metre of *ST* cannot be excused on the ground that it is a 'bad text'; no amount of editorial intervention will yield a 'flowing or poetical metre' from Lydgate (226). Schick's edition of *TG*, 442, is an example of substantial editorial intervention with a view to get things into a 'kind of shape' (227). There is 'no good reason' to deny Lydgate's authorship of the *Assembly of Gods* (228). [On this last point, see Sieper (458: vi), Rudolph, 639, and Schirmer (757: 275) for a dissenting view.] Lydgate composes generally better in eight syllable lines than those of ten (229–31). The example that Hoccleve and Lydgate leave for the poets who come after them is a 'lesson of disorganisation, almost of disbandment ... from the prosodic point of view' (232–3).

Little is known of Lydgate’s biography (197–8). Much of his work remains available only in manuscript or the editions of the early printers; these seem to offer bad texts which ‘may or may not be due to copyists and printers’ (198). It is difficult to authenticate or to date many of the pieces ascribed to Lydgate (199). Lydgate shows some skill in London Lickpenny, possibly the best of his works, and in PLM; but he is no match for Chaucer (199–200). His two faults are poor prosody and longwindedness (200–1). PLM has some merits, yet lacks Bunyan’s phraseology, lifelike characterizations, and tight control of action (201). FP is very dull (201–2). TG is ‘extremely prosaic.’ LOL has Lydgate’s ‘best and most poetical passages.’ Of Lydgate’s saints’ lives, Saint Margaret is the best; LSEF is ‘feeble’ (203). The Churl and the Bird and HGS are among Lydgate’s most successful pieces. AF is satisfactory; however, it suffers badly in comparison with Robert Henryson’s version. Ballade of the Midsummer Rose, The Prioress and her Three Suitors, and Testament are among Lydgate’s ‘most acceptable work.’ CBK has merit, but it also has Lydgate’s ‘curious flatness’ (204). The more one knows of Lydgate’s work, the more likely one is to dislike it (205).


Spurgeon discusses Lydgate’s praise of Chaucer, and accepts that he knew Chaucer personally (1: xii–xiii). Many of Spurgeon’s Chaucer citations include brief references to Lydgate.

Brief references. Lydgate’s use of headless and broken-backed lines can be cumbersome (252–3).


Seven of Lydgate’s works were printed by Caxton: *The Churl and the Bird* (twice), *Curia Sapientiae* [since removed from the Lydgate canon], *HGS* (twice), *LOL* (twice), *The Pilgrimage of the Soul* [see Hare, 697, for further cross-references regarding the debate about the prose pilgrimage], *SPMD*, and *TG*. De Ricci supplies bibliographic descriptions (74–80). See Bühler, 708, for a minor supplement regarding a fragment of *HGS*.


A stylistic comparison of the *Assembly of Gods* with Lydgate’s acknowledged work shows that he could not be the author of the *Assembly*. The *Assembly of Gods* shows none of the usual features of his style, and it is a much poorer piece of work. The fact that the manuscript evidence credits Lydgate as the author might mean that he coincidently wrote another poem of the same name. See Sieper (458: vi) and Schirmer (757: 275) who also eject the *Assembly* from the Lydgate canon; see Saintsbury, 634, for an earlier dissenting view.

It had been thought that the idea, found in the Macro play of *Mankind*, of tilling the earth to avoid idleness had come from the *Assembly of Gods*. In fact, it is more likely to derive from *Piers Plowman* (339). In her argument, Keiller accepts that the *Assembly* is Lydgate’s; see Sieper, 458, Rudolph, 639, and Schirmer (757: 275) for the rejection of the *Assembly* from the canon.


Lydgate’s pageant for the entry of Margaret of Anjou into London has survived in London, BL, MS Harley 3869, where it is placed just before the manuscript’s text of John Gower’s *Confessio Amantis*. Lydgate’s authorship is established on the grounds of style and the agreement of the manuscript with the record left by John Stow (225). Brown prints the pageant’s text (226–31). He also quotes the accounts left by John Stow, William Gregory, and the *English Chronicle* (231–3). The record left by Gregory, and a gap in Harley 3869, suggest that the manuscript text is incomplete. A comparison of Harley 3869 with Stow’s account indicates that Stow was either working from that manuscript or a very similar text (234). See Kipling, 1013, for the view that the Harley 3869 script is complete, but not by Lydgate; and see Crow, 999, for a discussion of Lydgate’s use of allegory. Withington, 658, notes that another version of the pageant is extant.

The prologue to Chaucer’s *Legend of Good Women* survives in two versions, A-text and B-text. Lydgate echoes the less frequently found A-text in Bk 3 of *TB* (59–61). The A-text is now accepted as Chaucer’s revised version, and Lydgate’s use of it might be evidence that ‘he recognized this text to be the ... more authentic form of Chaucer’s poem.’ This could suggest a ‘personal relationship’ between the two poets (61).


The first 73 lines of *An Holy Medytacion* are a ‘fairly close rendering’ of the opening 60 lines of a 13th-century Latin satiric poem, *De humana miseria tractatus* (283). Brown discusses the parallels and differences between the two pieces to show how a satire became a meditation (282–3). The discovery of the Latin source weakens the supposed extent of Chaucer’s influence on *An Holy Medytacion*. It also weakens the attribution of the English poem to Lydgate because the opening references to springtime in the English version come from the Latin original and not from Chaucer’s *CT* (283–4). The English poem’s composition in couplets would be unusual for a short Lydgate poem (284); the manuscript attribution to Lydgate is weak (284–5); and the evidence of rhyme is not in Lydgate’s favour (285). Brown qualifies his remarks on rhyme in 644.

A continuation of 643. Brown now believes that the rhyme of *An Holy Medytacion* is not inconsistent with Lydgate’s usage, but still maintains that Lydgate is not the author (997–8). The poem’s Latin source itself derives from the *De contemptu mundi sive de miseria conditionis humanae* of Pope Innocent III (1000). In the *Legend of Good Women* Chaucer says that he wrote ‘Of the Wreched Engendring Of Mankinde/ As man may in pope Innocent y-finde’ (1003). The evidence of style, rhyme, and manuscript presentation suggest that it is likely *An Holy Medytacion* is by Chaucer (1004–11). Brown quotes correspondence from Henry Bergen in support of this view (1008–9); and he incidentally suggests an amendment to line 82 (998–1000). See Dempster, 724–5, for a view that does not preclude Lydgate’s authorship; Tatlock, 657, opposes Chaucer’s claim and inclines to that of Lydgate; and Webster, 168, argues for Chaucer’s authorship. Modern scholars have accepted *An Holy Medytacion* into the Lydgate canon; see Schirmer (758: 271) and Pearsall (818: 267).


Brief references in a reply to Dempster, 724. None of Lydgate’s work successfully catches ‘Chaucer’s style and rhythm’ as seen in *An Holy Medytacion*; furthermore, Henry Bergen rejects Lydgate as a possible author of the poem (300).
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See Myche, Say Lytell, and Lerne to Soffer in Tyme is ascribed by Stow to Lydgate and printed among Lydgate’s minor poems by MacCracken [see MacCracken (474: 800–1)], but there is no ‘literary, linguistic or metrical’ evidence that it is Lydgate’s. A 15th-century manuscript, Oxford, Corpus Christi College, MS 203, seems to indicate ‘R. Stokys’ as the author (131). There is evidence of someone of this name holding an administrative post with Chaucer; he may belong to the ‘Chaucerian circle,’ although a conclusive identification is impossible (133).


The references to the Lydgate works provide a manuscript listing and brief publishing history. See Pearsall, 824, for a more recent manuscript listing; Edwards, 892, and Reimer, 1083º, offer a number of corrections to the Index and its Supplement. See Robbins, 772, for the annotation on the Supplement. [Articles offering minor corrections to the Index and its Supplement are not cross-referenced here.]


The 15th century saw an ‘evolution unprecedented and never since renewed in Syntax.’ Lydgate’s English stands between the late ME of Chaucer and the transition ME of Caxton (144). Courmont provides a summary of his research (142–4). Royster, 654, does not
accept Courmont’s conclusions; Schirmer (758: 262), on the other hand, sees Courmont’s study as fundamental.


It is likely that Lydgate dies between 29 September 1449 and Easter 1450. [Pearsall dates Lydgate’s death to the ‘last quarter’ of 1449 (824: 40).]


Moore does not discuss Thomas Chaucer as he probably lived in Oxfordshire (190–2). Lydgate’s *TG* was possibly written for the marriage of William Paston to Agnes Berry, but the evidence of the Paston motto in the poem is inconclusive (193–94). [MacCracken, 626, argues for the Paston marriage theory; Boffey, 1067, disagrees.] Metham’s reference to Lydgate’s death, 512, suggests that he knew Lydgate (200). Metham’s patron, Sir Miles Stapleton, probably knew Lydgate (200–1). Stapleton’s wife, Lady Catherine Stapleton, was the daughter of Sir William de la Pole, Duke of Suffolk, who was interested in Lydgate’s work, although not definitely associated with the composition of any particular piece (201–4). Lydgate’s abbot between 1429 and 1446 was William Curteis, a powerful lord in Norfolk and Suffolk (204). Curteis directed Lydgate to write *LSEF* for Henry VI’s visit during the winter of 1433–4 (204–6), and *De profundis* (206–7).

MacCracken, 471, claims that Cambridge, Trinity College, MS R.3.19 contains many notations by John Stow (539). Not all the manuscript’s notations are in fact by Stow, but the text of two Lydgate fables on folios 236–7, and their ascription to Lydgate, is in Stow’s handwriting (539–40). The principal scribe of MS R.3.19 is also the principal scribe of Cambridge, Trinity College, MS R.3.21 (540).


Studies the degree to which metrical apocopation follows the grammatical loss of final –*e*. Final –*e* is last seen as a ‘living’ usage in Lydgate’s early poetry. Linguistically, Lydgate bridges the medieval and modern worlds (92).


Henry Medwall’s *Nature*, and Lydgate’s *RS* have many points of ‘character, situation, and language’ in common, particularly in their ‘opening scenes’ (189). Medwall takes the ‘starting-point’ for his morality play from Lydgate (199). See Knowlton, 671, who agrees that Lydgate’s influence on Medwall is likely.
Lydgate is the first English writer to make frequent use of the *do* auxiliary. Courmont, 648, notes the use of periphrastic *do* tenses in *TG*, but the conclusions he draws are unreliable (449). If the dating of *AF* to 1387 is to be believed, then Lydgate’s use of the *do* auxiliary at such an early date is unusual. If we cannot accept that Lydgate’s usage with respect to the *do* auxiliary is possible at this time, then the poem’s composition date should be brought forward. *SD* does not exploit the *do* auxiliary but, as this device was probably first used in poetry, this does not weaken the claim for Lydgate’s authorship (450). There are similarities between the use of the *do* auxiliary in Lydgate’s works and in Fragment B of the *Romaunt of the Rose*; however, this is not sufficient to prove Lydgate’s authorship of Fragment B (456). [Lange, 602, argues that Lydgate is the author of Fragment B. Royster’s work continues in 655.]

---.

Periphrastic *do* tenses are not found in *SD*, but they are common in Lydgate’s verse. Lydgate uses them to avoid the third person indicative and perfect forms of verbs that allow ‘slight opportunity’ for rhymes compared to the infinitive forms (69). Royster provides examples from *TG* together with statistical counts from some other poems. Chaucer, Gower, and Hoccleve avoid the use of periphrastic *do* tenses (70). Lydgate seems to have been the first to use a technique that subsequent ‘weak versifiers have found of great help’ (71). See Royster, 654, and Lounsbury, 584.
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A number of brief references to Lydgate in a discussion and source study of works, chiefly dramatic, and generally written in the late 16th and early 17th centuries, that refer to the siege of Troy. It is likely that most uneducated people who knew something of the story of Troy had acquired this knowledge from plays and not from Lydgate, Caxton, or the Greek and Roman originals (674). It is sometimes difficult to tell whether a writer is using Caxton’s Recuyell of the Historyes of Troye or Lydgate’s TB as a source as the two works are very close. Caxton’s book was the easier to read, more available, and more frequently cited of the two. George Peele’s poem, Tale of Troy, may show some indebtedness to Lydgate, but Caxton is a more likely source (681, note 30). The Life and Death of Hector, 421, is little more than a modernization of TB (691–2). The main source for Thomas Heywood’s trilogy, The Golden Age, The Silver Age, and The Brazen Age is certainly Caxton and not Lydgate (719–25). Shakespeare’s Troilus and Cressida more probably echoes Caxton than Lydgate (737); it is certainly a mistake to assume Lydgate is a necessary source for Shakespeare’s play (737–8, note 29). [On this last point, Brandes, 677, agrees, but see Palmer, 1016, for a modern and dissenting opinion.]

657. ———. ‘Has Chaucer’s Wretched Engendering been found?’ Modern Language Notes 51 (1936): 275–84.

A reply to Brown, 643. Tatlock does not set out to prove Lydgate’s authorship of An Holy Meditation, but to disprove Chaucer’s. Nevertheless, he suggests that there is no good reason to doubt the ascription of the Meditation to Lydgate, although it is possible that the poem is by some other follower of Chaucer (276, and note). See Dempster, 724–5, who
argues against Chaucer's authorship, and leaves the matter open regarding Lydgate; and see Webster, 168, who supports Chaucer's claim over that of Hoccleve, Lydgate, or Gower. Modern scholars have accepted An Holy Medytacion into the Lydgate canon; see Schirmer (758: 271) and Pearsall (818: 267).


Brown's text of the pageant for Margaret of Anjou, 641, found in London, BL, MS Harley 3869 fails to note that a fragment of this poem is in MS Harley 542, f. 101a–2b. This manuscript was known in the 19th century (53). Stanzas 41–155, as numbered by Brown, are missing in a manuscript lacuna; nevertheless, it is likely that Stow works from Harley 542 for his account in the Annals at a time when the manuscript is not so defective (54). Withington prints the text from Harley 542 (55–7). See Kipling, 1013, for a related discussion.


Agrees with Chambers, 604, that it is probably Lydgate who introduces allegory and speech to the mumming. Lydgate thereby moves the mumming towards the masque (106–110). Lydgate also brings 'allegory to the pageant' (106). Lydgate's influence on the pageant and masque may have been previously underestimated (107). Withington discusses the pageant on Henry VI's return to London and Margaret of Anjou's entry into London (141–48).

See Metham, 512 for the annotation of *The Romance of Amoryus and Cleopes.* The unique manuscript of Metham's works dates from the mid-15th century (vii–viii). Metham's 'affectionate' reference to Lydgate, and knowledge of his death may indicate a 'personal acquaintance' (xii). [See Moore, 649, and Pearsall (824:40) regarding the date of Lydgate's death.] Some events of *The Romance of Amoryus and Cleopes* clearly show the influence of *TB* (xvii–xix; and notes passim); there may also be echoes of *ST* (161, note to line 928; 162, note to line 1684).


A number of brief references to *TB*.


Lydgate is possibly the closest anyone comes to being a 'professional poet' before the advent of printing (257). *LOL* is the most important of his saints' lives; it shows a 'genuine devotion' that overcomes it occasional literary failings (259). Gerould briefly discusses Lydgate's other saints' lives (260–6).

The expression 'amor hereos' or 'amor ereos,' meaning a kind of love-sickness, occurs in Lydgate's *Fabula duorum mercatorum* for only the second time in English.


Milton might have derived the characteristics of Memnon’s beautiful sister from Lydgate’s description of Memnon’s wife in Bk 5 of *TB*.


There are possible echoes of *TB* in Milton’s *Il Penseroso* and *Comus*.


Items 253 through 272 describe 15th-century Lydgate editions printed by Caxton, de Worde, and Pynson (71–7).

Brief references. Lydgate’s telling of the Criseyde story in *TB* defers to Chaucer’s: nothing new is added. He is very sympathetic to Criseyde and excuses her on the ground that ‘Nature had made her variable’ (387).


A number of references in the course of an early study on the aureate language of the 15th century. Chaucer’s vocabulary is rich in unusual words and provides an example to Lydgate (39ff.). Lydgate’s new words are ‘generally striking and apposite’ (46). Lydgate acknowledges his debt to Chaucer (46–8). Following Chaucer’s example, he does not seem to use an aureate word simply when ‘stuck’ for a rhyme, as later 15th-century writers do (52). Lydgate’s prose *SD* may deliberately prefer aureate diction for its rhythmic effect (56). Court patronage tends to encourage aureate diction; Lydgate’s *Legend of St Margaret* is an example (66–7). Chaucer uses the language best suited to his purposes; his ‘sense of fitness’ brought many new words into English. This example stimulates Lydgate (69). Aureate diction appears odd to us because it did not become part of our tradition (70–2).


Lydgate may not meet the aesthetic tastes of today, yet his role in the transmission of Chaucer’s style and his influence on subsequent writers needs to be noted (60–2). Berdan discusses Lydgate’s influence on the ‘erotic’ and ‘moral’ allegories of the early Tudor period (62ff). Lydgate’s *Devotion of the Fowles* may be the immediate source for the mock religious service at the end of the *Court of Love* (73). Readers in the early 16th century fail to appreciate the music of Chaucer’s verse, and so they do not see the degree of Chaucer’s superiority over Lydgate (56–9).

Offers some corrected readings to Hammond, 447.


Lydgate contributes little that is new to the representation of nature in ME, and follows the model provided by Chaucer and the French tradition; his importance, however, lies in the influence that his work subsequently maintains (192). His most significant poem in this regard is *RS* (193). Here Lydgate presents Nature as, on one side, ‘intellectual and moral’ and, on the other, ‘physical, sensuous, unmoral, and even immoral’ (194). *RS* is likely to be the source for Henry Medwall’s *Nature* as there are many parallels between the two works (194–6). On this last point, see Mackenzie, 653, who argues for Lydgate’s influence on Medwall.

672. **Hibbard, Laura A.** ‘Chaucer’s “Shapen was My Sherte.”’ *Philological Quarterly* 1 (1922): 222–5.

The weaving of a shirt was a metaphor in medieval times for the shaping of destiny. It is used to in lines 489ff of *CBK* (222).

Numerous brief references. Lydgate was possibly the most popular medieval poet writing commissioned pieces (98–103). He wrote for the men and women at court, ecclesiastics, and merchants: he was 'in fashion' (102) and as 'near the professional poet as is found in the Middle Ages' (103).


In considering an emendation from 'sage' to 'fage' at line 531 in *Sir Gawain and the Green Knight*, lines 2051–2 from *ST* are cited for their use of 'fage.' See Onions, 675.


Refers to 674. An example of the use of ‘fage’ that is still closer to that found in *Sir Gawain and the Green Knight* is at line 3811 in *RS*.


Prints the Latin prose *Guy of Warwick*, by Gerardus Cornubiensis, used by Lydgate as the source for his own *Guy of Warwick*.

Brief references. A consideration of the sources for Shakespeare's *Troilus and Cressida* suggests that he did not know *TB* (510). See Palmer, 1016, for a modern and dissenting opinion.


Suggests that Shakespeare took the Gonzago story for *Hamlet* from *FP*, but provides no specific reference. Readers are asked to find the passage for themselves as a test of the author's hypothesis.


It is doubtful that Lydgate knew Chaucer personally (29–31), but he was closely associated with Chaucer's son, Thomas (37–43). Lydgate also knew John Shirley (42, 453–71). A number of Shirley's comments and annotations on Lydgate's work have survived (461–71). Passages in translations made by Shirley suggest that Lydgate died in about 1449 (214). [Pearsall dates Lydgate’s death to the ‘last quarter’ of 1449 (824: 40).] About 30 items in MacCracken's listing of the Lydgate canon are doubtful, and about 15 are very doubtful, including *RS* (468). On balance, Lydgate may well be the author of *PLM* (468–71).

Brief references. Lydgate is remarkable for his 'retrograde tendency'; he marks the point at which 'decomposition overtook English verse' (157).


Rudd makes several references to Lydgate's *At the Departyng of Thomas Chaucyer on Ambassade in to France.* He prints the text of the poem, from Hammond, 448, in Appendix 6 (119–21). Rudd argues that Thomas Chaucer was almost certainly Geoffrey Chaucer's son. Furnivall's claim, 432, that Lydgate's failure to refer to Geoffrey Chaucer in this poem suggests that Thomas is unlikely to have been the poet's son, is weak. In fact, there is no particular need for Lydgate to make the references Furnivall seems to expect (85–6). See Pearsall (824: 20) regarding Thomas Chaucer and Lydgate.


Brief references. Lydgate draws mainly on Isidore of Seville for the view that the classical gods were once mortals who had come to be worshipped after their deaths.

Lydgate is, like Hoccleve, politically conservative and a follower of Chaucer; however, he is more versatile than Hoccleve is and more able to catch Chaucer’s spirit. Neither Hoccleve nor Lydgate succeeds in imitating Chaucer’s metre. Although Lydgate is long-winded, he can be warm and genuine; he acts as a bridge between the Middle Ages and the Renaissance (146–9).


Numerous brief references to the presentation of Fortune in Lydgate’s works as part of a more general survey.

685. **Spindler, Robert, ed.** *The Court of Sapience.* Leipzig: Tauchnitz, 1927.

On the grounds of language, metre, and date, *The Court of Sapience* cannot be by Lydgate. Spindler’s work finally excluded the *Court of Sapience* from the Lydgate canon. See Bühler, 701.
Hawes could recite lengthy passages from Lydgate, whom he seems to regard more highly than Chaucer (xiv). Lydgate can sometimes show Chaucer’s ‘freshness of spirit,’ and in short bursts he can be excellent, but his work is spoiled by its ‘verbosity and ... habitual prosing’ (xv). Hawes is deeply respectful of Lydgate who, although he has been ‘until recently ... unduly depreciated,’ is the worst master Hawes could choose (xli). Hawes is a ‘more careful workman’ than Lydgate, less verbose and a better judge of the ‘fitness of things.’ He lacks, however, the earlier poet’s ‘range,’ ‘humour,’ ‘freshness,’ ‘fluent exuberance,’ and ‘endless productivity’ (xlii). Frequent echoes of Lydgate’s style and usage occur in Hawes’s work (xliv). Lydgate’s influence on Hawes is much greater than Chaucer’s or Gower’s (lxviii).


The *Life and Death of Hector*, based on *TB*, has been traditionally ascribed to Thomas Heywood, 421, but the evidence for his authorship is not conclusive. See Bush, 692, for a supporting view, and see Bergen (463: 67–84) for the ascription to Heywood.

Includes a briefly annotated bibliography of early Lydgate studies and editions, including a number by German scholars that are not included in the present bibliography (228–37).


A study of Lydgate's cultural importance. The publication of *TG* by Schick in 1891, 442, was an important event in Lydgate studies, but little has followed in the following three decades. The publication, however, of *TB* and *FP* by Bergen, 460–7, and of *ST* by Erdmann, 469–70, offers hope of a renewal in interest. Lydgate is the most important writer of his time: he draws together the nature of his period as Alexander Pope and Samuel Johnson do in their age. We have not properly understood Lydgate's importance. *FP* supplies a significant insight into the historical transition from the Middle Ages to the Renaissance. The task is to show how Lydgate embodies the spirit of the new age. There is little material available on the development of humanism in England: it is difficult to know how well readers in the first half of the 15th century understood the meaning of the classical literary legacy. Humanistic knowledge was limited to a few religious orders and locations. The production of translations is an important indicator of the growth of humanism; these were relatively limited as the Church was preoccupied with Lollardy. England was still isolated in spite of the travels of the upper levels of English society, and was decades behind France in its knowledge of humanism. Lydgate's understanding of humanism is limited; he is heavily influenced by his religious beliefs and his secular education is not obvious. The question is to what extent does he move from the medieval Christian view towards the secular view of the individual in the Renaissance? Lydgate in *TB* is capable of a playful intermingling of pagan mythology and Christianity, with a freedom that is unusual for the time; however, of the three works, *ST*, *TB* and *FP*, only the last shows clear signs of humanism. In spite of its Christian moral, it is the first attempt in
English to present the history of the ancient world in overview in a humanistic manner. Lydgate is constrained by his use of intermediary French and Italian texts. The modern critical assessment of Lydgate’s humanistic elements has been hampered by adverse comparison with the much more developed humanism of Boccaccio. Lydgate’s religious outlook clearly conflicts with his leanings to humanism, but the poet takes the side of the humanists and enters into the intellectually progressive viewpoint of his time. Lydgate, unlike Gower or Hoccleve, and in spite of his own religious training, is sympathetic to the heroic and tragic aspects of pagan Rome, particularly self-sacrifice in the name of the state. He understands the spirit of the classical age and assists in its popularization.


Chaucer says that he took Statius and ‘Corinne’ as his authorities for *Anelida and Arcite*. The identification of ‘Corinne’ is uncertain (106). In *TB*, however Lydgate refers to ‘Corrynne’ in a list of well known authors and fictional characters who had been associated with sorrow. Lydgate’s list may be a traditional one that could have been known to Chaucer in a similar form (106–7).


Brief references to Lydgate and his influence. *TB* is the main source for Sir John Ogle’s *The Lamentation of Troy*, published in 1594 (309). See Wilson, 806, for a supporting view in his edition of Ogle’s work.


The name ‘Bycorne’ is related to that of a two-horned monster in modern French dialects, but it is not certain if it is the ancestor of the modern counterpart or if both derive from an older source.


Tyson briefly describes the manuscripts held by the library; two of these relate to Lydgate. Item one in the list refers to the present Manchester Univ., John Rylands Lib., MS English 1, which gives a text for *TB*; item two refers to the present Manchester Univ., John Rylands Lib., MS English 2, which gives a text for *FP* (156).

Lydgate lacks Chaucer’s lightness of touch, yet he is ‘not always painstakingly dull’ (88). RS and TG show an occasional ‘spontaneous fancy’ at work (89).


An inventory taken in 1545 for Markeaton Hall refers to the presence there of a manuscript of *TB*. There is ‘little doubt’ that this manuscript is now Manchester Univ., John Rylands Lib., MS English 1 (137). Clark-Maxwell traces the known history of the manuscript’s ownership (137–40). See Robertson, 813, for a related discussion.


Attributes to Lydgate an English prose translation, published by Caxton in June 1483, of Guillaume de Deguileville’s *Pelerinage de l’Ame*. This attribution is rejected by Schick (442: ci–ciii) and by McGerr, 338*; Schirmer discusses the matter briefly (758: 122). See Doyle, 217, for cross-references to the debate regarding Hoccleve’s authorship.


Dunbar owes little to Chaucer, and it used to be thought he is indebted to French poets such as Alain Chartier, Charles of Orleans and Villon. In fact, Lydgate is the major influence on
his work. The evidence of this is seen across his satires, the *Lament for the Makaris* (which
echoes Lydgate's *Testament, DM, and TMC.M*), other moral poetry, vocabulary, aureate
diction, and figures of speech. Lydgate was generally admired in Scotland. Dunbar takes
'almost three times as many words from Lydgate as he [does] from Chaucer' (223). See
Nichols, 699, Hyde, 779, Jack, 912, Zettersten, 992, and Ting, 1058, for further discussion.

699. ———. 'Lydgate's Influence on the Aureate Terms of the Scottish Chaucerians.'

Lydgate's aureate diction has a greater influence on the Scottish Chaucerians than
Chaucer's does. Lydgate and the Scots poets share a 'fondness for far-fetched epithets and
Latinizations' that are hardly found in Chaucer (518). Contemporary opinion suggests that
Lydgate, not Chaucer, was seen as the foremost exponent of aureate diction, and an
examination of Dunbar's vocabulary shows more words introduced by Lydgate than words
first found in Chaucer. See Nichols, 698, for further discussion.

700. **Bone, Gavin.** 'Extant Manuscripts Printed from by W. de Worde with Notes on the

A manuscript of *ST*, Oxford, St John's College, MS 266, formerly owned by Roger
Thorney, shows clear evidence of having been used as an early printer's copy (286–7). The
manuscript was overlooked by Erdmann and Ekwall, 469–70, for their edition of *ST* (287).
The text matches fairly closely that of de Worde's first edition, 388, of c.1500 (288–9). It
seems that the early printers occasionally have access to expensive manuscripts in the
hands of well-off collectors; the manuscripts would be returned to their owners with only
minimal signs of having been marked-up during the printing process (305). See Simpson,
721, on the technical significance of de Worde's use of the ST' manuscript, and Blake, 849, who comments on Bone's article.


Brief references. Acknowledges that the *Court of Sapience*, as a result of Spindler's edition, 685, has now been excluded from the Lydgate canon (9).


Lydgate’s *Verses on the Kings of England*, written in ‘fifteen practically worthless stanzas in rhyme royal,’ is printed by James Gairdner in *The Historical Collections of a Citizen of London in the Fifteenth Century* [not annotated] with the text based mainly on Oxford, Bodleian Lib., MS Ashmole MS 59. This manuscript dates to 1461 (47). Dublin, Trinity College, MS 516 gives another text, dating from ‘not much later than 1442,’ for the *Kings of England* that is not noted in MacCracken’s listing of manuscripts for the Lydgate canon, 471 (48). The Trinity College manuscript also contains Lydgate’s *Dietary*, a poem that Halliwell, 425, prints from another copy. Bühler offers a number of readings for the two poems from the Trinity College manuscript that are not found in the published versions (48–50).

New York, Pierpont Morgan Lib., MS 4 has been overlooked by modern editors such as MacCracken, 474, and Erdmann and Ekwall, 469–70, as well as by the usual bibliographic references. Bühler describes the manuscript (1–2). Aside from Chaucer’s *Compleynt un-to his purse*, it also contains *ST* and the *Letter to Gloucester*, and a work titled *A lenvoye to all prynces and lordes that be dysposyd to be lecherous* which is actually eleven stanzas formed of lines taken from *FP* (2). Bühler prints the text of the *Letter to Gloucester* (2–4) in order to ‘complete the list of variant readings’ found in MacCracken, 474 (2). He discusses Lydgate’s use of the word ‘Bokellersebery’ in line 43 (4–5). A listing of the variant readings supplied by this manuscript for *ST* ‘awaits a publisher,’ but the Morgan MS is closest to Oxford, Christ Church, MS 152, followed by Cambridge, Magdalene College, Pepys MS 2011. The contents of the Pepys and Morgan manuscripts are identical except that Pepys 2011 does not contain Chaucer’s *Compleynt un-to his purse* (2).


Sheets from *LOL* had been found in the binding of a Caxton edition of Boethius (155). Duff, 666, concludes that these are ‘cancelled’ sheets (164); it is more likely that they belong to an edition of *LOL* that has since been lost (166). See Bosanquet, 732, for further debate, and see 705 for Bühler’s subsequent reply.


Part 2 of this article (268–71) is a reply to Bosanquet, 732. Bosanquet’s premise is based on the position of the watermark in the paper used by Caxton: he is wrong both with regard
to the inferences he draws from this and in his assumption that the watermark is always placed in the centre of a page.


A unique perfect copy has survived from each of Caxton’s two known editions of The Churl and the Bird: one is in Cambridge University Library; and the other is in the Pierpont Morgan Library, New York. Critics had previously agreed that the Cambridge and Morgan versions were the first and second editions respectively. In fact, a textual comparison suggests that the Morgan version represents the first edition.


The rhyme scheme shows that some lines are out of order in stanza 24 of The Churl and the Bird as printed by MacCracken, 474.


A fragment from Caxton’s first edition of HGS, 378, in the British Library was overlooked by de Ricci, 638. Bühler speculates as to why Caxton discarded it.

It had been thought that Wynkyn de Worde unwittingly printed *HGS* from a Caxton edition that had a leaf missing. In fact, there were two leaves missing from the Caxton edition used by de Worde.


Summarizes the events of St Edmund's life as found in *LSEF* (101–3). Lydgate is likely to have known the version of the St Edmund legend in Oxford, Bodleian Lib., Bodley MS 240 (100); he adds little of substance to the story as it is there found. Nevertheless, his retelling is 'highly ornate ... full of classical and biblical allusions, as well as other stylistic details' absent from the Bodley version (103).


Brief references. Wayland's edition of *FP*, 414, was intended to have a supplement dealing with tragic English figures but, for whatever reason, does not. Subsequently, these lives were published as *The Mirror for Magistrates*. A copy of Wayland's edition in the Dyce Collection has an apparently unique title page that refers to the inclusion of these lives. See Campbell, 736, for further discussion.
Lydgate’s poem, *On the English Title to the Crown of France*, written at the instigation of the Duke of Bedford, is a translation of a French original. It is intended to accompany a picture showing the claim of Henry VI to the thrones of France and England. A copy of this picture survives. The picture and poem are meant to be propaganda for the English cause (78). Rowe prints extracts from Lydgate’s poem and the French original to demonstrate the relationship between the two (84–8). See McKenna, 839, for further examples of Lydgate’s propaganda; and see Pearsall, 824, and Fisher, 1098, for further discussion of Lydgate’s relationship to the Lancastrians.

Folios 76r to 90v of London, BL, MS Harley 2407 provide a text of *The Churl and the Bird* unnoted by MacCracken, 474, and Hammond, 454. It is the same as Hammond’s text, except that the first four stanzas are missing and eight additional stanzas are included (seven between stanzas 35 and 36, and one between stanzas 40 and 41). With the exception of the four missing stanzas, it is the same as the text that Ashmole prints 422 (90–1). Bowers prints the eight additional stanzas with notes (91–4).

The *Dance of Death* genre finds many expressions during the Middle Ages. Bowers sets out to list the 'literary antecedents, ideas, motifs and possible sentiments arising from contemporary social conditions' that stand behind Lydgate's poem (115). He briefly discusses these under the headings 'Literary Traditions,' 'Cultural Sentiment,' and 'Historical Circumstances.' We do not know how Lydgate's contemporaries reacted to his work: the most prudent hypothesis is that 'it must have affected different persons in different ways' (128).


Lydgate's *Order of Fools* belongs to the genre of 'fool satire': it lists 'antisocial behaviour and ... proclaims the practitioners thereof eligible for membership in a fraternity of fools.' Bowers briefly discusses some other examples of the genre (535). It has not been noted previously that item number 1135 in the *Index to Middle English Verse*, 647, piece 17 in London, BL, MS Harley 374, is not an anonymous poem but stanzas 6, 10, 12, 13, and 14 from the *Order of Fools*, possibly transcribed by John Stow (535–6). Bowers lists the 'important variants' provided by the new manuscript (536).


Refers to the manuscripts and published versions of *DM* in a discussion of English references and representations in that tradition (139–46).

Brief references. *Peter Idley's Instructions to His Son* draws on a number of passages from *FP* (49–50).


A description of all the woodcuts used by William Caxton, Wynkyn de Worde, Richard Pynson, and the lesser-known early printers.


Brief references. It is likely that the *Mirror for Magistrates* is first printed in 1554 as an intended supplement to an edition of *FP* also printed in that year. See Campbell, 736, for further discussion of the printing history of the *Mirror.*


Lydgate develops his metrical line-types by applying a set caesura and then following the conventions that were familiar to him from ME fourteen syllable and alexandrine lines (26–8). It is false to claim that Lydgate derives his metre directly from Chaucer (37–40).
In a ‘Note on Lydgate’s use of the line-types,’ Pyle argues that Lydgate’s past editors go too far in praising the metrical smoothness of the poet’s verse. An examination of Lydgate’s use of the line-types suggests that he is insensitive to both their employment and metrical units longer than the line (41–53).


Drawing on Bone, 700, Simpson discusses the significance of de Worde’s use of Oxford, St John’s College, MS 266 for his first edition of ST, 388 (57–9).


Two stanzas of lyrics best preserved in Oxford, Bodleian Lib., MS Bodley 3896 occur in whole or part in a number of other manuscripts. In London, BL, MS Add. 34360 one of the stanzas occurs with the title ‘The question of halsam’ (362). Both stanzas are also found at the beginning of a poem by Lydgate. The evidence suggests that Lydgate is not the author of the stanzas, but borrows them for his own use (364). Critical opinion on this has been divided in the past (364–5). It may be possible to identify Halsam (365–71). [Edwards, 876, refers to another copy of the Halsam verses.]

The verb ‘bask’ first occurs in John Gower’s *Confessio Amantis*, but it gains currency in English by Lydgate’s subsequent use of it. It is not certain that Lydgate correctly interprets its meaning.


The evidence against Chaucer having written *An Holy Medytacion* does not preclude the case for Lydgate’s authorship. Nevertheless, Brown, 643–4, thinks that it is unlikely that Lydgate wrote the poem. The question of whether *An Holy Medytacion* could have been written by Lydgate is a matter which ‘must be left for Lydgate specialists to investigate’ (295). See Brown, 645, for a reply; Tatlock, 657, inclines to Lydgate’s authorship of the piece; Webster, 168, supports Chaucer’s claim over that of Hoccleve, Lydgate, or Gower. Modern scholars have accepted *An Holy Medytacion* into the Lydgate canon; see Schirmer (758: 271) and Pearsall (818: 267). Discussion continues in Dempster, 725.


Discussion continued from Dempster, 724. There is no reason to believe that Chaucer wrote *An Holy Medytacion*, and the available evidence argues that he did not; the poem is probably the work of one of his admirers.

Ch. 4 is entitled ‘Falls of Princes: Chaucer and Lydgate’ (129–72). Lydgate makes a contribution to the development of Elizabethan tragedy on two fronts. Firstly, by his translation of Boccaccio’s *De casibus virorum illustrium*; and secondly, by his introduction into his translation of the notion that worldly retribution may follow evil conduct (160–2). Lydgate’s zeal for ‘schematic retribution,’ however, shows a moral view ‘far less perceptive of life’s complexity’ than that held by Boccaccio and Chaucer (165). Nevertheless, Lydgate sometimes acknowledges the role of misfortune (166). *The Mirror for Magistrates,* and the tragic poems that follow it, overshadow *FP* (278). See Kelly, 945, for a dissenting view to the effect that Lydgate is less schematic in his notion of tragedy than Farnham suggests.


McGarry makes a number of generally brief illustrative references to Lydgate; however, she offers a more extended discussion of his poems *The Interpretation and Virtues of the Mass* and *An exortacion to Prestys when they shall sey theyr Masse* (95–102), and *A Procession of Corpus Christi* (161–3).

Two poems are printed by MacCracken, 474, under the single heading of 'Death's Warning' (377). Metre, rhyme and style, however, argue against Lydgate's authorship (379). It is probable that the real author is the 'John Lucas' cited by the manuscript (382–3). MacCracken is also wrong in saying that some of the poems' stanzas come from FP (383).


References to Lydgate in a discussion of the importance of patronage and financial security to the early authors. Many writers enjoyed the support of an ecclesiastic office, but even they found that the Church had limits on its resources, and so sought they out patrons (12). Lydgate lacks any poetic merit; however, he is an example of a writer successfully using patrons (13–15).


Lydgate would have spent the bulk of his life in the seclusion of his religious order (138). [See Knowles, 780, for further views on this.] In a survey of Lydgate's longer works there is little to praise (138–40). Lydgate's religious lyrics, in particular the *Testament*, are better than most of Lydgate's work as 'real religious fervour gives some excitement to his verse' (141). Lydgate's style is marred by the prolixity and poor diction that are indicative of his limited poetic skills (141–4). He has no feeling for syntax (144–5). Schick, 442, and Lewis, 158, have written to explain the line characteristics of Lydgate's verse, but his metre remains poor under any interpretation. He does not have Chaucer's command of large
paragraph units or ability to match metre with meaning (145–6).


Several brief references to Lydgate’s work. The fact that the early printers often chose to publish the works of Lydgate instead of Chaucer is evidence that their customers could not discern that Chaucer was the better poet (147).


Takes issue with Bühler, 704. A simple printer’s error is likely to have made it necessary to reset the sheet in question for the whole edition. This would explain the different orthography of this sheet when compared to the rest of the edition (363). See Bühler, 705, for a reply.


Brief references to Lydgate’ *Secretum* as a work within the *mirror* genre.
LYDGATE: GENERAL REFERENCES


TB is primarily drawn from Guido della Colonna’s Historia destructionis Troiae; it is a myth that Lydgate is substantially ‘indebted to French sources in amplifying the account of Guido’ (25). Ovid’s Metamorphoses is Lydgate’s second source for factual material (27–33). Minor references are taken from Jacobus Vitriacus, Isidore of Seville, and Fulgentius (34). The works of Chaucer are a further source and fall into two categories: extracts from classical authors adapted by Chaucer (35–6); and ‘fine phrases and descriptive passages’ (36). Lydgate’s use of Chaucer’s reading of Virgil is notable (37–40): in the case of the Dido legend, Lydgate seems to be ‘mainly, if not entirely, dependent’ on Chaucer’s knowledge of Virgil (40). Lydgate’s borrowings from Chaucer, unlike those from the other minor sources, go beyond ‘facts’ and extend to ‘inspiration, literary ambition, and a large body of poetic conceptions’ (42).


Discusses the musical setting of two lines [latter identified as coming from TG] in a chanson found in a European manuscript in the library of the Escorial, Madrid. See Fallows, 977–8, Tiner, 1125, and Carnahan, 1127.


Campbell’s introduction traces the complicated printing history of The Mirror for Magistrates, and its conception as a continuation of FP (3–60). The subject of the Mirror
extends beyond princes to include the fall of ‘any which might teach useful political lessons’ (55); the *Mirror* also introduces a discussion of ‘current political philosophy’ and ‘divine justice’ (56).


See Lewis, 158, for an annotation.

738. **Webster, Mildred.** ‘The Vocabulary of “An Holy Medytacion.”’ *Philological Quarterly* 17 (1938): 359–64.

Webster matches samples of vocabulary taken from Chaucer, Gower, Hoccleve, and Lydgate against *An Holy Medytacion*. The results support the argument for Chaucer’s authorship. See Brown, 643–5, who inclines in favour of Chaucer’s authorship of *An Holy Medytacion*, for further discussion and cross-references to the debate on this poem.


The *Dietary*, *SPMD*, and *Doctrine for Pestilence* are found in a medieval leechbook, MS number 4, kept in the Army Medical Museum and Library, Washington (384).

Brief references to Lydgate. Lydgate typifies the 'wordy weakness' of writers in the 15th century who take such wordiness to be a 'virtue' (285). Renwick and Orton supply brief biographical and bibliographic details (284–5).


Manly and Rickert make numerous brief references to Lydgate's work, mainly in vol. 1 of their study in the course of the CT manuscript descriptions.


Brief references. Lydgate writes *SD* at the instigation of Humphrey, Duke of Gloucester who fears for England's political stability following the death of Henry V in 1422 when Henry VI was only nine months old. *SD* is reprinted in the year of Queen Elizabeth I's first parliament because there were again fears of civil disturbance (204–5).

Brief references. As the power of the Church weakens in the late Middle Ages, the didactic importance of literature is greatly increased; and, with the rise of nationalism, more attention is paid to the moral education of the prince. Boccaccio’s *De casibus virorum illustrium* is the clearest example of this development. Lydgate’s translation is the main vehicle for the dissemination of Boccaccio’s book in England (27–9). The *Mirror for Magistrates* is ‘advertised’ as a continuation of *FP* because Lydgate remains popular in the mid-16th century. Lydgate’s morality in *FP* is still not ‘out of date’ in the 16th century: it gives more of a renaissance perspective than Chaucer does by virtue of its derivation from Boccaccio (72).


Brief references. Parts of *TB* that deal with attitudes towards women provide hints of the ‘human consideration’ that by early Tudor times would ‘change the chivalric into the courtly ideal’ (31). Some of Lydgate’s work based on Boccaccio shows the transfer of ‘seriousness’ from the church to secular affairs that is characteristic of the shift from a medieval to renaissance outlook (75).


Lydgate looks back to Chaucer, but some of his ideas on poetry’s goals recall Petrarch and Boccaccio, and ‘look forward in a new way to the Renaissance.’ He is a ‘massive figure and quite central to the English literary tradition’ (172); this is in spite of his ‘usual poetical mediocrity’ (173). Tillyard then discusses *PLM* (173–6): it could have been the ‘stuff’ of
epic had there been a poet equal to the task (174). It is likely that Spenser’s Faerie Queene owes something to PLM. Shakespeare’s Troilus and Cressida shows a knowledge of TB (175). Malory’s prose is a ‘much finer ... instrument’ than Lydgate’s verse, and Malory has much the better understanding of ‘violent action’ (176). Lydgate suffers from ‘medieval prolixity’; nevertheless, he sustains the ‘medieval epic theme of the soul’s pilgrimage’ and introduces Petrarch and Boccaccio’s innovative ‘ideas governing the serious narrative’ into England (201). The prologue to TB shows a little of the ‘new and grimmer ethical temper that was to mark the neo-classic epic’; the poem itself aims to be ‘exemplary’ (202).


[There are several references to Lydgate in the introduction to Utley’s bibliographic work; these are followed by numerous references in the body of the work proper. In his introduction, Utley stresses the complexity of the issues that drive the medieval debate on women, and argues against placing too much individual emphasis on any of the traditional theories about the genesis of the debate. He includes among the latter theories those that tie the debate to the period of the Middle Ages, the influence of oriental culture, the asceticism of the Church, the bourgeoisie, or the personal experiences of the poets concerned. Utley points to the existence of other factors that should also be considered, such as Greek and Roman culture, sex antagonism, a desire for entertainment, and, especially, the psychology of courtly love.] It is unlikely that satires on women were driven by clerical bias (14). One must remember when reading Lydgate’s supposedly antifeminist jibes that women were part of his audience: such jibes rely on complex irony. Lydgate’s master in this is Chaucer (26–7). Lydgate is a continuator of Chaucer’s technique and subject matter (55–6). The fact that Lydgate both satirizes and defends women
Lydgate is a result of his wish to 'please everybody and to cultivate all the traditional genres' (60). Lydgate is not as deep and skilful as Chaucer is, but he may be as important in transmitting the genre of formal satire and defence for the following two hundred years (60–1). The gender debate is strongly represented in the manuscript anthologies dating from the second half of the 15th century; this representation is the result of the combined influence of Chaucer, Lydgate, and the French contributors to the debate (61–2).


Henryson’s *Testament of Cresseid* possibly takes some of its detail for the celestial trial scene from the *Assembly of Gods*. If this is so, Henryson improves on his source. [The *Assembly* is not now in the Lydgate canon: see Sieper, 458, for discussion and cross-references.]


Lydgate is called a ‘voluminous, prosaic and drivelling monk’ by Ritson, and ‘each epithet of that summary judgment can be defended.’ He shows occasional faint signs of his master’s humour, but entirely lacks his ‘vigour, pathos and vivacity.’ His best work is in *LOL. AF, Churl and the Bird*, and *HGS* show Lydgate’s talent for beast fables (84). He is the prime example of the ‘medieval mind in poetry’ (85). [This entry is essentially repeated in the 1970 edition.]
The verse of the 15th century generally does not break ‘new ground’ as it continues the pattern established in the previous century (288). Baugh gives a brief summary of Lydgate’s life and major poems (295–6). *FP* is Lydgate’s ‘most tedious’ work; it is hard to know how his readers ‘endured’ it (296).

Most of Lydgate’s references to science and medicine are in his minor poems (404–13). Lydgate lacks the humorous, intelligent, and exalted moments of Robert Henryson (413–4). He is also ‘less systematic’ and ‘gifted’ than John Gower. Lydgate is aware of science, but his main interest is in political and social issues (414).

John Heywood’s *A Mery Play betwene the Pardoner and the Frere, the Curate and Neybour* has the Pardoner and Friar quarrel. By contrast, Chaucer places quarrels between the Friar and the Summoner, and the Pardoner and the Host (55). The prologue to *ST* shows the same displacement found in Heywood. This suggests that Heywood may be influenced by a ‘recent reading of, or a more thorough acquaintance with, Lydgate’s poem’ (56).

In Bk 2 of *TB*, Lydgate speculates about the origins of chess and refers to Guido della Colonna and Jacque de Vitry. His citation of de Vitry as a source is misleading: in fact, he draws on Jacobus de Cessolis’s *De ludo scacchorum* (87). At about the time Lydgate is writing *TB*, Hoccleve correctly refers in *RP* to de Cessolis’s work on the origins of chess. Lydgate’s error shows that for his purposes, and for those of his readers, ‘one learned name served as well as another’ (88).

753. **Clark, James M.** *The Dance of Death in The Middle Ages and Renaissance.* Glascow: Jackson, 1950.

Generally brief references to *DM* in a discussion of the *Dance of Death* tradition.


The list of Chaucer’s works found in the prologue to *FP* is an important source for establishing the Chaucer canon. It includes three that Chaucer himself does not specifically mention and two that seem to have been lost. The list, however, gives the impression that the Chaucer canon is substantially larger than it is and this encouraged false attribution to Chaucer (466–7). At least 17 of Lydgate’s poems were once attributed to Chaucer; this is evidence of Lydgate’s close imitation of Chaucer (477–8). False attribution was also encouraged when Lydgate’s poems were frequently bound in
manuscript with Chaucer’s works, and when Chaucer’s name was linked with Lydgate’s during the 15th and 16th centuries (480).


An examination of the catalogue of ships found in the prose work, *The Sege of Troye,* tends to support the view that *The Sege of Troye* is based on *TB* and not Guido della Colonna’s *Historia destructionis Troiae.*


A number of generally brief references to Lydgate. The fact that Lydgate writes works in the ‘utterly decorous and artificial’ French lyric style suggests that the Church sees such things as harmless (2). His ‘prosodical anarchy’ is puzzling in the light of Hoccleve’s ‘meticulousness’ (104). Lydgate and Hoccleve share a ‘common mediocrity’; they are typical of their time; and neither sees the potential power of the lyric (134). Aureation is an ‘extreme stylistic affectation’ (137). There are some good points to *A Gentlewoman’s Lament, LOL,* and *CBK.* *A Praise of Peace* is ‘didactic and sententious’ (138). The *Ballade on an Ale-Seller* is ‘Lydgate’s most honest lyrical piece’ (139).
Some of Lydgate's religious and courtly poems closely recall Chaucer, but the application of aureate style to history in *FP* produces a 'wholly different world' that is a precursor to Sackville and the *Mirror for Magistrates*. Boccaccio's *De casibus virorum illustrium* has a 'revolutionary sting' in its portrayal of the fall of the great; the learned additions of Laurent de Premierfait's translation produce a bulkier, but less interesting work (105). Lydgate's translation of Laurent's version is different again: initially moralizing on the lessons of history, he moves by Bk 3 to historiography (106). His emphasis on the lessons of history caught the attention of the editors of the *Mirror for Magistrates* (108). Lydgate's treatment of the rise and fall of the great, continued in the *Mirror for Magistrates*, is ultimately found in Shakespeare's history plays. He is seen better as a 'pioneer' than Ritson's 'drivelling monk' (110).

Schirmer concentrates on putting Lydgate's work, which he sees as a precursor to the Renaissance, in an historical context. Lydgate is the 'most representative poet' of the 15th century, but he also shows the 'first tender shoots of a new literary epoch' (xiii). In addition to biographical and historical background, Schirmer discusses Lydgate's major genres. His borrowings from the 'humanistic world of antiquity' for use in saints' legends show Lydgate as the 15th century's 'greatest innovator' (172). Lydgate seeks to 'restore the
sacred character of the religious lyric,' and this brings to his work in this genre solemnity, reserve, abstraction, and an elevated diction. In doing this he moves beyond the conventions of the religious verse of the Middle Ages (197). *FP* is his 'greatest work,' the 'epic' of his 'war-torn century' (206).

-----Review by J.B. Trapp of the German edition, *Review of English Studies* NS 4 (1953): 371–2. The book may be overly condensed; and its structural divisions tend not to lead to a coherent picture of the subject, although the individual sections may be useful in themselves (371). More reference to the manuscript and early printing history would have been useful in assessing Lydgate's influence and reputation. There are a number of incorrect citations. Even with its defects, Schirmer's work is a 'painstaking and admirable ... handbook' (372).

-----Review by J. Norton-Smith, *English Studies* 45 (1964): 91–2. The biography of the poet and the criticism of his writing are not sufficiently worked together, and neither is explored deeply enough (91–2). Nevertheless, Schirmer's analysis of *SD* is 'masterly,' and his coverage of the religious lyrics and saints' legends is valuable (92).

-----Review by Alain Renoir, *JEGP* 63 (1964): 767–70. A satisfactory translation; Schirmer's work is the 'most important and challenging book about Lydgate and his period' (770).


Brief references. Lydgate's *Fifteen Signs Before Doomsday* follows what is known as the 'Voragine' text.
760. **Klinefelter, Ralph A.** ‘Lydgate’s “Life of Our Lady” and the Chetham MS. 6709.’
*Papers of the Bibliographic Society of America* 46 (1952): 396–7

The text of *LOL* in Manchester, Chetham Lib., MS 6709 is a copy taken from Caxton’s 1484 edition of the poem, 384.


Brief references. A ‘recently discovered manuscript,’ Rome, Venerable English College, MS 1306 contains, among other items, some Lydgate pieces including *LOL* and *DM*. The manuscript has an ‘interesting text’ of *The Siege of Calais* (889). See Klinefelter, 762, and Robbins, 771.


Describes the contents of the recently discovered manuscript, Rome, Venerable English College, MS 1306. The manuscript contains, among other pieces, some Lydgate items: *LOL*; *King Henry VII’s triumphal Entry into London*; *A Pageant of Knowledge*; *Four Thinges That Make a Man to Falle*; *Ballad of Good Counsel*; *A Treatise of a Gaunt* (a possible Lydgate piece); *The Pain and Sorrow of Evil Marriage*; *The Dietary*, and *DM*. See Robbins, 771, for a further description of the manuscript.
Lydgate’s astronomical references in TG are inaccurate and do not allow the poem to be dated. TB may be dated to 3 November 1412 (252–3). The date of Lydgate’s fictional meeting with the Canterbury pilgrims in ST may be dated precisely to 27 April 1421 (253–6). The Title and Pedigree of Henry VI dates to 28 July 1426 (256–8). That some of Lydgate’s astronomical references are inaccurate could be explained if he is using unreliable tables or taking his own measurements (258).

Lines 387–98 of ST give the horoscope at the birth of Edippus with the conclusion that the child would kill his father. The horoscope replaces the oracular prophecy, which may have been less creditable for a medieval audience, in Lydgate’s sources (117). The horoscope, however, does not accord with that traditionally given for sons who kill their fathers. It has only the appearance of being ‘appropriate’ which suggests that Lydgate did not research it deeply (122).

Proposes January or February 1415 as the composition date for LOL; this is in place of the date of 1421–22 suggested by Lauritis, Klinefelter, and Gallagher (492: 6). [A number of
dates have been suggested for LOL as Pearsall, who leaves the matter open, observes (824: 19–20). Schick puts forward 1409–11 (442: cviii); Norton-Smith points to a date after 1434 (496: 155).


Brief references. A stanza from FP (Bk 2, lines 4432–8) occurs in National Library of Wales, MS Porkington 10 at folio 198 (62).


Brief references. Two of Skelton’s elegies and three of his prayers are ‘clearly in the fifteenth-century literary manner, the manner of Lydgate.’ This traits of this manner include: moral instruction treated as the function of literature; a ‘lack of imagery’ (29); a typically medieval ‘rhetoric of abstractions’; and the ‘personifications ... found in late medieval allegory’ (30). Skelton’s later work abandons this style.


Rickert describes miniatures found in London, BL, MS Harley 2278. These miniature recall some aspects of the Continental International style (198, 202). The miniature showing Lydgate presenting his book to Henry IV is reproduced in black and white as plate
175a. The miniature in London, BL, MS Harley 4826, ‘The Pilgrim,’ (reproduced in black and white as plate 176) showing Lydgate presenting the work to Thomas Montacute, Earl of Salisbury, is a good example of the ‘tinted outline style producing vividly modelled heads’ that may have originated at Bury St Edmunds (199).


The Findern Anthology, Cambridge, Univ. Lib., MS Ff.i.6, among other items contains four poems accepted as Lydgate’s: Wicked Tongue; The Tongue; Complaint; and Treatise for Washerwomen. Except for the first, these are unique texts (611). Chaucer, Gower, Hoccleve, and Lydgate appear to have been the only major poets of the 15th century aside from Langland (611–12). Robbins describes the manuscripts contents, and he provides historical background on the Findern family.


London, BL, MS Harley 2251 and MS Add. 34360 preserve an epitaph for Humphrey, Duke of Gloucester. Modern scholars are right to say that it is not by Lydgate (242). The most certain evidence against Lydgate’s authorship is the piece’s tone (247). Robbins prints the text for the first time (243–7). While speculating on how the epitaph may have been first used, Robbins notes that Lydgate’s Image of Pity, Our Lady and Verses on the Kings of England may have been posted in a hall or church (28).

Provides a detailed description of the contents of Rome, Venerable English College, MS 1306, with historical commentary, and prints the text of a previously unpublished poem from the manuscript. The manuscript resembles a large number of ‘Lydgate collections, generally about the same date [second half of the 15th century], built around the *Life of Our Lady*’ (131). [Rome, Venerable English College, MS 1306 is first noted by Klinefelter, 762.]


Numerous references to the Lydgate manuscripts and printed editions in a supplement to Brown, 647. See Pearsall, 824, for a recent listing; Edwards, 892, and Reimer, 1083*, offer a number of corrections to the Index and Supplement. [Articles offering minor corrections are not cross-referenced here.]


Corrects an error in the Robbins-Cutler *Supplement to the Index of Middle English Verse*, 772. Item number 3926.5 lists, as a separate work, a brief poem found in Trinity College Dublin, MS 423 D.4.3; in fact, the poem is taken from the beginning of Bk 3 of *LOL*.


*ST* is a ‘courtesy book ... masquerading as a tragic history’ (232). It is so heavily indebted to Chaucer that it could ‘never stand alone’ (234). Chaucer’s genius has so crafted the fabliau that it is impossible for the writers who follow him to make the genre their own (243).


Southworth challenges the traditional scansion of Chaucerian verse by stress and syllable count; instead, he reads lines rhythmically with regard to the duration of syllables, as in classical Greek or Latin, using musical notation. The constant pronunciation of final –e is not supported by the manuscript evidence and is unnecessary. Viewed rhythmically, Lydgate’s lines read well: indeed, they read all too smoothly and lack sufficient variation (78). Lydgate’s supposedly broken-backed lines have been assumed to follow from his misunderstanding of the pronunciation of final –e in Chaucer’s verse; in fact, Lydgate is simply using the virgule inflexibly (80).

Brief references in a further discussion of the rhythmic reading of Chaucerian verse.


A study of valentine and other courtly poems from the 14th and 15th centuries shows that Chaucer’s eagles in the *Parlement of Foules* are not as humble as they should be (546–7). Stillwell cites Lydgate’s *Lover’s New Year’s Gift, Valentine to Her that Excelleth All, To My Sovereign Lady*, and (in particular) *Flour of Curtesye* in support of this view (553–7). One cannot always be sure that Lydgate and his contemporaries correctly interpret Chaucer (555).


Brief references. A discussion mainly of Chaucer’s use and adaptation of the traditional ideals of feminine beauty. Lydgate’s descriptions in *TB* of female beauty conform to the traditional model (269).
Nichols, 698–9, proves that Dunbar takes a number of expressions in his poems praising the Virgin from Lydgate. He does not mention, however, that nearly all of these expressions were not devised by Lydgate, but were part of a ‘common stock’ with its source in the ‘liturgy and patristic commentary’ (252). A number of Lydgate’s aureate terms in the Ballade at the Reverence of Our Lady seem to come by direct or free translation from part of the Anticlaudianus by Alanus de Insulis (252–4). Hyde provides a table of parallel Latin and English terms; these instances offer a clear example of Lydgate’s ‘halff chongyd Latyne’ as described by Metham, 512 (253).

Brief references. Lee, 586, thinks that Lydgate spends the bulk of his adult life at court in England and France; Bennett (730: 138) assumes that Lydgate’s life is passed almost entirely within a religious house. It is likely that Lee is closer to the truth than Bennett (273–4). [See Pearsall for a more recent consideration of Lydgate’s circumstances that argues that one should be cautious in asserting that Lydgate spent considerable time outside the monastic environment (824: 21–2). Bowers, r824, is not wholly convinced by Pearsall’s argument. Mathew, 864, takes the view that Lydgate spends much of his time at court.] Lydgate is highly regarded by Elizabethan readers in spite of him being a ‘monk and medieval man in every line.’ Gray, 554, Coleridge, 559–60, and Collins, 600, also hold favourable views of his work (275).

Brief references. Miles considers the eras of English poetry according to sentence structure. Lydgate’s verse, like Chaucer’s, is ‘clausal.’


Six stanzas from *The Lamentation of Mary Magdalen* and twenty-six from the *Testament* are painted on the wall of Clopton Chapel in the Church of the Holy Trinity, Long Melford, Suffolk. The transcription dates from about the second half of the 15th century (1). Trapp provides background to the history of the church and a description of the artwork (1–5). The previously published transcriptions are ‘inaccurate’ (5). [See Gibson who claims that Trapp incorrectly identifies the speaker of the poem (1005.81, note 145).] Trapp prints the stanzas from the *Testament* (5–11); those from *The Lamentation of Mary Magdalen* are too ‘dilapidated’ to be useful editorially. The manuscript source for the church text is not clear, but London, BL, MS Harley 2255 is ‘tempting’ (5).


A number of references to Lydgate in a discussion of the medieval concept of Alexander the Great. Lydgate is critical of Alexander in *FP*, as John Gower had been before him (255–7).

Examines 25 character names in considering whether Lydgate’s immediate source for *ST* was the *Ystoire de Thèbes*, as suggested by Koeppel, 583, or the *Roman de Edipus*, as suggested by Erdmann, 469–70. Where possible, these names are compared with their equivalents in Chaucer: ‘Lydgate departs from the forms sanctioned by Chaucer only to follow the *Roman de Edipus*'; and where a form is not found in Chaucer, Lydgate again follows the *Roman de Epidus* with only two certain exceptions (256). See Renoir, 788, and Schlauch, 855, for further discussion of the source for *ST*.


Saintsbury doubts that Lydgate is talented enough to have written the description of Chaucer’s verse as ‘gold dewdrops of speech.’ But this line does in fact come from a prominent passage in *LOL*. Much Lydgate criticism is similarly uninformed: ‘it is high time to reconsider seriously the negative verdict which our age has passed upon the works of John Lydgate’ (71).


Lydgate does not get the recognition he deserves. One example of his skill that has passed unnoted is the way that he can make certain expressions take different meanings in different contexts. The ‘binding knot,’ a symbol of a permanent bond, is one of these
expressions. Renoir focuses on instances from TG, the Mumming at Hertford, and A Gentlewoman's Lament. See Norton-Smith, 801, for a response.


Lydgate is a 'representative figure of the transition between the Middle Ages and the Renaissance in England' (9). In both The Churl and the Bird, written about 1400, and FP, written about 1438, Lydgate refers to Chaucer as his master. The earlier poem is drawn from the Gesta Romanorum, and has a medieval tenor; but the later poem shows a renaissance influence that makes the reference to Chaucer surprising (13–14). From his earlier to later works, Lydgate moves towards three key renaissance values: approval of classical antiquity (14–16); concern for the regiment of princes (16–17); and nationalism (17–19). [Among other works, Renoir refers to TB, ST, LOL, Mumming for the Mercers of London and HGS.] It is not surprising that FP leads to The Mirror for Magistrates, and SD influences Sackville and Norton's Gorboduc and Spenser's Ruines of Time (19). See Renoir, 789, for further discussion of these views.


A discussion of Lydgate's attitude to women in some of his secular poetry. The Church was critical of women; the courtly audience expected to hear women praised. Lydgate's own view is that 'women are like men; each one must be judged according to her own merit' (8). Lydgate's pro-feminine works are his courtly love poems. His poems against women are usually defences of the Church's view, but here he can be so vehement and sweeping that one doubts his seriousness. He elsewhere shows considerable sensitivity
towards his female characters. Lydgate's writings about women display an 'uncommon versatility of talent, ranging from the most satirical to the most deeply moving' that argues the need for a more general reassessment of his work's merit (14). See Edwards, 874, for a response.


Considers whether Lydgate's immediate source for *ST* was the *Ystoire de Thèbes* as suggested by Koeppel, 583, or the *Roman de Edipus* as suggested by Erdmann, 469–70. An examination of several character names and four sections of the Lydgate's poem crucial to the debate points to the *Roman de Edipus*. [Schlauch, 855, briefly considers the question of the source for *ST*.]


Renoir's principal argument, based mainly on *TB, ST* and *FP*, is that Lydgate's work reveals a transition from the Middle Ages to the Renaissance. In a brief historical survey of Lydgate criticism, Renoir notes the fall in the poet's reputation after the end of the 18th century (1–12). Lydgate shows craftsmanship, particularly when treating of human emotions. Much of the hostility directed at him can be attributed to a failure to evaluate properly his work, and to inappropriate comparisons with Chaucer (13–31). There is a transition period between the Middle Ages and the Renaissance in England that is partly characterized by a growing interest in the Greek and Roman classics, a belief in the 'intrinsic dignity of man' (44), nationalism, and princely conduct (32–45). Lydgate's early work, such as *CBK*, is clearly medieval; and his rhetoric shows the influence of the Middle
Ages to the end of his career. This encourages critics to classify him as medieval (46–60). A chronological view of Lydgate’s work shows that he becomes more aware of the classical past, and so closer to renaissance writers, as he grows older (61–73). Lydgate’s view of human dignity, particularly shown by his view of women when not writing in a monastic, antifeminist, style, has a renaissance perspective (74–94). TB and FP show definite signs of renaissance nationalism that explain the later continuation of FP in *The Mirror for Magistrates* (95–109). *ST* may be considered as a ‘French mediaeval romance translated into an English Renaissance epic’ (135). The enthusiasm of renaissance England for Lydgate’s work is driven by an appreciation of his concern for the ‘conduct of rulers’ and the ‘intrinsic dignity of man’ (142). See Pearsall, 818–23, for a view of Lydgate as a medieval writer; and see Tillyard, 743–5, and Schirmer. 757–8, for Lydgate’s renaissance credentials. Frankis and Norton-Smith also address this issue in the reviews below.


----Review by P.J. Frankis, *Review of English Studies* NS 20 (1969): 77–80. It may be true that Lydgate has renaissance attributes, but we might still conclude that he is dull irrespective of whether we place him in the Renaissance or the Middle Ages. Renoir’s argument is ‘rather barren’ (80). The little literary criticism that Renoir offers is not successful and his attempt at literary history ‘leaves much to be desired’ (79).

----Review by J. Norton-Smith, *English Studies* 52 (1971): 361–2. Renoir’s work is weakened by his failure to argue what he means by the terms ‘medieval’ and ‘renaissance.’ A detailed discussion of Lydgate’s poetry is avoided (361). The best of Renoir’s study is the chapter dealing with *ST*, but even this ‘remains general.’ A typographical error on page 61 that presents the word ‘poet’ as ‘post’ is an ‘unfortunate and unconscious allegory of the author’s regard for his subject’ (362).
790. ———. ‘Crist Ihesu’s Beasts of Battle: A Note on Oral-Formulaic Theme Survival.’ 

Lines 3712–22 in *LSAE* repeat the image found in Old English poetry of the wolf and the eagle attending the corpses of the dead, but with the variation that these animals are ‘metamorphosed from harbingers of death into protectors of the faithful and near-attendants of eternal life.’ Without tracing Lydgate’s sources further it is not possible to establish the relationship between the Christian and Anglo-Saxon images (457).

791. ———. ‘A Note on the Third Redaction of John Lydgate’s Verses on the Kings of England.’ 

*Verses on the Kings of England* exists in 42 MSS and a number of 16th-century printings. The first two redactions of the poem are in rhyme royal; the third redaction, which is based on the first, but is found in only one MS, is in 92 couplets concluded by a stanza of eight lines with a rhyme scheme of *ababcbcb* (347). Renoir discusses how the rhyme royal of the first redaction is changed into the rhyming couplets and final eight line stanza of the third redaction (347–8).

792. ———, and C. David Benson, eds. ‘John Lydgate.’ 
   New Haven, CT: Academy, 1980. 1809–1920, 2071–175. 10 vols to date. 1967–.

The editors supply an overview and synopsis of Lydgate’s works (1809–1920). This is followed by a bibliography that addresses each work, generally with brief annotations, and covers the manuscript and printing history and all aspects of critical reception (2071–175).
Although highly praised in the 15th and 16th centuries, Lydgate is criticized from the end of the 18th century as long-winded and dull. The diversity of Lydgate’s subject matter reflects the variety of his patronage (1809). He tends to side with the ‘established powers.’ Some critics see Lydgate as typical of the Middle Ages; others see traces of the new humanism in his work (1810). Literary interest in Lydgate, as opposed to historical, textual and linguistic interest, is relatively recent. The book-length studies by Schirmer, 757–8, and Pearsall, 818, are ‘indispensable’ (1811). See Edwards, 895, for some supplements to, and evaluation of, the Manual entry for Lydgate.


The Legend of Dan Joos is based on a story in the Speculum Majus by Vincent of Beauvais. The legend is ultimately part of a miracle cycle involving the appearance of a ‘flower, or some other phenomenon, ... in the mouth of one who has practiced extraordinary devotion to the Blessed Virgin’ (84). Boyd supplies summaries of literary examples of the cycle (84–6). It is very likely that Lydgate intends his only miracle of the Virgin to match Chaucer’s The Prioress’s Tale, a work which is also drawn from the same cycle of miracles (86–7).


Lydgate’s descriptions of the seasons show the consequences of embracing the excessive rhetoric that Chaucer successfully avoids (118). Lydgate borrows some matters of technique from Chaucer, but he cannot resist indulging in lengthy and disordered
amplifications (119). He offers an ‘encyclopaedic catalogue of topics and commonplaces’ for use in describing the seasons of the year (121). In FP, Lydgate’s embellishment of his source material is atypically restrained (123); this is not the case in TB (123–6). Lydgate’s amplified descriptions of the seasons show the ‘triumph of a new stylistic ideal in English poetry,’ but little verse of quality comes from it (127)


An inspection of the books printed by Caxton shows that the largest number of titles belongs to Lydgate, Chaucer, and Gower. These books are not published under patronage or for a clearly defined market; their publication seems to be a result of Caxton’s literary judgement of their merits (316).


Wright offers a general discussion of Lydgate’s handling of Boccaccio’s De casibus virorum illustrium in FP (5–22). Lydgate does not feel compelled to follow either Boccaccio or Laurent de Premierfait in all matters (6). He introduces his own note of moderate patriotism (7); he disapproves generally of war (7–8). He is antifeminist in a way typical of the time, but less stridently so than Boccaccio is (9–10). He is shy of sexual matters; and he is less critical than Premierfait is of the Church (10). He is politically conservative, although he shows some recognition of the humanist view of personal merit, in place of birth, as a source of nobility (11–13). Lydgate believes in Fate, but he adds a component of personal responsibility to his concept of Fate (15–16). Lydgate’s imagery
often turns to the countryside and to light (18–20). He frequently mixes ‘bliss with bitterness’ (21).


What may seem like pointless digressions when ST is read as a romance or epic become purposeful when Lydgate’s own viewpoint is understood. Lydgate treats ST as history, and gives to his poem a moral, didactic, purpose. This purpose is to ‘document from history an argument against war as an instrument of public policy,’ and so the poem functions in the mirror genre (476). Ayers supports his case by references to Lydgate’s handling of source material.


Reference to the custom of ‘lovedays’ occurs in the works of Lydgate, Chaucer, Gower, and Wyclif, but its meaning has been unclear (351). An examination of source material shows that the word refers to ‘any meeting of contending parties for the purpose of settling their dispute’ (361).
Lydgate studied at Oxford, 'probably' at Gloucester College (1185).


Considers the literary relationship of the group A and group B manuscripts of TG as they are categorized by Schick, 442. The major differences between the manuscripts are not caused by transcription errors, but by Lydgate's revisions. These involve the complaint to Venus (line 335ff), the response to Venus (line 453ff), the colour and flower symbolism (line 299 and 504ff), the motto (lines 310 and 530), and the ending of the poem (lines 1380–1403) (166–7). The manuscript favoured by Schick, Oxford, Bodleian Lib., MS Tanner 346, supplies Lydgate's final revisions (167). The changes develop the character of the Lady and produced an 'original and excellent courtly love complaint' (172).


A response to Renoir, 785a. Renoir is wrong to assume that Lydgate's knot metaphors are always 'binding knots used to express permanence of union' (90). The knot in lines 17–24 of Lydgate's Gentlewoman's Lament is closer to a remembrance knot—a knot that acts as a reminder—than to an 'amatory symbol' which is a characteristic not developed until the next stanza of the poem (91). Renoir misses the significance of the golden colour of Venus's chain, used to make the knot in the TG, which distinguishes it from the 'ordinary chain of positive law (marriage)' (92). Lydgate's metaphors, like his narrative, produce their 'poetic effects by a long accumulation of detail' (93).
The introduction provides a full manuscript description. The edition is a black and white photographic facsimile of Oxford, Bodleian Lib., MS Fairfax 16 (f. 14v is reproduced in colour as plate 1). Among other works, the manuscript contains a number of items either by Lydgate or conjectured to be by him: *A Complaint of a Lover's Life* (folios 20v–30r); *TG* (folios 63r–82v); *FP*, Bk 2, lines 4432–8 (f. 195r); *Four Things that Make a Man a Fool* (folios 195r–195v); *Doubleness* (folios 199r–199v); *Prayer for King, Queen and People* (folios 199v–200v); and *RS* (202v–300r).


Marlowe is familiar with *TB* and *ST* (28–33).


Ascribes a number of Lydgate’s works to Sir Richard Roos on the basis of cryptograms. Seaton makes numerous references to the Lydgate manuscripts. See Edwards, 893, for critical comment.
Numerous references to Lydgate regarding historical detail and his general importance to the origins of modern drama. Lydgate’s 1432 *Pageant on the Entry of Henry VI into London* is the earliest pageant to use ‘historical personages to point a moral’ (72); Lydgate uses a range of characters to extend the notion of Christian personal conduct to ethical kingship (75–7). Lydgate is of major importance to the history of mummmings and disguisings, even though he is largely ignored; it is he who imposes ‘rudimentary form upon the heterogeneous secular entertainments of the minstrel troupes’ (180). Lydgate’s mummmings should be properly considered as ‘dramatic entertainments’ (192). Wickham considers the differing features of Lydgate’s mummmings and disguisings. Lydgate builds on the tradition of mumming by adding allegorical signification, speaking parts, and a narrator to form a disguising (195–207).


Sir John Ogle’s work is first published in 1594. Wilson confirms Bush’s observation, 691, that *TB* is the main source for the *Lamentation* (xiii–xv).

Brief references. Hoccleve and Lydgate are the ‘best known of Chaucer’s followers in England ... yet they seem to belong to a different age.’ The work of each lacks ‘poetic merit,’ but Hoccleve’s poetry is the ‘more interesting’ of the two because of its ‘realistic and autobiographical touches’ (129). There is little reason to question the virtually universal judgement that Lydgate is a ‘bore.’ His verse is lame, and his syntax is loose. He does, however, contribute new words to the English language and new themes to English literature (130). He is generally best in his shorter pieces (130–1).

808. **Leach, Elsie.** ‘Lydgate’s “The Dolerous Pyte of Crystes Passioun” and Herbert’s “The Sacrifice.”’ *Notes and Queries* 205 (1960): 421.

Adds Lydgate’s *The Dolerous Pyte of Crystes Passioun* to the works listed by Rosemond Tuve as examples of the tradition behind George Herbert’s *The Sacrifice*. Lines three and four of Lydgate’s poem, ‘Was ever wight suffred so gret woo/ For manhis sake suych passioun did endured?’ recall Herbert’s refrain ‘Was ever grief like mine?’ Herbert uses the ‘common heritage of Latin devotional literature with far greater felicity’ than Lydgate does (421).


Manzalaoui attempts to ‘harmonize’ the metrical models suggested by Schick, 442, and Lewis, 158. In Lydgate’s verse the ‘dominating iambic rhythm is allowed to relax, and the lines frequently become non-iambic pentameters, or else relaxing further become lines of ... Middle English “alliterative” rhythm which carries no alliteration’ (99).

Brief references. Lydgate’s Book of the Governaunce of Kynges and Princes, completed by Benedict Burgh after Lydgate’s death, is based, to the confusion of its translator, on two Latin manuscript versions of the Secreta. Nevertheless, it is the only verse rendering of the Secreta that tries to remain faithful to the ‘true shape’ of its source (96).


The definition of ‘derring-do’ as ‘manhood and chevalrie’ was thought to have come from a misreading by Edmund Spenser of the phrase in TB. In fact, Lydgate’s use of ‘derring-do,’ at least in one instance in TB (Bk 5, lines 133ff), seems to suggest that this is the meaning he intended.


Van Dorsten discusses the unusual folio numbering of Leiden, Univ. Lib., Vossius MS Germ.Gall.Q.9 (315–7) and describes its contents (321–3). The Leiden manuscript ascribes Guy of Warwick, SPMD, and the Letter to Gloucester to Lydgate (319). Although containing some pieces not by Lydgate, it could be called a Lydgate anthology. The contents and ordering of London, BL, MS Lansdowne 699 are ‘almost identical’ to the Lydgate items in the Leiden manuscript; even the variants between the two manuscripts are ‘fairly similar.’ The two might ultimately derive from a common lost anthology (320). The Leiden version of Lydgate’s Testament is closely related to that of London, BL, MS
Harley 218 and might have been its original (320−1). The Leiden text for some Lydgate poems is sometimes better than ‘most other’ manuscripts; it also offers unique copies of five late ME poems (321). Van Dorsten prints three, previously unnoted, anonymous poems from the manuscript (318, 324−5).


Among other items, Robertson notes that the John Rylands library holds manuscripts of *TB* and *FP*. The Rylands version of *TB* [Manchester Univ., John Rylands Lib., MS English 1], previously in the Crawford collection, dates to the middle of the 15th century and is well illustrated with 69 miniatures. The opening illustration of Lydgate presenting the work to the king has been taken as an ‘authentic portrait of the poet’ (273). Robertson briefly describes the miniature of the Wheel of Fortune on folio 28v (273−4), and reproduces this facing page 273. See Clark-Maxwell, 696, regarding the earlier identification of the manuscript.


Cambridge, Trinity College, MS O.5.2, which contains *Generydes, TB* and *ST*, has ‘decorations and inscriptions’ that give insights into its ‘earlier history, and ... fifteenth-century book-production and distribution’ (205).
Marsh's evidence behind his claim, 624, that Lydgate is the author of *The Floure and the Leafe* is weak; the various stylistic points he notes are merely 'commonplaces' of the time (17–18). MacCracken (471: vii, 1) shows that the rhymes of *The Floure and the Leafe* argue against Lydgate's authorship (18–19). The characteristics of Lydgate's metre can only be explained by assuming that he takes what are occasional metrical variants in Chaucer and makes them the standards of his own verse (61–2).

Lydgate is, or should be, of 'overwhelming importance' to the literary history of the 15th century. He stands out from among the other poets of the period; he is more influential than Chaucer is; and he is responsible for defining how Chaucer is interpreted in the 15th century (203). He has suffered at the hands of a superficial and sneering criticism that has taken aim at the 'vast bulk of his work ... his metre and his syntax.' Lydgate wrote a great deal of verse that has no merit, but judicial excerpts show him to be a 'very considerable poet' (204). The loss of final -e after Chaucer might explain the metre of Ashby and others; however, it fails to shed light on Lydgate's metrical practice (204–5). The explanation for Lydgate's metre lies in his 'elevation of Chaucerian variants into systematic types'; Lydgate's prosody lacks judgement, not system (206). His unusual syntax is also explainable as a poorly judged imitation of Chaucer (206–7). Lydgate may be at his worst when imitating Chaucer, yet it is also when he is at his best; *CBK*, the *Flower of Courtesy*, *TG*, and *RS* provide examples of this (207–12). It is 'naive' to read *TB* just for the 'story': amplification is seen by Lydgate as central to the narrative, and it is used to explore issues.
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‘moral, political and historical’ (213). Pearsall discusses TB in the light of this view (213–18). In ST, Lydgate offers ‘moral comment and exhortation’ and an ‘exemplum of unwise government and divided rule leading to political chaos and ... war’ (218). FP is intended as a lesson to rulers regarding the need to ‘rise above Fortune by the practice of wisdom and virtue’ (218–9). Lydgate’s short poems, such as the Churl and the Bird, typically have a much more simple style than the longer works; they ‘aim low, but often strike home’ (220). Lydgate’s religious poems are outside the Chaucerian genres, yet they show the influence of Chaucer (221–2). It is Lydgate who consolidates the status achieved for English by Chaucer (222).


Lydgate encompasses all of the Chaucerian genres, except the fabliau; in addition, he adds others such as the Marian hymn and gnomic moralizing. He accepts commissions of various kinds. Lydgate achieves much of his poetic effect through the large scale of his poetry. In range, he is a greater poet than John Gower is. He does not have Gower’s skill, however, with what we see as the essential characteristic of poetry: that its meaning should be reflected in the minutiae of its verbal significance and metrical detail (23–6). Lydgate does not seem to understand the nature of Chaucer’s metre beyond its obvious mechanical characteristics. He takes Chaucer’s variant line forms as his own standard (26–7). The local detail of Lydgate’s verse can lack ‘verbal and rhythmical sensitivity,’ but in the broad it can be seen to have a texture and pattern. Rhetoric in the Middle Ages is much more concerned with style than ‘invention’ and structure (27); the poet’s job is to decorate and amplify what is familiar. For Lydgate, amplification is an ‘ingrained habit of mind’ (28). Lydgate’s words form a rich surface; they are not ‘instruments for penetrating reality’ (29). He uses rhetorical figures to control the ‘luxuriance of his verbal responses’ (30). Lydgate knows Chaucer’s work very well, in particular Troilus and Criseyde, The Parlement of
Foules, and The Knight's Tale; he is less familiar with CT (31). A passage from CBK shows that Lydgate's interpretation of nature is 'essentially meaningless except in a context of human ideas'; 'decorative art' is used by Lydgate to 'draw out the metaphysical reality' of the physical world (33). A passage from Lydgate's description of the lady in TG shows his habit of using an idealized metaphor in preference to realistic description (34–5).

Lydgate's literary techniques, such as amplification, are complementary to his world view (35–6); his style, in fact, is a response to his 'moral and philosophical' construction of meaning (39). 'Boethian morality' is the subject on which Lydgate writes best. TB is the 'cornerstone of Lydgate's achievement'; its 'enduring effect' lies in the treatment of the commonplace Boethian themes that Lydgate sees as underlying human existence (41). The prologue to LOL contains 'one of the finest passages of non-personal religious poetry in English' (42).


Schirmer, 757–8, and Renoir, 786 and 789, are wrong to suggest that Lydgate shows signs of the coming Renaissance (14–16). In fact, he is 'impregnably medieval' (299). Lydgate is deeply indebted to Chaucer for style, metre, and genre (47). Lydgate, building upon Chaucer, adds numerous new words to English (50–1). He takes over a large number of Chaucer's set phrases (51–8). Lydgate's loose syntax is exacerbated by the nature of Lydgate's mind and by a deliberate desire for an elevated style. Lydgate's metre may be attributed to a development of line-types found in Chaucer (58–63). Lydgate's Chaucer is not 'our Chaucer,' but the 'poet of sententious utterance and high rhetorical style' (64).

The tastes of middle-class readers are a major influence on Lydgate; insights into these are provided by the books owned by families like the Pastons, and by the work of John Shirley (70–9). The membership of the Lydgate canon is not quite certain: in particular, RS and PLM have no 15th-century ascription to Lydgate. Pearsall examines CBK, Flower of
Coutesy, TG, and RS as examples of Lydgate’s ‘courtly poetry’ (83–121); and he discusses TB and ST as examples of how Lydgate handles major medieval stories (122–59). TB for Lydgate is a ‘homily first, an encyclopaedia second, and an epic nowhere’ (129); this is in marked contrast to Chaucer’s treatment of Troilus as a story (128). Lydgate’s whole rhetorical emphasis is to show the moral and factual truth of his material (129). ST is ‘more subdued, less highly coloured and rhetorical’ than TB (154), and it shows much of what is best in Lydgate: ‘moral concern, good sense, a sober solemnity of style’ (156). Pearsall considers Lydgate’s role as an ‘official’ poet responding to the events of his time, a role in which he works for much of his career (160–91). It is not possible to give composition dates for most of Lydgate’s fables and didactic poems, although this does not matter as they all reflect the ‘moralistic and didactic preoccupations’ of Lydgate and his period (192). Pearsall discusses examples (192–222). Humphrey, Duke of Gloucester, is the first patron of humanist writing in England and the commissioner of FP (223–30). FP is filled with amplifications inserted by Lydgate into his source material; most of these are on the topic of morality and they are frequently against women (235–9). FP is not systematic in its presentation of moral lessons (241–9). Contrary to Schirmer, 758, the political views expressed by Lydgate are commonplaces that lack philosophic coherency (249–50). [Lawton, 1054, sees Lydgate as being more generally consistent in his philosophic outlook than Pearsall concedes.] That some of these views are also found in Shakespeare does not mean that Lydgate anticipates the Renaissance; it would be better to conclude that ‘Shakespeare is a relic of the Middle Ages’ (250). Lydgate’s religious poetry is practical and not personal. This is consistent with medieval religious poetry generally where the ‘purpose is always to sustain faith and aid devotion’ (256). Lydgate’s poetry is not a revelation of personal faith; it is a guide to the nature of medieval religious belief (255–92).

-----Review by M.C. Seymour, Neuphilologische Mitteilungen 73 (1972): 729–32. Pearsall ‘writes sensibly and informatively on individual poems.’ The part on TB is ‘particularly
well handled.’ The selection of poems for discussion shows a lack of balance, perhaps caused by some poems being available in more accessible and modern editions than others. Lydgate does have some legitimate claims on our attention, but Pearsall’s assertion that a ‘knowledge of his work is invaluable for “every reader of medieval literature” ’ is open to considerable doubt (729). Pearsall pays too little attention to ‘genre-study’ and to the substantiation of the ‘stylistic development’ that he sees in Lydgate’s work. The real need in Lydgate scholarship is for new editions (730). Pearsall’s book seems to have been written for undergraduates, and it tends to make sweeping, unsupported, assertions (730–1). Many aspects of Lydgate’s ‘historical context’ are distorted by Pearsall. For example, it is questionable that Lydgate is ‘typical’ of his time; he may, in fact, be anachronistic. Pearsall incorrectly cites some manuscripts that he has apparently not personally checked (731–2).

-----Review by P.J. Frankis, Review of English Studies NS 23 (1972): 472–4. Pearsall’s book is a scholarly ‘standard work’ that is clear, entertaining, and readable. Pearsall offers considered judgements on the basis of sound evidence. The only significant weakness in the study is that there could have been more space given to putting Lydgate’s work in context with the rest of the verse of the period.


Two Lydgate manuscripts, London, BL, MS Harley 2278, illuminated at Bury St Edmunds, and London, BL, MS Royal 18 D.ii, possibly illuminated at the abbey, show some signs in their miniatures of the influence of French realism in the presentation of nature. Lydgate’s own presentation of landscape, although not constrained by allegory, is not realistic as it recasts the natural world in terms of ‘human usefulness and human beauty.’ In the Churl
and the Bird there are 'casual touches of reality,' yet generally Lydgate 'embroiders the traditional charms of landscape with endless topics of excellence and imagery of painting' (193). In an appendix, the authors print extracts from the CBK, lines 36–84 (229–30), TB, Bk 1, lines 3907–41 (235–6) and Bk 2, lines 5067–91 (236–7).


Numerous references to Lydgate. Lydgate is the first 'monastic poet to give back to English poetry ... the status in the cloisters that it possessed freely in the eighth and ninth centuries' (51). John Shirley seems to be effectively Lydgate's London 'literary agent' (213). Lydgate is central to the transmission of Chaucer's artistic legacy. His treatment of the love-complaint is coloured by his religious vocation. CBK is typically 'detached' from its traditional allegory; it is a set-piece for Lydgate's rhetoric (214). TG is used by Lydgate to express the highest ideals of love with little development of its potential drama (214–5). Although an 'important contributor to the courtly tradition' through his love poems, most of Lydgate's commissions for the court circle, such as TB, LOL, PLM, and FP, are not courtly. They would be better described as the work of a 'professional man of letters employed for the advancement of piety, learning and the English language' (215). SPMD is an example of a courtly style adapted to the 'more sober and mediocre tastes' of the 15th century (224). The Dietary and Pageant of Knowledge are examples of work recast in rhyme royal or ballade to suit the 'new taste' (224–5). The dissemination of some of Lydgate's manuscripts shows the new breadth of the reading public (225). Lydgate may deliberately try to reshape Chaucer's work to a 15th-century mould (226–7). That his imitation concentrates on the more serious side of Chaucer, consistent with 'high poetic style,' reflects the fact that the 'conventional language of literary praise' did not extend to comedy. Lydgate distorts Chaucer by seeking out isolated passages that confirm his view of him as a moral teacher and rhetorician (227). Lydgate's heightened poetic diction
is best not described as ‘aureate’ as this term should be restricted to the florid Latinate aspects of Lydgate’s religious poems (227–8). Lydgate’s attempt to imitate Chaucer’s syntax is unsuccessful (228), as is his attempt to copy Chaucer’s metre in which Chaucer’s variants become his own standard (228–9). Lydgate’s metrical practice should not to be confused with the older four-stress line that re-emerges in some 15th century verse. The poets of the 15th century, especially Lydgate, fail to capture Chaucer’s innovations in narrative and form; they return to the older and more simple modes of thought, especially moralism (229–30). TB shows the difference between Lydgate and Chaucer in that it lacks a sense of ‘shaping energy’; Lydgate follows his source closely whereas Chaucer transfigures his. ST shows less straining for effect (230). FP is Lydgate at his worst and best: it is inflated and without a tight structure, but some of its moral observations are well served by the ‘weighty cadences of traditional rhetoric.’ These observations are fundamental to the poem’s contemporary popularity. Humphrey, Duke of Gloucester, may have hoped that Lydgate’s poem would bring to English ‘something of the dignity and repute of continental classical learning’; it did not (231). Claims for Lydgate’s authorship of PLM and RS are tenuous; the latter is much the better poem of the two. DM is one of Lydgate’s best pieces (232). It is likely that Henry V encourages Lydgate’s elevation of English liturgical style (234). LOL is the best of Lydgate’s long poems (235–6). Prior to Lydgate, poets like Thomas Hoccleve and John Walton are part of a ‘sensible and unostentatious verse-tradition’; this tradition is effectively corrupted by Lydgate (239). Lydgate’s unfortunate influence in reshaping the verse tradition is evident in the works of such poets as Benedict Burgh, George Ashby, and John Metham, among others (239–43). Lydgate’s influence extends to the non-courtly tradition of works dealing with a variety of practical or didactic subjects (242–3). 15th-century religious poetry also owes a debt to Lydgate; nevertheless, the role of other significant ‘older and simpler forms’ needs to be noted (243). Osbern Bokenham, John Capgrave, and Henry Bradshaw all show Lydgate’s influence (251–2).
Lydgate is 'perfectly representative of the Middle Ages,' and his DM reveals a late medieval view of death (58). Pearsall discusses the historical background to the Dance of Death genre (58–62). The manuscripts of Lydgate’s poem fall into two groups, A and B, possibly indicating that he had two requests to work on the topic (62). This is, however, only conjecture: the relationship between the two groups is unclear as the poem’s structure allowed stanzas to be rearranged, or added, as the scribes wished (62–3). The repetitious, straightforward nature of the French source suits Lydgate: its compact stanza form curbs his ‘natural prolixity,’ and he enjoys its ‘gnomic quality’ (63). A skilfully executed translation, with some original additions, results (64–6). Lydgate’s presentation is typically medieval in using death as a warning to the living, without dwelling on physical decay; an emphasis on decay belongs to a post-medieval world (65–71). Warren’s reference to Lydgate’s morbidity, 480, is misplaced (67).

Lydgate transmits Chaucer to the 15th century, by means of imitation, in a form consistent with that century’s ‘official taste’ (39). As modern readers, however, our tastes have been shaped by a more direct experience of Chaucer’s works. Consequently, we condemn Lydgate because he lacks ‘almost everything’ that we value in Chaucer (40). In an effort to ‘improve’ on Chaucer, Lydgate ‘systematically and indiscriminately’ uses some of the metrical line forms that Chaucer had used only for variation (41–2). Lydgate’s notoriously
loose syntax may be explained as an attempt to extend the range of Chaucer’s carefully controlled syntactic structures (42–3). Similar reasoning applies to general points of Lydgate’s style (43–7). Lydgate may also have tried to out-do Chaucer in each of Chaucer’s chosen ‘major poetic genres’ (47). Chaucer is interested in both the story and its truth, and in the complex relationship between the two. Lydgate is interested in the truth of the story (47–8). Pearsall contrasts *TB* and *Troilus and Criseyde* (47–9), *ST* and *CT* (49–51), and *FP* and *CT* and the *Legend of Good Women* (51–2). See Pearsall, 823, for further development of the author’s views on Lydgate’s merits as an innovator.


Pearsall portrays Lydgate as an accidental innovator who extends, largely at the behest of his patrons and those who commissioned work from him, what Chaucer had begun in the establishment of a tradition of English poetry; the article explores the different forms of Lydgate’s innovations. Lydgate’s reconstruction of Chaucer presents Chaucer in a medieval guise that is acceptable to 15th-century tastes (6–7). Lydgate is driven by a desire to out-do Chaucer by amplifying and extending what the earlier poet had done (7–8). Lydgate brings a number of new words into English and, more importantly, by repeated use, establishes as standard many others (8–9). The arguments put by Renoir, 786 and 789, and Schirmer, 757–8, that Lydgate anticipates the humanism of the Renaissance are not convincing (10–13). Lydgate is the first poet in the English written tradition to produce poems intended to serve the cause of royal policy; it is possible that he was recruited to the Lancastrian cause while at Oxford (13–17). Lydgate’s opposition to Lollardy might be encouraged by the Lancastrians: it could also be that his use of an elevated style, and support for religious orthodoxy, are intended as a response to Lollardy and its use of the vernacular (18–20). Lydgate’s numerous commissioned pieces break new ground for English poetry (21–2).
A discussion of all the known details of Lydgate's life in relation to his work (11–49). Pearsall adds to the end of the volume a substantial amount of bibliographic data. This includes: a table of key life-dates for Lydgate (50–2); the text of the Lydgate life-records (53–67); a full listing of the manuscripts [New York, Columbia Univ., MS Plimpton 255 is incorrectly listed as 225 (70)] and early prints of Lydgate's major works (68–80); a selective listing of manuscripts and early prints for the minor poems (80–4); a list of the major modern editions (84–5); and a select bibliography of (mainly recent) secondary sources (85–92). Lydgate is the most significant writer in England in the first half of the 15th century, but he is 'probably more important for his place in the literary and political culture of his day' (9).

-----Review by John Bowers, Speculum 73 (1998): 1160–61. The catalogue of manuscripts that Pearsall provides towards the end of his study will be of great use and encourage further critical investigation (1160). Pearsall's view that one should be cautious in asserting that Lydgate spent considerable time outside the monastic environment is open to some challenge. [See Knowles, 780, for further views on this issue.] Payments to Lydgate may have been delayed by Henry V's edicts prohibiting monks from receiving money. Pearsall's book offers an 'altogether creditable account' of Lydgate's biography and bibliography (1161).
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SD, printed in 1559 by Owen Rogers, was "set forth after the Auctours old copy by I.S." (201). In fact, contrary to MacCracken's suggestion in his edition of the work, 473, 'I.S.,' who is possibly John Stow, does not make use of manuscripts, but takes the text from an earlier edition printed by Treverys, 403 (201–2) and adds the name of Lydgate as author (203). A third printing by Edward Allde for John Perrin, 419, in 1590 also follows Treverys, not Rogers as thought by MacCracken (202).


A number of generally brief references to Lydgate. Part of the reason why it is not meaningful to speak of an 'early Tudor lyric' is that the medieval influence of Lydgate is still so strongly present in the works by Stephen Hawes and Alexander Barclay (8–9). The first stanza of Tyed with a Line comes from John Haslem (108). See Tiner, 1125, for a summary of the dispute on this last issue.


Brief references. Lydgate's interest for us is essentially historical. RS is 'one of his most pleasant works' (260); ST is possibly 'his most readable epic'; FP is also 'worth mentioning.' Lydgate's reputation today is in 'sad and probably irreversible decline' (261).
A number of brief references to Lydgate's work in a history of the pilgrimage theme in English literature and art (especially woodcuts and engravings) between about 1485 and 1642. Figure 54 reproduces a wood-cut of 'Many-handed Fortune' from Tottel's 1554 edition of *FP*, 413.


Brief references. Seven manuscripts in the Bodleian Library, now catalogued separately, were part of a single vernacular manuscript in the 15th century. One of these, Oxford, Bodleian Lib., MS Rawlinson poetry 35, contains, among other items, the *Dietary*; another, MS Rawlinson poetry 168, contains Hoccleve's *RP*. Smith discusses the characteristics of the original manuscript.


See item under Hoccleve.

Brief references. Lear’s ‘Learned Theban’ (III.iv.154) may refer to Oedipus. Cutts quotes *FP* in order to supply the medieval background to Shakespeare’s supposed usage of the Oedipus story.


Brief references. Lydgate and Hoccleve have ‘no individuality or reputation as poets’ in the 17th century (198). In his treatment of the poets of Lydgate’s period, Warton, 67, 552–3, and 1276–7, avoids either exaggerating their worth or comparing them unfavourably with the poets of his own day (201). He likes Lydgate’s ‘academic versatility’ and, most of all, his ‘flowery diction’; but he does not like Lydgate’s prolixity. Warton judges *TG* to be ‘completely derivative’ (202).


Brief references. In a discussion about the parallel medieval attitudes towards women, courtly and religious, Scaglione cites Lydgate as a case of ‘split personality.’ Lydgate is a ‘monk and a courtly poet consistently, but distinctly’ (179, note 28).
London, BL, MS Add. 10,449 contains an outline of a lost play based on the story of Troilus and Cressida. The outline was probably used by prompters and call-boys in productions by the Admiral’s Men (25). The lost play follows TB and Caxton’s *Recayell of the Historyes of Troye* for the ordering of events (38). It is probable that Shakespeare also draws on Lydgate for *Troilus and Cressida* (39). See Tatlock, 656, for further discussion.


Several references to Lydgate’s *Mumming at London* and *TB* in a study of the renaissance connotations of ‘magnanimity.’ Lydgate shows the word magnanimity is coming at his time to have connotations of Christian values and romantic heroism (19–21, 35–6).


Lydgate may often compose his poems aloud and dictate them to amanuenses. If this is so, it could explain why his poetry shows ‘bardic’ characteristics such as repetition, aureation, quotation and misquotation, spontaneous use of loan words, switching between direct and indirect speech, and the acknowledgment of an imaginary audience. It is likely that Lydgate reads Greek. In bardic composition the rhyme royal stanza could be a way for the poet to plan and predict ‘rimes and verse-formulas many lines ahead’ (19). It is impossible
to accept either Lydgate's modesty topos regarding his metrical skill or modern agreement with the poet's assessment. Criticism did not appreciate the music of Chaucer until he was read with an understanding of 14th-century language; it may be we will misunderstand Lydgate's metre until we read him with a 15th-century 'intonation' (23).


Brief references. The dream vision of the crowd of lovers in The Kingis Quair comes from TG. Lydgate's presentation of Venus is based on the goddess Fortune in a way that recalls Chaucer's portrayal of Fame in the House of Fame; consequently, lovers are shown as rewarded randomly without respect to their fidelity (145–6). In The Kingis Quair the fate of the lovers reflects their 'earthly fidelity' (146). The character of Good Hope in the Scottish poem is also found in the TG (147).


In TB, Lydgate aims to keep the 'sentence' and 'substance' of his source, but he knows that he cannot reproduce its 'stile.' His introduction of 'corious floures of rethorik' is a way of imparting an 'idiomatic freshness' to the original in translation and so ensuring its preservation (35).
The English consciously employed literature and the visual arts in support of Henry VI’s claim to the joint thrones of England and France (145). Lydgate’s translation of Lawrence Calot’s French poem on Henry VI’s claims to England and France, and other works, including the pieces on the coronation of Henry VI and the history of the kings of England, are evidence of literary propaganda (153–5). Lydgate’s use of repetition in this matter may be more than a habit of style; it may be part of his intention to propagandize (153–4). See Rowe, 712, regarding Lydgate’s translation of Calot’s poem as propaganda; and see Pearsall, 824, and Fisher, 1098, for further discussion of Lydgate’s relationship to the Lancastrians.

Lydgate uses ‘aureate’ only about nine times in a stylistic sense. Leaving Lydgate aside, the word is used infrequently of style in the 15th and 16th centuries. As a stylistic term it disappears by the late 16th century (369). References to ‘aureate’ during this early period are all favourable. When the word again occurs in the early 19th century it has become pejorative, and it stays so for the remainder of the century. In the 20th century the reputation of ‘aureate’ moves from ‘black to grey’ (371). These movements reflect the ‘shifting reputation of the traditional theory of style’ (370). See Nichols, 698–9, Jack, 912, and Zettersten, 992.
Passages from Lydgate’s *That Now is Hay Some-tyme was Grase* clarify that the reference to Judas Maccabeus by Strength in *Everyman* is ironic and based on the Nine Worthies.

842. **Richmond, Velma Bourgeois.** *Laments for the Dead in Medieval Narrative.*

To blame Fortune for disaster is characteristic of Lydgate (37). Nearly always he expresses this blame through the voice of the narrator. There is, however, a single instance in *TB* (Bk 5, lines 3244–55) where a character within the narrative laments the role of Fortune (46–7). Richmond compares the lamentation for Hector in *TB* with that in the Laud *Troy Book* (63–6). Lydgate introduces the idea of Fortune, but his treatment weakens the ‘heroic figure’ of Hector found in the Laud version, and it suffers from ‘didactic heaviness’ (64). The lament of Ipsiphyle in *ST* (lines 3229–59) is an example of a lament that is used to characterize the speaker (76–77). Richmond prints extracts in an *Anthology of Laments for the Dead* from *TB*, Bk 3, lines 3823–69 (152–3) and *ST*, lines 3229–59 (157–8).


*The Blind Eat Many a Fly* had been in and then out of the Lydgate canon (327–8). Some verses by the Earl of Suffolk, however, suggest that the original attribution to Lydgate may have been correct (328).

Several references to Lydgate which note that he argues in some poems for women, and, in others, against them. His attacks against women are likely to be only artistic exercises and not expressions of real feeling; by the 15th century the exempla against women had ‘worn very thin’ (71). Rogers briefly discusses RS (61), Examples Against Women (71–2), Bycorne and Chichevache (85), A Mummimg at Hertford (85–6), and Advice to an Old Gentleman Who Wished for a Young Wife (86).


Oxford, Bodleian Lib., MS Douce 148 contains TB and fragments of the Scottish Troy Book (365). Two scribes are responsible for the manuscript: Scribe A repairs Scribe B’s damaged copy of Lydgate’s poem. Scribe A does this by inserting new folios that he copies from another exemplar (365–6). Scribe A is identified from his handwriting as John Asloan (366). The author supplies biographical details for Sir Thomas Ewen, who commissions Asloan to undertake the work (366–8), and for Asloan himself (368–72).


Challenges the traditional view of Caxton as a discerning advocate of Chaucer. Caxton’s opinions of Chaucer are largely taken from Lydgate: ‘it would hardly be an exaggeration to say that he saw Chaucer through Lydgate’s eyes’ (34). Blake discusses TB (26–7, 30–3), ST (32–4), SD (32), and LOL (31, 33) as sources for Caxton’s praise of Chaucer.
Caxton’s critical vocabulary is acquired during his publishing career mainly from the ‘critical opinions surrounding the works of Chaucer’ and those of the ‘fashionable clientele’ at court. Lydgate is a major consideration in this because it is very likely that the printer sees ‘Chaucer through the works of Lydgate.’ Caxton is obliged to adopt a prose style derived from a poetic model because of the ‘prestige’ of the ‘new poetic style’ and because of a lack of a native prose style (34). Chaucer, Gower, and Lydgate dominate the courtly tradition: their influence naturally directs Caxton to print ‘work in the courtly stylistic tradition and to avoid the alliterative or native prose’ (37).

A discussion, in part, of Lydgate’s possible attitude towards patronage, and of the use Caxton makes, as a commercial publisher, of Lydgate’s work and reputation. Caxton’s choice of texts for translation may be influenced by Lydgate’s work (273–4). Caxton’s History of Troy shows details of structure and language that may come from Lydgate’s poetry, particularly TB (273–7). Caxton may be influenced by Lydgate’s use of history for moral instruction (277). Lydgate is among the first to employ informal prologues and commentaries on a work’s genesis and patronage, and this practice is also found in Caxton (276–7). Caxton’s publication of Reynard the Fox may be prompted by Lydgate’s animal allegories (278). Caxton actively seeks out patrons, or uses their names without permission, to make a book more marketable (278–82); it is ‘probable that Caxton acquired many of his attitudes towards patronage from Lydgate’ (282). Blake discusses the evidence for Lydgate’s use of patronage (282–7). We should treat with some caution the traditional view of Lydgate as a court poet passively producing work at the request of patrons (286–7).
Oxford, St John’s College, MS 266, contains printed material side-by-side with a handwritten version of ST. The ruling of the manuscript makes it clear that there has been a ‘conscious effort to unify’ the printed and handwritten elements. Bone, 700, notes that de Worde, 388, uses the St John’s manuscript as the text for his first edition of ST. Bone dismisses the possibility that the manuscript version of ST is copied from de Worde’s edition on the grounds of the date of the manuscript and the marks left on the manuscript by the compositor. It is, however, possible that the manuscript’s source for ST is a now lost Caxton edition (411–12).

Lydgate uses John Trevisa’s translation of the Polychronicon by Ralph Higden for the Hercules myth in TB (Bk 1, lines 591, 600, and 608–9). Chaucer seems to use the same source. It could be worthwhile to search the works of Chaucer and Lydgate for further borrowings from Trevisa.

The ME Chaucerian poem Asenath of Egypt has as its source a Latin text dating ‘before 1200’ (118). MacCracken excludes the poem from the Lydgate canon: the evidence of the Latin original tends to support his judgement (122).

Refers to Arthur’s stellification in *FP* (Bk 8, lines 3102–8). Lydgate is the first poet to devise this end for Arthur (161). The philosophical basis for this device partly derives from Boethius and the notion of an ‘instructed soul, free at last among the stars’ (163). Augustinian and Neoplatonic philosophy is also relevant.


Lydgate’s source for *FP* is Laurent de Premierfait’s *Des Cas des nobles*, a 1409 French prose translation of Boccaccio’s *De casibus virorum illustrium* (167). Lydgate’s version is a ‘paraphrase’ of the original. Lydgate is more profoundly religious than Laurent, and the issue of Fortune and its place with respect to God particularly concerns him. Lydgate’s poem, when compared to its original, is seen to have ‘acuter precision in wording, a more concise vocabulary, arresting descriptions, and more elaborate figures of speech.’ It is one of the ‘outstanding translations of its kind in the fifteenth century’ (178).


*SD* makes a ‘noteworthy if modest’ contribution to the stylistic development of English prose in the 15th century. Naturally, Lydgate’s style is influenced by that of his sources, but he extensively adds touches of his own (1758). The remainder of the article notes the main stylistic features of Lydgate’s prose.

Lydgate’s source for *ST* is a French prose version of the *Roman de Thèbes*, either the *Roman de Edipus* or *Ystoire de Thèbes*. Whichever of these is Lydgate’s main source, he follows the ‘spirit’ of the *Roman de Thèbes* in the last battle between Eteocles and Polynices(19). Lydgate’s sympathises with Polynices (20). See Renoir, 784 for further cross-references regarding the source of *ST*.


In a symbol depicting his soul’s devotion to God, on the one hand, and to pleasure, on the other, Donne’s poem reverses the traditional movement of the heavenly spheres. This is done so that the motion towards God is to the east and thereby consistent with Christian thinking. *PLM* (Bk 2, lines 12287–303, 12320–45) shows a similar reversal. This proves that a ‘moralization of the heavenly system more compatible with accepted Christian symbolism ... was current well before the seventeenth century’ (169).


Coventry, City Records Office, MS Accession 325/1, dating between 1450 and 1475, lost for the first half of the 20th century, has now been found (22). Doyle describes the manuscript (22–6). The figure pictured on f. 1† is unlikely to be Chaucer, Hoccleve, or
Lydgate; in light of the presence of Hoccleve’s *RP* at the beginning of the manuscript, it may be intended to represent Aristotle or Egidius de Colomna. *RP* is on folios 1r to 40r, and Hoccleve’s *Series* is on folios 40r to 70r followed by *DM*. These items are in the same order as found in Oxford, Bodleian Lib., MS Selden supra 53; this is also true for Oxford, Bodleian Lib., MS 221 and MS Laud Misc. 735 except that *RP* is placed last (24). *ST* is on folios 137r to 167v of the Coventry manuscript (25). It seems that those responsible for the compilation of the manuscript were able to use Lydgate and Hoccleve exemplars that were similar to, or possibly the same as, those from the scriptorium, based in Bury St Edmunds or London, that was known for its reliable copies of works by Lydgate and Hoccleve (25–6). The remainder of the article provides transcriptions of the Chaucer material, and discusses the manuscript’s affiliation to the ‘Bradshaw’ group of Chaucer manuscripts. [See Bergen 463, Doyle 858, Scott, 867, Edwards, 890, 893, and 899, for further references to a Lydgate scriptorium.]


Some references to Lydgate and Hoccleve manuscripts in a preliminary consideration of whether or not there might be grounds for saying that the English Court had a ‘uniquely distinguishable influence ... on the character of book-production in English’ (181). Doyle tentatively suggests that such an influence might not have been present. Inscriptions in two Lydgate manuscripts of *LOL*, New Haven, Yale, Beinecke Lib., MS 281 and Oxford, Bodleian Lib., MS Hatton 73, suggest that some manuscripts have ‘shifting ownership within the court.’ The London, BL, MS Harley 2278 copy of *LSEF* is the work of a ‘distinct school of scribes, miniaturists and illuminators’ working in the region of Bury St Edmunds over at least three decades, occasionally on considerable projects (174). [See Bergen 463, Doyle 857, Scott, 867, Edwards, 890, 893, and 899, for further references to a Lydgate scriptorium.]
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Brief references in a discussion of the involvement of the religious orders in the writing and publication of works in the Middle Ages. Many of Lydgate’s poems were commissioned by the ‘upper and middle classes of State and Church.’ It is likely that the ‘metropolitan or provincial book-trade’—in response to a need that centred ‘in and about the court’—are the suppliers of most of the longer Lydgate manuscripts (116). It is very probable that the monks of Bury St Edmunds are involved, initially and subsequently, in producing LSEF and some copies of FP. Much more manuscript research is needed, however, before the full role of the religious in the publication of Lydgate’s work can be determined; nevertheless, the commercial sector seems to be dominant (117–18).


As our understanding of 15th-century literature deepens it will be necessary to reassess completely the supposed influence of Chaucer on the 15th-century poets (385). Traditionally this influence is seen as all pervasive and bad, but this view may be false on both counts (385–8). Chaucer’s influence on the 15th-century interest in rhetoric has been exaggerated and he is not to blame when the aureate diction of later poets, like Lydgate, fails through clumsiness (388–9). It is impossible to explain the problem of Lydgate’s metre by the loss of final –e; it is likely that Lydgate deliberately combines Chaucer’s iambic pentameter with the kind of accentual verse described by Lewis, 158, as the 15th-century ‘Heroic Line’ (390). Some authority for this experiment may come not from
Chaucer but from corrupt manuscript copies of his work, or from other works wrongly ascribed to him (391). Lydgate often mentions Chaucer and his work, quotes from him, and draws on him for 'images and lines ... and ... information or misinformation about classical antiquity' among other things. In matters of genre and subject, however, he is quite unlike Chaucer (393). Lydgate is not a failed Chaucer; he is an independent writer pursuing his own course (394–5). He takes from Chaucer an approach not to fiction but to allegory (395). We need to leave behind the notion that Lydgate is part of an 'Age of Transition,' and consider the works of this period in 'their own right' (399).


Very brief references to Lydgate, but relevant in that it discusses the influences on the Middle Scots poetry other than Chaucer and Lydgate.


The *Dietary* was apparently one of the ‘most popular of medieval English poems.’ Gray identifies a previously unnoted copy on folios 1–2 of MS 204 (1180) in the Library of the University of Lille. It is a version of item 824 in the *Index of Middle English Verse*, 647. The copy is ‘not a careful one but contains a number of interesting variants’ (245). Gray prints the first and last stanzas (245–6).

Brief references to Lydgate in an argument that the importance of pathos in late ME literature has been understated. Lydgate is very good at conveying a sense of pathos; Gray cites examples from ST and FP (93–4).


Brief references. Lydgate almost entirely lacks ‘Chaucer’s complexity and creative imagination’; nevertheless, the severe criticism directed against him has been excessive. He handles the popular subjects and genres of his time in a ‘competent if uninspired way’ (322). There is ‘some good writing’ in TB, FP, RS, TG, ST, and LOL (323). Lydgate’s strengths are more readily seen in his shorter occasional pieces (324). He is always interested in style, and can write some impressive lines (325).


Lydgate spends most of his time as a writer in the court circle of London. [See Knowles, 780, for cross-references to the debate on this point.] Bale, 528, may be right in saying that he had previously been a student at Oxford and in France. The Lancastrians make Lydgate their favoured poet (58). Lydgate is ‘facile,’ but RS and TG are ‘major poems’; he is the
‘culmination’ of the ‘international court literary movement’ (59). Lydgate has connections with the city of London, just as Chaucer and Gower had before him (60). Lydgate’s use of aureate diction is based on the introduction of new nouns and adjectives, and on the rhetorical notion of a distinction between ordinary speech and eloquence (60–1).


Discusses examples from the *Testament* as part of an argument that most autobiographical literary references in the Middle Ages, with the exception of Hoccleve’s, lack a sense of individuality and authorial personality (5, 8–9). Mitchell draws some comparisons between Lydgate’s Marian lyrics and Hoccleve’s (34–9): Lydgate tends, in contrast to Hoccleve’s practice in *MG*, to reflect a new manner of 15th-century religious verse that is ‘highly affected in style and completely devoid of any genuine, personal religious feeling’ (34). Lydgate’s references to women are too varied and conventional to reveal what he actually thinks, but they seem to be made in an ironic way that recalls Chaucer (51–2). Mitchell briefly surveys critical judgements on Lydgate’s metre, beginning with Schick’s five linetypes, 442. In general, he concludes that Lydgate’s metre has been unfairly criticized; and a similar examination of Hoccleve’s metre suggests that he too has been dealt with unfairly (100–2).


Two Lydgate manuscripts belong to a group of six that can be linked by their ‘borders, initials, line endings, and other minor aspects of ornament’ to a single illuminating shop
(170). The two manuscripts are a fragment of ST bound into Oxford, Bodleian Lib., MS Rawlinson poetry 223; and the Oxford, Bodleian Lib., MS Bodley 596 copy of LOL (171). A folio from each of these manuscripts is reproduced in black and white facing page 177. Scott discusses aspects of the ornamentation of the Rawlinson (189–91) and Bodley manuscripts (192–4).


A scribe working after 1461 is central to the production of a number of Lydgate manuscripts including: London, BL, MS Yates Thompson 47; Oxford, Bodleian Lib., MS Ashmole 46; and London, BL, MS Harley 4826 and MS Harley 1766 (335–6). A manuscript from the library of Arundel Castle, which gives a text for LSEF, is now added to the group. Its scribe also writes the Yates Thompson 47 version of LSEF, and the two manuscripts are very close. Two different illustrators are involved, but they are alike in their technique and use a shared set of illustrations. London, BL, MS Harley 2278 gives examples of the older series of illustrations that provides the model for the Arundel and Yates Thompson artists. It is a rare chance that allows the work of two manuscript illustrators in these circumstances to be considered (336–7). Scott provides a manuscript history (338–40) and a detailed description (340–52). A former owner of the Arundel and Yates Thompson 47 manuscripts is John Stow (343–4). Fourteen black and white photographs between pages 351 and 352 illustrate common features of the manuscript group. Scott discusses the close artistic relationship between Arundel and Yates Thompson 47 (352–55): it is likely that the two artists who separately illustrate the manuscripts work from a common exemplar (355). Similarities between Arundel, Yates Thompson 47, and the other manuscripts of the group suggests the presence of artists working together, mainly on Lydgate texts, perhaps in a shop, with a single scribe (355–6). Harley 2278, as the
"prototype" of the *LSEF* manuscripts, has some influence on the "format" and, more conservatively, on the "iconography" of Arundel and Yates Thompson 47 (357). The Arundel scribe possibly works in the Suffolk area and uses the services of a local illuminating shop (360–66). [See Bergen 463, Doyle 857–8, Edwards, 890, 893, and 899, for further references to a Lydgate scriptorium.]


Caution is needed in using manuscript illustrations in the interpretation of vernacular texts. Such illustrations may simply be standard representations that are not strictly related to the text, or they may have been modified or inserted at the request of the book's patron, or they may have been changed in other ways because of some requirement on the part of the illustrator. In the presentation miniature found in a *FP* manuscript, Montreal, McGill Univ. Lib., MS 143, Lydgate is shown presenting his work to Humphrey, Duke of Gloucester. The duke is anachronistically dressed as if living in the reign of Henry VII (22).

A manuscript of *LOL*, New Haven, Yale Univ., Beinecke Lib., MS 281, shows evidence of the removal of an expected miniature to allow for the patron's coat of arms to be inserted (25–7). Scott provides a black and white photograph of the relevant folios (27) with a detail from Cambridge, Trinity College, MS R.3.22 showing the type of miniature that would have been expected (26). In the London, BL, MS Arundel 119 text of *ST*, the patron's family arms occupy an illustrated initial (29). Three manuscripts of *LSEF*, and one of *FP*, demonstrate the workshop practice of interchanging images, with minor variations, between manuscripts (39, 42). See Lawton, 1022, for a related study of the textual significance of manuscript illustrations.
A number of references to Lydgate. In general, 15th-century lyrics on the Passion were more didactic than devotional in tone, with less 'visual meditative detail' and a greater emphasis on narrative, than those of the 13th and 14th centuries (183). When a poem of the period refers to the imago pietatis it is often with the assumption that its force would be conveyed by some 'visual representation external to the poem' (184). One of Lydgate's poems in the complaint genre, beginning 'Erly on morwe, and toward nyght also,' shows this assumption. It is odd that such poems as this by Lydgate are extant in literary rather than devotional manuscripts with accompanying illustrations. It may be Lydgate's intention that the poems are read in preparation for a church service. Woolf offers a close reading of the poem's religious imagery (198–202). In part 5 of the Testament, and in another piece beginning 'Man, to refourme thyn exil and thy loos,' Lydgate also uses the complaint of Christ on the cross (207–10). Lydgate's two nightingale poems are clearly influenced by John Pecham's poem, Philomena, but they render what is a 'passionate and moving' original into an 'odd blend of ornateness, didacticism, and emotional intensity' (232). Lydgate's lyrics typify those of the 15th century: tightly packed, long, didactic, and fervent, but without love or tenderness (237–8). He is a much more skilful poet than most of the earlier lyricists. If we are not happy with his work, it is more likely to be because of our perception within it of the 'disruption of the mediative tradition ... than any defect in him as a writer' (238).
Brief references. Burrow quotes lines 1–65 from ST(42–4) as evidence of the ‘enormous impact’ of Chaucer’s style on his followers (35).


John Stow writes the text of London, BL, MS Add. 29729 from a now lost volume copied by John Shirley (702). Folios 7r to 8r contain an eight-stanza poem; although the manuscript does not ascribe this poem to Lydgate, its contents are drawn mainly from his poems (702). The poem’s fourth stanza is also found on folio 169r of London, BL, MS Add. 21410 which gives a text for FP. This association further suggests that the short poem is by Lydgate (702–3). Edwards prints the text of the poem for the first time (704–6).


Folios 77r–78r of Cambridge, Magdalene College, MS Pepys 2011 contains previously unnoted extracts from Bks 2 and 3 of FP. Among some other unnoted FP stanzas in London, BL, MS Lansdowne 699, occurs one, on f. 61v, previously unpublished and now printed for the first time (170–1). The rarely found ‘Rome’ stanza from FP, Bk 2, lines 4481–7, occurs on f. 13r in Oxford, Bodleian Lib., MS Ashmole 59, a manuscript written by John Shirley. This previously unnoted instance is also printed for the first time (171). Edwards discusses the variants found in these manuscripts (170–1). [Edwards, 884, later adds Chicago, Newberry Lib., MS 33.3 to the list of manuscripts giving the ‘Rome’ stanza. See Edwards, 892, for further discussion of a newly rediscovered manuscript with the ‘Rome’ stanza.]

A bibliography for the period indicated, excluding ‘reviews and casual references in studies of wider scope’ (95).


A response to Renoir’s claim, 787, that ‘Lydgate’s attitude to women varies according to the nature of his audience’ (436). Bycorne and Chychevache, Mumming at Hertford, and Epistelle to Sibille suggest that the ‘occasion’ for the writing of a poem, and not just its audience, directed Lydgate’s attitude towards women (436–7). These ‘occasional pressures’ can be more important than an inferred ‘symmetry between stated attitude and assumed audience’ (437).


Cambridge, Univ. Lib., MS Add. 2707 (2) (BB) is a piece of the initial leaf of an ST manuscript (133). This text escapes the attention of the poem’s editors, Erdmann and Ekwall, 469 and 470, and of the authors, 647 and 772 of the Index to Middle English Verse (133–4). Edwards describes the fragment. Previously it must have been ‘part of a handsome manuscript, written on vellum by a professional scribe, decorated and rubricated.’ It may be related to another manuscript now lost (134). Edwards prints the text of the fragment (135–6).

London, BL, MS Add. 29729 is a John Stow autograph ‘almost certainly based on a lost original’ by John Shirley (527). Edwards prints three stanzas from folios 131 and 132 (528). The manuscript ascribes the second and third of these stanzas to Lydgate, and they seem to be a unique copy of previously unpublished stanzas from Lydgate’s poem, *Tyed With a Line* (527). The first stanza is without ascription, but it is found elsewhere ascribed to ‘Halsam’ (527–8). [South, 722, also refers to Lydgate and Halsam.]


Alexander Barclay’s *Life of St George* exists in only one printed text. Ten stanzas of this work, however, are found on the flyleaf of an FP manuscript, London, BL, MS Sloane 4031.


New York, Columbia Univ., Plimpton MS 255, now a fragment, seems once to have been a complete text of *FP* (29). A single leaf from this manuscript is found in the Free Library of Philadelphia. Edwards describes the leaf (30).
The number of surviving manuscripts for *FP* is evidence of its popularity; but the large number of manuscripts in which an extract from the poem is found is also significant. The poem seems to have been a favoured source for excerpts, particularly for the didactic parts added by Lydgate to his source (337). Some excerpts provide evidence of the 'conjunction of Lydgate and Chaucer' in the 15th and 16th centuries (338). Edwards provides a citation list for the surviving selections (338–42). See Mortimer, 1116, for supplements and corrections.

As a supplement to the few examples provided by Hammond (454: 368, 528, note on lines 65ff), Edwards provides a more accurate list of George Cavendish's borrowings from *FP* for his *Metrical Visions*. The borrowings give an 'indication of Cavendish's indebtedness to Lydgate' (207). See Edwards, 889, for discussion of the date of Cavendish's work.

Cambridge, Univ. Lib., MS Add. 3303 (7) provides an unrecorded text from Bk 3 of *LOL* (lines 1037–92, 1099–1141, 1378–1428, and 1429–84). The new manuscript contains 'many unique readings' (2), and originally formed part of another manuscript containing Columbia, Univ. of Missouri Lib., MS (Fragmenta Manuscripta) (3). See Jones, 905, and
Reimer, 1081, for discussion of other possible fragments that survive from the parent manuscript of the Cambridge text.


Notes and briefly describes a manuscript fragment of *FP*, in private possession in the United States, that is not recorded in the *Index of Middle English Verse*, 647, 772. The fragment contains the ‘Vitellius’ stanza.


*FP*, which offers Lydgate’s ‘most extended satire on women,’ enjoyed contemporary popularity, and selections from it were often included in manuscripts. Folios 81–143r in London, BL, MS Harley 2251 is such a selection, taken mainly from the envoys which represent ‘Lydgate’s own additions to his source’ (32). The extracts on folios 138r to 143r are particularly antifeminist in tone. On these folios a contemporary annotator, ‘possibly the scribe himself’ (33), has written his disagreement into the manuscript margin. Edwards prints the text for these folios with their marginal annotations (34–44). See Hammond, 613, for a related discussion.

The version of *FP* in San Marino, Huntington Lib., MS HM 268 is textually interesting for containing the infrequently found ‘Rome’ stanza from Bk 2, lines 4481–7. [Edwards adds in a footnote that he has also discovered this stanza in another manuscript, Chicago, Newberry Lib., MS 33.3 (37, note 2). For further references to this stanza in other manuscripts see Edwards, 872 and 892.] The Huntington HM 268 manuscript is of particular interest because of its numerous miniatures, a feature that is ‘extremely rare’ in *FP* manuscripts. A number of leaves are missing from the manuscript; some of the missing leaves form a second manuscript, London, BL, MS Sloane 2452 (37). Edwards describes Sloane 2452 (37–40): its miniatures seem to have suffered ‘heavy retouching’ (39); unfortunately, it sheds no new light on the provenance of HM 268 (40).

885. ———. “‘Slyppur is to Grype Ouer Whom is No Holde.’” *Neuphilologische Mitteilungen* 74 (1973): 126–7.

A fourteen line poem on folio 55 of London, BL, MS Royal 17 D.xviii, signed by ‘Nicholas Wikes,’ shows clear echoes of *FP*. Edwards prints the text (127) as it represents a ‘minor instance’ of the considerable influence of Lydgate’s poem (126).


Stow’s use of *LSEF*, together with manuscript evidence (particularly from London, BL, MS Yates Thompson 47), shows the nature of his ‘scholarly method and antiquarian interest in medieval poetry’ (366). Stow seems mainly to use *LSEF* as a source for his historical and topographical researches (369).

London, BL, MS Harley 2251 gives the text, among other pieces, of a Hymn to the Virgin. A variant of this poem is found in Oxford, Bodleian Lib., MS Ashmole 59, transcribed in the hand of John Shirley. Both manuscripts seem to reproduce imperfectly a lost original. The poem uniquely shows the influence of both the Office of the Assumption and the Song of Songs; the former, in particular, assists in the sequencing of its stanzas. Style, language, and form suggest that the poem may be a possible addition to the Lydgate canon. The authors print the text of the poem (64–6).


Two lines from Gavin Douglas’s Palice of Honour show a knowledge of FP, and so offer ‘yet another instance of the pervasive influence of Lydgate’s poem in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries.’


Brief references. Hammond (454: 368) implies that Cavendish’s Metrical Visions were written after 1554 as they ‘borrow extensively from Lydgate’s Fall of Princes, two editions of which probably appeared in that year’ (129). [See Tottle, 413, and Wayland, 414, for these early editions.] Other factors, however, show that this evidence is not persuasive and suggest that Cavendish started work on the Metrical Visions in 1552–3 (132). See Edwards, 880, for discussion of Cavendish’s borrowings from FP.

Edwards describes Montreal, McGill Univ. Lib., MS 143, a fragment of *FP* (75–6). It contains two miniatures, ‘rare in manuscripts of this poem,’ one of which may be of Lydgate, and the infrequently found envoy to Duke Humphrey. The manuscript’s most important feature, however, is its relationship to London, BL, MS Harley 1766 (76). These two manuscripts are very similar in their handwriting and share some unusual features (76–77). It seems that both come from a scriptorium producing presentation copies of Lydgate’s poems (77). [See Edwards, 893, and 899, Doyle, 857–8, Bergen 463, and Scott, 867, for further references to the matter of a Lydgate scriptorium.] They might represent an earlier version of the *FP* produced by Lydgate to secure payment prior to the release of the final text (77).


*FP* translates Laurent de Premierfait’s second prose translation of Boccaccio’s *De casibus virorum illustrium* (424–5). Lydgate adds didactic commentaries to his ‘shapeless’ original and gives it ‘poetic form’ (425). There is no proof that Lydgate uses Boccaccio’s original (425); *De casibus* was probably little read in England, with most readers knowing only Lydgate’s translation (426–8). *FP* is read across a ‘broad social spectrum’ that includes nobles, priests, and bibliophiles (429). It is printed four times between 1494 and 1555 (430). [See Pynson, 386 and 404, Totté, 413, and Wayland, 414.] Its manuscripts contain few miniatures, suggesting they are ‘made to be read, not to be looked at’ (430). Manuscript excerpts indicate that Lydgate’s ‘sententious generalities’ were valued (431). References to Boccaccio in Barclay, Sempill, Caxton, and Hawes show familiarity with
him through Lydgate's translation (432–4). John Hardyng, Gavin Douglas, and, especially, George Cavendish use Lydgate as a source (436–8). [See Edwards, 880, regarding Cavendish, and 888, regarding Douglas.] The Mirror for Magistrates lies outside this article's terms of reference, but it is the 'most ambitious attempt to chronicle history on the Lydgatean model' (438), and it, not Lydgate's poem, gives 'stimulus to Elizabethan tragic writers' (439).


Item number 1168 in The Supplement to the Index of Middle English Verse, 772, a copy of FP, had been missing. It has now been found in the collection of the University of Victoria (Victoria, BC, Univ. of Victoria, McPherson Lib. MS). Edwards describes the manuscript (176). It is related to Princeton, Univ. Lib., MS Garrett 139: both contain the rare 'Rome' stanza from Bk 2, lines 4481–7, in addition to five lines following Bk 3, line 1078, which are not found elsewhere. [See Edwards, 872 and 884, for further discussion of the 'Rome' stanza]. Aside from these passages, the manuscript is of 'no great authority' (177).

Edwards provides a list of complete and fragmentary manuscripts of FP to 'supplement and correct' that of the Index of Middle English Verse, 647, and its Supplement, 772 (177–8). See Edwards, 879, for a list of manuscript selections, and Edwards, 895, for a later update.

The Lydgate manuscripts are an important and neglected resource (15). Study of their decoration is needed: publications by Spriggs, 830, Scott, 866–8, and Alexander, 929, are ‘helpful beginnings’ (16). Studies of the scribes would also be useful (16–17). Edwards discusses the work of a Lydgate scribe who may have a role in disseminating the manuscripts (17–19). [See Edwards, 890, and 899, Doyle, 857–8, Bergen 463, and Scott, 867, for further references to the matter of a Lydgate scriptorium.] Notwithstanding Green (958: 132), John Shirley may have a commercial motive in circulating Lydgate’s work (19–21). Green’s theory (958: 211) of the importance of the court over the new reading class as the driving force of 15th-century literature is doubtful, at least for Lydgate (21–2). The manuscripts attest to Lydgate’s broad popularity in the 15th and 16th centuries (22–3). Manuscript study is badly needed to settle the Lydgate canon (24–5). Seaton’s ascription of Lydgate material to Sir Richard Roos, 804, on the basis of cryptograms is very suspect. The same may be said for the claim by Gibson, 1005, that Lydgate is involved with writing the N-Town cycle (25). Kratzmann’s theory, 993, that Lydgate does not influence Scottish literature is open to challenge (25–6). See Edwards, 894, for a related discussion.


A survey of about a hundred critical works and editions relevant to Lydgate. Pearsall’s book-length study, 824, is the best (30–1), follower by Schirmer’s, 758 (29–30); Renoir, 789, is ‘illuminating’ only on ST, otherwise it has ‘fewer virtues’ than the others do (30). New Lydgate editions are badly needed (31); Norton-Smith, 496, provides the best of the recent editions (31–2). There should be a reassessment of Lydgate’s metre based on the manuscripts and not on editions that already imply a model of the poet’s metre (39–40). It is likely that further study would show some of Lydgate’s works to be highly influential ‘models of style and diction’ for readers more socially diverse than those of Chaucer (40).
Work is needed to establish the canon, parts of which are disputed (40–1). See Edwards, 893, for a related discussion.


A partial update to the Lydgate manuscript listing provided by Renoir and Benson, 792. The Manual entry, although ‘valuable,’ still presents some ‘problems’ following its revision: the Lydgate canon has not been reconsidered; an adequate check has not been made of the accuracy of ‘assertions made in the Index of Middle English Verse [647]and its Supplement [772]; and there are ‘frequent errors in foliation’ (450). Edwards lists specific updates (450–2).


Lydgate has read Chaucer’s works thoroughly and he has taken from them a ‘stock of stylistic commonplaces.’ His better short narrative poems, like the Churl and the Bird, owe something to the model of the compact verse-narrative developed by Chaucer in the Legend of Good Women and CT (176). Sometimes, Lydgate’s adaptation of Chaucer’s example is ‘inept,’ as in CBK (176–7), but the echoes of Chaucer’s CT in ST are a deliberate signal that his work is to command the same respect and attention as Chaucer’s (177). A similar strategy is behind Lydgate’s praise of Chaucer for introducing a ‘distinctive poetic language’ (178). Lydgate does not specify which of Chaucer’s works he has in mind because the values he praises are, in fact, the characteristics of his own verse for which he seeks astutely the ‘protection of Chaucer’s achievement’ (179).

Edwards provides a full manuscript description. Cambridge, Magdalene College, MS Pepys 2006, gives a text for *CBK* (1–17), *TG* (17–52), and *SD* (191–209).


Prints, for the first time, eight lines of text, item 1164 in the *Index of Middle English Verse*, 647, from folio 1 of London, BL, MS Royal 18 C.ii (307). Edwards identifies the verse as coming from Bk 2, lines 1849–56, of *TB*. Quotations from Lydgate, particularly *FP*, are common, but this is one of only two known examples from *TB*. It is a minor instance of the ‘late medieval manuscript conjunction of Chaucer and Lydgate’ (308).


Several references to Lydgate in a discussion of the early commercialization of the English book-trade. There is ‘some evidence’ that Lydgate collaborates with John Shirley, and with a scriptorium, perhaps at Bury St Edmunds. [See Bergen 463, Doyle, 857–8, Scott, 867, and Edwards, 890 and 893, for further references to a Lydgate scriptorium.] It is also possible that some of his work may be written to supply the commercial book-trade (259–60). Some Lydgate manuscripts provide hints as to the use and retention of exemplars by commercial scribes, these manuscripts include: Oxford, Bod. Lib., MS Digby 230; Oxford, Bod. Lib., MS Rawlinson C.446; London, BL, MS Royal 18.D.vi; Oxford,
Exeter College, MS 129; London, BL, MS Harley 1245; London, BL, MS Add. 39659; London, BL, MS Longleat 254; and, especially, the 'Lydgate scribe' copies of LSEF and FP (263–6). [See Scott, 867, and Edwards, 890, regarding the Lydgate scribe copies.]

Similarly, Lydgate manuscripts also provide evidence of the treatment of ordinatio by scribal copyists. A general trend to compress material additional to the poetic text, and to omit illustrations, may be explained, in part, by commercial factors and by a lack of suitable exemplars (264–7). It is difficult to tell whether a manuscript has been produced speculatively or in response to a specific commission. For example, London, BL, Add. MS 21410 has spaces left for some decoration, but it is likely that this reflects the purchaser’s request and not the scribe’s intention to produce something speculatively that could be completed later according to the buyer’s wish (265–6). Sometimes it appears that even buyers of means were happy to purchase manuscripts with incomplete decoration, as the London, BL, MS Royal 18.D.ii copy of TB and ST shows (266). The New York, Pierpont Morgan Lib., MS M876 copy of TB ‘comes closest’ to giving evidence of incomplete illustration that may be attributed to a purely ‘economic cause.’ It is not possible to say whether the incomplete illustration is because of speculation on the part of the scribe, or the failure of the customer to finalize the commission (267). The evidence of the Lydgate manuscripts for provincial manuscript copying is interesting, but speculative (268–9). See Edwards, 900, for a related discussion.


The New Haven, Yale Univ., Beinecke Lib., MS 661 text of ST provides a number of insights into manuscript production (181). The compression of its layout suggests the commercial production of a ‘standardized format’; the quality of its decoration suggests the prestige both of the poem and of its readers. The lack of illustrations is typical of the
secular texts written in English at this time, but may in this instance also indicate a 'lack of available illustrative models' (182). The scribe was Stephen Doddesham (184). Edwards discusses the known details of Doddesham's life and work (184–93). Doddesham copies ST three times: Beinecke MS 661; Massachusetts, Boston Public Lib., MS F. med.94; and Cambridge, Univ. Lib., MS Add. 3137. Edwards supplies brief descriptions of the manuscripts (191–3) and reproduces a page from each of them (figs 1–3). See Edwards, 899, for a related discussion.


A discussion of Oxford, Bodleian Lib., MS Arch. Selden B.24 and its role in the Scottish literary culture of the late middle ages. The manuscript contains a text of Lydgate's CBK, ascribed to Chaucer with the title *The Maying and Disport of Chaucer.* In 1508, Chepman and Myllar print CBK, 394, under the title found in the Selden manuscript. Selden is either the source for the Chepman and Myllar print or 'not very far removed from it.' These attributions to Chaucer may be part of a 'Scottish misappropriation of Chaucerian identity' (60). On this last point see Edwards, 236.

The manuscripts owned and circulated by John Shirley give an insight into the presentation of courtly culture to a non-courtly audience. Shirley's frequent rubrics about the circumstances that give rise to the composition of works by Lydgate strive to show the poet as an intimate of the 'great and the good.' The rubrics may or may not be strictly true: it could be that they are intended simply to give the manuscripts' non-courtly readers a feeling that they are sharing in court culture (316). Shirley's motivation behind the circulation of the manuscripts is likely to have been primarily commercial, but his snobbishness in wishing to 'refract' courtly culture may be a factor in his choice of works (317).


Brief references to the Lydgate manuscripts owned by William Browne. Edwards lists these manuscripts with others known to have been owned by Browne (445–7).


In a discussion of the surviving examples of inscriptional verse that are known to be closely related to a visual context, Edwards makes brief references to *DM* (31–2), *Bycorne and Chychevache* (32–3), *Legend of St George* (33), *A Procession of Corpus Christi* (33–4), *The Dolerous Pyte of Crystes Passioun* (34), *Balade of ye Ymage of Our Lady, De profundis, Cristes Passioun, Testament, and Lamentation to the Virgin* (34). *Bycorne and*
Chychevache and the Legend of St George are two of only three surviving texts written to accompany a tapestry. [See Hammond, 451, for a related discussion.] Lydgate's apparent 'preoccupation' with the visual context of some of his religious poetry follows from his belief that his texts will 'complement the display of scared images' (33). There are also examples where his texts seem to be intended to be, or subsequently used as, display pieces in themselves (34).


Leaf number 178 of a manuscript in the University of Missouri Library [Columbia, Univ. of Missouri Lib., MS (Fragmenta Manuscripta)] is an unedited fragment of LOL. Jones describes the manuscript and discusses its relationship to the other surviving LOL manuscripts (93–5). He prints the text (95–6). See Edwards and Jenkins, 881, and Reimer, 1081, for discussion of other possible fragments that survive from the parent manuscript of the Missouri text.


Using the system devised by Morris Halle and Samuel J. Keyser for the analysis of Chaucer's metre, it can be shown that Lydgate's metre is consistent according to Lydgate's own practice. Lydgate has to struggle with a language that is undergoing rapid change at the time he writes (123). Final -e is more important to Lydgate's orthography than as a syllable in the scansion of his poetry (126–7). English stress-patterns also may have changed between Lydgate and Chaucer (127). Lydgate could find in Chaucer examples of
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the five line-types identified by Schick, 442 (143–4). Lines that were exceptional in Chaucer are over-used by Lydgate (144). Many later poets have written lines with stress patterns similar to those favoured by Lydgate: it is not the Chaucerians, but the 18th-century poets who are metrically aberrant because of their excessive emphasis on regular metre (144–5). See Burrow, 47, Jefferson, 320, and Stanley, 331, for discussion of Lydgate’s metre.


Several references to LSEF in a discussion of the complex evolution of the St Edmund legend. Lydgate takes liberties with his sources in the names of consistency, politics, and art. This does not mean that he disbelieves the historical reality of his subject, but it does show that he does not see his source as ‘sacred and unalterable fact’ (61). Lydgate’s version of the St Edmund legend works, as do the others, to ‘foster the cult and spread its influence’ (62).


In his study on Lydgate, Schirmer (758: 165) says that the miracles listed in the second half of Bk 3 of LSEF have only an instructive purpose and lack any artistic plan (279–80). In fact, they reveal a ‘notable interest in artistic balance’ on Lydgate’s part (280). Lydgate’s use of rhyme, and thematic, syntactic, and verbal repetitions give artistic structure to his work (280–90).
The argument that Shakespeare's *Troilus and Cressida* is a satire partly relies on the assumption that the Trojan and Greek characters are earlier criticized in Caxton and Lydgate. This assumption is false. Lydgate, in particular, presents the 'heroes predominantly in a favourable light, as admirable figures' (125). Sacharoff discusses Lydgate's treatment of Hector, Agamemnon, Ajax, Troilus, and Paris, among others (127-30). Hector's 'tragic error' follows from his 'trust in Fortune' (127); his virtue may be meant to recall Henry V (127-8). See Benson, 915, for an examination of Hector's fatal flaw.

Lydgate shapes, and moralizes upon, his supposedly historical material in *TB* in order to use the story as a vehicle for moral instruction (5). Studer briefly surveys the medieval distortion of the Troy legend (6-7); he then discusses Lydgate's treatment of the legend, and focuses, in particular, on the poet's use of Fortune (7-13). See Benson, 916, for the view that the historical aspect of *TB* is more important to Lydgate than its moral emphasis.

Refers to DM (168–70) in a discussion of allegory and mirror as modes of expression in ME writing. Lydgate’s poem combines a discussion of the estates with the imagery of the Dance of Death genre (168). The poem focuses on the ‘inevitability of death’ (168–9). Lydgate’s characters are based neither on ‘ideals’ nor on their debased counterparts, but represent ‘rather typical figures’ (170).


A consideration and development of Nichols’s earlier studies, 698–9. Nichols fails to ‘highlight the marked rhetorical similarities’ between Lydgate and Dunbar (227), and he misses a number of parallels between RS and the Golden Targe, A Wicked Tunge and Of Deming, and Evil Marriage and The Tua Mariit Wemen and the Wedo. Perhaps, more seriously, he does not sufficiently note the differences between the two writers: Dunbar sees the limitations of the complex style used by Lydgate, and he is much more concise in his own expression; he favours lyric over narrative, and avoids the extremes of amplification (217). The parallels Nichols sees between the devotional verse of the two poets is open to challenge as some of these may simply be the result of the two poets working within the same tradition (219). See Zettersten, 992, and Ting, 1058 for further discussion.


It has long been known that the prose Sege of Troy is a ‘brief redaction’ of TB. Nevertheless, in the characterization of Calchas, the Sege of Troy takes its detail from Chaucer’s Troilus and Criseyde (127).
In creating a sense of history in *TB*, Lydgate follows Chaucer's lead. Whereas Chaucer exploits the 'clash between present and past to produce ... complex dramatic and thematic tensions,' Lydgate's approach is 'much less sophisticated and more mechanical' (300). In order to suggest an ancient and distant culture, Lydgate includes: 'classical stories and mythological decoration; accounts of ancient secular customs; and accounts of pagan religious practices, especially burial rites' (301). Benson discusses examples of these (301–11). In spite of Lydgate's efforts, the 'final effect ... is surprisingly unimpressive' (311).

Lydgate praises the 'historical accuracy' of Guido della Colonna's *Historia destructionis Troiae* and uses the *Historia* as his source for *TB*. For the death of Hector episode, however, he turns to Christine de Pizan's *L'Epistre Othea* (115). He does this for the presentation of Hector's death as the result of a fatal flaw, an episode of foolish imprudence on the 'part of a knight who had previously symbolized prudence and discretion' (119). Lydgate uses the theme of prudence borrowed from Christine throughout *TB*, partly to 'explain the forces behind the events of the war' (117). See Sacharoff, 909, for the view that Lydgate's portrayal of Hector may be modelled, in part, on Henry V.
Ch. 5 is entitled ‘John Lydgate’s *Troy Book: History as Learned Rhetoric*’ (97–129). Lydgate uses the convention of rhetorical amplification in his translation of Guido della Colonna’s *Historia destructionis Troiae* to make his work interesting without diminishing what he sees as its factual content. His model is Chaucer: the difference between the approach of the two writers is that Chaucer fundamentally reshapes his source material as fiction, whereas Lydgate only decorates the surface of his history (98–106). Lydgate adds classical allusions to his translation to create a sense of the past: he is influenced in this by Chaucer, but he does not show Chaucer’s sophisticated ability to use cultural differences to dramatic effect (106–113). Despite the claims of Renoir, 789, and Pearsall, 818, Lydgate is not blindly hostile to classical poetry and religion (108). Lydgate’s commitment to historical accuracy never allows style to distort the facts of the story as he finds them (113–15). He draws numerous moral lessons from his material, but contrary to Schirmer, 758, and Studer, 910, these are generally superficial. His text is primarily a history and not a vehicle for moral instruction the like of *FP* (116–20). Lydgate’s Lady Fortune is not a consistent expression of destiny; as with his rhetorical touches and moralizations, the references to fortune and fate are decorative (120–24). In the death of Hector, Lydgate lightens the pessimism and fatalism of his source and advocates prudence as a virtue. His treatment of Hector relies on Christine de Pizan’s *L’ Epistre Othea*. (124–9).


Brief references. *TB* is unusual among the English histories of Troy for its interest in the love story of Troilus and Criseyde. Lydgate seems to appreciate the ‘comedy and tragedy’
of Chaucer’s *Troilus and Criseyde* and to understand Chaucer’s ‘sympathy for Criseyde’ (156).


Compares *TB* and Robert Henryson’s *Testament of Cresseid* in terms of their response to Chaucer’s *Troilus and Criseyde*. Much of this comparison is structured by examining how Lydgate and Henryson shape the four elements that C.S. Lewis identifies as added by Chaucer to his source material: ‘history, rhetoric, doctrine, and courtly love’ (27). Lydgate comes to Chaucer as a literary critic, but Henryson comes as a fellow artist. ‘We should honor Lydgate for his critical acumen (and consider him the patron saint of academic Chaucerians), but Henryson is more than a Chaucerian; he is the English writer’s true poetic successor’ (40).


Lydgate and Hoccleve seem to be clearer in their praise of Chaucer’s language than in their praise of his verse (104–5). They belong to a period that admires the ‘aptness, freshness, conciseness, and polish’ of Chaucer’s use of language (105). When Lydgate speaks of Chaucer’s rhetoric he should be taken as meaning not just the technical study of rhetoric, but the general use of language (106). In seeking to copy the ‘polish’ of Chaucer’s language, Lydgate overlooks ‘aptness’ and ‘freshness’ (108). Lydgate, unlike Hoccleve, correctly sees the distinctiveness of Chaucer’s metre, but he fails to reproduce it because he
can not or will not 'adhere to it strictly' (113). The subtleness of Chaucer’s use of final -e is not apparent to Hoccleve and Lydgate (115).


A number of references to Lydgate in a discussion of English literary style in the late 14th and early 15th centuries. The period is one when an ‘enriched language moved towards new forms of expression’; its occasional appearance of frigidity followed from writers putting ‘old wine in new bottles’ (381). An analysis of lines 29-56 of *A Balade in Commendation of Our Lady* shows that Lydgate’s use of aureation is not simply an exchange of familiar words for new ones, but involves a highly considered use of language (353–6). TG is an example of much of the writing at this period that has the appearance of allegory, but is, in fact, basically narrative in nature (376).


Rollins, 667, argues that the reputation of Crisyede went into decline only as a result of renaissance readers’ misunderstanding Robert Henryson’s treatment of her in the *Testament of Cresseid*. He uses this to explain why Chaucer presents her favourably and Shakespeare does not (74–5). In fact, Chaucer’s portrayal is ironic, and this was understood by 15th-century writers like Henryson and Lydgate. The original of the story by Benoit de Sainte-Maure, *Le Roman de Troie*, acknowledges women’s fickleness (79–89). The most popularly successful adaptation of the story, Guido della Colonna’s *Historia destructionis Troiae*, is ‘even more rigidly a lesson in the fickleness of women’ (90). TB translates
Guido, but it is heavily influenced by Chaucer's *Troilus and Criseyde* and its ironic presentation of Criseyde (116–26). Henryson's *Testament of Cresseid* draws on *TB* (136–40).


A number of references in an argument that Chaucer's verse was not written as iambic pentameter. Robinson maintains a better reading of Chaucer is produced by being sensitive to sound and speech rhythms, and to manuscript punctuation, and by avoiding a mechanical approach to final –e. Before Thomas Tyrwhitt regularized Chaucer's metre no one saw a distinction between the metre of Chaucer and that of Lydgate; after Tyrwhitt, Lydgate was regarded as having misunderstood the metre of his master (67). Bennett, 730, Saintsbury, 634, and Legouis, 680, are among examples of this later opinion. Schick's classification of five Lydgate line-types, 442, has the effect of supporting the traditional view of the differences between Chaucer and Lydgate; but Schick's admission that many of Lydgate's lines would not fit these patterns seems to undermine the value of his model (68–70). The argument that Lydgate has simply 'forgotten' the mechanics of reading Chaucer is impossible to accept (70–1). Lydgate's lines are generally rhythmical, and they are in the same metrical tradition as those of Chaucer and Hoccleve (200). The verse is often bad; however, this does not mean that Lydgate is metrically incompetent. He is, in fact, a 'competent hack' (201). Example lines show Lydgate's metre working within a basically pentameter framework (202–5). One way to explain Lydgate's 'broken-backed' line is to begin by seeing the pentameter written by Hoccleve and Lydgate, and possibly by Chaucer, as being two half-lines with five metrical feet. In the case of a broken-backed line, the feet are abandoned and the line relies on the balance of the half-line structure. Such lines are only a problem if one tries to read them as composed of metrical feet (206). Robinson discusses the 'decorative' nature of Lydgate's approach to poetry (207–11). In a poem like
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*FP,* the processing of Lydgate’s material is one of translation and aureation. Lydgate avoids becoming the ‘I’ of the poem in contrast to Chaucer’s practice, and instead applies ‘beauties to a separately existing subject.’ He adds emotional adjectives, and he follows these with encyclopedic digressions and amplifications (208–9). Lydgate’s use of rhetoric is not incompetent, and can be effective in its own way (210). It is ironic that the metre Chaucer uses to express ‘lively speech’ is ‘fossilized by Lydgate to keep speech out.’ The poets of the 15th century have not forgotten Chaucer, but they misuse him as the ‘great rhetorical innovator’ (212).


Each of the various terms that is applied during the Middle Ages to narrative genres carries its own connotations (348). Lydgate’s use of ‘storie’ in *TB* contributes to the evidence that he sees his task as being to ‘write history in English according to the decorums by which history should be written, to paint the _substantia _of a venerable story in _colours _of his own choosing’ (352).


Brief references. Although Lydgate calls *ST_ a tale, he always stresses that ‘it is based on a source-storie that is grounded in earlier legend’ (19). See Strohm, 923, for a related study on *TB._
Brief references to Lydgate and Hoccleve in an argument that the Chaucer tradition is not 'exhausted' at the death of Chaucer; what is subsequently lost, with the dispersal of the primary audience and with the arrival of a new social context, is the capacity to appreciate Chaucer's work. Chaucer seems to write for his 'circle' at court, and only infrequently does he address those who are clearly socially superior (16–17). Lydgate and Hoccleve, living at the outer edge of the circle enjoyed by Chaucer, frequently write for their social superiors in the hope of profit or advancement. It is possible that Lydgate's and Hoccleve's poetry would have benefited if they, like Chaucer, had written for a close and supportive audience (17–18).

Some of Strohm's material is restated or further developed in 927 and has been annotated there. The present item offers additional consideration of the political context of Lydgate's verses on Duke Humphrey's marriage to Jaqueline of Hainault. Lydgate's verses for the duke are typically Lancastrian in that their bland surface hides internal contradictions that come close to irony (192–4).
In part, a restatement and further development of material from 926 with additional perspectives on the sense in which Lydgate is a court poet and on the range of his work. Lydgate is not a court poet in the sense of one who lives within the court and enjoys its steady remuneration for creative writing (640); nevertheless, much of his work may be seen as courtly on the ground that the court acts as its ‘imaginative stimulus and emotional aspiration’ (641). The Lancastrians are many faceted, yet they have an abiding self-interest in the use of literature. The Lancastrian ‘literary enterprise’ is particularly absorbed with the theme of ‘legitimation’ (643). Prince Henry’s letter requesting that the young Lydgate be permitted to continue his studies at Oxford may indicate that the prince has already seen Lydgate’s ‘potential political usefulness.’ TB and ST are the first examples of Lydgate’s large-scale endeavours to foster Henry’s interests (651); these are followed by the ‘laureate period,’ between 1422–3 and 1433–4 (654), the end of which sees Lydgate start on FP. In TB Lydgate deals with the dubious legality of the foundation of Lancastrian government by focusing on the proper inheritance of power by Henry V from Henry IV (653) and on the ‘right’ of Henry V to rule in France (653–4). The theme of Henry V’s claim on France is repeated in other works of the laureate period. TB and ST have frequent references to the idea of ‘just succession.’ TB, ST, and FP, however, all acknowledge, as Hoccleve does [see Strohm, 292–4], the ‘chaos’ that may undermine the order of history. Lydgate refers to his ‘just authorial inheritance’ from Chaucer as a counter to these uncertainties, and so he creates a reassuring parallel to the inheritance of Henry V (654). Nevertheless, Lydgate undermines his efforts here by his obvious ambition to replace Chaucer in the vernacular canon (654–5); and his insistence on the importance of ‘good sources’ for TB is likewise weakened by his frequent variations from the inherited source material. Lydgate appears to offer a ‘reluctant acknowledgement’ that author and prince, may be ‘self-legitimating’ (655); the ‘official optimism’ of his work, however, inevitably shows cracks of pessimism (656). Lawton’s analysis, 321, of the role of dullness in Lancastrian poetry is astute; but to it may be added an acknowledgment of the ‘morass of embarrassing half-acknowledgements and debilitating self-contradictions’ into which even the most loyal Lancastrian poets are plunged (660).

Stanzas 31 and 32 of Lydgate's poem, *King Henry VI's Triumphant Entry Into London*, form a roundel (36–7). The refrain lines are not fully written out in the manuscript. This may mean that Lydgate is an innovator alongside Christine de Pizan who also curtails the refrain in her French rondeaux; or it may simply mean that the refrains have not been repeated as a matter of shorthand, as occurs in some Chaucer and Hoccleve manuscripts (38).


Brief references. Lydgate's translation of Deguileville's *Pilgrimage of the Life of Man* found in London, BL, MS Cotton Tiberius, A.vii has 53 coloured drawings, possibly by William Abell. The borders, initials, and a small historiated initial on folio 1 of Oxford, Bodleian Lib., MS Bodley 686, a manuscript which contains Chaucer's *CT* and some Lydgate pieces, may also be by Abell (167).


Nostalgia for chivalry in the 15th century came from a desire for order. *TB* initially reflects the martial values of its patron, Prince Henry, and supports the ideal of chivalry; but the expression of Lydgate's doubts about wars, even those fought for a just cause, grows as the
poem proceeds. Many of Lydgate's additions to his source concern chivalry; Lydgate's discussion of the Trojan war uses the language of knighthood (8–10). By the time of writing ST, Lydgate is 'anti-militaristic' (12).


Brief references. Elaborate storm descriptions, although a recognized feature of alliterative poetry, are not generally found in non-alliterative poetry. TB contains some extended storm descriptions not directly attributable to its source, Guido della Colonna's Historia destructionis Troiae. These are not strong evidence of an independent, non-alliterative, tradition of 'expanded storm descriptions' as they may be taken from the alliterative Destruction of Troy (699). [Sundwall, 952, also refers to a possible relationship between TB and the Destruction of Troy.]


Kean makes a number of references to Lydgate, principally in Ch. 6 (210–39), during his argument that 15th- and 16th-century writers have a deeper understanding of Chaucer's literary achievement than is usually acknowledged. In particular, Kean takes issues with the notion that the 15th-century Chaucerians' view of Chaucer's rhetoric excludes substance and is limited to matters of style. Lydgate's short poem beginning 'Lat no man booste of conning nor vertu' is an example of an 'assured handling' of imagery (199). It is very doubtful that the Chaucerians see nothing more in Chaucer's work than a high rhetorical style: the stylistic range of the 15th-century writers, which includes the plain writing also found in Chaucer, is wider than is often acknowledged. They are not to be
dismissed as ‘stupid’; and their concept of Chaucer’s achievement goes beyond their apparent praise for the rhetorically over-blown (210–11). Lydgate shares Chaucer’s interest in classical antiquity (213–14). Examples from Lydgate and Feylde, 522, show that the 15th- and 16th-century concept of rhetoric includes content as well as style (215–16). What the later writers really admire about Chaucer is his ‘ability to suit style to subject-matter’ (226). Lydgate’s use of aureate language is partly a technique of translation that can also be seen in Chaucer (227–8), and partly a desire to enrich the vernacular and form new words that can be used in rhyming (228–9). Lydgate’s use of words like ‘aureate’ (229–32), ‘enlumyne’ (232–3), and ‘fulsome’ (236–7) implies meanings that go beyond superficial issues of style.


Pikeryng does not derive the serious plot for *Horestes* from Caxton’s *Recuvel of the Historyes of Troye*, as previously thought, but from *TB* (255). A close comparison between the Pikeryng, Caxton, and Lydgate shows *TB* to provide the basis for *Horestes*. The two works share a ‘vocabulary, phraseology, and moral outlook’ (266).


Brief references. There is a tendency to exaggerate the modernity of 15th-century writers like Lydgate and Hoccleve (242–3). When Lydgate calls Chaucer a ‘rhetorician’ he means that poetry is a form of rhetoric (246). It is possible that John Blakeney knew Lydgate.
The region of Lydgate’s monastery is a ‘comparative oasis’ in the ‘turbulent times’ of the 15th century (246); the young Henry VI stays at Bury St Edmunds during the winter of 1433–4 (246–7).


Brief references. The presentation of Antony and Cleopatra varies widely in the Middle Ages. Lydgate treats Cleopatra as a ‘model of constancy’ or as fickle, duplicitous, and greedy (147). This range of treatments follows from the nature of the exemplum genre, and the complexity of the story of Antony and Cleopatra which allows for multiple interpretations (148).


A number of brief, illustrative references to Lydgate in a discussion of mirror imagery in medieval and renaissance texts.


Lydgate’s descriptions of landscape draw on traditional stock images (46–50).

*The Kingis Quair* clearly shows the influence of *PLM* (36–8). This influence has a bearing on the dating of James’s poem (38).


*FP*, lines 4348–65, provides an unusual representation of avarice in terms of the three-headed god Cerberus. Lydgate may have been partly influence by Laurent de Premierfait’s translation of Boccaccio’s *De casibus virorum illustrium*, but a more probable source is Coluccio Salutati’s *De laboribus Herculis*.


Brief references to *PLM* as a translation of Guillaume de Deguileville’s *Pelerinage de Vie Humaine* in a broader discussion about the temptations of the Flesh, World, and Devil in Spenser and Milton (5–6). [On the basis of the edition by Triggs, 444, Cullen incorrectly credits the *Assembly of Gods* to Lydgate (6).]


*HGS* was probably the most popular of Lydgate’s short poems, yet it has been dismissed by modern critics. A close reading of the arguments put by the three animals shows that these
are undercut by irony. Lydgate's originality lies in combining the 'rhetorically skilful double argument' with the more traditional elements of 'estates philosophy,' 'debat pattern,' and 'beast-fable parliament' (157).


Lydgate seems to be responsible for popularising proverbs regarding the fierceness of tigers. He tends to use them in reference to 'pagan warriors, enemies of the Church, and women.' This example may be indicative of Lydgate's wider influence on the language (303).


Provides a selected listing, sometimes with brief annotations, of editions and criticism about the five poets included in the present bibliography in addition to several that are excluded.
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Brief references. *TG* presents a marriage proposal that seems to follow a model Chaucer sets in *Troilus and Criseyde* (291–3).


Kelly argues that neither Boccaccio nor Laurent de Premierfait sees the stories of *De casibus virorum illustrium* as tragedies, whereas Chaucer and Lydgate do. Kelly examines to what extent this perception on the part of Chaucer and Lydgate leads them to change the original stories when incorporating them into their own work. Lydgate is discussed primarily in Ch. 4 and Ch. 5, with a strong emphasis on Lydgate’s potential sources, both classical and medieval, for the meaning of tragedy. Kelly makes frequent reference to *FP* and *TB* (149–215). Lydgate is concerned to be seen as a ‘sincere and devout religious’; he says nothing about the potential for irony in a reading of Chaucer’s Monk or his tale (149). It is possible that Lydgate does not bother to check back to *CT* while he is writing (150–1). Lydgate’s concept of tragedy as an instructive tool, narrating the ‘disastrous’ end of those concerned, draws on medieval notions of the genre found in Averroes and Chaucer.

Lydgate shows a consciousness, however, shared by Boccaccio, but not by Chaucer, of the ‘acted dimension’ of classical tragedy (151). Kelly points to Lydgate’s apparent knowledge of acting as a part of classical tragedy, and to a range of possible sources for this knowledge (152–66). Lydgate’s general concept of tragedy has a number of shared points with that held by Chaucer (162). Lydgate’s definition of tragedy generally allows both for the random action of Fortune and for falls brought about through sin. Nevertheless, Lydgate sometimes suggests (and so creates the potential for contradiction in his work) that tragic victims are ‘always responsible for their fall’ (175). Kelly then discusses Lydgate’s presentation of tragedy in *FP* (177–215). Farnham’s notion, 726, of a progression in the element of personal responsibility found in tragedy from Boccaccio to Chaucer and then to Lydgate is wrong (214); and Scanlon’s work, 1108, lacks some supporting evidence (214, note).


Tabulates adjectives, nouns, and some verbs associated with Fortune in *FP* as part of an argument that Fortune changes from a goddess, connected to Luna and Saturn, in pagan times, to an evil force, connected to Mars in medieval Christian society. See Budra, 1060, for a related view of Lydgate’s presentation of Fortune in Christian history.


Considers the role of the Goddess Fortune in *TB, ST, SD,* and *FP.* Lydgate’s presentation of Fortune varies in these works: she may be good or evil. Nevertheless, there is an underlying continuity to Lydgate’s treatment because Fortune consistently moves with Mars and Division in the world of the Iron Age.


Chaucer and Lydgate employ a modesty topos involving ironic use of *occultatio* (‘insinuation, allusive suggestion, concealment’) and *occupatio* (‘denial of authority’).
(121–6). A contrast between the two authors in this regard points to the distinction between the 'silent assertion of Chaucer's autonomy, by controlled refusal and multiple allusion, and Lydgate's voluble inability either to follow his auctoritee or to avoid its mastery of him' (124). Lydgate is an important influence on the verse of subsequent Chaucerians like Stephen Hawes (237–40); and his works are a major element of the Chaucerian apocrypha as seen in the 16th-century editions of Chaucer (245ff).


The Kingis Quair achieves a 'formal unity' by using 'structural patterns' that in some respects recall TG, but they are more complex than Lydgate's 'amplification of conventions' (342). There is an underlying structure to TG, as there is in the Kingis Quair, based on units of seven (354–9). Boethian ideas form the basis to the allegory of Lydgate's poem as they do for James's (354); however, the 'differences between the two poems are more interesting than their parallels.' TG is constructed according to a 'numerical decorum' centred on the number seven (355). The seven parts of TG reflect changes in the narrative form of the poem (355–6). Lydgate's poem is about 'woman's suffering in love,' and shows an 'admirable' craftsmanship (356). TG may be unsubtle, and its form may follow its allegory arbitrarily, but this does not mean that Lydgate has tried and failed to copy Chaucer. The numerical form Lydgate adopts is suited to his material (358). The works Lydgate and James are 'typically postmedieval' in that they use earlier symbols, which carry inherited meaning, within an individually structured form. Lydgate's use of units of seven and 'visionary imagery' are 'relatively inert terms' of his writing when compared to the variations used by James (360).
In the *Dance of Death* tradition, Death is an authoritative figure whose word is law. The principal literary example is *DM*, popular in the 15th and 16th centuries. The tradition of which the poem is a part stands behind Shakespeare’s ‘Fell Sergeant, Death.’

Evidence suggests that Chaucer may have used *The Tales of Caunterbury* as the title for his poem. In *ST* and *FP*, however, Lydgate names Chaucer’s work as *The Canterbury Tales*. This usage by Lydgate may have been a factor in giving the poem its modern title (22-3).

A minor detail of the storyline in *TB* and Chaucer’s *Troilus and Criseyde* is also found in the *Destruction of Troy* (315–16). It is possible that the author of the *Destruction of Troy* took this detail from Lydgate; if so, this would date his work after 1420, the year in which *TB* was completed (316–17). The relationship between the two poems ‘deserves serious investigation’ as it could clarify the date for the *Destruction of Troy* (317). [Jacobs, 931, also refers to a possible relationship between *TB* and the *Destruction of Troy*.]

It is doubtful that *TG* is written in 1420 for the marriage of Sir William Paston and Agnes Berry; the earlier date of 1403 first suggested by Schick (442: cxiii–cxv) is more likely (26). [Boffey, 1067, agrees that the Paston connection, first suggested by MacCracken, 626, is unlikely. Amoils, 1027, accepts the Paston theory as probably correct.] The new middle class readers of the 15th century are conservative and favour the genres previously fostered by the nobility; nevertheless, they are also aware of ‘political and economic realities,’ and seek ‘moral exempla as guidelines in a time of social change and growing spiritual anxiety’ (27). This period sees the decline of allegory and the rise of realism (25). The moral conservatism of his readers leads Lydgate to modify his portrayal of a married woman in the love triangle of the courtly love tradition: the Lady is ‘completely virtuous’ in terms of both ‘conjugal fidelity’ and ‘true love.’ This gives her a new realism. She thinks about her situation and emerges as a ‘fallible and self-seeking person’ instead of ‘womanhood perfected’ as expected by the courtly love convention (30). But Lydgate does not extend this realism to the poem’s wider structure and thereby he submits to his ‘social obligations as a poet’ (32).


Brief references. In explicating Chaucer’s simile of ‘proud Bayard,’ Burnley refers to *PLM* (lines 11134ff): Lydgate sees Chaucer’s allusion as ‘no more ... than an image of the regulation of thoughtless youth by some external agency’ (149). Lydgate refers to ‘blind Bayard’ in *TB* (Bk 2, line 4731, and Bk 5, line 3506) in discussing people who undertake ‘tasks of literary composition or criticism for which they are unfitted’; he refers to it again in the *FP* (Bk 5, lines 1825–9) in ‘speaking of the instability of the affections of people’ (150).
Brief references. Authors in the late Middle Ages were becoming more aware of the 'niceties of verbal style'; this awareness is partly demonstrated by the use of the phrase 'picked terms' (195). Lydgate’s praise of Chaucer (ST, lines 53–7) provides an example. A similar reference in the prologue to Caxton’s second edition of Chaucer’s CT is a clear imitation of Lydgate (196).


John Brice, deputy to the Controller of the Royal Household, commissioned the *Mumming at Hertford*. Brice was killed in 1431. The mumming is likely to have been performed in 1427, or perhaps 1426, and it may refer indirectly to a contemporary court scandal (14–16).


A response to Walls, 981; see also Hammond, 617. The ‘balance’ of ‘external evidence’ argues for Lydgate’s authorship of the verse *PLM* (106). The supposed evidence to the contrary based on John Shirley’s ‘kalundare’ is doubtful and ambiguous (105). In any case, Stow’s attribution of the poem to Lydgate is unlikely to be because of the ‘kalundare’ alone. Further evidence from an early inventory of the books of Alice de la Pole, Duchess of Suffolk, links Lydgate and a work named as the *Pilgrimage* (106).
A number of references to Lydgate in an argument that the royal court, served by poets struggling to gain its recognition and support, is more important than the middle class in setting the mainstream literary tastes of 15th-century England (211). [Edwards, 893, questions Lawton’s position.] John Shirley’s motives in circulating Lydgate’s work may be altruistic rather than commercial (132). [See Edwards, 893, for a dissenting view.]

Lydgate writes little love poetry, perhaps because of his vocation as a monk; many, if not most, of his love poems may be commissions. That there are few examples of his work in this genre may suggest that these commissions were not well paid (133). Most writers of works of ‘polite amusement’ are courtly ‘amateurs’ (134). Works like FP offer courtly readers a less ‘abstruse’ substitute for Boethius’s Consolation of Philosophy (147). The practical value of Lydgate’s craft is probably demonstrated by his confidence in raising the subject of financial remuneration with Humphrey, Duke of Gloucester, in FP (156–7).

Such remuneration, even on commissions, was likely to have been seen as a ‘privilege rather than a right’ (205). A comparison of Lydgate’s relatively simple treatment of rhetoric in FP with Hawes’s detailed discussion in PP suggests that by Hawes’s time ‘poetry, even vernacular poetry, had come to be seen as part of the ostentatious public front’ of the court (177). This need for ostentation led poets at the end of the 15th century to look to Lydgate, rather than to Chaucer, as a model (177–8). Lydgate’s priorate at Hatfield may be a sinecure to allow him the freedom from the monastic rule of Bury that he needs to undertake his ‘political verse’ (190).


Oxford, Bodleian Lib., MS Ashmole 61 contains a reshaped version of A Ram’s Horn that was possibly used by a ‘popular entertainer’ (257). London, BL, MS Add. 12195, f. 121v,
gives a single stanza of Lydgate’s poem with a number of changes more typical of ‘popular
transmission than of authorial revision’ (259). These two manuscripts suggest that the
poem was ‘well received on its first production and passed out from its original courtly and
literary milieu to entertain a more popular audience’ (259).

960. Schell, Edgar T. ‘Scio Ergo Sum: The Structure of Wit and Science.’ Studies in

John Redford’s character, Wit, in Wit and Science recalls aspects of Lydgate’s pilgrim in
RS (190–1).


TG shows Lydgate’s failure to understand Chaucer’s treatment of the dream vision (171–6).
Lydgate takes superficial details from Chaucer’s work, but gives to them no wider
significance (172–3). His narration does not have the psychological depth of Chaucer’s
(174–5); and the meaning, if there is any, of the poem’s allegory is very unclear (175–6).

962. -----. ‘Chaucerian Authority and Inheritance.’ Literature in Fourteenth-Century

Chaucer leaves his imitators a problem: not only does it seem that he already achieves all
that can be achieved, but he also avoids the creation of a father-like persona in his text for
his followers to inherit because he allows characters like the Host to tell their stories
independently (199–200). Lydgate seems to be aware of the impossibility of being another
Chaucer, yet becoming Chaucer appears to be his goal (200–1). Chaucer does not feature in ST because Lydgate wishes to take his place and the ‘nearer The Siege of Thebes gets to The Knight’s Tale ... the more of Chaucer’s actual words Lydgate uses’ (201–2). When Lydgate is trying his best to be like Chaucer he tends to adopt an authorial ‘didacticism’ that is quite unlike Chaucer. Skelton, Henryson, and Douglas were ‘genuinely Chaucerian’ because they dared to be themselves (202).


The substance of the material here is annotated in Spearing, 964.


ST partly completes the Canterbury pilgrims’ homeward journey; it is connected at a number of points to Chaucer’s CT, especially The Knight’s Tale (66–8). Lydgate combines high style and moral meaning, but he misunderstands the complex ‘relationship between narrative and moral generalization in Chaucer’ (69). It is difficult to tell whether Lydgate’s ‘verbal eloquence’ is intended to be Chaucerian: we do not know how he perceives Chaucer. The very act of imitation distances him from Chaucer’s originality (70). We sometimes cannot tell whether he simply wishes to allude to Chaucer or actually become Chaucer (70–2,108–9). Spearing discusses Lydgate’s use of Latinisms, complex syntax, and figurative expression (72–82). At times he seems to have misunderstood Chaucer’s irony, but at other times he seems to be deliberately rewriting the chivalric and pagan elements of Chaucer’s text from a Christian viewpoint (82–8). In the 15th century,
Lydgate transmits and distorts Chaucer’s achievement such that, in the 16th century, Chaucer’s ‘literary Renaissance ... had to be done all over again’ (120). See Kohl, 984, Bowers, 1037, and Farvolden, 1113, for related discussions.


In *ST*, Lydgate ‘medievalized Chaucer.’ Lydgate takes the place of Chaucer as a pilgrim (25). Lydgate’s attempt to copy Chaucer’s logical, complex, and purposeful opening sentence to *CT* produces ‘merely decorative devices, with no logical function at all’ (26). There are numerous echoes of Chaucer in *ST* (26–7). Lydgate may have a greater ‘pictorial imagination’ than Chaucer does (28): he can depict ‘space, light, and colour, often with haunting delicacy’ (29). *ST* is a ‘rambling chronicle’; by comparison, Chaucer’s *Knight’s Tale* and *Troilus and Criseyde* show ‘classical simplicity and rationality of structure’ (32). In the *Knight’s Tale*, Chaucer imagines the classical world in a way that foretells the Renaissance (32–4); Lydgate shows that he is unable to equal Chaucer in this (34–5).


A detailed description of London, BL, MS Add. 31042, a manuscript that contains some minor Lydgate items including partial texts of the *Dietary* and the *Kings of England*.

LYDGATE: GENERAL REFERENCES

See Stern, 966, for annotation.


Lydgate and Hoccleve supply examples of the ‘growing sense of individuality’ in 15th-century England (18–19). Tristram discusses *DM* and compares it to Holbein’s woodcut on the same theme (168–71). Lydgate combines images of ‘vengeance with compassion’ in a way that ‘reflects the diversity of his original’ and is also ‘typical’ of his own style (169). Lydgate’s address of Death to the Child is particularly notable for its ‘tenderness’ (170). A significant difference between Lydgate’s treatment and Holbein’s is that Lydgate shows less ‘social optimism’: for Lydgate, the powerful and the great are more likely to be corrupt (170–1).


Brief references. Considers *The Bowge of Courte* as a ‘dramatic entertainment intended for performance’ (3). It has a ‘fundamental structural resemblance’ to a form often used by Lydgate, the disguising (5). Skelton’s character of Dread has a similar function to that of the Presenter in Lydgate’s *Disguysing at London* (5–6). The interaction, however, of Skelton’s characters with Dread ‘distinguishes them emphatically from the wooden figures’ of Lydgate’s work (6).

Lydgate’s digressions on poetry constitute an influential ‘new critical vocabulary’ (76). Some key terms include: ‘enlumyn’ (76–9); ‘adourne’ and ‘enbelissche’ (80–1); ‘aureate’ (81–3); ‘goldyn’ (84); ‘sugrid’ (84–5); ‘rethorik’, and ‘elloquence’ (85–8). The poet is a craftsman extending and improving his ‘medium’ and leading the reader to ‘virtue’ (89–90). Chaucer’s concern about the relationship of fiction to truth is absent from Lydgate’s work: Lydgate has an ‘unfailing assurance’ in the nobility of the poet. ‘High style,’ treated with suspicion by Chaucer, is a natural product of Lydgate’s poetics (91). Lydgate’s ‘amplification’ does not aim at the variation and entertainment implied by Geoffrey of Vinsauf, but at clear explication (92–4). Lydgate’s ideas owe something to Boccaccio, yet they are distinctly his own (94–7ff). His treatment of the Amphion myth, mainly in *ST*, is a statement of the relationship between language and the state—the ‘word’ and the ‘sword’ (97–103). It is in the poet’s power to bring order to chaos (103–4). The influence of Lydgate’s poetics on later 15th-century poets is a ‘prelude’ to the first ‘formal poetics’ of the 16th century (104–5).


A ‘myrie tale’ for the Host in *CT* is one which entertains without ‘preaching or heavy moralizing’ (317). Chaucer develops a second definition that combines instruction and entertainment; but he also seems to suggest that a tale constructed along these lines may be ambiguous (318–25). Finally, in the *Parson’s Tale*, a ‘myrie tale’ abandons fiction altogether in its search for truth (325–30). *ST* attempts to be an entertainment and a ‘moral speculum’ of practical and spiritual value. Lydgate manipulates the Theban story to develop a ‘major theme ... the opposition of the word and the sword’ (331). He uses
a ‘popular narrative’ rather than Chaucer’s ‘explicit moral forms’ of allegory, fable, and sermon (332). Lydgate believes in poetry as a force for good, with none of Chaucer’s concern about the difficult relationship between truth and fiction (332–3). He does not imitate Chaucer, but extends what he has done and uses poetry to discuss the ‘artistic and poetic concerns of the time’ (333).


Brief references. Douglas owes a debt to Chaucer, Boccaccio, and Lydgate for his Eneados prologues where the poem’s philosophical issues are reflected in the concerns of the narrator. His approach, however, differs from that of the earlier poets (353–4). His praise for Virgil may recall Lydgate’s praise for Chaucer, yet, Douglas ‘generally lacks Lydgatian self-effacement and humility’ (354).


Brief comparisons with Lydgate in the context of Dunbar’s use of a complicated poetic surface, characterized by the terms ‘anamalit’ and ‘ourgilt,’ in order to make the occasional poem an ‘enduring artifact’ and distinguish it from the other aureate poems of his contemporaries (292). See Ebin, 974, for a wider development of this theme.

Late medieval poets intend their work to ennoble and to lead to truth, and their style reflects this (263–4). To describe his work Lydgate develops a ‘new critical language’ using such words as ‘enlumyn,’ ‘aureate,’ and ‘sugrid’ (268–9). Ebin discusses examples of Lydgate’s mix of high style and noble purpose in *Ballade at the Reverence of Our Lady Qwene of Mercy*, and *TB* (270–3). Lydgate’s work is a catalyst for the ‘more effective experimentation’ of the later 15th-century poets. His influence is apparent on James I, Robert Henryson, and William Dunbar (273). Ebin discusses Dunbar’s work in terms of Lydgate’s poetic (274–7). Dunbar develops and changes Lydgate’s ideas on poetry by ‘emphasizing a perfection of craft and a density or closeness of design’ (276). Stephen Hawes’s early work reflects Lydgate’s concept of poetry, but he later abandons the elevated style and develops the notion of the poet as ‘prophet’ (283–4). The ‘refinement’ of Lydgate’s poetic ‘ideals’ by later 15th-century poets ultimately leads to many of the poetic views of the Renaissance (289).


A study of Lydgate’s ‘aims and purposes as a poet’ (Preface), with readings across his work that emphasize his willingness as a craftsman to experiment with new forms and techniques in order to transform what often may otherwise have been ephemeral pieces into a lasting work of art. Ch. 1: ‘John Lydgate: Monk of Bury’ (1–19). Ebin discusses the religious, historical and political background to Lydgate’s life, the powerful position of his abbey, his connections to the court and broader society, and his view of the role of a poet. Lydgate sees the poet as a one who civilizes and orders human existence. The need for peace in the state is a recurring theme in his work (16–9). Lydgate’s confidence in the power of
literature to lead its readers to the truth marks him out from his English predecessors (18–19).

Ch. 2: ‘Courtly Poems’ (20–38). Ebin offers readings of CBK (22–5), Floure of Curtesye (25–7), the ‘Short Courtly Lyrics’ (27–8), TG (29–35), and RS (35–8). Lydgate shifts the complaint from Chaucer’s narrative realism to ‘artefact’: action and the extent of the allegory are restricted; the poem concentrates on a ‘single moment or moments in time,’ and has an ‘intricate surface of words and sounds.’ Lydgate’s ‘formal and stylistic devices’ used to achieve these effects become the standards of the time (21).

Ch. 3: ‘Poetry and Politics: Troy and Thebes’ (39–59). Readers of Lydgate’s period often see TB and ST as connected by their ‘matter and ... moral lessons’ (39). Ebin discusses the medieval tradition of the Trojan story (39–41). In TB, Lydgate chooses Guido della Colonna’s Historia destructionis Troiae as the base for his own version because he sees Guido as successfully combining ‘truthfulness and eloquent style’ (41). Lydgate does not share Chaucer’s concerns on the ability of fiction to convey truth (41–2). Guido presents Fortune as a largely random force; Lydgate suggests that Fortune is an agent of God’s will (43–4). As the poem progresses it is developed as a mirror for the king (44–6). Nevertheless, Lydgate’s major concern in his version of Guido is with the construction of a ‘work in English that is loftier and more impressive than any before him’ (47). Ebin considers Lydgate’s method of achieving this (47–52). ST is quite different from TB: it is shorter and more freely translated, with less ‘rhetorical amplification’; it is also more sharply focused on the ‘moral significance’ of the story and its function as a mirror for the king (52). Ebin discusses these aspects (53–9). Chaucer’s ‘myrie tale’ explores the possibility of fiction that is both ‘entertaining’ and ‘beneficial’ in terms of spiritual instruction; Lydgate sees the rewards of the ‘beneficial’ tale as being potentially practical rather than spiritual (58). Lydgate shares some of the questions raised by Chaucer, but his answers, more worldly and less ‘transcendental’ than Chaucer’s, ‘move the long form in different directions’ (59).
Ch. 4: ‘The Fall of Princes: Fortune and the Lives of Men’ (60–75). Lydgate explores the interaction of human will and fate: in helping others to deal with fate he sees that his task as a poet is to provide ‘models of the civilizing and ordering abilities of men.’ In the end, however, his long poem serves to show that ‘all human order ... appears transitory’ (60). Ebin considers the tradition of this genre (60–2); she also considers the relationship between Lydgate and his patron, Humphrey, Duke of Gloucester (62–4). Boccaccio emphasizes the role of Fortune. Lydgate changes this emphasis somewhat: his work is clearly intended to be a mirror for the king (64–7). Rulers in Lydgate’s view are much more susceptible to harm from Fortune if they are corrupt (68). The broad shape of Lydgate’s poem allows its author to examine the structure of humanity’s history (69–72); the work advocates virtuous conduct in opposition to Fortune (72–4). Lydgate’s view of the poet’s role, and the ‘expansive structure’ of FP, influence Renaissance writers (75).

Ch. 5: ‘Laureate Lydgate: Public and Political Poems’ (76–91). Ebin discusses Lydgate’s patrons, and the poems he writes for them. Lydgate’s patrons include: Thomas Chaucer; Humphrey, Duke of Gloucester; the Warwick family; Queen Katherine, widow of Henry V; and Henry VI. Ebin also considers Lydgate’s mumblings (86–90). In the best of Lydgate’s occasional poems he is able to go beyond the limits of his immediate commission to produce an ‘artefact’ of lasing value (76). Lydgate’s public poetry is ‘politically conservative,’ but tactfully hints at more transcendent issues in it ‘didactic emphasis’ on the responsibility of the ruler (90).

Ch. 6: ‘The Poet of “Hie Sentence”: Moral and Didactic Poems’ (92–112). Ebin’s discussion includes the homilies (92–101), ‘Didactic and Satirical Poems’ (101–5), and ‘Fables’ (105–112). Lydgate’s work in this area is ‘neglected.’ Although he may seem to be using conventional forms and themes, he often ‘manipulates his structures to achieve striking and innovative effects’ (92). In spite of the ‘mixed success’ of his experiments in moral and didactic poetry, Lydgate inspire such writers as ‘Henryson, Dunbar, Hawes, and Skelton’ (112).
Ch. 7: ‘Religious Poems: Saints’ Lives, Lyrics, The Life of Our Lady’ (113–38). Ebin provides critical readings of samples of Lydgate’s religious poetry. Lydgate’s religious poems are ‘one of his most significant contributions’ to poetry. His emphasis is on the ‘literary rather than the didactic or devotional,’ hence we find frequent use of amplification and aureation (113). Later writers in the genre of the saint’s life, such as Osborn Bokenham, John Capgrave, and Henry Bradshaw, look more to Lydgate than to Chaucer for their example (132).

Ch. 8: ‘Lydgate’s Achievement and Impact’ (139–42). Lydgate is a very significant figure in 15th-century English literature. In the 15th and 16th centuries his work was valued for its ‘rhetorical nature and ... sententiousness’ (139). Lydgate’s name is placed alongside Chaucer and Gower by his successors. Lydgate, however, takes a different direction from the older poets when he chooses to write on subjects outside the usual bounds of literature (141–2). Lydgate functions as a ‘public poet’ who, at the call of his patrons, transforms ‘occasional events into works of a more permanent nature’ (142).

———Review by Alain Renoir, Speculum 62 (1987): 933–5. Ebin’s book is a ‘learned, reasonable, and stimulating assessment of the more representative English poet of the fifteenth century’ (935). One of the particular strengths of Ebin’s study is that it approaches Lydgate’s work from a number of different viewpoints (933–4).

———Review by Derek Pearsall, Notes and Queries 232 (1987): 65–6. Ebin is ‘eminently well qualified for her task’ (65); nevertheless, she is a ‘little prone to take Lydgate at his own valuation, and she rarely says what the poetry is actually like, perhaps for obvious reasons.’ There is a small number of errors of fact (66).
We are wrong to read 15th-century praise for Chaucer as being simply about his rhetorical skill and ornate diction. Lydgate, among others, shows that this praise is about Chaucer’s status as a poet, not just as a rhetorician, and his elevation of English into a poetic language (3–5). In the 15th century, poets are not so influenced by Chaucer’s individual works as by his example in extending the boundaries of ‘literary language and poetic forms’ (7).

During the second half of the 15th century a number of Lydgate’s works find themselves in the Chaucer canon, which has the result of making Chaucer’s work look more like Lydgate’s (10–11). Distinctions are further blurred by Lydgate’s adaptations of Chaucer’s originals (11-12). Lydgate provides examples of his development of Chaucer’s choice of words, syntax, and rhetorical devices; Lydgate’s improvements became influential in their own right (12–15). TB shows Lydgate trying to produce a more elevated and grand version of the Trojan story than has been attempted before (15–16). Lydgate’s use of ‘enlumyne’ combines spiritual and artistic connotations (22–4). Ebin discusses other keywords from Lydgate (22–31), including ‘adoune,’ ‘enbelissche’ (24–5), ‘aureate’ (25–7), ‘goldyn,’ ‘sugrid’ (28), ‘elloquence’ (29), and ‘rethorik’ (29–31). These become the standard critical terms of the 15th century (31–2). Lydgate’s development of high style is significant when compared to the suspicion with which Chaucer treats such style. Lydgate expresses a craftsman’s confidence in the ability of art to convey truth and improve humanity, this is a view not shared by Chaucer (32–3). High style is partly related to the rise of English as a literary language, the presence of new patrons like Humphrey, Duke of Gloucester, and the development of a wider literate audience (33). Lydgate’s striving for style is very evident in his religious poetry such as LOL, and Ballade at the Reverence of our Lady Qwene of Mercy (34–6). Lydgate employs amplification not primarily as a device to introduce variety as earlier writers use it, but as a means of ensuring that the truth of what he has to say is highlighted (36–8). Lydgate’s poetics are somewhat similar to Dante’s, yet they are less rich being ‘didactic and moral rather than philosophical or epistemological’
Ebin discusses Lydgate’s treatment of the Amphion legend in *ST* (41–4) and *FP* (44–7) as an example of the interrelation of the poet and fine language, and of the ruler and social order. Ebin also makes a number of references to Lydgate when considering the work of James I, Robert Henryson, and William Dunbar (49–90). It is the Scots poets who pick up Lydgate’s vision of the function of poetry (49–50). James adopts Lydgate’s view on the importance of literary style, and adds what he sees as the more important need for ‘governance in the poet’s writings and in his life’ (55). Henryson, although he defends the power of poetry to enlighten, returns to pre 15th-century concerns about the relationship between poetry and truth (55). Dunbar extends Lydgate’s treatment of the poet as an illuminator and craftsman (74–89).


Not sighted; referenced in Carnahan, 1127, as a discussion of the musical setting of lines 970–6 from *TG* in a European manuscript. See Fallows, 978.


A reconstruction of a corrupted song text dating from the 1450s suggests that it is likely to have been taken from two lines of *TG*. See Bukofzer, 735, Tiner, 1125, and Carnahan, 1127.

There are ‘close thematic similarities’ between Skelton’s *Bowge of Courte*, More’s *Fortune*, Machiavelli’s *Capitolo di Fortuna*, and Lydgate’s *Mumming at London*. Lydgate’s mumming informs our reading of Skelton (66). Skelton’s work may have been presented as a pageant like Lydgate’s (67).


Brief references. There had been speculation before MacCracken’s clarification of the Lydgate canon, 471, that Lydgate may have been the author of a poem called *The Mirror of the Periods of Man’s Life* found in Cambridge, Univ. Lib., MS Ff.ii.38. This poem however, is ‘metrically too various, and in language and imagery too startling, vivid and colloquial, to be by Lydgate’ (74).


The evidence for ascribing the verse translation of the *Pelerinage de Vie Humaine* to Lydgate comes mainly from John Stow. Stow’s attribution may follow from a confusion of the prose and verse versions of the *Pilgrimage* caused by a misreading of John Shirley’s *Kalendar*. See the reply by Green, 957; see also Hammond, 617.

A comparison between DM and William Dunbar’s Lament for the Makaris is generally much to Dunbar’s advantage: ‘Lydgate’s poem is conventional in the worst sense of that word’ (146).


See Lynn, 273, for annotation.


*ST* draws on Chaucer’s *Knight’s Tale*: both poems concern the Theban legend, a dispute between two brothers, and a ‘background of what passes as Boethian philosophy’ (119). The two tales are very different, however, in their attitude towards fortune. In the *Knight’s Tale* one’s fortune is something that must be accepted as unchangeable (120). Lydgate, on the other hand, links ‘human behaviour with a corresponding fate’ to ensure that sin and virtue are appropriately rewarded in this life (121). Philosophy in the 15th century is ‘no longer restricted to securing a detached view of life and calm endurance of misery,’ but aims at the ‘improvement of one’s fortune’ (126). It might be that Lydgate deliberately changes the model left to him by Chaucer in order to express this new idea (128–31). See Kohl, 985, for a related discussion of Lydgate’s treatment of the Chaucer inheritance.
A comparison of the different responses of ST and The Tale of Beryn to some of the cultural assumptions of Chaucer’s CT. Lydgate and the author of The Tale of Beryn comment on the cultural practices of Chaucer’s pilgrims from the viewpoint of a society that is no longer medieval (221-2). They are provoked into comment by the non-committal attitude of Chaucer’s narrator towards ‘medieval values ... [and] ... the old cultural norms’ (225). The Beryn author feels ‘no longer bound to the moral norms of the Middle Ages’ (229). This is not so for Lydgate: to him the Host is a satanic figure who leads the Canterbury pilgrims to surrender their spiritual values (230-3). It may be hoped that Chaucer’s pilgrims will be redeemed when they reach Canterbury. There is no such hope for the redemption of Lydgate’s pilgrims as they are already on their return journey from the shrine (233-4). Chaucer’s ironic comment on cultural practice is impossible in ST and The Tale of Beryn because the norms of the Middle Ages are, by the time of the later pieces, clearly past (234-5). See Farvolden, 1113, for another example of Lydgate’s re-writing of Chaucer, and Bowers, 1037, regarding Beryn. Kohl, 984, gives a related discussion of Lydgate’s treatment of the Chaucer inheritance.

Brief references. Lydgate’s list of abuses by various social groups is unusual for being more detailed than that generally found in English estates literature (11). As Chaucer and Gower do, Lydgate reminds his readers that the pride and self-interest of the powerful should be tempered by the knowledge that material change is a ‘condition of the world’ (12).


Brief references. *ST* provides examples of the early understanding of Chaucer’s *CT* as a dramatic work, as opposed to the later view which sees the poem as a collection of stories (221–2).


English civic pageantry changed so little between 1400 and 1600 that ‘some of Lydgate’s pageants were merely adapted and reissued’ (224). Parry discusses the characteristics of several of Lydgate’s pageants in the context of their influence on Elizabethan pageantry.

The manuscript dates from the first quarter of the 15th century and contains Lydgate’s *TG* (folios 490v–509v) and *La Compleyn* (509v–16v).


Brief references. Lydgate’s *Quis Dabit* is the consummate example of the excesses of the ‘Late Gothic devotional aesthetic’ (145–6): it is ‘ostentatious’; and the Virgin’s direct appeal for the reader’s compassion is spiritually dangerous. The poem is ‘witness to the spiritual complacency of the waning Middle Ages’ (146)


Lydgate’s use of the word ‘aureate’ in *TB* is the first recorded in English. Zettersten accepts Norton-Smith’s analysis (496: 192) of the ‘four main metaphoric configurations’ in which Lydgate uses the word ‘aureate’ (52). Lydgate’s religious poetry is particularly aureate. Aureation may be something original that Lydgate adds to the Chaucerian tradition, but the influence of Chaucer on Lydgate is considerable. It was through Lydgate that Dunbar and ‘his contemporaries in England as well as in Scotland carried on the
tradition established by Chaucer' (55). Nichols, 698–9, is unwise to assume that because Dunbar uses words first found in Lydgate that he necessarily takes them from Lydgate: it is possible that some of these words belong to a common ‘stock’ shared by the Scottish Chaucerians (63–4). It is unsound to assume that the OED is reliable in giving the first known occurrence of a word (64). Lydgate is the main source for Dunbar’s aureation; however, Dunbar expands the technique from its mainly religious context in Lydgate’s verse, and he makes it more employable and diverse (68). See Jack, 912, Ting, 1058, and Conley, 840.


Kratzmann argues that English poetry of the period is generally distinguished from the Scots poetry by its flat tone and lack of a distinctive authorial voice. Lydgate’s influence on the English poets, and his relative lack of influence on Scots poets, is a significant factor in creating this distinction. [See Edwards, 893, for a different view about Lydgate’s influence on the Scots.] Chaucer’s tonal variety and strong authorial identity follows from the courtly environment and its emphasis on oral performance; Lydgate’s monotony and authorial anonymity follows from monasticism and writing for publication (26–7). The ‘circumstances of presentation’ are probably more important in determining the differences between the two poets than the ‘new reading public’ (27). In considering the relationship between Dunbar’s The Lament for the Makaris and Lydgate’s TMCM, DM, and Testament one finds that Lydgate’s influence on Dunbar is indirect, and the comparison demonstrates Dunbar’s skilful adaptation (140–9).

Considers the relationship between a number of medieval versions of the legend of St Alban and St Amphibal. Two of these, *LSAA* and a version found in the *Gilte Legende*, possibly compiled by Osbern Bokenham, may share a common, now lost, Latin source. See Reinecke, 505, for a related discussion.


Brief references. A short poem that occurs in some of the manuscripts of John Harding's *Chronicle* is partly based on an envoy found in a manuscript of *FP* (202).


Brief references. Even allowing for the fact that *AF* is one of Lydgate's early works, his treatment of the fable of the sheep and the dog is so inferior to Henryson's version that a comparison between the two is 'cruel.' Henryson's is deft and dramatic; Lydgate's is flaccid and sententious (207).


A discussion, based on Lydgate's text of *PLM*, of Deguileville's use of allegory.
The genre of the dream vision generally loses its vitality after the 14th century (195). *TG* follows closely the conventions of the dream vision, but it lacks the ‘spirit and complexity’ of Chaucer’s *House of Fame* on which it is based (199). The difference between Chaucer’s approach and Lydgate’s is the difference between the medieval and renaissance dream vision: Lydgate emphasizes descriptive detail; Chaucer creates a persona who experiences the dream (199–200).


In the 1432 pageant for Henry VI’s entry into London, Lydgate is possibly the first English writer to exploit consistently the ‘allegorical potential of street pageantry’ (170). In the pageant for Margaret of Anjou in 1445, Lydgate develops his allegorical technique by elaborately and consistently linking political issues with ‘moral and spiritual allegory.’ Not all of the verses from the pageant have survived (171). Crow discusses the pageant’s allegory (171–3). Lydgate highlights, by use of the Noah story, Margaret’s role as a bringer of peace, and places the ‘desire for international peace in a wider context—the spiritual peace with God enjoyed by mankind after the Flood’ (171). See Kipling, 1013, for the view that the script is complete, but not of Lydgate’s authorship.

Notes a reference to *FP* from Ch. 18 of John de Irlandia’s, *The Meroure of Wysdome*, written in 1490. See Irlandia, 514.


Brief references. Tertius Lydgate’s name in *Middlemarch* recalls Bk 3 of *FP* with its description of men ‘conquered by the worldly goods through which the daughters of Eve tempted them to the worship of Mammon’ (128). Eliot’s Folger notebooks have a ‘good many notes’ referring to John Lydgate’s work (152, note 43).


Brief references to *FP* are used in a detailed discussion of the medieval literary and iconographic background to Spenser’s Occasion episode in Bk 2 of the *Faerie Queene*.


Brief references to Lydgate in an argument that 14th-century English literature shows an increasing concern for improving the moral behaviour of those in power that reflects the rise of the ‘public voice’ of the literate middle class.
LYDGATE: GENERAL REFERENCES


Virginia Woolf’s *The Journal of Mistress Joan Martyn* draws on TG and, possibly, TB (70, 78–9).


The provenance of the *N-Town Cycle* lies with Bury St Edmunds, and Lydgate is an ‘extremely likely influence, direct or indirect, upon the composition of the plays’ (58). The monastery at Bury St Edmunds is a prosperous centre of learning and dramatic arts (61). The *Digby Plays* and *Macro Plays* are connected with Bury St Edmunds and there are a number of similarities between them, particularly the Digby *Killing of the Children,* and the *N-Town Cycle* (62–6). The dialect of the *N-Town Cycle* belongs to the Bury St Edmunds region (67–8), and the plays theological emphasis is consistent with that of Bury St Edmunds (68–74). Lydgate’s *Pageant for Margaret of Anjou* has elements in common with the mystery plays (82–3) and, among his other works, demonstrates that he has the ‘prerequisites’ to contribute to the *N-Town Cycle* (84). The style and language of the Mary pays from the *N-Town Cycle* can be sourced to ‘Lydgate’s direct influence if not to his very hand’ (86). See Edwards, 893, for briefly expressed doubts about Gibson’s argument.


*TG* makes it clear that ‘true lovers’ who are not able to marry may be virtuously ‘united in heart,’ as long as they are ‘faithful and chaste,’ until properly married. Lydgate is able to
deal with the ‘delicate subject’ of courtly love because the dream poem convention does not require the individualization of character or the use of ‘concrete social situations.’ His treatment of the lovers informs our understanding of the relationship between Malory’s Lancelot and Guinevere (413–14).


Considers the origins of the association of St Valentine with lovers and spring. There was confusion in medieval England as to the dates of the seasons and this is reflected in the *Secrees of Old Phissoffres* (551–2). [See Stobo, 1025, for a related discussion about Lydgate’s timing for spring in the *Testament.*] Lydgate’s *A Valentine to Her that Excelleth All* is the first example of the saint’s name indicating a poetic genre (559). Here Lydgate makes the Virgin his Valentine, but in the *Kalendare* he extends this and makes God and all the saints his Valentines (560). St Valentine’s day, February 14, might seem too early to be associated with spring; however, its borderline position between winter and spring lends it to poetic contrasts of ‘frost and fire’ that Lydgate exploits (563–4).


Lydgate’s work shares the linear structure of English Gothic architecture in that it is composed on an additive rather than an organic principle. Steinberg provides brief examples.

Brief references. The use of ‘Rome Renner’ in the eighth stanza of Lydgate’s poem, *Rhyme without Accord*, when taken with examples from other authors, seems to suggest that the phrase is not always negative in its connotation (118).


A number of references to Lydgate, and his influence, in a survey of 15th-century English drama that stresses the diversity of the genre. Lydgate’s influence shows itself in an ‘East Anglian style’ found in late 15th-century plays. It is sometimes ‘pretentious,’ but it can be used to achieve successful dramatic effects (10). The moral view of *FP* is dominant in the drama of the period (22–3). Davenport briefly discusses Lydgate’s *Pageant of Knowledge* and his mumming in relation to the medieval play, *Wisdom* (102–3). Ch. 6 is entitled: ‘Scope and Style: Lydgate and East Anglian Drama’ (130–7). Lydgate is central to the ‘translation, adaptation and popularisation’ of non-English writing (132). The Abbey of Bury St Edmunds is a significant cultural and political site (132–3). *King Henry VI’s Entry into London* and *Entry of Queen Margaret* show the development of a ‘style’ that is ‘Lydgate’s greatest contribution to fifteenth-century theatre’ (133). Lydgate’s aristocratic connections through Thomas Chaucer, and aureate style, influence the literary development of the period (134–5). Writers in East Anglia use the ‘high style’ with more or less success (135–6).

A description of Oxford, Bodleian Lib., MS Rawlinson C.86. The manuscript is made up of four ‘booklets,’ the first dating from the first half of the 15th century and the remainder dating from the early 16th century. It contains, among other items, several minor pieces ascribed to Lydgate.


The fables of Lydgate and Henryson show a social focus, an elaboration and detail of moralization, and a vivid colloquial style that looks back to Odo of Cheriton, among others (40–1). They are part of an innovative tradition. This explains why their morals seem harder to source than the nominal plots that serve as their vehicles (42).


Medieval English pageants use speeches and acting; on the Continent, pageants at this time tend to be static visual presentations (5). The pageant for Margaret of Anjou in 1445 may introduce the dramatic element into the English pageant; the script in London, BL, MS Harley 3869, is the earliest surviving of an English pageant (6). The traditional ascription of this pageant to Lydgate is mistaken as it is actually written by one or more anonymous authors; and the pageant is more successful as a work of art than has been supposed (7–13). The pageant’s script is basically complete; it is not a fragment as previously thought. The
script may be restored by adjusting for 'various misassigned speeches, omitted marginalia, and unidentified rubrics' (18). Kipling prints the restored script (19–23). See Crow, 999, for the view that the script is a fragment.


Several references to Lydgate. The content of *TB* and *TG* is influenced by their patrons (231). Duke Humphrey’s ‘intermittent’ interest in *FP* is typical of an English patron of the time, but it amounts to ‘interference’ when he has Lydgate include a retelling of Coluccio Salutati’s *Declamation of Lucretia* (232–3). The estimated cost of producing a copy of *LSAA*, 15s, suggests that Lydgate’s payment of £3 6s 8d is an example of a writer receiving a ‘reward in excess of the cost of producing the book’ (235). The names of Lydgate’s patrons and those who owned copies of his work demonstrate the spread of literary patronage down the social scale (241–2). See Blake, 848, for a further consideration of Lydgate’s use of patronage.


Prints the text of an English translation, which follows its source ‘much more closely’ than does Lydgate’s version, of the Latin poem *Stans puer ad mensam domini*. The claim sometimes made that Lydgate offers a consistently accurate rendering of the Latin source is false. Lydgate’s poem translates the Latin original fairly closely only for the first 24 lines (4). It is also untrue that the Latin original is Sulpicius’s *Carmen iuvenile de moribus* or
Doctrina mensae. This error is caused by an incorrect reference in some manuscripts (4, note 4). The poem’s manuscript is likely to date to between 1460 and 1480, with the probability weighted towards 1480 (5).


Palmer discusses Lydgate’s possible influence on Shakespeare’s Troilus and Cressida (28–30). Shakespeare may be in debt to Lydgate for aspects of the character of Ajax, some matters of wording, the sequencing of an incident in Act V, scene iii, and the practical usefulness of ‘set “character” pieces’ (30). See Brandes, 677, for an earlier view that questions the likelihood of Lydgate’s influence.


The narrative frame of TG guides audience response and exploits emotional and physical ideas of light and dark. The darkness of its opening suggests a ‘sober theme and perhaps a sad outcome’ (109); the terseness of the opening is also indicative of the dreamer’s emotional darkness (112). The dream-frame convention generally presupposes that the dreamer has a need that will be fulfilled by the poem’s vision (107). Lydgate’s audience would assume that this particular vision would bring light to the dreamer’s passive darkness (117). Lydgate plays on this assumption by apparently returning the dreamer to darkness at the end of the poem, but now armed with the ‘ability to cast off his poetic darkness’ (120-1).
Discusses Lydgate's *A Seying of the Nightingale*, *TG*, and *An Holy Medytacion* in an argument that there are identifiable narrative patterns in medieval English poetry. These patterns provide the early readers with frames of reference and influence their response to the text. Davidoff divides the structure of each of the poems she considers into a 'framing fiction,' which provides the context and introduction to the poem's action, and a 'core,' which comprises the remainder of the poem. In the dream-vision genre, the original audience's expectation is that the framing fiction will serve to give the *exemplum*, and the core will act as the *moralitas* (63). The frame of *A Seying of the Nightingale* combines courtly and religious love, but in a retrospective reading these are both pointers to the poem's religious core (67–8). Lydgate exploits his audience's structural expectations, and so demonstrates that the conventions of framing fictions are still current in the middle of the 15th century (69–70). The framing fiction of *An Holy Medytacion* is best considered as moving from 'need' to 'fulfilment' (81, 88–9). *TG* has been misunderstood because critics have not given regard to the framing convention: although the link between the Lydgate's poetic persona and the lover in the dream sequence seems poorly developed, audience expectations would have provided the necessary linkage (135–6). The interaction of framing fiction and core shows that *TG* is thematically about light and darkness (136). Lydgate manipulates reader expectations so that *TG* tells readers about the need for moderation, and the 'light' that may be found in writing poetry (145–6).

In the 15th century, literary moral didacticism replaces the irony of the 14th century; the new verse carries the expectation that readers require a ‘system of moral buttresses’ (14). Ch. 4 is entitled ‘Mannerism and Moralism in Lydgate’s *Siege of Thebes*’ (103–22). Lydgate’s approach in the *ST* is very literal; the moralizing of Lydgate as poet and pilgrim is the same (104–5). The framing technique of the poem is intended not to open up the possibilities of irony, as would have been expected from Chaucer, but to suppress them. Lydgate’s use of Chaucer’s pilgrimage device is meant to show the ‘seriousness’ of his own work (106). Lydgate’s style is a blending of the characteristics of courtly and monastic literature that creates a ‘voice that could speak to prince and merchant on the same level.’ His style conceals contradictions that he does not resolve: on the one hand, Lydgate offers advice to the prince on how he should rule; on the other he presents human affairs as part of a downward cyclical movement (108–9). Lydgate’s descriptions are generally not concerned with detail, nor do they achieve the level of allegory; they have a sermon-like quality that is also found in other 15th-century poets (109–10). Lydgate’s style emphasizes his use of words; it is ‘rhetorical in the most didactic sense, not mimetic or even narrative’ (112). The overt moralizing of *ST*, the way that ironic potential is suppressed by rhetoric, and the suggestion that the old social moral order and literary themes need support, point to a society that is falling apart (116–22).


Brief references. In lines 330–36 of the prologue to *FP*, Lydgate is the first to suggest an antifeminist element to Chaucer’s *Legend of Good Women*. In fact, Chaucer’s irony is not directed at women, but at Cupid and the poem’s narrator (12).

Addresses the purposes served by manuscript miniatures. Most of the TB manuscripts are large, impressive, and designed for display by their wealthy owners (52–4). The general uniformity of the TB miniature sequence suggests that the constituent miniatures were produced in ‘editions’ (54). The miniatures note the ‘formal divisions of the text’ (55); it is generally a subject’s position in the text, and not its relevance, that selects it for illustration (55–9). Lawton provides a table to show the topics of all TB manuscript illustrations, with the exception of those in Manchester, John Rylands Lib., MS English 1 (56–8). Lawton considers the last manuscript separately, as it is the most lavishly illustrated (60–66).

Lawton reproduces folios 151v and 53r from English 1 in black and white (62–3). Although more extensively illustrated, the previous sequence of miniature is still found in English 1 (60); and the illustrations again function as a guide to the text (64). The artist, likely to be associated with William Abell, uses an ‘extensive vocabulary of stereotyped figures’ (65). Lawton discusses London, BL, Royal 18 D.ii as an example of a manuscript owner influencing manuscript design (66–9); a miniature from f. 6r is reproduced in black and white (67). It is unwise to generalize too much on the purpose of miniatures (69). See Scott, 868, for a related study of the textual significance of manuscript illustrations.

The 15th century sees the legitimation of a new type of literary truth; the works of Lydgate and Hoccleve 'abound in metafictional elements which reveal sophisticated self-reflexion and a modern awareness of the possible truth of fiction' (120).


Seymour considers the scribal transmission, past ownership, and likely audience of the surviving manuscripts of *LSEF* (10–13). He also describes the manuscripts (13–21). The manuscript record suggests that the poem did not circulate widely (10), but had a readership drawn principally from the 'wealthy and professional and gently born' (12). Seymour lists the manuscripts containing *DM* and discusses their sub-groupings (22–4). The survival of the *DM* text is typical of other small poems in three ways: it survives by being included in anthologies, usually dating from the latter part of the 15th century; the 'taste' behind these anthologies determines what is to survive; and the transmission of the poem shows that it is more 'vulnerable to revision' than longer texts are (24).


Brief references. ME poets seem to regard March, April, and May as springtime. Lines 294–5 and 325–31 from the *Testament* show this with respect to Lydgate (4). See Oruch, 1007, for a related discussion.

Considers, through Lydgate's use of the verb 'war,' the implications of a lack of sudden moments of discovery in Lydgate's poem. Tripp compares the use of 'war' between several medieval poems, with particular emphasis on Chaucer's *The Book of the Duchess*. A lack of suddenness in his work follows from Lydgate having a 'fixed way of thinking and experiencing the world' (263).


In the 15th century marriage was commonly used to further the financial or political ends of the families concerned (1–11). The Pastons had a 'long-standing connection' with the monastery at Bury St Edmunds; the family motto, 'De Mieulx en Mieulx,' occurs twice in *TG*. It is 'very likely' that Lydgate's poem is commissioned for a wedding, 'quite possibly' that of William Paston to and Agnes Bury (11). [Boffey, 1067, and Wilson, 953, find the Paston connection, first suggested by MacCracken, 626, unlikely.] *TG* acknowledges the potential tension between private desire and relationships sanctioned by society, but it is ultimately conventional in its depiction of marriage in a 'practical world' and 'stable society' (20).


Brief references. Dunbar's *To Aberdein* has 'important precursors' in Lydgate's mummings and *King Henry VI's Triumphal Entry into London*. The extended character descriptions, however, made by Lydgate in the last of these poems are quite unlike
Dunbar's in *The Golden Targe*. The Scottish poet keeps such descriptions to the 'emblematic minimum.' This is not simply a difference between 'prolixity' and 'economy': it is evidence that 'Dunbar's poem does not behave like an occasional poem' (119). *The Golden Targe* is more profitably considered as a masque (116).


A number of illustrative references to Lydgate, particularly to *PLM* as a translation of Guillaume de Deguileville's *Pelerinage de Vie Humaine* (51–8), in a discussion of Chaucer's imagery and narrative technique.


Brief references. Lydgate's poem in London, BL, MS Harley 565, which tells the story of the French dauphin's gift of tennis balls to Henry V, and the king's response, is one of the earliest and 'most popular' of the several versions of the story (7).


*SD* is the only prose work that is definitely attributable to Lydgate (228). Matheson briefly refers to the work's critical reception. MacCracken's edition, 473, is 'marred by a number of wrong transcriptions and typographical errors' (229).
Henryson's creative treatment of Aesop's *Fables* goes well beyond Lydgate's (132). What may be a collection of fables to Lydgate is to Henryson a series of distinct artistic challenges (137). Mehl compares Henryson's treatment of the fable of the Cock and the Jewel with Lydgate's (139–40). It is not just that Henryson's telling is better than Lydgate's: the two differ in their basic approach (139). Both writers use the tale for 'moral instruction,' but Henryson focuses on both the action of the tale and its moralization, whereas Lydgate is much more concerned with the latter than the former. A similar comment applies to the way Henryson and Lydgate handle the fable of the Sheep and the Wolf (140). Henryson, unlike Lydgate, is at pains to ensure that his work addresses both the 'moral awareness' and 'critical attention' of his readers (147).

Brief references. Lydgate uses a speaking voice framed within a persona (250). Chaucer is the standard by which Lydgate measures himself: he feels his poetry will be 'authenticated' if his poetic voice can sound like Chaucer's, but he does not recognize the way Chaucer exploits his own voice (256). See Spearing, *962-4*, on Lydgate's imitation of Chaucer.

Brief references in an argument that Dunbar’s knowledge of continental writing may be direct rather than second-hand through writers such as Lydgate (172).


Discusses Lydgate’s parody *My Fair Lady So Fresh of Hue* in London, BL, MS Harley 2255 (211–12). ‘With this poem, Middle English parody reaches its climax’ (211).


Prints pages 172–6 from Tillyard, 754 (219–20), pages 203–22 from Pearsall, 816 (220–5), and pages 106–19 from Ganim, 1020 (225–7). [In vol.11, Bloom also prints selected publication details for Lydgate’s poems (6393–4).]

Lydgate: General References

ST is an example of a 15th-century reader’s belief that the structure of Chaucer’s CT requires a return journey to be complete (26–7). Whether Lydgate intends his work to be an ‘independent piece or ... an organic continuation’ of Chaucer’s poem is unclear (39); some manuscripts and early editions present ST as a continuation (39–40). Lydgate’s recollection of some details in CT is strangely inaccurate and his efforts at verisimilitude are ‘frail’: this is because his concern is with history and ethics, not fiction (40–2). The end of Lydgate’s tale returns to the ‘earnest’ of the Knight’s Tale and not to the ‘game’ of the Canterbury pilgrims. Lydgate sees a circular structure in Chaucer’s work and in human history generally (45–9). See Kohl, 984, and Farvolden, 1113, for related discussions.


Brief references to Lydgate in an argument that the play, Mankind, is written by a monk of Bury St Edmunds. The Latinate diction of the character, Mercy, may be a local reference to the memory of Lydgate (97–100).


Cites Lydgate’s treatment of the Host in the prologue to ST as evidence that Lydgate correctly reads Chaucer’s portrayal of Harry Bailly as a ‘parodically inverted Christ’ (179).

A number of brief references, which draw parallels between contemporary literary texts and Henry V’s political practices, that illustrate Henry’s approach to kingship. The composition of TB, as of Hoccleve’s RP, corresponds to a time when Henry, as prince, is taking a close interest in government (9).


Lydgate’s version of Chaucer’s decasyllables becomes ‘standard for English poets composing in “iambic pentameter”’ (135). Wright discusses Schick’s five-line classification of Lydgate’s metre, 442 (135–6). The use of a strong caesura in a five-beat line probably follows from the alliterative tradition that leads poets to think in terms of two half-lines (137). Depending on the number of syllables preceding and following the caesura, up to eight variant lines are available, each of which can be varied by a feminine ending (137ff). Unlike the earlier Chaucerians, Wyatt uses these variations with purpose and intelligence: the earlier poets usually think of metre ‘purely as a frame, not as an expressive instrument’ (144). The ‘Lydgatian line’ proves too difficult for both readers and writers, and so it falls out of use (150). It is a mistake to see the later development of a smooth iambic pentameter as a reaction against the supposed metrical disorder of the Chaucerians: the later line is simply subject to less obvious variation (151–2).


The ‘month of May’ passage in Malory’s story in Mort Darthur about Launcelot and Elayne of Ascolat possibly recalls Lydgate’s Pageant of Knowledge and its reflections on life’s instability (252–4). The steersman of the funeral barge for Elayne may also be an echo of Charon from FP, although this is less likely (242–3).
Lydgate had similar ideas on amplification to those of Geoffrey of Vinsauf (8). Under this view, amplification does not necessarily imply ‘great length but ... uses of description, opposition, personification, apostrophe, and other figures’ (6–7). Lydgate’s aureate style is more than ‘new words.’ Lydgate’s views may influence Dunbar (8–9).


Brief references. Medieval courtesy literature sees language as underlying the ‘social order,’ advocates language as a device for advancement, and attempts to ‘integrate various elements of ethical and rhetorical doctrine’ (22). In *ST*, lines 244–92, Lydgate adapts Boccaccio’s treatment of the Amphion myth to typify the ‘power of speech, and uses it to exemplify the king’s need for eloquence, which he describes wholly in ethical and courtly terms’ (36).


Brief references. The Cardigan Manuscript (Austin, Univ. of Texas Lib., MS 143) contains, *ST*, and the *Churl and the Bird*, in addition to Chaucer’s *CT*. Manly and Rickert (741: 1: 72) claim that the manuscript is the work of three scribes working in an organized shop (113). A palaeographical and codicological analysis shows only two scribes to be
Lydgate: General References

responsible for copying the manuscript; there is no evidence to suggest that these scribes work in a shop environment. The fact that ST precedes the Knight's Tale in the manuscript suggests that the codex’s compiler has an interest in history (123–4). See Mosser, 1046.


Brief references. The Cardigan manuscript of CT (Austin, Univ. of Texas Lib., MS 143) contains, among other items, ST and the Churl and Bird. The inclusion of ST contributes to an impression that the manuscript’s first owner has an interest in history (95). The poem is also a ‘logical companion-piece’ for CT (100). Two scribes write the manuscript: Scribe A is less faithful than Scribe B is in reproducing the grammatical forms of the exemplar (100–3). It is Scribe A who copies the Lydgate pieces (96). See Mosser, 1045.


Oxford, Bodleian Lib., MS Digby 181, in addition to poems by Chaucer, contains several Chaucerian pieces, including CBK, extracts from FP, and Hoccleve’s LC. The manuscript is composed of seven quires, not nine as previously thought.


The Jesse tree in the sixth of the pageants for the entry of Henry VI provides an organizing principle for the whole sequence (215). The importance of the image is not just political: it
also has a religious aspect in that it portrays the coming of the king to the city as messianic (216–17). The pageant sequence is an expression of a mercantile desire for 'justice, peace, and prosperity' (231). Osberg provides a detailed analysis of the pageant’s religious imagery and how this structures the pageant as an event.


The medieval view of Dido was that she is a chaste widow who commits suicide in order to avoid a forced second marriage. This is the Dido of Boccaccio’s *De claris mulieribus* and *De casibus virorum illustrium*. FP, Lydgate’s translation of *De casibus*, is widely known in Shakespeare’s time (368). The ‘widow Dido’ joke in *The Tempest* turns on one character referring to the medieval Dido and others responding on the basis of the Dido of Virgil and Ovid (369).


A close reading that explores ideas of mirroring and division in *TG*. See Torti, 1052, where this material is substantially restated, for the annotation.

Lydgate treats the love of Troilus and Criseyde as a subplot of his principal concern, the retelling of the Trojan War as a history in the mirror genre. He takes Criseyde's faithfulness, already characteristic of feminine fickleness, as indicative of war and Fate, and so strengthens the division found in his sources, Chaucer and Guido della Colonna, between the truth of Trolius and the falseness of Criseyde. Henryson also uses this division, but within the fiction of a tragic love story.


Ch. 2, "'Atwixen two so hang I in balaunce": Lydgate and the Temple of Glas’ provides a close reading of TG with a particular emphasis on mirror imagery (67–86). TG imitates some of Chaucer's poems, but it is also innovative in the way it gives an important role to the lady of the poem, and in its "'new" use of a standardized imagery.’ The poem combines a ‘feeling of instability’ with the ‘theme of constancy in love’ (68). The lady’s ‘human nature’ unites the characteristics of an exemplar of virtue with emotional division (71). The subject of the poem has a complex ‘mirror nature’ (73). The lady, like the poem itself, is both a mirror of wholeness and of division (86).


The apparent popularity of DM might have been because it was included in collections of Lydgate’s poetry, but it was nonetheless a factor in making the Dance of Death scene at Old St Paul’s more widely known (88–9). Some of the handful of other references to the Dance of Death in the literature of medieval England may show Lydgate’s influence (90). Dunbar’s Lament for the Makers may also show this influence, possibly at second-hand (90–1).
Writers of the 15th century are more topical in their references, and more historically centred, than is generally allowed. This is true even of Lydgate (777). *TB* is composed during the years of the English campaigns in France. It is to Lydgate’s credit that he uses *TB* to suggest the ‘tragic waste of war’ (778). Lydgate further expands on the anti-war theme in *ST* (778–9). Pearsall (818:139) is wrong to suggest that Lydgate’s calls for peace are simply commonplaces. Lydgate is, in fact, a consistent and sincere advocate for peace (779). Lydgate’s interest in *FP* is with the social macrocosm (782). The *de casibus* genre is intended to correct ‘vicious folk,’ and its focus on princes must suggest that they are seen to be the ‘most vicious’ (783). In *FP*, Lydgate refers to France and to the story of Arthur in ways that must inevitably have relevance for his contemporary audience (783–4). Lydgate is not a political allegorist, but he does have the courage to go ‘wherever his matter takes him’ (785). He is able to use Boccaccio in *FP* as a convenient and protective authority when advocating peace and criticizing those princes who make war (785). He treats his patron, Humphrey, Duke of Gloucester, generously; this is a prudent thing for a writer to do in the *de casibus* genre (786–7). Three factors make the public frankness of the 15th-century Chaucerians possible: firstly, the protection offered by the persona of the ‘foole sage’; secondly, and more importantly, the fact that poet and patron share the ‘same concerns and a similar, Boethian, frame of reference’ (789); and lastly, a renaissance-style collaboration between poets and patrons that sees the poet confer on the patron ‘fame in return for attention to his moral lessons’ (791). Lydgate provides a particularly strong example of the last of these factors at work (790). See Lawton, 321 and 1179, for further discussion of the author’s argument.
Briefly discusses Lydgate’s work for Thomas Chaucer, and his circle, in an argument that Caxton moves away from such a traditional patronage model as he pioneers the ‘mass market’ (445–6). See Blake, 848, who sees Lydgate himself as breaking away from the old patronage model.


*ST* is part of a manuscript, Longleat House, Wiltshire, MS 257, once owned by Richard, Duke of Gloucester, latter Richard III. The fact that *ST* is frequently paired with Chaucer’s work may explain its presence with Chaucer pieces in the Longleat manuscript (376). Lydgate saw himself as writing a morally instructive history (377). See Sutton and Visser-Fuchs, 1057.


*ST* occupies folios 1–48b of Longleat House, Wiltshire, MS 257. Folio 28 is missing together with a ‘considerable number of single lines’; folios 49–52 are also missing with the last 300 lines of the poem (426). In common with the other works in the manuscript, *ST* has the ‘motif ... of order.’ The manuscript presents a balance of secular and religious pieces and may have been assembled ‘in its entirety’ for the youthful Richard of Gloucester (432). See Sutton and Visser-Fuchs, 1056.

Jack’s claim, 912, that *RS* is an influence on the opening lines of the *Golden Targe* is made on ‘very flimsy evidence.’ It is more likely that *RS* influences the opening lines of the *Thrissill and the Rois.* Ting discusses the parallels between the two works (183). See Nichols, 698–9.


References to *FP* in a discussion of the possible sources for Malory’s use of the phrase ‘Hic iacet Arthurus, rex quondam rexque futurus.’ The line does not necessarily come from a written source; but if it does, that source is most probably one of the *FP* manuscripts (141–2). *FP* circulated widely, and there is evidence that the Arthur episode from Bk 8 was popular with anthologists. It is not inconceivable that Malory owns one of these extracts of the Arthur story (125–9). Lydgate is ambiguous about whether or not Arthur dies, and this is consistent with the ‘folk-tradition of Arthur’s survival’ (131–2). Caxton refers to *FP* in his preface to *Mort Darthur.* An Arthur miniature in the London, BL, MS Harley 1766 version of *FP,* provides evidence of the 15th century belief in Arthur’s historical existence (138–9).


Boccaccio’s *De casibus virorum* takes medieval tragic theory, based on a ‘reversal ... from good to bad,’ and shows it to be the ‘active principle’ of human history. *FP* is a
continuation of the approach taken by Boccaccio (305). Lydgate and Boccaccio deal with the potential conflict between the pagan concept of Fortune and the Christian view of history by making Fortune an inevitable aspect of earthly life in ‘opposition to the rational eternity of the next world’ (309). See Kurose, 946–7, for a related view of Lydgate’s adaptation of Fortune to a Christian setting.


Alludes briefly to Cavendish’s debt to *FP* (84–5). See Edwards, 891.


Folios 139v to 141r of MS Cecil Papers 281, a late 15th-century manuscript among the papers of the Marquis of Salisbury at Hatfield House, give Lydgate’s *Verses on the Kings of England* in fifteen rhyme royal stanzas from William the Conqueror to Henry VI (441).


In the *Mumming at Hertford*, Lydgate ‘abandons his customary moral rigor’ in favour of the ‘recreational realism’ found in the *Gawain*-poet. The mumming deals with the complex issue of the relationship between the sexes, and it also reminds the royal audience of their wider social responsibilities. Nevertheless, in keeping with its recreational tone, the mumming allows the difficult judgement it calls for to be delayed by a year (155).
delay is an echo of the coming of God's final judgement (155–6). The Gawain-poet could not have known Lydgate's poem, but he may have been familiar with similar examples of recreational fiction (156). See Reed, 1064, for a further study.


Reed argues that many of the ME debate poems that fail to reach an apparent resolution may be intended to be read 'recreationally' rather than 'didactically.' In this light, these poems are seen more as statements of the 'complexity of experience' than of the 'simplicity of authority' (97–8). Ch. 8 (363–84) deals with HGS and *The Mumming at Hertford*; there are also a number of generally brief references in the other chapters to Lydgate. Lydgate is important to this study as he is regarded as a 'typically medieval "ethical poet"' who might not be expected to show 'recreational' characteristics (363). HGS is 'realistic and recreational' (375). Lampe, 941, sees the poem as an estates satire in a parliamentary context (369–70); his reading is useful, but it overlooks the way in which the narrative details tend to undermine a simple allegorical reading (371–2). Lydgate seems to be acknowledging the complexity of the issues under discussion (372–3). Support for a reading of the poem's playfulness is found in *The Mumming at Hertford* (375). The mumming is a deliberately and cleverly 'unresolved debate' (380). In HGS, Lydgate's 'acceptance of earthly variety and vitality ... [constitutes] ... a kind of recreational "voiding of hevynesse," ... for the sake of tolerance and even celebration' (383).

Refers to *On the Image of Pity*, *The Dolerous Pyte of Crystes Passioun*, and *Cristes Passioun*. In reading these poems we need to put aside the expectation of 'personal' or 'autobiographical' references that characterise the 'lyrics of a later age.' The poems are 'successful spiritual guides' (168); they work in combination with their associated images rather than merely translating those images into words (172). Lydgate’s success in this 'hybrid' art form shows his ‘flexibility in his own medium and his sensitivity to the power and suggestiveness of the visual arts’ (175).


*CBK* and Hoccleve’s *LC* are regularly included in anthologies of fiction from the second half of the 15th century. The anthologies seem to be based on a small number of exemplars in the form of ‘booklets,’ each containing an individual work or a number of shorter pieces, that could be assembled together (280). Examples of such anthologies include: Oxford, Bodleian Lib., MS Fairfax 16; Oxford, Bodleian Lib., MS Tanner 346; Oxford, Bodleian Lib., MS Bodley 638; Longleat House, Wiltshire, MS 258; and Cambridge, Uni. Lib., MS Ff.i.6. Buyers of anthologies ranged from the ‘wealthy’ to those of ‘lesser means’ (282). It is not certain that all the anthologies were produced in London (282–3). The occurrence of *LC* and *Anelida and Arcite* with the English version of Alain Chartier’s *La Belle Dame sans Merci* in several manuscript anthologies suggests that Chartier’s poem previously circulated in a ‘series of items, or as part of a small collection’ in addition to its ‘independent’ transmission (283). The affiliations of the six surviving anthologies containing Chartier’s work reveal the ‘co-existence of different manuscript traditions’ for individual works copied by metropolitan scribes. Boffey considers the activity of John Shirley, and she includes references to the *Kalundare* as a work that may have been written by Lydgate (284–6). A manuscript by the ‘Hammond scribe,’ Cambridge, Trinity College,
MS R.3.21, has some works repeated: one explanation for this would be that the buyer chose a number of pre-made booklets to make the anthology and so had to tolerate some duplication across the booklets (288).


The London, BL, MS Sloane 1212 manuscript of Hoccleve’s RP contains some parchment leaves which give the text of two lyrics, A Pitiless Mistress and A Sovereign Mistress, together with some slightly adapted lines from Lydgate’s TG (125–8). Boffey prints the texts (125–7). It is not certain what the lines from Lydgate represent. Were they ‘appropriated’ because they fitted the context? Were they meant to be ‘read independently’? Or were they used to fill up space on the page? They might even predate Lydgate and be borrowed by him for his poem; or they might be a survival of an earlier version of TG (128). Early readers see parts of TG as approaching the status of isolable lyrics (129). The Lydgate fragments in Sloane 1212 probably come from a larger ‘Lydgate anthology’ (131). Using some marginal references to family names and mottos, Boffey speculates regarding the manuscript’s original audience (131–4). The suggestion that Lydgate writes TG for the marriage of William Paston and Agnes Berry is unlikely to be true (133). [Wilson, 953, also finds the Paston connection, first suggested by MacCracken, 626, to be unlikely. Amoils, 1027, accepts the Paston connection as probable.] Whether or not a lyric based on an extract from a longer poem keeps the meaning of its source varies somewhat from case to case. Boffey briefly discusses the above example, and two others concerning LSAA and CBK (137). Boffey considers such issues further in 1071.

Considers the ‘associations and expectations’ that testaments might have for the early readers of Lydgate’s *Testament* and Robert Henryson’s *Testament of Cresseid* (42). Boffey discusses examples of actual wills (42–3), as well fictional versions (43–4), and parodies (44–5). The word ‘testament’ can carry a range of meanings including ‘confession,’ ‘arrangement,’ ‘disposition,’ or ‘covenant’ (45). Lydgate’s *Testament* shows something of this range. The first part of the poem is an ‘imprecatory prologue’ (46). This is followed by an ‘extended meditation on childhood’ (46–7); a ‘penitential prayer’ (47); a ‘confession’ (47–8); and a ‘complaint.’ London, BL, MS Harley 2255 and Oxford, Bodleian Lib., MS Laud Misc. 683 show that Lydgate seems to take some trouble with the poem’s structure (48). The important detail of the poem’s form seems to be undervalued in other manuscript versions and in Pynson’s edition, 401 (48–9). Manuscript presentation and provenance suggest that different early readers find different aspects of the poem appealing: some favour Lydgate’s autobiographical references; others prefer the poem’s devotional and religious elements (49–50). This might mean that the ‘testamentary features’ of the poem are not of ‘consistently significant interest’ to manuscript compilers. Pynson’s presentation of Lydgate’s poem could be evidence of renewed interest in this aspect of the work (51).


The stanza form of Lydgate’s *Ballade of her that hath all virtues* and *Letter to Gloucester* shows the influence of Chaucer’s use of French stanza patterns (29). *TG, CBK*, and the *Flower of Courtesy* frequently echo Chaucer’s *Complaint of Mars, Pity, and Anelida and Arcite*. Therefore, they provide evidence that some of Chaucer’s short poems are in circulation during the first decades of the 15th century. *TB* and *FP* also show an echo of
Chaucer’s *Complaint of Venus*; as does PLM of Chaucer’s *ABC*. The PLM instance may have further significance as PLM is commissioned by Thomas Montacute, husband of Chaucer’s grandchild, Alice. There are further snatches of Chaucer’s short poems in Lydgate (31). Lydgate’s influence later in the century makes it difficult to be precise about the extent of any direct knowledge of Chaucer’s lyrics (32).


Focuses on the part played by women in ‘generating, reading and circulating’ Lydgate’s poems (140). A number of these poems are commissioned by women or at least written with an apparent sense of a female audience (140–1). It is possible that the Latinate diction of some of Lydgate’s shorter religious pieces may be aimed at readers who want to gain a deeper understanding of liturgy, but who lack the necessary Latin to follow the liturgy in the original text (142). The circulation of some manuscripts may have been through the agency of women (143–4). Some of Lydgate’s poems may have been used in the household devotions of both men and women (144–8).


A consideration of some of the manuscript configurations of Lydgate’s short poems, focused mainly on London, BL, MS Harley 116 and Cambridge, Univ. Lib., MS Hh.4.12. Care is needed when commenting on the apparent significance of the ordering and content.
of a manuscript collection. Not only must one be mindful of the vagaries of the physical compilation of a manuscript, the role of accident as opposed to design, but also of the elusive 'intellectual, aesthetic, practical, and possibly even financial considerations' that may influence those responsible for the production of the manuscript. For example, in the case of Cambridge, Univ. Lib., MS Hh.4.12, one must consider if it is simply chance that has the Churl and the Bird collocated with Chaucer's Parliament of Fowls (81). In London, BL, MS Harley 116, missing quire signatures raise questions about the strength of the apparent association between some parts of the manuscript (81–2).


In Bk 1 of FP, lines 4373–82, Theseus is spoken of as a ‘Hercules’ (43). Lydgate’s usage is based on a traditional, but false, etymology for the word ‘Hercules’: ‘eroneleos (heros, “hero,” + kleos, “fame”)’ (44).


References to Lydgate in a discussion of the range of manuscript books in demand by English readers and on offer in the early English book market. A lack of knowledge hampers our social analysis of manuscript ownership, and, as a result, we are presented with a number of puzzles. For example, some of the surviving copies of FP, such as London, BL, MS Harley 1776 and Philadelphia, Rosenbach Foundation, MS 439/16, are ‘exceptionally elaborate.’ In spite of this, none of the copies appears to come from the court, and none represents the presentation copy (209). Regardless of social status, owning
a manuscript of works by Chaucer or by one his 15th-century followers was a public sign of one’s ‘fashionable tastes.’ Oxford, Bodleian Lib., MS Fairfax 16, which contains courtly Chaucerian works, including pieces by Lydgate, is produced for John Stanley, and its appearance is complementary to its owners ‘connections with the court.’ It seems, however, that many Chaucerian manuscripts are produced in London during the 1460s and 1470s for mercantile clients. Cambridge, Magdalene College, MS Pepys 2006, similar in content to the Fairfax volume but more cheaply produced, is one such example (218).


Several generally brief references to Lydgate works and manuscripts. Some annotations in Elizabeth Peche’s manuscript copy of TB, Oxford, Bodleian Lib., Rawlinson MS poetry 144, may support the suggestion that the ownership of books is not necessarily proof of literacy (134). The role of Alice Chaucer in commissioning the London, BL, MS Arundel 119 text of Lydgate’s ST may be substantial; nevertheless, this matter is open to speculation as the part played by her husband is not known (135). The fact that so many of the patrons of Lydgate’s lesser religious poems are women contributes to the impression that religious literature is the area of greatest interest to female readers of this period (137).

Argues that Lydgate’s Kings of England is written, and used, as political propaganda. It is likely that the poem dates from 1426 (257–8). Its brevity suggests that it is meant to be read aloud as an occasional piece, but this brevity also makes it suitable for school use (258–9). The poem’s primary purpose, however, is to glorify the young Henry VI (255ff). It is read widely among the literate middle and upper class of the period (262–3). Subsequent changes and additions show that it is still a vehicle for political propaganda down to Henry VIII (259–63). Mooney’s Appendix I lists the poem’s 35 known manuscripts (277–8). Another verse chronicle on the kings of England, described as the anonymous ‘Kings of England’ (items 444 and 3431 in the Index of Middle English Verse), is probably not by Lydgate (263ff). See Reimer, 1083.


Focuses on the characteristics of Lydgate’s prosody across verse-units larger than single lines. Schick’s interventionist editing of TG, 442, makes his edition less useful than Erdmann’s edition of ST, 469–70, for a consideration of Lydgate’s metre (151–2). Analysis shows that Lydgate is more metrically skilful than is usually acknowledged (152–5). In those lines where it is commonly agreed that Lydgate is metrically regular, he usually follows the practice of Chaucer in matters of ‘syllabic pronunciation,’ elision, and placement of the caesura (152). Lydgate’s so-called broken-backed lines are often effective in achieving emphasis or facilitating enjambment (152–5). An examination of the Mumming at Hertford shows that Lydgate can achieve smoothly flowing metrical units over a number of lines (155–7). It is wrong to see Lydgate’s metre as a failed copy of
Chaucer's; Schick's line-types have tended to blind critics to Lydgate's capacity for metrical variety (157). See 331 for the first part of this article in which Stanley discusses Hoccleve's prosody.

1077. Arn, Mary-Jo. 'The Brute Manuscript of The Privity of the Passion (Yale University, Beinecke MS 660.)' Manuscripta 34 (1990): 177–89.

A description and discussion of New Haven, Yale Univ., Beinecke Lib., MS 660. The manuscript provides texts for The Privity of the Passion and LOL.


Primarily a study of Guillaume de Deguileville's Pelerinage de Vie Humaine that happens to take Lydgate's translation, because of its availability and ease of use for students, as the basis for discussion. Hagen considers, however, special features of Lydgate's translation and divergences from its source. For example, Lydgate's concept of his work as facilitating the intellectual visualization of Deguileville's text by its readers, hence assisting them to lead better Christian lives (107–9ff).


See McGerr, 338a, for annotation.
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Announces a computer-based re-examination of the Lydgate canon. The proposed study will produce a bibliography of materials relating to Lydgate, including a complete manuscript listing and concordance. It is envisaged that a body of poetry by Chaucer and the 15th-century Chaucerians will be made available in ‘machine-readable’ format (249).


Not sighted. Reimer is working on a project to settle more firmly the extent of the Lydgate canon. He is analysing word samples, in conjunction with computer technology, from poems for which authorship is undisputed. Where determinations cannot be made by other means, Reimer will employ linguistic and stylistic features. [This annotation has been based on an abstract found on the World Wide Web, www.ualberta.ca/~sreimer/lydgate.htm.]


Identifies a fragment of velum, Cambridge, Gonville and Caius College, MS 804/808 (1) as a coming from a lost manuscript of *LOL*. Examination of the fragment suggests that it belonged to the same manuscript from which two other fragments also survive. See Jones, 905, and Edwards and Jenkins, 881 for discussion of the other possible fragments of the Cambridge text.

London, Inner Temple, MS 524, the 'Petyt' manuscript, includes a single leaf from *TB* (180). Originally, the fragment was the first page of text from an unidentified copy of *TB* (181–2).


London, BL, MS Cotton Julius B.xii contains a nine-line fragment of verse that is influenced by Lydgate's *Verses on the Kings of England* (426). Reimer describes the manuscript setting of the fragment (426–8). The manuscript probably dates to the late 15th century (428). The verse fragment is further evidence of Mooney's view, 1075, that there was still interest in Lydgate's poem after the fall of the Lancastrians.


Offers a number of corrections to the Index, 647 and 772.

A number of generally brief references to Lydgate, mainly involving *FP*. Lydgate, like Caxton, is a ‘half-hearted humanist’: his version of the Dido story in *FP* contains many ‘inconsistencies’ that follow from his efforts to make the largest possible number of moral observations (18). Significant issues for Lydgate relate to Dido’s ‘constancy’ and ‘role as a ruler’ (19).


Lydgate sets the terms by which Chaucer is praised in the 15th century (3). He establishes Chaucer as the first and best of the English poets (4), and as the person who magnified, adorned, and sweetened ‘English poetic diction.’ Lydgate’s praise helps to consolidate the notion of a Chaucer canon (5). It is Lydgate who first sets the trend followed by writers in the 16th century of defining Chaucer’s work relative to ‘classical models’ (6).


*ST* throws light on Lydgate’s view of the ‘moral impact’ of *Troilus and Criseyde* and *The Knight’s Tale* (122). Allen discusses the plot of *ST* (123–6). Lydgate assumes that comparisons between his poem and *Troilus and Criseyde* will generate ‘ironies ... to show how human plans can be disrupted by the malevolence of others’ (125). Allen discussed the sources for the Theban legend (126–8). Lydgate concentrates on Thebes as a ‘city of evil’ and ‘misfortune.’ The surviving manuscripts show that early readers view Lydgate’s poem as a ‘tale of antiquity in association with the story of Troy’; a stand-alone tale; and as
a story from *CT* (128). Allen considers the tale’s narrative technique (128–30). Lydgate, although mainly interested in history, includes ‘passages of frustrated romance.’ His poem offers instruction not just to the ruling men, but also for ‘dowager queens, princesses and royal nannies’ (129). *The Knight’s Tale* deals with a period of ‘resolution’ in the Theban saga; Lydgate shows ‘evil ... reasserting itself’ (130). Allen then further discusses Lydgate’s story in the context of *CT* (130–8). For the early booksellers, *ST* allows them to sell versions of Chaucer’s *CT* that represent better ‘value for money’ (131). Lydgate’s preference for ‘facts’ leads him to overlook the subtleties of Chaucer’s narrative (132–4). Lydgate’s tale seems intended to complete *The Knight’s Tale* (135–8); it is a ‘poem of endings’ (138).


Brief references. Preliminary work on the first-line index of early Scottish verse is finding ‘increasing evidence’ that Lydgate enjoyed a readership in Scotland to the 17th century (257–8).


A discussion, with an emphasis on the Medea story, of the tradition of featuring women in medieval exempla that stands behind Chaucer’s *Legend of Good Women*. In *TB*, Lydgate’s antifeminist commentary ‘amplifies’ the approach of Guido della Colonna’s *Historia destructionis Troiae*, which had already made Medea’s behaviour ‘emblematic of that of’
women in general,' to a point that strains the subject-matter (58). In *FP*, Lydgate exploits the attraction of Medea as a powerful figure that can provide gifts to men and then take those gifts away (59-60).


Chaucer presents himself as a compiler who relies on other auctores, or independent authorities. In the early 15th century, he is himself cited as an auctor by his successors, such as Hoccleve and Lydgate, perhaps, with a view to bolster their own literary fortunes. These successors present themselves as compilers and translators (75–76). By the end of the century, as Henryson shows, Chaucer’s status has changed such that the ‘truthfulness of his writings is questioned’ (76). Fichte traces this development through a discussion of *ST* and Henryson’s *Testament of Cresseid*. Lydgate sees Chaucer’s poetry generally as a vehicle of ethical instruction ‘written in high style.’ The ‘problematic’ aspects of Chaucer’s work are quite unapparent to Lydgate because he is thinking in a set, ‘one-dimensional’ manner (67). Lydgate cites Boccaccio as his source for the *ST*, but he uses Chaucer’s *CT* as his legitimizing authority (68). Lydgate’s story presents history as a ‘series of events with exemplary universal significance’; this is in marked contrast to the complexity of the *Knight’s Tale* (70).

The many failings of the Lauritis, Klinefelter, and Gallagher edition of *LOL*, 492, might explain why such a highly successful poem has not received proper attention recently (139). Among other things, the editors do not pay due regard to the poem's manuscript annotations and textual divisions (140). Courtly readers would be accustomed to a 'complex manuscript apparatus' from the works of Nicholas Love and Thomas Hoccleve (146). The Duquesne editors' assumption for *LOL* of a six-book format with 87 chapter divisions is not based on a consistent manuscript record (148–9). Nevertheless, the six-book structure is likely to be authorial (150). The chapter divisions are probably inserted by the scribes (150–1): this suggests that early readers see the poem not only as a story, but as a resource for 'meditation' on the details of the Virgin's life (151). Manuscripts of Nicholas Love's *Myrrour of the Blessed Lyf of Jesu Christ* may influence the chapter layout of Lydgate's poem (152). Keiser briefly discusses the dominate themes of *LOL* (156–7).

See Keiser, 1091, for a further discussion.


The manuscript divisions and marginal notations for *LOL* show how early scribes attempt to format the work in a way that will best serve readers who are using *LOL* as a text for meditation (207). Keiser discusses a number of examples of the scribal division of other medieval texts (207–14). The Huntington Lib., MS HM 115 version of Lydgate's poem was once part of a single volume that contained four hagiographical works, three of which, including Lydgate's poem, have 'Lancastrian associations' (213). Other works in the original volume show signs of an apparatus inserted to assist readers in navigating the texts (214–15). The scribal apparatus found in the Huntington version of *LOL*, with its 36 chapter structure, seems to be used as the basis for more elaborate chapter divisions in later manuscripts. The 87 chapter structure is the most common of the later chapter divisions (215–17).

Brief references to Hoccleve and Lydgate. *Henry V* plays a part, along with other patrons of literature, in encouraging Hoccleve and Lydgate, and other translators, in advancing English as the national language (420–1). Lydgate assists in the cause of English nationalism by presenting England as a country with a long and important history (414–5).


Several references to Hoccleve and Lydgate in an argument that the grouping, sequencing, and juxtaposing of items in a manuscript compilation may provide a ‘commentarial function’ (946). Oxford, Bodleian Lib., MS Bodley 638 contains among other items, Lydgate’s *TG* and *Complaint of a Lover’s Life*, and Hoccleve’s *LC*. The manuscript’s construction argues that ‘despite its difficulties, courtly love is a valuable and worthwhile pursuit’ (948–9). Boyd discusses the *Complaint of a Lover’s Life* as an example (950). Lydgate’s *ST* is among the items in Oxford, Bodleian Lib., MS Laud Misc. 416. The theme of this collection reinforces the notion of ‘social duty’ (952). The compilation in Oxford, Bodleian Lib., MS Digby 181 includes Hoccleve’s *LC*, and Lydgate’s *Examples Against Women* and *FP*, and has a complex message within the framework of a ‘mirror for a prince’ (955–9).


The physical presentation of *DM* and Hoccleve’s *Series* in New Haven, Yale Univ.,
Beinecke Lib., MS 493 provides clues as to how they are understood as social and political texts by medieval readers. The manuscript presents these two poems together with Hoccleve’s *RP*, this suggests that they are perceived as thematically related.


An examination of *ST* in the context of the *roman antique* and *histoire ancienne* reveals its ‘ideological purpose’: Lydgate’s poem is not a ‘chivalric romance but an historical romance—like narrative in the historiographical tradition of the *Histoire ancienne.*’ Lydgate probably writes the poem for Humphrey, Duke of Gloucester, to commemorate the Treaty of Troyes. Tydeus is modelled on Henry V (18).


Considers the French antecedents of *ST* [see Clogan, 1095] and the relevance to Lydgate’s poem of concepts of the ‘city’ in Christianity. Lydgate makes clear the moral of the Theban story, whereas Chaucer leaves the moral ‘implicit.’ The story of Thebes becomes, in Lydgate’s telling, a ‘mirror for magistrates’ (160). The city symbolizes human aspirations for control over the natural world; Thebes comes to represent a ‘trap ensnared by fratricide and darkened by conflict’ (163).

Rhetoric has a high profile in *FP* and in Hawes’s *PP*. This is a consequence of a vernacular tradition, represented by the work of Brunetto Latini, Dante, and John Gower, that argues for the pre-eminence of rhetoric on the ground of its important social function in public debate. The vernacular tradition is a reaction against the Latinate, clerical construction of rhetoric that reduces the role of rhetoric, found in the Roman authors as a tool for public debate and as a way to challenge authority, by subjugating it to the other branches of knowledge in the medieval curriculum (57–70). Political ideology, however, is not the driving force behind Lydgate’s and Hawes’s presentation of rhetoric. For Lydgate and Hawes, rhetoric is important because of its poetic, and not its civil, function (57–70). Lydgate shows an awareness of the tension between the political and poetic functions of rhetoric, but it is the latter function that he allows to be the dominant. For him, rhetoric is a matter of poetic beauty (71–5). Rhetoric is even more prominent in Hawes’s poetics than it is in Lydgate’s, and he uses it to describe broadly the ‘ability to speak fictively’ (76). It is ironic that the 15th-century writers keep the status of rhetoric they inherit from the vernacular tradition, yet diminish its social function in the manner of the Latinate clerical pedagogues (81). In some ways, although firmly medieval in their sources of influence, they anticipate aspects of humanist-inspired Renaissance court poetry (81–2).


Explores the hypothesis that the sudden increase in literary works written in English after 1400 is a deliberate government policy to win over English citizens to support the doubtful legality of the Lancastrian succession. It is possible that Prince Henry, Henry Beaufort, Thomas Chaucer, and Lydgate know each other at Oxford, and they might there decide to cultivate English as the language of England (1172–3). Lydgate’s references to the encouragement he receives from Prince Henry, and praise of Chaucer’s role in the development of the English language, might be part of a deliberate language policy fostered by the Lancastrian rulers (1176–7).
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For the 15th-century vernacular authors, Chaucer provides the model for ‘textual authority’ in vernacular texts. Lydgate refers to textual authority much more often than Hoccleve does, but he fails to show the earlier poet’s concern for the underlying issues (285). Machan discusses examples from *ST*, the minor poems, and *FP* (285–95). Many of Lydgate’s authority references in *ST* look like line-fillers, especially when compared to similar instances from Chaucer (286–8). Lydgate’s treatment of the issues raised seems ‘perfunctory’ (288–9). The minor poems present a similar picture (290–1). *FP* provides many references to textual authority, yet these show that Lydgate chooses not to explore their implications more deeply (291–5).


A number of generally brief references to Lydgate in a discussion of issues surrounding the editing and interpretation of ME texts. In *ST*, Lydgate is insistent that his sources, his authorities, impose strict limits on what he is able to say. He is much less ‘ambivalent’ in this than Hoccleve is when dealing with the same issue. His references to authority, however, seem mechanical and lacking the wider ‘thematic and narrative purposes’ found in Chaucer (122). Machan considers examples of this (122–5). Machan also finds evidence for his thesis in Ashby, 1182, and Hoccleve, 350–1 (119–21). Lydgate tends to ignore conflicts between his sources (124–6).

See Wright, 352.


See Wright, 353.


A reading of *TG* as a 'sustained, ironic treatment of frustrated love' (68). Ironic allegory is not uncommon in Lydgate's work (69–70), and many examples may be found in other medieval poems (85). Readers who fail to see irony in *TG* think that the poem awkwardly accommodates a sympathetic handling of adulterous love with the cultural prohibition against such love (70). In fact, a close reading shows that Lydgate consistently uses irony to undermine the presentation of Venus, the Lady, and her Lover.


Parts of the *Seven Deeds of Honour* are very similar to Lydgate's story about Marcus Manlius Torquatus in Bk 4 of *FP*. Nevertheless, a comparison suggests that the two versions are probably not directly connected (156–7).

A study of how and to what ends Chaucer and his work are portrayed and interpreted in 15th- and early 16th-century England. Lerer argues that later poets, working amidst political instability and uncertain patronage, create a mythology that sees Chaucer enjoying a privileged position under assured patronage. Hoccleve presents his relationship with Chaucer as a personal one. The 'laureate' and 'aureate' Chaucer is a public figure, one from a golden age, constructed by Lydgate and others (23–4). The later construction of Chaucer is consistent with a Lydgatean poetic theory that is centred on the 'social and political institutions and individuals that order, read, and transmit works of literature' (24).

Ch. 1. (22–55) considers Lydgate's construction of a model for past literary patronage, and use of the narrative he finds in Chaucer's *Clerk's Tale*, in order to create a 'laureate present' for himself (26). Lerer's references are mainly to *FP*, but include several other Lydgate works. There is a change in tone in Lydgate's work from the optimism in the decade before the death of Henry V to the desperation that followed with the reign of Henry VI: it is a time when his need to be the laureate poet becomes acute (49–51). Lerer's second chapter (57–84) considers *TG* in a discussion of the significance of the ordering of the texts in Oxford, Bodleian Lib., MS Tanner 346 as a guide to the 15th-century construction of the 'gallant Chaucer' (60).


Applies the technique of deconstruction to a historical discussion of the way Henry V and Lydgate form their social identities. Patterson argues that these identities seek to amalgamate apparently disparate elements in a way that is not just medieval, but self-consciously medieval. *CBK, TG,* and the *Departyng of Thomas Chaucer* are the product of
an artist who is both subservient to, and detached from, the world he describes (73–4). In *TB* and *LOL*, by contrast, Lydgate works directly to provide Henry V with the ‘monastically generated materials needed to sustain royal authority.’ In *ST* Lydgate’s intention is again to support the legitimacy of the Lancastrian reign (74). Patterson discusses *ST* in terms of its presentation of truth and doubleness, and in terms of Lydgate’s agenda to identify himself with truth (74–7). Lydgate simplifies and changes details from his source in Chaucer, and so asserts his difference from Chaucer, in order to highlight the seriousness and truth of his own message (75–7). Henry V constructs himself as a legitimate ruler using the ‘contemporary language of public virtue’ that is found in *ST* (78). Patterson considers the detail of this construction (78–87). The language of Lydgate’s *The Title and Pedigree of Henry VI* strains to show the legitimacy of Henry V’s contrived claim to the French throne. The scepticism that Lydgate there reveals about his own position and agenda as an apologist for the Lancastrians may also be detectable in *ST* (92–3). Lydgate’s response to Henry V’s criticism of the Benedictine order is seen in his handling of the central events of the Theban story in *ST*. *ST* both offers material for the medieval monarch to exploit and undermines the endeavours of secular power (93–7). Lydgate may show himself to be genuinely ‘Chaucerian’ in his subtle handling of these opposing aspects (97).


Brief references to Lydgate in a discussion of the commercial world of letters in England in the years following the death of Chaucer. Lydgate is unusual for his time in that he writes for money, yet he heralds the ‘incipient professionalization of writing’ (276).

FP assisted the development of renaissance tragedy. Lydgate is an ‘important transitional, and in some ways, even innovative figure’ (322). Lydgate substantially alters his source for FP in a variety of ways and develops the Fürstenspiegel aspect of the work (324). Scanlon considers this development in the new vernacular lay setting of the time (324–6). The ambiguous position of Humphrey, Duke of Gloucester, as a subject with royal aspirations, ideally suits him as the recipient of FP: his position highlights the ‘identification between reader and monarch’ on which the Fürstenspiegel relies (326). Scanlon explores the idea of character within the exempla of FP, and the impact upon it of Lydgate’s notions of authority in the poetic and political arenas (326–44). Lydgate is confident of the ‘moral value of human history’ (342). FP influences the development of renaissance tragedy (344–9). See Kelly, 945, for a different view of Lydgate’s interpretation of tragedy.


Lydgate’s translation of his source for DM is influenced by the imagery of the fresco that accompanies the source text in the cemetery of the Innocents’ in Paris. This influence is apparent in his concentration on the word ‘dance,’ and associated concepts, beyond the degree to which they are present in the source text.

The "outdoing" topos has a long history in Western literature, and Chaucer's efforts to outdo his predecessors are a part of that history (90). Lydgate's praise of Chaucer should not be read as an implicit acknowledgment of the later poet's 'inferiority' (90). In fact, Lydgate's attitude towards Chaucer contains an 'ambitious competitiveness worthy of Chaucer himself.' Lydgate canonizes and subverts Chaucer at the same time (91). In TB, Lydgate adds weight to the moral elements of the story he shapes in the genre of a 'mirror for the prince' (92–5). Lydgate in TB is critical of 'women, fictions, and poets,' and this puts him in opposition to Chaucer's sympathetic treatment of Criseyde in Troilus and Criseyde (96). Behind his publicly voiced praise of Chaucer, Lydgate privately positions Chaucer with the 'lying poets,' and himself on the side of truth (101).


*LSEF and LSAA* do more than change the formal presentational elements of the genre of the saint's legend and bring it into the realm of literature: they present a revised 'representation of sainthood,' that has greater length, historical detail, and moral complexity (221). Winstead discusses the earlier tradition (222–6), and provides an analysis of Lydgate's poems (226–35). Religious devotion in the 15th century shows a 'new respect for social obligations, a tolerance of human weakness, and a valorization of worldly experience' (236). Lydgate's poems reflect and explore the complexity of these issues (237).

There is a parallel between Lydgate’s construction of the ‘line of literary succession,’ which lends historical authority to TB, and the construction of the authority of the Lancastrian succession (40). Lydgate claims that he draws on a number of unnamed ‘auctours’ from whom he gains access to the ‘substance’ of the Trojan story. He rejects other authors as representing a false tradition. He presents his immediate source, Guido della Colonna, as a figure who restores the true ‘substance’ of Trojan history after it has been overly embellished by an earlier telling (41–4). Historically, Henry IV presents himself in a somewhat similar way as the restorer of a ‘broken series’ (50). Ambrisco explores the parallels between the validating signs of true history and legitimate royal authority (47–54). Lydgate’s ‘Brutys Albyoun’ is an imaginary construct where the ‘succession is not a problem’: it is a place of ‘true kingship,’ just as ‘true history’ is the ‘substance’ of the story of Troy (48). ‘True kingship’ is established by the possession of ‘dignitas,’ just as ‘substance’ is the keystone for ‘authorial integrity’ (49).


In Lydgate’s *Fabula duorum mercatorum* and Chaucer’s *Knight’s Tale* the friendship between two men is put to the test, with very different consequences, by the love of a woman. Nevertheless, the part played by the central female character in both stories is identical (21–2): ‘courtly romance, male friendship, and courtly love are linked by the exchange of women’ (24). Lydgate may embellish his source, the *Perfect Friend* of Petrus Alfonsi, in order to provide a contrast, and a ‘“better” solution,’ to the clash between the two friends in Chaucer’s poem. In fact, he only makes the intimate relationship of ‘courtly love, the exchange of women, and male friendship’ all the more obvious (27).

Lydgate and the Gest author share Guido as a source: both perceive an underlying structure to the Destructionis, but only Lydgate articulates this explicitly (149). Finlayson provides a comparison of the structural divisions used by the two authors (149–56). Guido moves between a presentation of events as ‘in process’ or ‘completed’ (and, if completed, open to moralization). The Gest author generally uses the ‘in process’ approach. Lydgate is firmly on the side of the ‘completed’ event and moralization (152–3). Lydgate’s treatment of the death of Hector in Bk 3 of his poem improves on Guido’s version and carries a sense of doom in anticipation of the fall of Troy (153–4). Typically, the Gest author prefers a more ‘open-ended’ approach (154). Nevertheless, both poems may be seen as part of the ‘English appropriation of the Trojans’ at a time of political turmoil (159).


An examination of the ‘Psalter’s ... influence on the shape of moral discourse in late medieval England’ (xv). The significance of Lydgate’s work in imitation of the Psalms has tended to be lost in the bulk of his other poems, and the relation of this work to the tradition of which it is a part is not clear from MacCracken, 471. Even Pearsall, 818, allows Lydgate’s Psalms only a relatively brief mention (135). Lydgate’s psalmic poetry is not a great literary success, but it is interesting because it shows the poet experimenting in how to fulfil both private and public needs (135–6). Kuczynski discusses Lydgate’s translations of Psalms 42, 53, 102, 129, part translation of Psalm 88, and two translations of the Eight Verses of St Bernard (136–48). The translations of Psalms 53 and 102 are ‘essentially devotional’ (137); the translations of Psalms 42 and 129 have a ‘more public
tone' because Lydgate positions them 'surrounded by instructive matter' (139). The prologue to the translation of Psalm 129 may show signs of Lydgate's insistence to combine, following the model of David, a 'private' devotional role and one that is 'public, or morally instructive and even grossly political' (142). In A Defence of Holy Church, Lydgate compares Henry V to David (147). Ch. 5, 'Two Versions of Captivity: Lydgate, the Lollards, and Psalm Complaint' (151–88), explores how the Lollards and Lydgate employ the 'Psalms to represent their very different senses of political beleaguerment' (152). Kuczynski undertakes a detailed discussion of A Defence of Holy Church (152–64). This poem may be written for Henry V, and not Humphrey, Duke of Gloucester, as Schirmer assumes, 758. It may, therefore, be earlier than previously thought and belong to a period of sharper concern with the Lollard problem (154–5). Lydgate's 'moral authority' in A Defence of Holy Church is derived from a reworking of Psalm 136 'according to contemporary events' in England (164).


Corrects and supplements the guide to manuscript selections from FP published by Edwards, 879.

A study of John Palsgrave’s references to words from Chaucer and Lydgate in his 1530 French grammar and English-French dictionary, *Lesclarcissement de la langue francoyse*. Palsgrave does not seem to use these references as examples of “good” language (131); instead, they tend to illustrate examples of “special language use” (135).


Lydgate’s French source for *The Churl and the Bird* could be one of two French poems: *Le Donnei des Amants* and *Trois Savoirs* (11). Wolfgang concludes that the likely French source is *Trois Savoirs*; she suggests, however, that Lydgate’s poem may ultimately derive from Petrus Alfonsi’s *Disciplina clericalis* (19). See Cartlidge, 1128, for a development of this view.


Brief illustrative references to Lydgate in an analysis of the development of the myth that Chaucer is the founder of Modern English.


Brief references. Lydgate demonstrates, along with John Skelton and Thomas Malory, the smallness of the impact of humanism in their time. Lydgate’s narrative in *FP* is
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'thoroughly medieval': the descent from joy to sorrow is 'ultimately seen as a fall from grace and is explained in terms of a moral lesson' (247).


A study that principally maps Henry VI’s Triumphal Entry into London against contemporary concerns about the urban renewal needs of London. In particular, DeVries explores the concept of the city water conduits both as symbols, or indicators, of physical and moral cleanliness, and as important public sites.


London, BL, MS. Additional 16165 contains several Lydgate items, including Complaint of a Lover’s Life, and TG. It is the earliest manuscript to present Chaucer and Lydgate works together (95).


Material that is bound with the Chaucer text in San Marino, Huntington Lib., MS EL 26 C 9 [the Ellesmere manuscript] is a guide to the manuscript’s provenance. The manuscript has connections to the Drury family, at least as early as the 16th century. It is possible that the Drurys first obtain the manuscript from a bequest of the De Vere family in Essex. The Drurys also own some Lydgate works and have strong ties to the Bury St Edmunds locality (15–16). It is likely that the Huntington manuscript is in the area of Bury St Edmunds by the early 15th century (16). There are some similarities in the style of glossing and
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A consideration of the structural functionality of LOL. Traditionally, critics have seen a structural division in LOL, based on length, between Bks 1–3 and the shorter Bks 4–6. In fact, the division of real significance, which is based on narrative style, is between Bks 1–2 and Bks 3–6 (248–9). Hardman explores this view further (249–56). Bk 3 is central to the structure of LOL: it may be read as the culmination of the preceding books or as a self-contained unit that sets a pattern for the remaining books of the poem. In the second of these readings, Bks 3–6 may still be read as a chronological sequence of scriptural narrative for use over Christmas (255–6). It is possible to see the overall form of LOL as a ‘representation of transformation: an enactment of the significance of the Incarnation’; nevertheless, it may also be the case that Lydgate changed his intentions for the poem as he wrote it (256). The first three books may be written first, as an independent work, and subsequently extended, possibly after, or over, a period of years (258–9). The manuscript copies of LOL show that scribes sometimes extend the finished poem, by the addition of other material, or abbreviate it. Edinburgh, National Lib. of Scotland, MS Advocates 19.3.1 is an example of the latter as it contains only Bks 4–6, presented as an independent text. This arrangement is a demonstration that Lydgate’s poem can be read to accompany a


decoration between the Huntington manuscript and the London, BL, MS Arundel 119 presentation copy of ST. This suggests that the Huntington manuscript is near at hand while Arundel is being prepared (16–17). There are further manuscript and Drury family connections to the Bury St Edmunds region (17–19). A poem in the Huntington manuscript in praise of the De Veres, either authored or copied by someone indicated as ‘Rotheley,’ draws on a Lydgatian lexicon. This further strengthens the Bury St Edmunds connections of the manuscript (20–1).
calendar of religious events in the way suggested by Keiser, 1090–1, and provides an insight into its 15th-century reception (259–62).

1125. Tiner, Eliza C. "Euer aftir to be rad & song": Lydgate's Texts in Performance—

Explores the hypothesis that some of Lydgate's shorter pieces were written to be sung, and, when considered as performance pieces, offer new insights into his style. Evidence is provided by the manuscript and historical sources (42–6), and by references to musical accompaniment in the texts (46–9). Fallows, 977–8, finds an example of two lines from TG that were set to music (42–3). Tyed with a Lyne may provide another example, but the text's authorship is problematic (43–4). [See Edwards, 876, and Stevens (826: 108).] Lydgate's patrons also support minstrels; a number of Lydgate's shorter pieces are in a form that could be set to the music of the time (44–6). Some of the shorter pieces actually refer to musical accompaniment, for example, Henry VI's Triumphal Entry into London (46). It is not unusual that any accompanying musical notation has not survived (48). See part 2 of this article under Carnahan, 1127.

1126. Baswell, Christopher. 'Troy Book: How Lydgate Translates Chaucer into Latin.'

TB mirrors the process of England's 'cultural and political self-translation' during the late 14th and 15th centuries. Within this translation there is an inherent tension between England's desire for continental dominance and its vernacular cultural identity. TB is an expression of the 'imperial myth'; the fact that it is a vernacular translation of a Latin text, however, shows the tension between that myth and national pride in an 'insular tongue'
Lydgate imports ‘Chaucer and Chaucer’s English’ into his Latin authority, and in this way the vernacular comes to supplant imperial Latin. In a political sense, Lydgate’s retelling of the Troy story also reminds its readers of England’s place as the successor to Troy. Lydgate’s additions to the beginning and end of his material are used to expand both on the relationship between enduring truth and writing, and on the ‘imperial projects’ of his patron.


Discusses the preliminary work necessary to perform several Lydgate pieces as songs. Musical settings for two of these songs, lines from *TG* and *Tyed with a Lyne*, are already available in manuscript (86–7). In order to test further whether performance of Lydgate pieces as songs was feasible, settings, based on Franco-Flemish tunes, were prepared for extracts from *My Lady Dere*, *On Gloucester’s Approaching Marriage*, *Ballade to King Henry VI upon his Coronation*, and *Henry VI’s Triumphal Entry into London* (88–91). The claim that some of Lydgate’s poetry is written to be sung is ‘entirely plausible’ (92). See also the first part of this article by Tiner, 1125, and Fallows, 977–8, and Bukofzer, 735.


A response to Wolfgang, 1118. It is certain that *Le Donnei des Amants* and *Trois Savoirs* constitute the direct source for Lydgate’s *Churl and the Bird.*
Brief reference. Bale may draw on editions instead of manuscripts for some, but not all, of his catalogue of Lydgate’s work (324–5). Lydgate escapes sectarian attack from Bale, possibly because of his role in enriching English, and because of his translations (327). It is debatable whether or not Bale’s book plays a part in directing subsequent critical attention to the ‘Chaucer tradition’ at the expense of other 15th-century writers. He does, however, seem to anticipate future trends. Bale’s attention to Lydgate’s work, and avoidance of the work of others, may stem from the fact that the Chaucerians had ‘discoverable names, whereas the imitators of Piers Plowman did not’ (329).

A description of Philadelphia, Rosenbach Foundation, MS 439/16. It seems likely that the three artists who apparently work on the manuscript’s illuminated initials also produce its miniatures (301–3). The representation of Lady Fortune on folio 146v may owe something to the independent influence of Alain de Lille’s Anticleudianus on Boccaccio and Lydgate (306–8).

Several references to CBK and TG in a wider discussion, much of which has general application to Lydgate and to Hoccleve, of the characteristics of Chaucerian poetry.
Chaucerian poets are better seen as participants in the tradition of *dit amoureux* than merely as followers of Chaucer (71). Their work typically comprises lyric-like productions (even when in narrative form), based on French models, within framed narratives (71–2). Criticism is now finding Chaucerian poetry responsive to such modern interests as audience reception, manuscript and printing studies, feminism, and cross-disciplinary studies in history and economics (72). Chaucer's influence on the Chaucerians is very great, but the latter may owe an equal debt to French writers (73). The best of Chaucerian poetry 'excels at using structure and style to carry meaning'; this is seen in the exploitation of a tension, expressed in various ways, between 'frame and core' (77). *CBK* and *TG* are among examples of Chaucerian poetry that express 'thwarted' love (94).


A reading that stresses Lydgate's active, humanistic engagement with Chaucer. *ST* would be better known as the *Destruction of Thebes* as this title has strong manuscript authority. It also conveys the dark tone of a poem that seems more to comment on the dangerous instability that followed Henry V’s death in 1422 than to praise the king’s achievements of 1420 (15). Lydgate uses Chaucer’s *Knight’s Tale* to build a ‘powerful, prudential admonition concerning the treacherousness of history’ (16). Modern scholarship has noted that *ST* presents truth in political life as important (16–17); political prudence is another important part of the poem (18–20). What is crucial, however, is that Lydgate places his set-piece references to truth and prudence in a dynamic dialogue with Chaucer’s *Knight’s Tale*. It is through this dialogue that he reveals a dark historical reality over-shadowing truth, prudence, and eloquence (20–1). *ST*, the first tale on the return leg of the Canterbury pilgrimage, is in answer to that of the Knight and takes up the cause of tragedy that had
been espoused by the Monk (22). It stands in a complex mirror-like relationship with the
Knight’s Tale (22–5) that adds ‘historical depth’ to Chaucer’s poem, and creates
a ‘consistently political narrative’ from Chaucer’s focus on individuals (25). Lydgate is
more pessimistic than Chaucer is about the feasibility of prudence in politics yielding
positive outcomes (25–30). This pessimism (which stems from the influence of the past on
human action, and the limited power of prospective prudent government to counter it)
offers comment on the action of the Knight’s Tale (30–3). See Kline, 1139, on ST and the
Knight’s Tale.

1133. -----, ‘The Other Book of Troy: Guido delle Colonne’s Historia destructionis
397–423.

Brief references. Geoffrey of Monmouth’s Historia regnum Britanniae is sometimes said
to be both an exercise in the Virgilian philosophy of history and an exemplar of the
extension of the Trojan story in England. This claim as a whole may be open to question,
but the second part certainly overlooks the 14th- and 15th-century English versions of the
Trojan story that were based on Guido delle Colonna’s Historia destructionis Troiae.
These vernacular works, although written for noble patrons, are totally at odds with
Geoffrey’s model. They are ‘clerical’ and anti-imperialistic in their perspective (397); they
make no particular use of the ‘genealogical potential’ of the Trojan story; they are
‘relentlessly exemplarist’; they see no comfort in history for imperialist undertakings; and,
free from propaganda, they do not present empires as ‘divinely sanctioned’ (404). The
works concerned are the Laud Troy Book, TB, and the alliterative Destruction of Troy
(404–5). Simpson uses the alliterative Destruction of Troy as the principal basis for his
argument, but he notes that the conclusions he reaches also apply to TB (405).
The placement of the Chaucer and Lydgate pieces in San Marino, Huntington Lib., MS HM 140 is evidence of medieval England's volatile politics. The manuscript is made up of two, perhaps three, booklets from the late 15th century that were brought together early in the 16th century. The first booklet begins with Lydgate's LSAA, followed by Chaucer's Clerk's Tale and ballad Truth, Lydgate's Prayer Upon the Cross, the complaint passage from Chaucer's Anelida and Arcite, Lydgate's Midsomer Rose, Song of Vertu, and the opening 14 stanzas of Lydgate's Testament. The booklet either ends with the Testament extract or a vernacular retelling of the Job story depending on the disputed division of the booklets (296–297). Lydgate's commissioned pieces for the court are more than vehicles to praise the crown: they deal with the England's founding myths and the lessons that these offer (298). LSAA is intended to be reflect on the troubled reign of Henry VI (299); Alban is a knight whose characteristics are central to the English experience (300–1). Significantly, Alban is not just a righteous person but a 'prince ... skilled in the practical virtues of rule.' LSAA is a national epic, and its leading presence in the manuscript shapes reader perceptions of the works that follow it (301). The remainder of Staley's essay considers the provenance of the first booklet (301–2), contemporary perceptions of a link between the royal household's private mismanagement and the public failure of the king's rulership (302–6), and thematic relationships between the manuscript texts (306–16). The first booklet relates 'public and private systems of order' in a way that points to concerns about English governance that were then current (302).

Reference to Lydgate in a discussion of Chaucer’s interaction with Italian literature and its political models. *FP* is the next work, after Chaucer’s *Monk’s Tale*, to try to bring the Italian model of *de casibus* history into English. Lydgate’s view of the power of ‘authorly fame to illumine national interest’ is consistent with that of the Lancastrians (332). As a patron, however, Humphrey, Duke of Gloucester, keeps Lydgate under his artistic control. This control stands in contrast to both the position of Petrach, who manages to write in such a way that pleases the powerful and yet keeps them at arms length from the writing process, and Boccaccio who engages with the powerful in an adversarial way. As a consequence of Humphrey’s control, *FP* could not be a work to ‘curb and dissuade the excesses of the great’; instead it became merely a ‘general handbook’ (333). Wallace discusses brief examples of Lydgate’s caution in shaping his material so as not to offend those in power (333–4).


Numerous references to Lydgate’s work in a discussion of Shirley’s life and manuscripts. In particular, a chapter is given to each of the major Shirley manuscripts: London, BL, MS Add. 16165 (27–51); Cambridge, Trinity College, MS R.3.20 and its affiliates (69–101); and Oxford, Bodleian Lib., MS Ashmole 59 (145–69). The choice of texts for London, BL, MS Add. 16165, and the exemplars that were available for the manuscript, may be influenced by Shirley’s association with Richard Beauchamp, Earl of Warwick (27). An examination of the manuscript shows that, although it presents itself as an integrated whole, it is in fact a collection of material recycled and brought together by Shirley (32–3). Cambridge, Trinity College, MS R.3.20 shows more signs of organization than at first appears evident; it is also assembled more quickly than is usually supposed, ‘possibly within ... two years’ (69). Shirley’s notes about Lydgate suggest strongly that he knows the
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poet. The Trinity manuscript appears to be conceived by Shirley as a 'showcase' for Lydgate's work (84). Oxford, Bodleian Lib., MS Ashmole 59 lacks 'introductory material'; however, its assemblage of material resembles the other Shirley anthologies (145).


Brief references. The decline of Lydgate's printing history during the 16th century may be explained by the fact that the physical presentation of his work by Caxton and de Worde had come to be seen as unfashionable. [In 1136ª the author indicates that some of his views have subsequently altered. He there argues that Lydgate's religion and religious vocation is the critical factor in explaining the decline in the number of Lydgate editions printed in the 16th century.]


The decline in the number of Lydgate editions in the 16th century is better attributed to the poet's religion than to his literary style or to the physical presentation of his work by Caxton and de Worde. Chaucer did not suffer the same fate because he was considered to be a religious reformer. See Dane, 1136ª.

Among the essays are those by Fisher, 1098 (81–99); Strohm, 291 (101–26); Boffey, 1069, (127–44); Spearing, 965 (145–66); Machan, 1099 (177–99); Bowers, 1037 (201–25); and Benson, 918 (227–41).


Criticism has overly emphasized the influence of Chaucer on Lydgate’s love poetry at the expense of the French tradition of dit amoureux (60). One aspect of the French tradition clearly found in Lydgate’s work is a ‘discernible link between poetry and contemporary characters and events’ (61). Watriquet de Couvin and Jean Froissart provide examples of this. Some of Froissart’s work shows a more discrete use of the technique than is found in the work of de Couvin; this discretion is also practiced by Chaucer (61–3). Lydgate, however, under the influence of French models, presents an ‘identifiable lady’ in TG (64). The structure of TG is also closer to the French examples than it is to Chaucer (65–6). At the time Lydgate writes, the traditional models of courtly poetry are French rather than English (66).


Lydgate’s implicit relationship to Chaucer in ST is an Oedipal one in which the younger poet seeks both to acknowledge his reconstructed Chaucer as a ‘literary father’ and to remove that father’s ‘paternal presence’ (217). Lydgate alters his inherited material from Chaucer by means of strategic misreading with the result that Chaucer is simultaneously elevated and disarmed (218–9). ST should not be seen as ‘failed copy’ of CT. CT presents
itself as operating in the real world; Lydgate makes it clear that his own work is invoked by Chaucer’s fiction. This difference points to a much more complex relationship between the two works than that between original and copy (221). Lydgate recasts the members of the pilgrimage to produce a company that is male and, in spite of a focus on the more rowdy characters of _CT_, at peace with itself. In effect, Lydgate reproduces the characteristics of his own religious life (221–3). Lydgate’s reconfiguration of the make-up of the pilgrimage extends to removing Chaucer the pilgrim and to assuming for himself the role of narrator. Lydgate continues, however, to praise, and to use, the presence of Chaucer the author (223–4). Chaucer the author in _ST_ is Lydgate’s own creation and represents a fixed and safe presentation of the older poet as the ‘compilator’ of _CT_ (225). By acknowledging the authority of his re-written Harry Bailly, Lydgate cleverly sidesteps the overt influence of Chaucer (226–7). Lydgate effectively quits the Knight of _CT_ by placing himself as the Monk who now takes precedence in the pilgrimage (228–9). _ST_ stands in parallel to the _Knight’s Tale_ in a way that answers, extends, and appropriates it (229–32). [See Simpson, 1132, on the relationship between the _Knight’s Tale_ and _ST_.] Lydgate’s moralizing in _ST_ on the duty children owe to their parents takes on new meaning and depth when read in the light of his presentation of himself as son to Father Chaucer (232–3).


Brief references in a study of the interaction of politics and religion with the press in the 16th century. Richard Pynson’s printing of _TB_ in 1513, which includes the Tudor coat of arms on the title-page, is probably an example of government propaganda in support of Henry VIII’s proposed military campaigns (581–6).

A reading of Lydgate’s mummings for the mercers and goldsmiths in terms of the openness towards strangers that they appear to advocate and of their implicit expectations of mayoral governance. The mummings belong to a time of xenophobia and protectionist trading practices. In this context, they are both an expression of the guildsmen’s desire for a city government that is sensitive to their needs (236) and a ‘fantasy of easy solutions to the complex problems’ inherent in the London trading sector of the time (239).


References to Lydgate are chiefly in Ch. 5, ‘John Lydgate’s *Isopes Fabules: Appropriation through Amplification*’ (124–48). Lydgate’s version of the fables seems to be one of his early works and may reveal his own ‘interests’ better than the later pieces completed under Lancastrian patronage or influence (124). Lydgate’s treatment of the fables is heavily shaped by the scholastic tradition; and, under the influence of that tradition, amplification of his source material text is the key element of his commentary upon it (124–5). Lydgate’s main source for *AF* is Marie de France’s version of the *Fables* (125–7). Manuscript evidence suggests that Lydgate’s poem moves widely among contemporary readers (127–8). Wheatley provides a reading of *AF* in terms of the role of natural law (129–35). Lydgate’s first fable on the Cock and the Jewel sets his approach for the remainder of the collection: his method is one of ‘natural allegory’ in which the allegory move according to the ‘natural properties’ of its players (130). Lydgate has clear social concerns, but this does not mean that he encourages the disadvantaged to look for justice in this world from God (134–5). It is possible that this concern for natural law suggests that
Lydgate is not sympathetic to the Lancastrian usurpation of the English throne (135). Wheatley further considers Lydgate's sources and the scholastic tradition of commentary (135-48). This analysis shows that Lydgate is taking aim at the injustices caused by 'liars and tyrants'; in fact, his concern is so intense it suggests that his work was sparked by some incident in his own life (147).

§
George Ashby (c. 1390–20 February 1474/5)

Editions


Supplies an introduction (139–40) with a text of PR and occasional footnotes (141–52). The neglect of 15th-century texts that are so important to the history of the English language is lamentable. This neglect is caused by the dryness of the material and its unedited and unpublished state (139). The editorial approach is generally conservative: punctuation and capitalization are modernized, and some omissions are restored. Editorial changes on the basis of the poem’s metre are not attempted because too little is understood about 15th-century metre, and even what is claimed as known is overly influenced by Chaucer’s practice (140). [Förster’s text is very close to that of Bateson, 1143, but it is quite different from that of the more interventionist Holthausen, 1144.]


Offers a brief introduction (v–vii), followed by the text of PR (1–12), APP (12–41), and DP (42–100). A glossary, compiled by F.J. Furnivall, concludes the volume (101–5). There is a reference in the letters of Margaret of Anjou to Ashby as clerk of the signet (v). [See Monro, 1147; Otway-Ruthven speculates that Ashby himself may have been responsible for putting together this collection of letters (1161: 120).]
1144. **Holthausen, F.** ‘Ashby-Studien II: George Ashby’s Trost in Gefangenschaft.’

*Anglia* 45 (1921): 77–91.

Holthausen’s article follows his earlier article of 1919, 1153, but he now gives the text of *PR* (77–89) with notes (90–1). In a brief introduction he expands on his earlier criticism of Förster’s edition, 1142, and he implies that Förster is too conservative in emending metrically defective lines. Holthausen’s premise is that, once scribal distortions are removed, Ashby’s metre can be seen to be accurate (77).

§
General References


Ashby was a clerk of the signet to Queen Margaret and the author of *APP*, which was written for the benefit of Prince Edward. [Tanner refers to Bishop John More's manuscript, Cambridge, Univ. Lib., MS Mm.IV.42, and notes that it is missing a 'folio or two at the end.'][1]


Ritson briefly refers to Ashby in an entry that seems to be based on Tanner, 1145.


Ashby was a 'poet of some note.' Monro prints the text of a letter from Queen Margaret, written sometime after the death of the Duke of Gloucester in 1447, to an unnamed correspondent, thanking her and her husband for payment of Ashby’s wages (114).


This is the only edition of Warton’s standard work to refer to Ashby (the previous editions were 1774–81, 1824, and 1840). Hazlitt’s reference to Ashby is basically a repetition of Ritson’s brief note, 1146, of 69 years before, with the addition of some minor references to
the manuscripts. Hazlitt claims that Ashby had been cited elsewhere as the author of some translations of French devotional works previously assigned by Robert Copeland to Andrew Chertsey, but he gives no source for the citation (4: 43).


Briefly states the facts known about Ashby’s life and descendants.


Asks if the whereabouts of a copy of the inscription on Ashby’s tomb in Harefield Church, Middlesex is known, and if any of Ashby’s writings are extant outside those kept in the Cambridge University and Trinity College Libraries.


Ashby’s poetry does not show the degeneration of Chaucer’s pentameter into a four beat line of uneven syllable count. On the contrary, the use of final –e and placement of accents have some ‘metrical consistency.’ The syllable count is ‘almost rigid, the lines seldom running over ten exact syllables and easily normalized when they do pass the syllabic limit’ (21). See Pearsall, 1167, for another view of Ashby’s metre.

‘There is no poetry in ... George Ashby’ (209). Saintsbury briefly mentions Ashby’s three poems. His concluding remarks appear to refer to *PR*, but may be indicative of his overall view of Ashby’s work: ‘The sense is sound and often shrewd enough, showing the rather Philistine and hard but canny temper of the later Middle Ages.’ Other writers of Ashby’s time could be faulted as more metrically irregular than he is; however, his poetry is ‘not illuminated by one spark of divine fire’ (210).


Scribal errors are numerous in the manuscript of *PR*, and Förster, 1142, corrected only a few of these in his edition of the poem. It is possible with limited editorial intervention to put the poem into a correct metre (319). Holthausen offers emendations to over 100 lines of *PR*. See his subsequent articles, 1144 and 1154.


Provides a list of amendments to Bateson’s text of *APP*, 1143 (92-102), following the approach Holthausen earlier suggested, 1153, for *PR*. From Furnivall’s glossary to Bateson’s edition, Holthausen lists 49 words that are either unique occurrences or antedate the previous earliest known examples.
Briefly mentions the speculation that Ashby might be the author of the *Court of Sapience*. *APP* and the *Court of Sapience* are likely to be written within ten years of each other; both are dedicated to the king; and they have a common stanza (stanza 67 of the *Court of Sapience* and stanza 99 of *APP*). If Ashby is the author of the *Court* then the 'writer's defeat at Chess might possibly mean that his Active Policy of a Prince had not received hearty recognition' (17). Three other lines in the *Court of Sapience* are also similar to ones found in Ashby (84). See Kekewich, 1180, for the view that it is likely that Ashby borrows the stanza Bühler identifies from the *Court of Sapience*; Bühler again refers to this stanza in 1156.

Stanza 99 of *APP*, also found as stanza 67 of the *Court of Sapience*, again occurs as the last (eighth) stanza of Lydgate's *HGS* as it is written in San Marino, Huntington Lib., MS HM 144 (563, 568). See Bühler, 1155.

Chaucer uses variations of the proverb ‘Wirk alle thyng by conseil’ three times in *CT* (410). Ashby also uses this proverb in *APP* and *DP* (411). A shared misquotation suggests that Chaucer and Ashby’s source might be Albertano of Brescia’s, *Liber consolationis et consilii* (412). See Bühler, 1158, for further discussion of Ashby’s use of proverbs.
DP is based on a Latin work, Liber de dictis philosophorum antiquorum. Bühler considers the ‘extent and accuracy’ of Ashby’s use of this source (282), and tabulates instances where Ashby attributes a saying to a different philosopher from the one given in his source (284). Analysis shows that Ashby is unusually accurate in his ascriptions, and suggests some other sources that he may have used (283–5). Bühler cites examples of Ashby’s use of ‘common proverbs’ in DP and APP (287–9).


Provides biographical details. Ashby was a ‘poet of some note’ (22).


Brief references to Ashby’s APP as a work within the mirror genre. Dependent on the state’s support, Ashby is reluctant to offend those in power.


Ashby indulges in ‘pseudo-literary composition.’ Unfortunately, he does not give the insights into daily life in the signet office that Hoccleve does. He seems to have lived, on the whole, a comfortable life and to have read some of the works of Gower, Chaucer, and
Lydgate. Although the work of the signet office in the 15th century requires some facility in English, French, and Latin, the signet clerks are not highly educated (142). Otway-Ruthven supplies some details of Ashby life-records.


Brown and Robbins offer brief descriptions of the Ashby manuscripts: [PR], Cambridge, Trinity College, MS R.3.19 (item 437); [DP], Cambridge, Univ. Lib., MS Mm.iv.42 (item 738); [APP], Cambridge, Univ. Lib., MS Mm.iv.42 (item 2130).


Brief references in an argument that the lack of a rigorous medieval pacifism puts the later work of the renaissance humanists in a ‘truer perspective and more striking relief’ (446). [For Adams’s opinion on Hoccleve, see 177.] The advice offered in APP is generally ‘well-worn.’ Ashby has ‘no coherent pacifist ideas,’ and he approves of the ‘orthodox medieval notion of a “just war”’ (445). See Ferguson, 1165–6, Pearsall, 1167–9, Bornstein, 1176, and Lawton, 1179, for later views that generally see Ashby as more innovative than Adams concedes.

Brief references to Ashby's three poems in a section carrying the marginal note 'The Amateurs.' Ashby is among a ' number of amateurs who hazarded an occasional venture in verse' (298).


*APP* is a sign of the coming of the Renaissance, and although it has the appearance of a work in the *mirror* genre it is in fact a practical examination of English policy (194–5). It shows that, by Ashby's time, the old assumptions of chivalry were evaporating in the 'dry light of a practical, undoctrinaire, largely pragmatic realism,' and men were being chosen for office on the basis of their worth and not birth (195).


Ashby's work has points in common with that of Sir John Fortescue: both men argue for the restoration of the crown's power as a necessary condition for good government, and both have a sense of 'political realism' (29). The model *de regimine principum*, which takes the *Secreta secretorum* as its basis, tends to limit an analysis of English political problems because it concentrates on the character of the king at the expense of other political factors. This tendency is all the greater because English political discussions of the time have a natural inclination to focus on the king (87–9). Ashby is unique among those writing in the tradition of the *Secreta* because he uses it as a device for serious analysis. *APP* is 'remarkably penetrating' and looks forward to the 'humanist pamphleteers' of the 1530s and 1540s (89). Like Fortescue, Ashby anticipates some of the policy initiatives of Edward IV and Henry VII (107). Ashby's work, although constrained by the limitations of the *mirror* genre, is distinguished by its acknowledgment that even a virtuous prince must have political policies (108–109). The proposals it puts forward,
although focused on the ‘business of government’ and not on the national view, form a ‘coordinated legislative programme.... unique in the political literature of medieval England’ (111).


Brief references. Ashby’s metre, unlike Lydgate’s, can be explained by the loss of final -e and by the tendency to return to the older, English, half-line patterns (205). Ashby is not much of a poet; his importance lies in the ‘shrewdness and honesty of his response’ to contemporary socio-political issues. In his advice he shows himself to be quite free from the ‘concepts of chivalry’ that were still ascendant at the time (237).


Lydgate has much to say about the politics and society of his day, but it is ‘a good deal less apt and perceptive’ than Ashby’s observations (15). Ashby is among a considerable number of poets writing in the latter part of the 15th century in whose work we observe ‘native four-stress patterns, often with alliteration, asserting themselves against the pentameter.’ This may be connected to the loss of final -e in pronunciation (61).


Brief references. Ashby provides evidence of the unfortunate influence of Lydgate on 15th-century poetry; although some of his comments on the workings of government show intelligence, his general expression is a ‘fog of Lydgateian abstraction’ (239).

Brief references. Ashby's autobiographical writing lacks a sense of 'individuality.' This is typical of a period in which Hoccleve is the exception (8).


A number of brief references to Ashby's poems, mainly to illustrate points on the politics and society of 15th-century England. Ashby's concern leans more to 'theories about the proper conduct of a ruler than to explicit comment on particular events' (17). *DP* may have been written as an extension of *APP*. The two poems each use a seven-line stanza; and *DP* is mentioned in the Latin head-note to *APP*. English translations following Latin phrases are frequent in *APP*, and this recalls the structure of *DP*. Both works contain 'sententious moral and political platitudes' (285–6).


What appear to be references to contemporary matters before Parliament in *APP* suggest a composition date of 1463 (168–71). This dating may also apply to *DP*, as it is possible, on the basis of certain features of content and structure, that it is written as a section of *APP* (171–4).

PR is coupled in its unique manuscript, Cambridge, Trinity College, MS R.3.19, with an English, rhyme royal version of the story of Guiscardo and Ghismonda from Bk 4 of Boccaccio’s Decameron (102). The element of wrongful imprisonment in Boccaccio’s story is ‘almost certainly’ the reason why it was paired with Ashby’s poem (103). Suffering and patience are major themes of PR. PR may draw, directly or indirectly, on Boethius’s Consolation of Philosophy or Thomas Usk’s The Testament of Love (104–6), commonplace collections like the Liber de dictis philosophorum antiquorum (105), and Alan of Lille’s The Art of Preaching (106–8). PR is ‘highly organized’ and combines personal elements with ‘more general consolatory maxims’ (109).


Reprints items 1172 (258–65) and 1173 (266–74).


Provides a selected listing, sometimes with brief annotations, to editions and criticism about the five poets included in the present bibliography in addition to several that are excluded.

Brief references. Medieval Latin works in the mirror genre are generally 'abstract and divorced from reality,' but vernacular versions frequently offer 'vivid pictures' of the political and social realities of medieval life (77). Ashby shows a 'practical, unmilitaristic attitude' in *APP*, and his presentation of the 'ideal king' is influenced by 'reality and economics' (82-3).


Brief references to Ashby in an argument that the royal court is more important than the new middle class in setting the mainstream literary tastes of 15th-century England. See Doyle, 858, for a related discussion.


Stanza 99 of *APP* is found in lines 463–9 of the *Court of Sapience* (xxiii). On the basis of rhetorical evidence, Ashby is likely to have copied the stanza; this would place the composition of the *Court of Sapience* in the reign of Henry VI. Ashby could not be the author of the *Court of Sapience* because his poetry is 'bumpy and undistinguished, and he is far more autobiographical than the author of the *Court*’ (xxiv). See Bühler, 1155 and 1156, for an earlier discussion of the shared stanza.

Ashby’s humility topos in *AP*, although part of the repertoire of the 15th-century poet, is unusual for its spritely elements that echo Chaucer’s *Troilus* (767). The boundaries that we might normally place between literature and society and history do not apply in 15th-century England: the writing of the period is best seen as a ‘culture’ (771). The ‘paradigms’ of ‘public poetry’ are neatly displayed in Ashby’s three poems. The form of *DP* is close to that of the *Secreta secretorum*. The *Secreta* was also a major influence on both the genres to which Hoccleve’s *RP* and Lydgate’s *FP* respectively belong. *DP* is deeply influenced by the work of Hoccleve and Lydgate; it also owes debts to Gower’s *Confessio Amantis*, Chaucer’s *Melibeus* (perhaps), and to the *Court of Sapience* (772). *PR* shows many of the same influences as *DP*. *PR* (lines 36–42) echoes Hoccleve’s *Complaint* when Ashby laments that his friends have forgotten him: Hoccleve and Ashby are both expressing their feelings in a conventional way, but this is no reason to doubt their sincerity. Ashby’s poetry, weaving together different genres, brings the public and private worlds together in a way that makes it representative of its time (773). One needs to read past the commonplaces of *AP* to see that it expresses Ashby’s fear of the treason that may face Prince Edward in the years 1470–1. Ferguson (1165: xvii) is wrong to claim that the notion that the values of humanism within a classical education should be an important part of the education of those in power is left unstated until the Elizabethans. This idea is already found in Lydgate’s *FP*; it is also quite clearly stated by Ashby in *DP* (774–5). See Lawton, 321 and 1054, for further discussion of the author’s general argument.


Despite Ashby’s apparent initial concept of *APP* as a translation of *Liber de dictis philosophorum antiquorum*, his work turns out to be a ‘fairly original poem’ in the *mirror* genre. Ashby makes some use of Benedict Burg’s *Distichs of Cato*, and he borrows
a stanza of the *Court of Sapience* (533). A further, and previously unnoted source, is a short anonymous poem, probably dating to the first half of the 15th century, on the virtues that a prince should possess. The third stanza of this seven stanza poem is ‘practically identical’ to four lines of the final stanza of Ashby’s poem (534). The author of the anonymous poem is likely to have been Lydgate or Burgh (535). Ashby borrows from other works more widely than he acknowledges. In addition to their influence on *APP*, the *Summum sapientiae* and the *Distichs of Cato* may influence at least the layout of *DP* (535).


Explores the way Chaucerian writers, particularly James I, use the idea of imprisonment. The philosophy of *PR*, although ‘commonplace’ has ‘some Boethian echoes’ regarding the sustaining power one can later draw from a ‘virtuous youth,’ and the ‘potential troubles of family life.’ It is probable that Ashby knows of Boethius through Chaucer’s translation. *PR* shows how writers in the 15th century who are forced to write by their circumstances turn ‘almost automatically to Chaucer, or to Chaucer’s sources, for help’ (89).


Brief references in a discussion of the 15th-century response to Chaucer’s presentation of vernacular literary authority. Ashby’s self-presentation in *APP* and *PR* is typical of the period’s lack of real engagement with the issues of literary authority that Chaucer raises (119–20). See Machan, 350–1, and 1099–1100 for the author’s broader argument.
Thomas Norton (1433?–1513/14?)

Editions

1183. **Maier, Michael.** *Tripus Aureus, hoc est Tres Tractatus Chymici Selectissimi.* Frankfurt, 1618.

A close translation of the original into Latin. Norton’s work is included (76–182) as the second of three alchemical tracts, the first is Basil Valentine’s *Practica*, and the last is Cremer’s *Testament*. This is the first published version of *OA*; the poem does not appear in English until Ashmole’s edition of 1652, 1185.

1184. **Maisner, Daniel.** *Chymische tractat thomae nortoni eines engelländers, credi mihi seu ordinale genandt.* Frankfurt, 1625.

Not sighted; a German verse translation of Maier, 1183.


Prints the text of *OA* (1–106) with notes by Ashmole (437–55). Maier, 1183, came to England to learn English and translate *OA* (*Prolegomena*, n. pag.). Norton’s detractors, such as Bale, 1190, Robert Record, and Pits, 1195, are wrong to criticize him: ‘it is no good Conclusion for Blinde men to affirme the Sun has no light, because they were never so happy as to see it.’ [Ashmole’s reference to Robert Record seems to follow from Bale’s citation of Record as one of his sources. See Bale, 1190.] The concealment of Norton’s
name, and the occasional obscurity of the text, is part of a plan 'whereby the Ignorant might be more Ignorant, but the Wise understand and profit, the one be deceived, the other allured' (439). Ashmole consults 15 manuscripts for his edition of *OA*. The best of these, 'a very faire one,' is a lavish presentation edition bearing the Nevell coat of arms; quite possibly Norton gave it to George Nevell, Archbishop of York (455). [The identity of this manuscript is not known. See Reidy (1189: xiv). Ashmole's work is available in several facsimiles that are annotated here only when the introduction to the facsimile refers to Norton. See Holmyard, 1206, and Debus, 1225.]

1186. **Jennis, Lucas.** *Musæum Hermeticum.* Frankfurt, 1677.


Not sighted; see Reidy (1189: xxviii). Manget reprints the text from Maier, 1183.


An English prose translation of Jennis, 1186.

The first English edition of OA since that by Ashmole, 1185. The preface is followed by an introduction that covers: ‘The Manuscripts’ (ix–xxi); ‘Editorial Policy’ (xxi–xxvi); ‘Editions’ (xxvi–xxviii); ‘The Language of MS. A’ (xxviii–xxxvii); ‘The Author’ (xxxvii–lxi); and ‘The Alchemy of the Ordinal’ (lxi–lxxv). The text of OA is then printed (1–96) based on London, BL, MS Add. 10302 (Latin preface, and lines 1–2502, and 2623–82) and MS Sloane 1873 (lines 2503–622, and 2683–3102). This is followed by a glossary (97–121), and ‘Index of Authors and Books’ (122–5). Reidy does not provide a bibliography of alchemical works or material relating to Norton, but his introduction is footnoted.


—Review by Gillis Kristensson, *English Studies* **58** (1977), 450–2. Reidy’s edition is creditable; however, there are some points of concern in the way that emendations to the text have been handled.

—Review by E. Ruth Harvey, *Notes and Queries* **24** (1977): 184-5. A good edition, but it should have reproduced or described the illustrations in the manuscripts and early printed editions in more detail.

§
General References


Thomas Norton of Bristol was not the least of the alchemists of his time, but the art that he avowed is no art and should rather be called the dregs of an idle brain. It was on account of vanity that he went so readily into alchemy, a craft that proffers what God has made neither to be touched nor experienced. Nevertheless, he wrote the Alchimiae epitomen [OA] and De transmutatione metallorum so that he might demonstrate by such deceit that he was a craftsman of this new thing and able to change one substance into another. He was alive around the year 1477. [Bale lists his source for information as ‘Robert Record’. Nierenstein and Chapman (1216: 295) point out that Bale’s published notebook says his source is the library of Robert Record.]


An eight line Latin poem praises Norton as a writer who revealed the earth’s secrets; it concludes ‘Yet he is an author far more valuable than gold.’


1193. **Norton, Samuel.** 'Key of Alchimie.' 1577. London, Bodleian Lib., MS Ashmole 1421 ff. 165v – 217r.

A manuscript written by Norton’s great grandson. The *Key of Alchimie* draws on *OA*, and refers to Thomas Norton at a number of points.

1194. **Maier, Michael.** *Symbola Aureae Mensae.* Frankfurt, 1617.

Maier refers to Norton and renders into Latin a number of incidents from *OA* (467–80); see Reidy (1189: xxvii) for a discussion of Maier. An edition of Norton’s work, as yet unpublished, is much sought after and will be available shortly. [See Maier, 1183.] Norton is not an unpleasant author to read on account of the various things he weaves into his text. Amid these things we see more important matters, and our attention is drawn to items that are of use to us (467–8).


Pits’s entry on Norton is based on Bale, 1190. He adds an additional work to the Norton canon entitled *De lapide philosiphico*.


Fuller provides a biographical sketch for Norton, based mainly on information taken from Pits, 1190, and *OA*. 

Tanner includes *De lapide philosophico* (following Pits, 1195) and *De transmutatione metalorum* (ultimately from Bale, 1190) as distinct works by Norton. He notes that Norton is the most skilled alchemist of his day, but he dispenses with the other subjective remarks made by the earlier two bibliographers. Tanner refers to Oxford, Bodleian Lib., MS Ashmole 57 and the editions by Ashmole, 1185, and Maier, 1183. He cites his sources as Bale, 1190, Pits, 1195, and Fuller, 1196.

1198. **Barrett, William.** *The History and Antiquities of the City of Bristol.* London, 1790.

Not sighted; according to Porter, 1203, pages 677–8 refer to Norton.


Brief reference to Norton as the author of *OA* (92).


Not sighted in this edition. See Waite, 1202.

NORTON: GENERAL REFERENCES

[The previous editions of Warton’s standard work, 1774–81, 1824, and 1840, do not refer to Norton.] Norton is one of the most skilled alchemists of his time; Ashmole, 1185, and Maier, 1183, undertook editions of his poem. OA is ‘totally void of every poetical elegance’ (131).


A revision of Barrett’s 1814 text, 1200, that recounts the anecdotal details of Norton’s life.


Norton’s work is ‘singularly fresh and bright, and in style of versification has been compared to the works of Surrey and Wyatt’ (221). [See Saintsbury, 1204, for another view. Porter mistakenly lists De transmutatione metallorum and De lapide philosophorum as distinct works by Norton. The inclusion of De lapide philosophorum is an error that dates back to Pits, 1195; De transmutatione metallorum is first mentioned by Bale, 1190. The details Porter provides for Norton’s life are unreliable as the poet is confused with an uncle of the same name.]

OA is written in 'exceedingly irregular heroic couplets.' If Ascham, 1192, truly has Norton in mind when he praises OA it simply proves 'how entirely insensible he was to true English prosody' (213).


A discussion of OA in the context of the English tradition of chemistry. Holmyard mistakenly identifies Norton with his uncle (575). As an alchemist, Norton is probably an 'imposter.' The concept behind his chemistry is 'confused, illogical and puerile' (576). OA, however, has an 'amusing side.' The poem is an example of the state of 15th-century chemistry: 'It is, indeed, a sorry picture' (577).


Holmyard introduces a facsimile edition of Ashmole, 1185. Norton may be sincere in his practice of alchemy; however, he is lost in the 'realms of abstract speculation.' His work is lightened by a 'subtle humour or a delicious naïveté, and so possesses a quite unpremeditated attraction for the modern reader.' OA is worth little for its insights into chemistry, but its style, language, and 'atmosphere of romance' render it 'delightful' (iii). [Holmyard then confuses Norton with his uncle, probably following Porter, 1203; he also incorrectly acknowledges De lapide philosophorum and De transmutatione metallorum as distinct works (iv).] The work of Norton's alchemist great grandson, Samuel Norton, 1193, is not as interesting as his great-grandfather's. Verses printed by Ashmole, 1185, and ascribed by him to Pierce, the Black Monk, may have been written by Norton because they are credited to him in a 16th-century manuscript found in Clifton College's Science Library (vi).

The rejection by Nierenstein and Chapman, 1216, of Thomas Norton, great grandfather of Samuel Norton, as the author of *OA* is very questionable in light of the evidence provided by the manuscripts and by the testimony of Maier, 1183 and 1194, and Ashmole, 1185.


Argues for the identification of Thomas Norton, great-grandfather of Samuel Norton, as the likely author of *OA*, and recounts the known details of his life and career. *OA* is a 'sprightly and attractive alchemical poem' that demonstrates Norton's 'considerable,' albeit incomplete, grasp of alchemy (555).


Norton might have developed an improved laboratory furnace capable of better temperature regulation than its predecessors, but one should be sceptical (44). Holmyard outlines of the action of *OA*.


Brief references. *OA* is a 'quaint alchemical poem' (413).

A general discussion of the place of *OA* in the history of chemistry (174–82).


*OA* offers 'much valuable information about the organisation and working of an efficient laboratory, together with an account of the important materials and apparatus in use at the time' (79). For a less favourable view of Norton’s technical aspect see Holmyard, 1205.


Brief references. Much alchemical literature lacks human interest, but *OA* is a clear exception: it is an ‘attractive work ... [that] ... tells us something of the thoughts and feelings of the writer, and describes in considerable detail the equipment, organization, and practice of his laboratory’ (25).


Brief references. Norton is a man of practical ability; he is not besotted, as many other alchemists are, with the ‘mystical aspects of alchemy.’ Norton pays unusual attention, for his time, to the details of correctly weighing ingredients, to the operation and design of laboratory furnaces, and to the ‘problems of laboratory upkeep and administration in the fifteenth century’ (86).

Item number 814 lists two manuscripts for *OA* from the 15th century: London, BL, MS Add. 10302 folios 1V-67; and Oxford, Bodleian Lib., MS E. Mus. 63 folios 1-40 (556–7). See Reidy for a nearly complete listing of *OA* manuscripts (1189: ix); Schuler, 1231, adds one more manuscript to those given by Reidy, and notes a Latin translation.


Nierenstein and Chapman set out to show conclusively that no one identified in 15th-century Bristol as going by the name ‘Thomas Norton’ could write *OA*. The name ‘Thomas Norton’ is attached to *OA* only in the 17th century, and it is omitted from a number of early sources where one would have expected it to be listed. Samuel Norton’s references to his great grandfather are unspecific. In any event, the only Thomas Norton who might possibly be the author of *OA* has ‘no credentials whatever for it, unless he was a hypocrite as well as a thoroughly disreputable character’ (320). [Reidy, 1222, establishes that this ‘disreputable’ man is the author of *OA*. Holmyard, 1207–8, also questions the conclusion reached by Nierenstein and Chapman.]

An examination of the manuscript of *De lapide philosophorum* (Northampton, Northamptonshire Record Society, Finch-Hatton MS 323) has shown that the work is simply *OA* with some variations of spelling, wording, punctuation, and format.


Brief references in a discussion of the quackery associated with the rise of alchemy in Europe during the Middle Ages. ‘Norton ... ruined himself and some of his friends financially’; this would have been a typical outcome for many of the alchemists of the time (204).


Item 3772 refers to Norton and lists 19 manuscripts. [Reidy notes in his introduction (1189: x) that item 7 of the Brown-Robbins list, Oxford, Bodleian Lib., MS 7642 is an error and should be deleted—the item is omitted from the Robbins/Cutler Supplement, 1223. See Reidy, 1189, supplemented by Schuler, 1231, for a full manuscript listing.]


Norton does not seem to have learned alchemy from Ripley (130). [Taylor confuses Thomas Norton, the alchemist, with Norton’s uncle, the privy councillor.] *OA* is a ‘long rambling poem’ (132).

Ward refers to Nierenstein and Chapman, 1216, and claims to have found a medieval document that overturns their findings regarding the authorship of *OA*, but he does not detail his research. He asks if readers are aware of any material published since 1932 in the United States that contradicts Nierenstein and Chapman.


Refutes the Nierenstein and Chapman argument, 1216, that no one living in 15th-century Bristol under the name 'Thomas Norton' could have written *OA*. A number of manuscript and early printed sources show that the name of Thomas Norton is already connected to *OA* in the 16th century. A close examination of Samuel Norton's references to his great-grandfather's work shows that these are very likely to refer to *OA*. The argument that this Thomas Norton is of bad character, and so morally unfit to be the author of *OA*, lacks force.


Item 3772 has been revised to list 26 Norton manuscripts. Item 3581.5 lists a 'Prologue to Certayne Principall Questions drawen oute of Raymundes Questyonary,' found in Oxford, Bodleian Lib., MSS 7642 and 7643, as a translation of the Latin prologue to *OA*. [Reidy finds two errors in the Supplement listing (1189: x, note 3). See Robbins, 1224, for further enhancements to the Index listing.]

Robbins adds 24 Norton manuscripts, most from the 16th century, to the two listed by Singer, 1215. [Supplements to this list are found in Reidy, 1189, that take the number to 31; Schuler, 1231, finds one manuscript not listed by Reidy, and notes a Latin translation. Reidy also corrects an error in Robbins’s entry for Oxford, Bodleian Lib., MS Ashmole 1451: the ‘Summary Catalogue number is given as 8343, whereas it should be 7629’ (1189: x).]


The esteem in which Ashmole holds OA is shown by the fact that he gives it ‘pride of place’ with Sir George Ripley’s work. The engravings Ashmole commissioned from Robert Vaughn for OA are ‘among the most widely reproduced engravings of this genre’ (xxxviii). The obscuration found in OA is intended, as in other alchemical tracts, to be a barrier to the ‘ignorant’ and invitation to the ‘wise’ (xxxix). Norton emphasizes the importance of astrology and the ‘mystical properties of numbers’ (xxxix). The references in OA to colour reflect the importance of the notion of transmutation in alchemy. Some of Norton’s technical descriptions have a modern style, but generally lack the detail found in other alchemical texts. Norton’s descriptions of analysis are ‘crude’ in the light of other contemporary records of chemical analysis (xl–xli).

Frick makes passing reference to Norton in providing some bibliographical details for his work (xxiii–xxiv).


Provides a selected listing, sometimes with brief annotations, to editions and criticism about the five poets included in the present bibliography in addition to several that are excluded.


Briefly refers to manuscript illustrations in *OA* of a cat and mouse. The cat, because of the dilation of its pupils, raises connotations of ‘Luna, or sophic mercury’; the significance of the mouse is unknown (245).


Brief references. Hawthorne’s use of the alchemical colours red and white in ‘The Birthmark’ is consistent with that found in *OA* (408). See Swann, 1234, on Hawthorne and Norton.

Brief references. William Blomfild's 'account of alchemical theory and practice' is consistent with Norton and Ripley (12).


Item number 391 is the primary entry for Norton. Yale Univ., Beinecke Lib., MS Mellon 46, dating to c. 1610, is a previously unrecorded manuscript of *OA*; a Latin verse translation of *OA* is found in Yale Univ., Beinecke Lib., MS Mellon 56 (63).


The tradition that Chaucer was an alchemist dates to at least 1477 when Norton cites him as an authority in *OA* (305). Poems like *OA* represent the 'main vernacular alchemical tradition' in the 15th and 16th centuries (306). Schuler then discusses the six alchemical manuscripts that contain an alchemical excerpt from Chaucer's *Canon's Yeoman's Tale*; three of these are also relevant to Norton. London, BL, MS Sloane 1098 gathers together various texts on alchemy, mainly in verse, and it has marginal cross-references to *OA* next to the Chaucer passage (309–10). *OA* and the Chaucer excerpt is found in the alchemical collection, London, BL, MS Sloane 3580B (312); and in London, BL, MS Sloane 1092, lines 1107–204 from *OA* precede a fragment of Chaucer's text (313). The anonymous author of Oxford, Bodleian Lib., MS Ashmole 1408 refers to, and quotes from, *OA* (317–8). William Thynne is interested in alchemy, and he refers to Norton (322). Elias Ashmole
quotes Norton’s citation of Chaucer as an alchemist; and he provides extensive notes and references to OA in his Theatrum (324–7).


Item numbers 197, 372, 926–8, 990, 1037–8, 1081, 1203, and 1239 in Pritchard’s bibliography refer to Norton. [All of these citations are listed in the present bibliography. In item 1239, however, Pritchard refers the reader to Anthony Wood’s *Athenæ Oxonienses* (London, 1691–2) for information on Norton and other figures in the history of alchemy. This would seem to be the result of a confusion by Pritchard of Thomas Norton, the 15th-century alchemist, and Thomas Norton, the 16th-century dramatist. Wood refers to the latter, not the former.]


Hawthorne changed the name of the character Septimus Felton to Septimus Norton because he wished to stress the alchemical element of his story; Hawthorne’s work is a well-informed meditation on the idea of a ‘Romantic “quest”’ (372). See Gatta, 1229, for an incidental parallel between Hawthorne’s work and Norton’s.
Norton's work is 'particularly engaging' (135). OA places special emphasis on offering good advice to alchemists (135–8). Norton stresses that the alchemist must have the necessary training, equipment, workplace, and servants (136).
Stephen Hawes (1470s–1529)

Editions

I base the following list on that given by Edwards (1366: 119–21), with some additions and relevant cross-referencing. In the annotations for the early editions, as my listing is not intended to be a detailed bibliographic description, I simply use the modern English titles of the poems. For the editions up to 1555, I include the name of the printer first in the citation for ease of indexing, but I do not group the editions by printer. Scammell and Rogers, 1335, offer an elegy on the death of Henry VII as a possible addition to the Hawes canon.

1236.  **Worde, Wynkyn de.** *Conversion of Swerers.* London, 1509.

Not sighted. Extant in a single copy held in the British Library; see Gluck (1263: xvii), and Ames (1275: 2: 146).

1237.  **Worde, Wynkyn de.** *Example of Virtue.* London, [1509].

Not sighted. Extant in a single copy held in the Pepysian Library, Cambridge; see Gluck (1263: xv–xvi).
1238. **Worde, Wynkyn de.** *Joyful Meditation.* London, 1509.

Not sighted. Extant in a single copy held in the Cambridge University Library; see Gluck (1263: xix).

1239. **Worde, Wynkyn de.** [*Pastime of Pleasure.*] London, 1509.


1240. **Worde, Wynkyn de.** *Conversion of Swerers.* London, [c. 1510].

Not sighted. See Gluck (1263: xvii–xviii), and Morgan, 1345.

1241. **Worde, Wynkyn de.** *Comfort of Lovers.* London, [c. 1515].

Not sighted. Extant in a single copy in the British Library; see Gluck (1263: xix–xx) and Sellers, 1325.

1242. **Worde, Wynkyn de.** *Pastime of Pleasure.* London, 1517.

Not sighted. Extant in a single copy in the Pierpont Morgan Library, New York; see Mead (1260: xxx–xxxii) and Ames (1275: 2: 211). Mead thinks that it is possible the edition might have been checked by Hawes in proof, but considers that there is 'no direct evidence' (xxxii). This issue is considered further by Edwards, 1364, and Mukai, 1382.
1243. **Worde, Wynkyn de.** *Example of Virtue.* [London], [1520?]

Not sighted. Extant in a single leaf held in Cambridge University Library; see Gluck (1263: xvi).

1244. **Butler, John.** *Conversion of Swereres.* London, [1530?].

Not sighted. Printed by John Butler according to the colophon, but Gluck claims that typographical evidence indicates John Skot as the printer (1263: xviii). The volume is extant in a single copy held in the Huntington Library at San Marino.


Not sighted. Extant in two copies, one held in the Huntington Library, San Marino, and the other in the Carl H. Pforzheimer Library, New York; see Gluck (1263: xvi–xvii) and Ames (1275: 2: 281).

1246. **Copland, William.** *Conversion of Swereres.* London, 1551.

Not sighted. Printed by William Copland for Robert Toye. Only a fragment is extant, held in the National Library of Scotland; see Gluck (1263: xviii–xix).

See Mead who prints the introduction to the edition (1260: xxxi–iv), and provides a description of the copy in the British Library (xxxii–xxxv), as does Ames (1275: 3: 523). On signs of editorial intervention in the 1554 edition, see Mead (xxxv) and Edwards, 1364.


See Mead (1260: xxxv–xxxvii) and Ames (1275: 4: 427). Mead finds this edition to have been indifferently printed although based on a good text, probably that of 1517 (xxxvii).


Prints the text of *PP* from John Wayland’s edition of 1554, omitting lines 3481–2, 3487, 3620–1, and 3655–70 (76–126), with a brief introduction (76). ‘Little addition was made to English poetry, and no improvement, for more than a century after Chaucer’s death.’ *TG* is not by Hawes, as occasionally claimed, but is by Lydgate. Just as *PP* is the ‘best English poem of its century, so is it the best of a kind which was cultivated more successfully in Scotland than England’ (76). See Mead for brief comments on the reprint (1260: xl).


Printed by the Percy Society and based on the edition of 1555. A short preface (v–vi) is followed by the text of the poem (1–220). *PP* is ‘one of those allegorical writings which were popular with our forefathers, but which can now only be looked upon as monuments
of the bad taste of a bad age.' Nevertheless, its place in literary history justifies a new edition (vi). See Mead’s criticism of this edition’s failings (1260: xl–xli).


A preface (iii–viii) is followed by a black-letter text of *CS* and *JM*, pages unnumbered. Hawes and Skelton are the only poets ‘worthy of special notice’ between Lydgate and the first Elizabethan poets. *CS* and *JM* are ‘chiefly remarkable’ for the scarcity of their editions (iii). Laing briefly discusses the critical and biographical opinions of Bale, 1271, Wood, 1273, and Warton, 1276–7, on Hawes (iii–iv). *PP* is Hawes’s most important work (iv–v). The text for *CS* draws on the editions by de Worde (1509), Butler [1530], and Copland (1551); editorial changes are not noted (vi–vii). The text of *JM* is taken from de Worde’s edition of 1509.


Prints from *PP* lines 4214–4395 (118–25). Skeat follows Wright’s text, 1249, with some corrections noted on the page. He provides notes (413–15) and a glossary to the volume (481–543). Hawes ‘sometimes’ improves on his model, Lydgate. The extracts in the present edition are ‘rather more lively than usual, and shew some imagination,’ and give a hint of Spenser’s technique (118).

Not sighted. According to Burkart (1296: 21), Arnold prints lines 2339–52, 5089–95, and 5352–4 from *PP.*


Collins provides an introduction (175–7) and then prints lines 2164–219, 2437–85, 3312–32, and 3780–825 (178–83) from *PP.* Hawes takes Lydgate as his model, but he lacks most of the older poet’s ‘fluency’ and all of his ‘vigour’ (175). Hawes has many failings (175–6); nevertheless, he is by virtue of his nature a ‘true poet,’ and he possesses a ‘strange charm.’ His prosody can be ‘harsh,’ yet it frequently has a ‘plaintive music, and ... a weirdly beautiful rhythm.’ *PP* is the link between *CT* and the *Faerie Queene;* it is the last moment of the Middle Ages and the first hint of the Renaissance (176). Critics of Hawes have been unreasonably severe. Hawes’s minor poems are ‘best forgotten’ (177).

1254. [Withdrawn.]


Prints *EV* in modernized English (217–96).


Prints the text of the songs found in Oxford, Bodleian Lib., MS Rawlinson C.813. See Gluck for a discussion of the borrowings in the manuscript from PP and CL (1263: xxi).


Prints substantial extracts from PP, based on Wayland edition of 1554, 1247. Summaries of the excluded portions (271–86) follow Hammond’s introduction (268–71). Hawes is a clumsy and childish plodder; Spenser’s debt to him is likely to be small (269–70).

An edition based on that of 1517, **1242**, with selected variant readings from the 1509, **1239**, 1554, **1247**, and 1555, **1248**, editions. Mead includes reproductions of the 1517 woodcuts. An introduction (xiii–xiv) includes: ‘Hawes and his Time’ (xiii–xix); ‘Analysis of the Pastime of Pleasure’ (xx–xxviii); ‘Editions’ (xxx–xl); ‘Sources’ (xxx–lxxxi); ‘Grammar’ (lxxxi–lxxii); ‘Metre’ (lxxii–lxxix); ‘Literary Traits’ (lxxix–lxxxi); and ‘Notes on the Woodcuts’ (lxxv–lxxvi). The text (1–224) is followed by: notes (225–43); ‘Index to Text’ (245–8); ‘Index to Introduction and Notes’ (249–51); and a glossary (253–9).

***PP*** is a ‘direct outgrowth of the fifteenth century, to say nothing of earlier centuries’ (xv). In general, the literature of the 15th century could offer Hawes little inspiration (xv–xvi); it was a century of transition from the old to the new (xvi–xvii). [Mead then describes each of the editions (xxix–xl).] The level of textual agreement between the four editions is ‘remarkable.’ The edition of 1555 is the most ‘carelessly printed’; the 1554 edition shows ‘some attempt at “editing”’ (xxxv). [On this last point see Edwards, **1364**.] The careless edition of 1555 is ‘quite likely’ based on the good edition of 1517, but with an indifference to matters of textual detail (xxxvii). Hawes’s poem is heavily indebted to Lydgate; its most significant features are its ‘deference to authority’ and ‘conventionality’ (xliv). There is no evidence to support a claim for the influence of Malory’s *Morte d’Arthur* (xlvi). Mead discusses the influence of the Seven Arts on education in the Middle Ages (xlvi–lxiv); Hawes’s source is the *Margarita philosophica* by Gregorius Reisch (lxiv–lxxvi). There is little evidence of Chaucer’s influence, and even less of Gower’s (lxxviii). There is ‘no evidence’ that Hawes is much concerned with the syllable count of his lines; what matters to him is that a line should ‘move easily’ (xcv). Hawes’s allegorical approach proves unpopular with readers after the 16th century (c). His efforts to combine entertainment and instruction are often unsuccessful (civ–cv). The poem’s romance has its attractions (cvi–cvii); and some of Hawes’s descriptive passages have some merit (cvii–cxi).

--- Review by Albert K. Potter, *Modern Language Review* 24 (1929): 337–8. The introduction is burdened with some unnecessary material, and is not always very instructive; nevertheless, it ‘contains much well-organised information.’ Unfortunately, the
editor tends to accept the biographical assertions of earlier commentators without sufficient critical consideration. There is little evidence that survives to prove that Hawes's work had readers before Warton, 1276–7. The editor's consideration of sources 'greatly exaggerates' the importance of the Court of Sapience and Margarita philosophica, and fails to adequately consider the Mirrour of the Worlde and the Recuyl of the Historyes of Troye. The analysis of Hawes's metre is 'painstaking,' but it yields nothing new and fails to show how an educated poet could be so insensitive to 'melody' (337). The failure of the editor to provide a full list of variants for the text is a significant fault. The edition falls short of being 'definitive' (338).

---Review by H.S. Bennett, Review of English Studies 5 (1929): 207–9. An edition of Hawes's hard-to-find poem is welcome. As a piece of writing, PP belongs among those that are 'frequently discussed, but seldom read'; this is 'not entirely due to its rarity' (207). Hawes's use of the 'conventional learning' of his day is 'most uninspired.' The present edition spends too much space speculating on the philosophical source material that might have been used in PP and fails to explore the potentially interesting question of the relation of PP to The Court of Sapience (208). There are some worrying inconsistencies and lapses in the edition (208–9).


Prints extracts from PP (180–3); with a brief biographical introduction (179–80). Hawes looks to the past and not to the future. His work is marred by its didacticism, by its preference for 'talk' over 'action,' and by its poor metre (179).
1262. [Withdrawn.]


The first modern edition of Hawes's minor poems (*EV, CS, JM*, and *CL*). A 'Biographical Note' address the know details of Hawes's life (xi–xiv); and a 'Bibliographical Note' describes the extant editions and manuscript copies (xv–xxii). The introduction covers: 'Metre' (xxiii–xxvii); 'Grammar and Syntax' (xxvii–xxxii); 'Word and Image' (xxxii–xxxv); and 'Literary Tradition and the Conventions' (xxxv–xlvii). The editors then print the texts for *EV* (1–71), *CS* (73–84), *JM* (85–91), and *CL* (93–122); these are followed by the notes (123–62), glossary (163–74), and bibliography (175–8). Fourteen woodcuts are reproduced from the early editions. Hawes's metre is irregular (a clear indication of his 'pre-Renaissance' status), especially in *EV* (xxiii). The reasons for these irregularities are unclear: Hawes's apparent command of metre improves over time, and he can write metrically regular lines when he wishes (xxvi–xxvii). The heart of the problem may simply be the poor standards of the time (xxvii). Hawes's grammatical structures often show a similar confusion to that found in his metre (xxvii); although, as with his metre, Hawes shows, on occasions, that he is capable of successfully organizing his material (xxx–xxxii). Hawes's 'poetic figures' are guilty of 'weakness and conventionality' (xxxii); however, some of the images in *CL* are successful (xxxii). Hawes may seem to herald Renaissance poetry, but he is more properly seen as a medieval poet (xxxv–xxxvi). The evidence of Hawes's influence on later poets, including Spencer, is inconclusive (xlvi–xlvii). He uses the medieval conventions to poor effect; he clearly represents the 'transitional quality of the early Tudor period' (xlvii).

HAWES: EDITIONS

Review by E. Ruth Harvey, *Notes and Queries* 221 (1976): 169–70. The edition’s text is accurate; emendations are minimal and usually acceptable. The textual notes for *EV* do not allow readers to see what emendations, if any, are made by the editors. The notes in general are not full enough (169). Some of the sources and parallels that are cited do not seem credible (169–70). The introduction could have looked more at Hawes’s circle of associates, the relationship of his work to the contemporary fashion for romances, and parallels with Skelton. Hawes is more interesting than this edition suggests (170).

Review by P.J. Frankis, *Medium Aevum* 47 (1978): 179–81. Ferguson, 1337, was right to show the importance to English literary history of Hawes’s stress on education over ‘knightly achievements’ in *PP*; but it is arguable whether he was also right in seeing this as a sign of the Renaissance. The present editors are to be congratulated on taking a job that ‘nobody else could face up to’ (179). Their editorial policy, however, is deficient: they do not use modern punctuation, when to do so would have helped readers, and erroneous word-divisions are needlessly reproduced from the source; nevertheless, when the editors do intervene some of the emendations are ‘wild.’ The qualification of the editors to undertake their work must be questioned. The notes are ‘not always helpful’ (180). Hawes failed to unite the various levels of his allegory; the editors’ assumption that the poem is autobiographical with private and political references is not fully established (181).


Not sighted. According to Edwards (1366: 120–1), Spang presents facsimiles of all of Hawes’s works.


Prints lines 1–112, 148–96, 358–71, 904–31, 5474–87, 5803–16 from *PP* (529–35). The editor provides a brief biographical sketch (529); glosses are given on the page. The text is based on the edition of 1517. Pearsall lists textual variants (671). *PP* is a ‘stumbling step’ on the way to Spenser. Hawes’s command of metre and aureate language is poor; but he shows some ability in narrative, and in the use of ‘conventional and moral and descriptive motifs’ (529).

§
**General References**


Barclay's poem dates to about 1513 or 1514. Edwards (1366: 7) suggests that references by Barclay to 'Godfrey Gormand' in lines 838–40 and 845–6 of his *First Eclogue* may be disguised references to Hawes that indicate a dispute between the two men.


Skelton apparently refers to Hawes in the title and line 36 of the second of his poems against Garnesche, dating to 1514, as 'Gorbellyd Godfrey.' See Gordon, 1318.

1269. **Feylde, Thomas.** 'A Contraverse bytwene a Lover and a Jaye.' London, [1529?].

[Printed by Wynkyn de Worde during Feylde's lifetime. An apparent reference to Hawes's death dates the poem to after 1523, and c. 1529 is thought likely by Edwards (1366: 89). Arber reproduces the poem in modernized English (1255: 192–216).] Lines 22–5 of the Prologue to Feylde's poem refer to Hawes: 'Yonge Steuen Hawse whose soule god pardon/ Treated of loue so clerkely and well/ To rede his werkes is myn affeccyon/ Whiche he compyled of Labell pucell.'
Copeland’s poem serves as the introduction to Wynkyn de Worde’s 1530 edition of Chaucer’s *Parliament of Fowls*. The second stanza briefly praises the memory of Chaucer and his followers, Lydgate and Hawes. Spurgeon quotes from it (1303: 76–7), as does Ames (1275: 2: 279–80). For further discussion see Edwards, 1363.

Stephen Hawes was a man from an illustrious family, and he desired from the time of his youth to extend his mind through worthy studies. He left his parental home and went to various institutions of learning in different places in order to absorb the art of writing. The good instruction that he carefully and thoroughly acquired through a period of study in England, Scotland, and France, showed itself in his speech, habits, and in all the practices of his life. A most fortunate talent had fallen to him, and a tongue adapted to all manner of speaking. All his life he was like, as one might say, an ‘example of virtue.’ That wisest prince, Henry VII of England, called him, on the recommendation of his virtue alone, to the court, to the inner camera, and at length to his private chamber. While there, during the sweet leisure of contemplation, he wrote in English [Bale gives the following titles in their Latin equivalents]: *The Delight of the Spirit* [Edwards suggests that this may be *PP* (1366: 2)], *CL, EV, Concerning the Marriage of the Prince, The Alphabet of Birds* [the last two works are unidentified and possibly lost], and *The Temple of Glass* [by Lydgate]. He wrote several other works in verse and prose that were read by many in England with pleasure. He was alive around the year 1500 during the reign of Henry VII. See Edwards (1366: 1–2) and Hudson (1387: 319–20) for discussion of Bale’s entry for Hawes.

Follows the account given in Bale, 1271, with some embellishment.


Brief biography, somewhat embellishing that given by Bale, 1271. Hawes was able to recite many of the works of the English poets, and especially Lydgate, from memory. [This is the first occurrence of such a claim in the critical record.] *PP*, once very popular in the time of Henry VII and Henry VIII, is now relegated to street vendors. Besides *PP*, Hawes’s works include *EV*, *Delight of the Soul*, *CL*, and *The Crystalline Temple* [*TG*]: ‘one or more of which were written in Latin’ (10). [The editor of the 1813–20 edition, Philip Bliss, notes that the ascription of *The Crystalline Temple* to Hawes is open to doubt as the poem may be by Lydgate. Bliss adds *CS* and *JM*, as well as the non-extant pieces given by Warton, 1277, to the list of Hawes’s works (10).]


Tanner follows Bale, 1271, in his preliminary discussion of Hawes’s life; however, he then correctly cites all of Hawes’s poems either by their English titles or the Latin equivalents. Tanner also gives the other doubtful titles from Bale, including *The Delight of the Spirit*, and, again following Bale, ascribes *TG* to Hawes. He notes the 1555 printing of *PP*, 1248, and the fact that de Worde prints *JM* and *CS*. Tanner also refers his readers to Feylde’s poem, 1269. He gives his sources as Bale, 1271, Pits, 1272, and Wood, 1273.

Describes the prints of *CS* in 1509, **1236** (2: 146), *PP* in 1517, **1242** (2: 211), and *EV* in 1530, **1245** (2: 281) by Wynkyn de Worde; *PP* in 1554 by John Wayland, **1247** (3: 523); and *PP* by Richard Tottel in 1555, **1248** (4: 427).


Hawes is ‘generally unknown,’ yet he ends the literary darkness that had preceded him in the work of John Hardying and others, and brings back the ‘invention’ to English verse that had been in decline since Chaucer’s time. He revives and improves the old allegoric element of English poetry that had almost disappeared. In place of the dry descriptions of some earlier poets, Hawes brings the ‘luxuriancy of Spenser.’ He improves the versification of Lydgate, and adds to it the ‘sentiment and invention’ that it lacks; and he brings ‘new graces’ to the seven-line stanza that Chaucer and Gower had borrowed from the Italians. Hawes is the first of the English poets to combine ‘perspicuous and harmonious numbers’ with imaginative and polished writing. His principal work is *PP* (233). Skelton does not improve on those who went before him and his ‘versification is [not] in any degree more polish’d than that of ... Hawes’ (234).


In the time of Henry VII, Hawes is the ‘only writer deserving the name of a poet’ (210). Warton, following Bale, **1271**, and Wood, **1273**, briefly states Hawes’s biography and bibliography (210–11). Warton wrongly includes *TG* in the Hawes canon and considers it to be the best of the poet’s work after *PP* (212–17). *PP* is almost the lone example in the century after Chaucer of ‘imagination and invention’ (219); its unjust neglect was caused
only by the availability of ‘better books’ (220). Warton recounts the action of PP (220–36).


Brief references. In letter 25, Percy remarks that the reprinting of Hawes’s poems would be a desirable thing to do (70). In letter 45, Percy thanks Warton for providing a ‘very poetical extract’ from Hawes. The editors of Percy’s correspondence, Robinson and Dennis, suggest that this extract may have been the one used by Percy in the *Reliques*, 1279 (98, note).


Prints lines 344–417 from PP (87–90). Hawes was a ‘celebrated poet in the reign of Henry VII, though now little known.’ He is also the author of *TG* (87). See Percy, 1278, regarding the assistance Warton gave to Percy.


The first edition of Ellis’s work, published in 1790 in a single volume format, covers poetry from only the reign of Henry VIII and so excludes any reference to the English Chaucerians. Ellis prints extracts from PP (411–15). Hawes main work is PP (410). Not everyone is likely to share Warton’s good assessment of PP (410–11). [See 1276–7 for Warton’s views.] Hawes copies the ‘worst manner’ of Lydgate’s style (413). Ellis
incorrectly ascribes Lydgate's *TG* to Hawes, following Bale, 1271; Warton, 1277; and Percy, 1279 (416).


Lists Hawes's works as *PP, JM,* and *CS.* Warton is wrong to say that Hawes is the author of *TG* as the work is Lydgate's (59–60).


Not sighted; according to Edwards (1366: 97), Dibdin announces on pages 665–6 that he has found the 1509 edition of *PP* and the only copy of *CL.*


Brief references. *PP* is the most significant of Hawes's poems. *PP'*s characterizations recall the school of Old French romantic allegories; unfortunately, *PP* preserves the school's 'puerility' without its 'novelty.' *PP* is 'very tiresome.' In spite of Warton's comment to the contrary, 1276–7, it is not clear that Hawes improves on Lydgate's style. There is too little of beauty in Hawes to have offered much inspiration to Spenser (40).

1284. **Marsh, George P.** *The Origin and History of the English Language.* London, 1862.

Brief references. Hawes's poems are 'deservedly forgotten': it is Wright, 1249, not Warton, 1276–7, who correctly estimates their value. Nevertheless, Hawes's work has
some 'philological interest' with respect to its versification and Romance vocabulary (512). Marsh prints the text of Ch. 5 of that 'dull allegory,' *PP* (512–5).


*[The Book of the Poets was published posthumously in 1863.] Hawes has been 'unjustly depreciated' (251). *PP*, *Piers Plowman*, *The House of Fame*, and Lydgate's *TG*, are the four marble columns that support Spenser's *Faerie Queen* (252). Hawes is not just 'ingenious and fanciful, but abounds ... with passages of thoughtful sweetness and cheerful tenderness.' Now, *PP* is buried under the dust of the centuries, and seldom does anyone ask 'What lies here?' (253).


Brief references. *PP* is Hawes's main work. It indicates Hawes's poor artistic taste that he takes Lydgate as a model, even if he does add 'new graces' to Lydgate's style. In the 150 years following the death of Chaucer, it is Lydgate and Hawes who do most to continue the 'regulation and modernization of the language' that Chaucer initiates (449).


Hawes is dealt with in a section under Chaucer's 'English Successors' (91–3). Hawes is 'well-intentioned,' nevertheless *PP* is effectively without any merit (91). Southey's praise
of Hawes, **1248**, is very lame and a consequence of the belief that 'everything moral is poetical, no matter how tame, stupid, and lifeless' (93).


*PP* is Hawes’s best work. It is the first poem for half a century to show the power of imagination. ‘But, like all false resurrections, it died quickly.’


Briefly recounts Hawes’s biography and works. Hawes shows an understanding of Provençal poetry. His main work, *PP*, is artistically flawed, but has some charm; it is a clear link between *CT* and the *Faerie Queene* (189).


Brief references. Hawes’s admiration for Lydgate demonstrates his own dullness (32). *PP* is just the sort of work one might expect from a follower of Lydgate (32–3).
1292. **Brink, Bernhard ten.** *Geschichte der englischen Litteratur.* Strassburg, 1877–93.
2 vols.

Not sighted. See Brink, 1293, for the English language version.


Hawes’s poetry is the product of a secure and undemanding time (93). For Hawes, it is essential that poetry is instructive. *PP* is his best work (94); nevertheless, it is from many viewpoints ‘meagre and unpoetical’ (95). Lydgate has more ‘poetic productivity’ than Hawes, but Hawes may be better at ‘invention’ and establishing ‘allegorical motives.’ The artistic merit of Hawes’s work is open to question; nevertheless, he is on the path that leads to Edmund Spenser (97). Like Lydgate, Hawes shows few signs of humanism (98).


Courthope briefly discusses *PP* (380–2). *PP* is an odd mixture of ‘literary styles’; its presentation of an allegory of chivalry shows that the tradition is quite dead by Hawes’s time (382).


Not sighted. According to Burkart (1296: 12), Wülker refers briefly to Hawes.
London, 1899.

Burkart’s introduction (7–12) is followed by: ‘The Author: His Life and Works’ (13–18); ‘The Pastime of Pleasure: Transmission of the Text’ (18–21) and ‘Connection between the Different Prints’ (21–3); ‘Hawes’ Metre’ (23–30); ‘The Rhyme’ (30–8); ‘Hawes’ Treatment of Final e, and e in unaccented Syllable’ (38–49); ‘The Sources of “The Pastime”’ (49–57); ‘Hawes’ Style and Didactic Tendencies’ (57–9). *PP* has suffered ‘much undeserved negligence and unfair judgment by literary critics’ (7); it may be aesthetically unpleasing, but it is of historical and philological interest (10). William Neville’s *Castell of Pleasure* is heavily influenced by *PP* (11). See Cornelius, 1314, for a dissenting view regarding this last point.


Brief references. Hawes’s poetic merits are few, but he is of great interest because he is the last voice of the allegorical mode that is characteristic of the Middle Ages (24). He finds inspiration for *PP* in Lydgate’s *TG* (25). Hawes lacks the ‘restlessness’ of the Renaissance (26).


Brief references in an iconoclastic discussion of English literary criticism. J.J. Jusserand is wrongly dismissive of *PP* (199). Jusserand overlooks *PP*’s significance as a transition work, its ‘probable influence’ on the *Faerie Queene*, and its ‘intrinsic charm,’ ‘pathos,’ ‘picturesqueness,’ and ‘sweet and plaintive music’ (200). [For examples of Jusserand’s views, see 1300.]

Snell briefly summarizes Hawes’s biography (112–5). If it is true that Hawes comes from Suffolk, it could help explain his delusional notions of Lydgate’s greatness as the older poet is also from Suffolk (112–3). Snell notes the action of *PP, EV, CS,* and *JM* (115–22). *PP* still has relevance for the modern world (115), but it suffers from an ‘ill-regulated enthusiasm for the minutiae of learning’ (118). Hawes cannot be highly rated for his prosody, although poor printing may have played a part here (122). Nevertheless, he bears an interesting relation to the morality play, and he anticipates Spenser in that he is the ‘first of the English moralists to exploit the paraphernalia of the feudal system in the interests of symbolism’ (123).


Not sighted. According to Edwards (1366: 125), Zander notes similarities between *PP* and the *Faerie Queene*.


Brief references. Hawes is one of the ‘continuators’ of a medieval tradition that is dead and misunderstood by the time that he writes (112–3).
Hawes's courtly poetry belongs to medieval times, but he writes in a period of transition that sees the rise of more popular themes (223). Murison discusses Hawes's biographical and bibliographical details (224–5); and he supplies a brief synopsis of the poems (225–7). Hawes's range is not great (227). PP is more interesting and skilful, and less moralizing, than EV. In devising his ‘didactic allegory’ for PP Hawes's innovation is to stress the ‘element of chivalrous romance’ (228). The poem's discussion of knighthood, however, focuses more on formal education than on military training. The mechanics of the allegory in PP are generally successful, although the ‘details [are] tiresome and obscure’; there are also some inconsistencies and mistakes in the narrative (229). Hawes shows evidence of wide reading. His interest is on the moral rather than the intellectual side of life. His poetry shows the influence of Chaucer, Gower, and Lydgate; it also recalls the Roman de la Rose (230). Murison discusses examples of this influence (230–1). Hawes's works have the hallmarks of the medieval writer (231–2). His writing can be beautiful when he forgets the old conventions (232). Caution is needed in assessing Hawes's influence on Spenser as its 'extent ... is easy to overstate and very difficult or, rather, impossible, to prove' (233). Murison cites parallels between the two writers (233–5). Hawes's use of rhyme royal is often inappropriate to his subject matter (235). His command of metre seems faulty, but some of this might be because there is no critical edition (235–6). Murison presents examples of metrically poor lines (237–8). Hawes shares, and sometimes exaggerates, the typical 'defects' of the 15th-century poets (238).

Saintsbury finds Hawes prosody beyond hope of redemption or rationalization, even though there is a more 'poetical quality' to Hawes than is found in John Skelton or Alexander
Barclay. ‘Not even Teutonic classification-mongering [i.e. Schick’s five-line systemization of Lydgate’s verse, 442] ... could do anything for Hawes’ (235). Saintsbury briefly discusses what he sees as the metrical chaos of CS and PP (236–8).


Records Hawes’s praise of Chaucer in *EV* and *PP* (66–8). See the supplements offered by Rude, 1362.


A commentary on the contents of Oxford, Bodleian Lib., MS Rawlinson C.813. See Gluck, 1263, for a discussion of the borrowings in the manuscript from *PP* and *CL*.


Brief reference. Writers of short lyric poems in the 15th century find Chaucer’s model hard to follow because of the changes that have taken place in the English language between Chaucer’s time and their own. The 15th-century lyric writers are, instead, heavily influenced by the rhetorical techniques of medieval Latin (288–9). An example is Hawes’s use of aureation. Hawes is driven by the need for rhyme words and a desire for a more refined mode of expression; the effects can be ‘terrifying’ (301). If this influence theory with respect to the lyric writers of the 15th century is correct, then ‘order is brought out of chaos and we may criticise their work from the point of view of their own age’ (313). See Howell, 1333, on Hawes’s use of Ciceronian rhetoric.
In his time, Hawes, under the influence of Lydgate, is the ‘great exponent’ of the moral allegory (74). Berdan discusses Hawes’s life and bibliography (74–6). Boccaccio provides Hawes with his poetic theory, as he does for Lydgate: moral teachings are to be conveyed via allegory (76–7). Berdan discusses and compares *EV* and *PP* (78–86); the *Court of Sapience* has an influence on both poems (82). In the first half of these two poems, Hawes seems to be working passively in the medieval tradition. He is ‘dull, incoherent, verbose.’ But in their second halves, the poems become ‘rapid, varied and romantic’ (84). The overall affect, however, is disjointed and artistically unsatisfactory (84–6). In *CL* Hawes carries the allegorical method to an extreme; that it was not printed at the time shows that readers had lost interest in such ‘charades and conundrums’ (88). [CL was in fact printed. See de Worde, 1241.] Hawes’s significance is that he combines allegory and romance (91). Modern critics, including Browning, 1285, have praised Hawes excessively because of the better writers that followed him; but if Hawes does prefigure Spenser, ‘he is Spenser with Spenser left out’ (91). Nevertheless, he is important as the ‘gateway between medievalism and the Renaissance’ (92).


Brief references in the course of an early study on the aureate language of the 15th century. Passages from *PP* show how rhetoric had been separated from its previous association with law and identified with literature (20). There is an increasing tendency during the 15th century for poets to resort to aureate words when ‘stuck’ for a rhyme; but Hawes, in spite of his problems with rhyme, never conceives of aureation as a ‘matter simply of rhyme’ (52–3).
The representation of Nature in Hawes’s work shows the influence, just as it does in Chaucer’s, of Old French and, to a lesser extent, 12th century Latin (207). Hawes’s Nature references, however, have an ‘encyclopedic’ bias indicative of his ‘informative temper’ (200). PP draws on Caxton’s Mirrour of the World and, ultimately, on the De nuptiis Philologiae et Mercurii of Martianus Capella. It is structurally similar to the ‘love-allegories and chivalrous romances’ (201–2). EV allows Nature a more ‘active,’ but more ‘literary,’ role than is the case in PP; its description of Nature is ‘most meagre though favourable’ (204). Knowlton briefly describes the presentation of Nature in EV (205–7).

Hawes is ‘mediocre,’ but his work hints faintly at the coming of the Renaissance. The attempts of his time to revive chivalry in poetry were an ‘empty show’ (160). Hawes is a ‘ghost from the past’; and his style is generally ‘among the worst known to English poetry’ (161).

Seeks help in the interpretation of lines 134–40 and 558–60 from CL.
See reply by Parker, 1312.

Not sighted. Described by Edwards as the 'best account of Hawes’s life' (1366: 123).


Offers suggestions in response to Humphreys, 1310, but complains that it would help if Humphreys would make available the whole text of CL for discussion.


La Belle Pucelle is not derived from the two works that obviously influenced PP, the Court of Sapience and the Romance of the Rose. La Belle Pucelle, by inspiring the lover to ‘intellectual and moral self-improvement,’ recalls Dante and Beatrice. In fact she is drawn from Boccaccio’s poem, Amorosa Visione, which, in turn, is influenced by Dante (195). Hawes offers the first English example of the ‘ideal woman’ created by poets working in the ‘sweet new style’ made famous by Dante (197). Hawes also draws in PP on Boccaccio’s Genealogia deorum (197–8).


Considers the possible influence of Hawes on William Nevill’s The Castell of Pleasure (24–9). The evidence of the influence of PP is not extensive, and Burkart (1296: 11) is wrong to say that Nevill’s poem is heavily indebted to PP (24–6). There is even less evidence of the influence of EV on Nevill (26). CL is a much more likely influence on
Nevill, and it might have served as his model (26–9). Edwards, 1365, disagrees with Cornelius’s appraisal of the influence of PP.


Sets out to establish the relationship between PP and the Court of Sapience. Textual echoes make it clear that Hawes draws on the Court of Sapience for EV (286–92). In turn, EV sets the pattern for PP; hence, the influence of the Court of Sapience on the latter poem is transmitted at a distance (292–4).


Summarizes and discusses the critical opinions about the conjectural influence of PP and EV on the Faerie Queene, and notes the parallels between the work of Hawes and Spenser (414–18). It is Warton, 1276–7, because of his ‘misplaced’ fondness for Hawes’s poetry, who first links the name of Hawes with that of Spenser (414). It is true that there are similarities between Hawes’s work and Spenser’s both in terms of allegory and verbal likenesses, but these are of a commonplace and insignificant nature. It is likely that PP and EV are just a small portion of the ‘rich storehouse’ that is available to Spenser when he writes the Faerie Queene (418). See Kaske, 1381, for a dissenting view on the extent of Hawes’s influence on the Faerie Queene.

The character of King Melyzyus in PP may come from Pindar’s third *Isthmian Ode* (439). [Harvey dismisses this claim, r1366.]


Skelton’s poems against Garnesche refer to another person, who wrote with Garnesche, as ‘Gorbellyd Godfrey.’ It is likely that this reference is meant to point to Hawes as PP contains a character called ‘Godfrey Gobilive.’ See Skelton, 1268.


Not sighted. According to Edwards (1366: 124), Spargo discusses the Godfrey Gobelive passage from PP.


A description of all the woodcuts used by William Caxton, Wynkyn de Worde, Richard Pynson, and the lesser known early printers. In spite of Mead’s view, 1260, it is doubtful that any of de Worde’s woodcut illustrations for PP were specifically made to accompany the poet’s text, and the same is likely to be true for *EV* (24–5). See King, 1361, Edwards, 1363–4, 1366, and 1368, and Lerer 13755 and 1376 for some dissenting views regarding this last point.
Hawes is a poor poet. Writing in a tradition that has become exhausted, he is the ‘final dilution of the pure Chaucerian spring’ (155). The Scottish Chaucerians, on the other hand, are stimulated by Chaucer’s example because it is to them a ‘foreign influence’ (156). Skelton escapes Hawes’s fate by buffoonery: ‘It is better, always, to be a buffoon than a bore’ (163).

Discusses *PP* and *EV* (278–87). *PP* constantly suggests that it could be better than it is, and this is because Hawes is, in his imperfect way, ‘trying to write a new kind of poem.’ Hawes thinks that he is reviving a mode of extended poetry that combines ‘allegory’ and ‘chivalrous romance.’ In fact, such a combination had not been done before, and is not successfully done until Edmund Spenser and *The Faerie Queene* (279). *PP* is more an allegory of life than of love. Hawes gives three themes special attention: ‘love, education, and death’ (282). It is the last of these in which ‘Hawes’ treatment ... is most remarkable’ (283); his concept is let down only by the failure of his expression. *EV* lacks the attractive power of *PP* (285).

Brief references. Hawes is the ‘most completely medieval’ of the ‘bad poets’ of the period. *PP* and *EV* are ‘not unimportant ... in the history of English allegory’; it is likely that Edmund Spenser read *PP*. Hawes gives the impression that he is ‘grasping at really good things beyond his reach’ (128).

Brief references to Hawes in an argument that Barclay’s metre is more regular than has been admitted in the past. Part of the reason for the denigration of Barclay’s metre has been a critical association of Barclay and Hawes, particularly in discussions of *PP* and the *Ship of Fools*. It is false to assume that because two Chaucerians are ‘writing at the same time they are necessarily writing the same kind of verse.’ *PP* is more metrically regular than the majority of 15th-century poems that use both heroics and a four-stress line; even so, its mixture of heroics and four-stress patterns is ‘haphazard,’ and it cannot be described as metrical (355). Metrically, Barclay stands between the conservative and backward-looking Hawes and the ‘wayward’ Skelton (373).


A number of references to Hawes particularly in Ch. 3, ‘Skelton, Hawes and Barclay’ (31–46). Hawes and Skelton are the ‘most language conscious’ of the important poets of their day (31). Hawes’s use of aureate language is unlike Skelton’s: the influence of Lydgate causes him to avoid the usages of ‘ordinary speech’; ‘satire and vulgar humour’ and ‘homely terms’ are absent from his work (37). Hawes’s emphasis is on the elaboration
of language (37–8). He uses few archaisms (38–9). Rubel briefly discusses Hawes’s use of figurative patterns (39–40). In terms of influence, Hawes and Skelton may represent a dead-end, but their significance lies in the profile they give to the vernacular as a means of literary expression (46).


Ch. 8 includes a discussion of the literary theory presented by Caxton, Hawes and Skelton (163–81). Hawes represents a poetic theory based on Boccaccio (164). He reflects the contemporary renewal of interest in traditional rhetoric (166). Hawes welcomes the ‘new aureate diction ... enthusiastically and without reserve,’ and he does not share Caxton’s concerns about the use of ‘curyous termes’ (169). Hawes and Skelton are the first poets to consider the ‘nature of poetry’ in the manner of Boccaccio; the results of their consideration, however, often only faintly recall Boccaccio (173). Hawes maintains the medieval concept of poetry as a ‘rhetorical conception,’ and presents himself as having a classical notion of poetry (173). As he develops his ideas, however, he generally follows the lead of Boccaccio (173–5). Hawes’s dismissal in *PP* of the ballads is evidence that John Gower, Geoffrey Chaucer, and John Lydgate are regarded at this time as the ‘reigning school of poets ... [and] ... heralds of a new order of poetry’ (177–8).


*CS* gives the first English example of a pattern poem. Pattern poems come to Europe through Greek literature; Hawes is likely to have known of them in French imitations (637). Hawes’s pattern poem may have influenced George Daniel (638). See Frankis, 1343, who claims that Church misunderstands the structure of Hawes’s poem.

Hawes is the last practitioner in the tradition of Chaucerian courtly poetry, a tradition that is by his time ‘antiquated.’ [Sampson wrongly credits Hawes with the authorship of *TG*, and this claim is repeated in the revised edition of 1970.] Hawes has ‘very little to say’ (87). It is possible that Spenser had read Hawes; but Spenser does finely in the *Faerie Queene* what Hawes does ‘feebly’ in *PP* and *EV*. It may be that Hawes’s verse is discordant to modern ears because we read it wrongly, and it could help our reading of it, and other 15th-century verse, to keep in mind the ‘liberties of the ballads and the nursery rhymes’ (88).


Several brief references. Hawes works in a degenerated medieval tradition. In *PP* he draws on the *Court of Sapience*, and he ‘clings’ to ‘chivalry and scholasticism’ even though he is writing at the beginning of an intellectual renaissance. The poem is ‘depressing’ and of limited artistic interest (155).


Brief references to Hawes (324–5). The printings of *PP* in 1554 and 1555 may be attributed to the work’s ‘reactionary’ nature (324). ‘Passages have sometimes been cited to prove that Hawes was a poet’ (325).

Summarizes passages from *EV* and *PP* in a discussion of the seven deadly sins (238–40). The seven deadly sins are 'not important concepts in either of these poems,' nevertheless the poems are representative of an 'important strain of the dying Middle Ages' (240).


*PP* provides an example of Caxton's treatment in the *Mirrour of the World* of the moral purpose of logic in the 'quest for salvation' (49). Hawes turns 'Ciceronian rhetoric' to the purposes of poetic theory (81). It is natural that the lover in *PP* should seek the help of Dame Rhetoric to meet his special needs (81–2). Dame Rhetoric's discussion of poetic 'disposition or arrangement' has some relationship to Ciceronian rhetoric (83–4), but the relationship is stronger in her discussion of memory (85–6). Hawes's adaptation of classical rhetoric to the needs of poetry is probably inspired by Geoffrey of Vinsauf's *Poetria nova* (87). *PP* should be regarded as the first printed disposition in English of Cicero's five parts of rhetoric (87–8).


Brief references. Hawes's verses on the seasons recall Lydgate's 'magniloquent volleys of commonplace' (131).
Prints, for the first time in full, an elegy on the death of Henry VII. The text has been recovered from a copy found among documents of the period 1508–9 at Durham Cathedral. The author is unknown, but the style and tone of the elegy strongly resemble that of Hawes's *CS* and *JM* (169).

Hawes is 'reputed' to have studied at Oxford, perhaps at Magdalen College (888). His best known poem is *PP*, which combines the 'well-worn features of medieval romances with the strong personal feeling ... of the Elizabethan age' (888).

A number of references, generally about the educational requirements for knights stated in *PP*, and how these show a transitional view of chivalry. Hawes’s handling of the courtly love conventions reveals the dominance of the new practical notions of bourgeois marriage over an older romantic tradition (65–6). This sense of bourgeois practicality is again found in Hawes’s educational regime for knights with its emphasis on the utility of the liberal arts in Tudor public life (67–8). Humanism stresses the value of training in rhetoric and history for those who aspire to play a part in the ruling society (208). Hawes is not a humanist in the manner of Thomas More, but he has sufficient knowledge of classical writers to give him the ‘raw materials of humanism’ (210). Hawes presents learning as far more important than martial training in the education of a knight (212): the knight’s military role is just
a part of his broader function in the ruling society (213). See Frankis, r1263, and Lawton, 1179, for some responses to this view.


A number of generally brief references to Hawes. Part of the reason why it is not meaningful to speak of an ‘early Tudor lyric’ is that the medieval influence of Lydgate is still so strongly present in the works of Stephen Hawes and Alexander Barclay (8).


A number of references to Hawes’s work in a history of the pilgrimage theme in English literature and art (especially woodcuts and engravings) between about 1485 and 1642. *EV* and *PP* share the ‘Path of Life’ form, although this may not be immediately apparent because of Hawes’s ‘digressions’ (204). Chew discusses the action of *EV* (204–6). *EV*, in spite of its defects of metre and language, and ‘tedious divagations,’ is a ‘beautiful poem’ that has not been adequately received by ‘modern scholars,’ including C.S. Lewis. [See 1322-3 for examples of Lewis’s views.] *PP* shares the strengths and weaknesses of *EV* (206). Chew reproduces several illustrations from the early Hawes editions: ‘Time’ (fig. 33) from the 1509 edition of *PP*, 1239; and ‘Fortune and the Nine Worthies’ (fig. 62), ‘The Meeting with Lady Lechery’ (fig. 90), ‘Justice’ (fig. 96), and ‘Nature with Death behind Her’ (fig. 144) from the 1530 edition of *EV*, 1245.

At first glance, *PP* seems to demonstrate the ‘exhaustion’ of the old medieval literary traditions at the end of the 15th century, but closer consideration reveals signs of new ideas. The active and contemplative lives were kept separate in medieval thinking; however, Hawes shows them as united in his educational regime (133). Hawes’s presentation of marriage is also an advance on the older courtly love genre (133–4). *PP* is an important historical document because of these new ideas and because of the way it anticipates Spenser. It also has moments of beauty. Nevertheless, on the whole, its verse is ‘doggerel’ and typical of didactic poetry in England at this time (134).


Brief reference. Hamilton finds examples in *PP* of the ‘plaintive and serious romance’ that is present in some late 19th-century epigrams. Hawes overcomes the lack of polysyllables in English, and suggests something of the ‘eminence’ that later English epigrams would achieve in a monosyllabic medium (6).


*PP* brings together the ‘didactic allegory’ found in *PLM*, the ‘encyclopaedic interests’ of the *Court of Sapience*, and aspects of ‘popular romance’ and love allegory. Hawes, although looking to revive chivalry, anticipates the ‘Tudor ideal of the Governor’ (231). Hawes has significance for what he attempts, not for what he attains. The ‘inner logic’ of *PP* holds together poorly; and Hawes’s style, his greatest ‘failure,’ is ‘mechanical’ and inorganic (232).
Hawes is a transition poet. A first impression of his work may be that it contains no sign of 'new ideas' or originality (266). One finds, however, in PP new notions about chivalry and learning, marriage, and the function of the poet. The problem is that, although their presentation may be original, they are not 'fully absorbed or assimilated.' Hawes's reach far exceeds his grasp, and his command of narrative technique is disastrous (267). PP is at its best when it deals with familiar conventions or borrows from Lydgate (268).

The crucifixion pattern poem in CS shows that the -es inflexion in plural nouns has the value of a separate syllable. It is unlikely that this inflexion would have been pronounced in the daily speech of Hawes's time; however, the poem suggests that it has kept its value as a syllable in verse during the 14th and 15th centuries (11–2). The poem also proves that final -e is no longer counted as a syllable by this time. The pattern poem is printed from the 1509 edition of CS (12). The studies by Church, 1328, and Davies, 493 (not annotated for this reference), misunderstand the poem's stanza form (11).

Brief reference. CS is the latest and sole poem that is complete in the genre of complaints against swearers (399). Generally, the portion of the poem dealing with the letter from Christ is 'moralistic and threatening.' The lyric section of the poem, however, is a 'genuine planctus': it has a 'devotional note exceptional for the form and period.' It is very
noteworthy that a poem of this genre and 'late date' is 'so successfully assimilated to the love complaint' (400).


An incomplete copy of *CS* in the Huntington library is not, as has been previously thought, an example of Wynkyn de Worde's 1509 edition of the poem. Instead, it seems to represent a corrected, second edition printed by de Worde in about 1510. Morgan describes the Huntington text, and considers its textual relationship to the three other early editions of *CS*.


Brief references. *PP* is the source for a part of Gerard Leigh's *Accedens of Armoury* that deals with courtship. This piece may be acted out for the Inner Temple revels of 1561 with a contemporary eye on the relationship between Robert Dudley and Queen Elizabeth (371).


Brief references. As the Middle Ages become the Renaissance, the English perception of Petrarch shifts from seeing him as the moral philosopher of his Latin works, to the humanist with Laura beside him in the *Trionfi*, to the love poet of the *Canzoniere* (306–7). *PP*, which may owe a debt to the *Trionfi*, suggests a view of Petrarch that is still close to that of moral philosopher (312–13). See Carnicelli, 1349.
Stephen Hawes, Alexander Barclay, and John Skelton are the three poets born in the later 15th century whose work 'deserves remark.' Hawes's reputation, 'such as it is,' depends on PP (330). This poem brings together allegory and romance, but Hawes lacks the strength of imagination to realize the potential that this union offered (330–1). The poem is marred by didacticism and by Hawes's efforts to be eloquent; nevertheless, Hawes sometimes achieves a 'pleasing simplicity, and, fitfully, even a curious haunting beauty' (331).

A discussion on pages 49–52 of Hawes's personification of Fame, Time, and Eternity at the end of PP in an argument that this is influenced, as are Thomas More's Nyne Pageauntes and John Skelton's Colin Clout, by 'iconographical representations' of Petrarch's Trionfi (47). The detail of Hawes's description suggests that he is following some unspecified illustrations of the Trionfi from the 15th or early 16th century (49). See Coogan, 1347.

Brief references. It is not apparent why Hawes praises Chaucer language as 'eloquent terms subtle and couert.' Presumably, he means much the same as Lydgate means when he writes of the 'ornate or polished' nature of Chaucer's verse. Nevertheless, Hawes's embellishments go well beyond anything found in Chaucer (109).
Brief references in an argument that the reading of Chaucer’s verse as iambic pentameter is an imposed one. Robinson maintains that a better reading is produced by being sensitive to sound and speech rhythms, and manuscript punctuation, and avoiding a mechanical approach to final –e. Hawes mechanically reproduces Lydgate’s pentameter (214). PP is ‘quite dead’ (215). John Skelton, Alexander Barclay, and Thomas Wyatt are of more interest than Hawes (216). See Robinson, 922, for a further statement of the author’s general argument.


Brief references. The initial printing of Hawes’s poems by Wynkyn de Worde might be at the instigation of Margaret Beaufort, mother of Henry VII, or Bishop John Fisher. [Edwards agrees that this is a possibility (1366: 6).] It is possible that de Worde is attracted to Hawes’s work more by its instructional and devotional aspects than by its poetry (134–5).


Not sighted. Referred to by Edwards as claiming, ‘very unconvincingly,’ that PP contributes to the genre of the consolatio (1366: 123).
Hawes's PP reflects both conventional and new elements of landscape presentation (54–5).

Brief discussion of EV and PP in a broader argument about the temptations of the 'infernal triad' of the Flesh, the World and the Devil in Spenser and Milton. EV and PP are strikingly similar to Spenser's Legend of Holiness as they are allegories, with structures based on the 'infernal triad,' dealing with romance and chivalry (7–13). Taken together, EV and PP are a near approximation of the 'general outline' of the first book of the Faerie Queene (13). See Kaske, 1381, for the view that EV is a much more significant influence than PP on Bk 1 of the Faerie Queene.

Provides a selected listing, sometimes with brief annotations, to editions and criticism about the five poets included in the present bibliography in addition to several that are excluded.

Several brief references. Hawes flounders in the 'wake of Lydgate.' In his hands, the 'rime royal stanza is a visual unit in which words move according to measures no longer intelligible' (237).

A revival of interest in chivalry in late medieval England is essentially a middle class phenomenon (324). Most of the nobles that Hawes seeks to instruct in chivalry by means of *PP* are new to their class as a result of the Wars of the Roses (331). The values Hawes adopts are not those of traditional chivalry but of the new middle class, and consequently they emphasize industry and education (331–2). Virtue and vice are defined in the middle class terms of business (332). *PP* shows that by the early 1500s chivalry is extinct and found ‘only in its language’; the values of chivalry are now the ‘bourgeois virtues’ (333).


A response to Schroeder, 1360. Schroeder overlooks the work of Axton, 1346, when he says that no one has previously noted Hawes’s *PP* as the source for the masque in Leigh’s *Accendens of Armory*.


The story of Desire in Leigh’s *Accedens of Armory* is taken, with some minor changes, from Hawes’s *PP* (47). [This had been discovered earlier. See Axton, 1346, and Bland, 1359.] The Nine Worthies of *PP* represent ‘ever-enduring fame,’ but in *EV* they show the ‘fickleness of all worldly fame’ and so recall the Nine Worthies of the alliterative *Morte Arthure* (48).

Argues that a comparison of the earlier and later sections of *PP* shows a transition from the medieval influence of Lydgate to a new ‘Renaissance mode’ (67). King reviews the action of Graunde Amour’s quest (57–60). The woodcuts in Wynkyn de Worde’s 1509 edition generally do not follow the text closely; however, those accompanying the final pageants act as a ‘pictorial extension of the text.’ Hawes either writes with the woodcuts in mind or they are cut according to his text (62). [Hodnett, 1320, disagrees; but see Edwards, 1363–4, 1366, and 1368 for a supporting view.] King discusses the action of the poem’s conclusion (61–7). The Renaissance manner of the final pageants is far more interesting than the earlier narrative of Graunde Amour’s quest, and this greater interest marks a point of ‘transition to a new Renaissance mode of allegorical patterning’ (67).


Notes two allusions to Chaucer from *CL* not mentioned by Spurgeon, 1303.


A reference to Hawes in Robert Copeland’s prologue, 1270, to Wynkyn de Worde’s 1530 edition of *The Assemble of Fowles* is evidence of the regard for Hawes within de Worde’s circle. De Worde is the first to publish Hawes’s works; and it seems that there was cooperation between the two men in the relation of text and woodcuts in Hawes’s books. A posthumous Hawes reference by Thomas Feylde in a poem, 1269, published by de Worde further suggests that de Worde’s associates hold Hawes in high regard.
A close relationship between Wynkyn de Worde and Stephen Hawes is suggested by the care de Worde takes with the presentation and text of Hawes’ poems, and by de Worde’s regard for Hawes’s reputation (82). Woodcuts accompanying de Worde’s prints of Hawes’s poems are generally appropriate, sometimes strikingly so (83–7). The various reprints made by de Worde suggest that considered editorial intervention is carried out either by Hawes or by de Worde (87–8). [See Mukai, 1382.] The few surviving examples of 16th-century posthumous praise for Hawes come from figures close to de Worde (88).

In considering William Nevill’s use of Hawes’s work for the Castell of Pleasure, Cornelius, 1314, concludes that it is more probable that Nevill knows CL than PP or EV. In fact, Nevill does refer to EV. Hawes’s first publisher, Wynkyn de Worde, is probably the first publisher of the Castell of Pleasure. This edition has prefatory verses by Copeland, 1270, a writer who also admires Hawes. A common admiration of Hawes may be partly responsible for forging the links between de Worde, Nevill, and Copeland.

Puts the argument that Hawes, although a minor literary figure, is ‘more effective and innovative’ than has been previously acknowledged (Preface, n. pag.). Ch. 1: ‘The Poet and His Milieu’ (1–25). Little is known of Hawes’s life: he is born perhaps in the 1470s; he may have gone to Oxford; he is a member of the royal court at least until 1506; and he is dead by 1529 (1–2). Henry VII keeps a number of literary figures working to political ends
The opinion that Margaret Beaufort encourages Wynkyn de Worde to publish Hawes's poems is 'plausible' (6). Hawes appears not to be favoured by Henry VIII (8). Hawes would have contact with numerous humanists through the court and, possibly, as a student at Oxford (9); but there is little evidence of such contact in his work (10). Although Hawes pays tribute to Gower, Chaucer, and Lydgate, the first two of these writers are not a prominent influence on his work (11), and the influence of the last is not as great as Hawes and some critics suggest (11–16). The real importance of Lydgate to Hawes is that Hawes sees the older poet as a moral instructor to the great and powerful—a model Hawes wishes to follow (16–20). Wynkyn de Worde's close role in the publication of Hawes's poetry suggests that the poet is very concerned that the printed form of his work should maximize its potential for moral instruction (20). De Worde seems to go to great trouble with the woodcuts accompanying Hawes's poems (20–3). This suggests that Hawes sees the possibilities of his poetry 'existing in a complementary relationship' with the medium of the book, and uses woodcuts to engage with his verse and provide 'dramatic impact' (24).

Ch. 2: 'The Pastime of Pleasure' (26–58). PP shows signs of the influence of the Court of Sapience (28). There are some broad similarities between PP and the Pelerinage de Vie Humaine by Guillaume de Deguileville; it is unlikely, however, that there is a single source for Hawes's poem (29–30). The allegory in PP is nearly always a matter of 'personification' (30), and 'generally quite straightforward'; although working in a religious form, PP is essentially secular (31). Hawes's main aim is educational, and he has a particular focus on rhetoric (33–5). Serious poetry for Hawes is allegorical poetry, as it is a vehicle by which to teach a sense of social order (35–41). Edwards considers some aspects of PP's apparent thematic and structural inconsistency; it may be that this 'inconsistency' follows from our failure to see the poem from the point of view of Hawes's principal allegorical concerns (41–56). In spite of stylistic failures, PP is structurally coherent with an 'intermittent but genuine poetic force' (58).

Ch. 3: 'The Minor Poems' (59–87). Even more than PP, EV seems to take the Pilgrimage of Life as a 'generic model' (60). The Court of Sapience is a significant influence on EV
EV appears to have serious flaws in the workings of its narrative and allegory; some of these flaws may follow from the author’s incompetence, but some may be explicable on other grounds (61–2). It seems that EV is addressed to a courtly audience, and some of its political, historical, and social concerns relate to that audience (63–6). But not all the poem’s difficulties can be explained (67–8); EV is an imperfect vehicle for its message of ‘Christian virtue’ (69). The form of CS follows from its rhyme scheme; it is not an example of a pattern poem as has been wrongly claimed (71). CS seems to be addressed to the court circle and to show Hawes’s capacity for ‘overt admonition’ (73). JM seems to be written in a failed attempt to gain favour from Henry VIII (77). CL, as one finds elsewhere in Hawes’s work, seems to lack a clear, meaningful form (78); it moves between ‘largely inaccessible personal reflections’ and ‘stylizations of allegory’ (87).

Ch. 4: ‘Reputation, Influence, and Achievement’ (88–108). Wynkyn de Worde is likely to be responsible for the editing of the 1530 printing of EV; his changes seem to be intended to reduce the work’s obscurity and elements of archaism (88). Wynkyn de Worde seems to be the centre of a circle of Hawes admirers (88–90). Hawes’s poems do not appear to be widely read in manuscript (90–1). Hawes’s already limited readership is greatly reduced by the mid-16th century; there is little evidence of his influence with the exception of some instances in Tudor drama (91–4). [See Axton, 1346.] It is unlikely that Spenser is directly influenced by Hawes (94). Thomas Wharton is the first to attempt a ‘critical reassessment’ of Hawes’s poetry (95). Edwards supplies a ‘Selected Bibliography’ (119–25).

—Review by E. Ruth Harvey, Notes and Queries 229 (1984): 425–6. There is a need for a substantial study of Hawes that would place his poetry in context. Edwards’s work, however, contains ‘some most unwarrantable assertions.’ Edwards’s reading of PP is hampered by his desire to force order onto the plot; and his argument about Hawes’s incorporation of topical issues ‘could have been much more securely based.’ There are problems with the treatment of Hawes’s sources. Edwards’s claim for a Hawes ‘fan club’ centred on Wynkyn de Worde is ‘most disquieting’ (425). The evidence of the woodcuts for a close collaboration between the poet and his printer is weak (425–6). Edwards’s book also contains some errors of fact (426).
William Walter's poem, *The Spectacle of Louers*, draws on *PP*, and so it adds to the few examples of Hawes's influence in the 16th century. The Walter's piece joins others by Thomas Feylde, 1269, William Nevill [see Burkhart, 1296, Cornelius, 1314, and Edwards, 1363, and 1365–6 regarding Nevill], Robert Copeland, 1270, and the anonymous author of the 'enturlude of youth.' [Regarding this last reference, see Lancashire, 1370.] The writers of these verses are all published by Wynkyn de Worde who is also Hawes's publisher. This latest example of Hawes's influence goes to confirm the interest of 'de Worde's circle' in Hawes's work.

It is difficult to explain why Wynkyn de Worde chooses to publish a number of Hawes's works in 1509: it is possible that this is a way into the 'court circle'; or, it could be that figures at the court see the publication of *PP* and *EV* as a means to comment publicly, albeit allegorically, on the kingship of Henry VII (145). Wynkyn de Worde's editions of Hawes's poems show care in the choice of appropriate illustrative woodcuts; they also provide examples of considerable editorial intervention, probably by de Worde or his associates (146–7). There might be evidence of a 'primitive marketing strategy' in references to Hawes that occur in the works of other authors published by de Worde, and of a parallel between de Worde's handling of the works of Hawes and William Walter (147). See Edwards, 1367.

A number of generally brief references to Hawes in an argument that the royal court, served by poets struggling to gain its recognition and support, is more important than the new middle class in setting the mainstream literary tastes of 15th-century England (211). [See Doyle, 858, for a related discussion.] A comparison of Lydgate’s relatively simple treatment of rhetoric in FP with Hawes’s detailed discussion in PP suggests that by Hawes’s time ‘poetry, even vernacular poetry, had come to be seen as part of the ostentatious public front’ of the court (177). This need for ostentation led poets at the end of the 15th century to look back to Lydgate, rather than Chaucer, as a model (177–8).

1370. **Lancashire, Ian, ed.** *Two Tudor Interludes: The Interlude of Youth; Hick Scorner.* The Revels Plays. Manchester: Manchester UP, 1980

*EV* is one of the influences on *The Interlude of Youth* (36). The composition of the *Interlude* belongs to the months between August 1513 and May 1514 (17–22). The play shows no interest in the poem’s theme of ‘sexual love and *fines amours*’ but draws closely on its ‘courtly dialogue’ (39). Lancashire considers the *Interlude’s* specific borrowings from *EV* (39–40).


Discusses the allegory of *PP* and Hawes’s use of comedy; in this context, Leonard draws some comparisons between *PP* and Gavin Douglas’s *Palice of Honour*, and makes some references to John Gower, William Dunbar, and Edmund Spenser (115–27). The Court of Love is not ‘predatory’ for Hawes as it is for Douglas and Dunbar. The free choice exercised by Graunde Amoure in his love recalls Amans in Gower’s *Confessio Amantis*, and it looks forward to the ‘pilgrim-knights’ in Spenser’s *Faerie Queene*. As in the *Confessio Amantis*, the fault ultimately lies not in the Court of Love but in the free choice of the pilgrim. Graunde Amoure’s journey is extremely direct and free from ‘opposition or
digression' (115). There are some differences between Douglas and Hawes in the treatment of pilgrimage as a shaping metaphor. In Douglas, the pilgrimage occupies only the second half of the poem and deals with the ‘nature of poetry’; Hawes’s pilgrimage is enveloping and encompasses a whole life. Douglas moves from the real to the unreal; Hawes begins with what is ‘consciously poetical hence unreal’ and relates this to a psychological and social reality (117). There is a brilliance to Douglas’s approach that is lacking in Hawes, yet the latter is more accessible and consistent in its realization (117–18). Comedy in Douglas moves in step with the pilgrimage; for Hawes comedy is an ‘interlude.’ At the end of PP, it can be seen that the comic episodes serve to ‘provide an alternate perspective on the pilgrim’s progress’ (118). Hawes is poor at comedy (118–20). Leonard considers the essential seriousness of Graunde Amoure’s quest (120–125). The problem of the allegory in PP is not that it is ‘medieval,’ but that it is ‘weakly and mechanically realized’ (125).


Brief references. Hawes is cited in an argument that ‘close verbal analysis’ (195) of late medieval authors may have some validity because these authors show a concern for the precise use of words. This concern might have its source in classical Latin rhetoric (198).


Brief references in a discussion of Chaucer’s imagery as a central feature of his narrative technique. Lines 1247–64 from PP provide a ‘remarkable statement of the role of the mental image in the making of narrative art’ (40).
Hawes's use of aureation differs from Lydgate's practice. Lydgate sees aureate language as a way to 'reform and beautify his world' (169); for Hawes, aureate language serves to 'make a poem's subject memorable and its author immortal.' The cause of this difference between the two poets lies in the rediscovery of the texts by Cicero on philosophy which lead to the 'humanist preoccupation with public service and literary fame,' and the invention of the printing press (170). [The body of the article explores these issues further.] The difference in attitude between Lydgate and Hawes with respect to aureation helps explain Hawes's repeated references to painting: it is an art that has the same purpose as poetry, and both are 'recepticals of history and fame' (174).


A study of how and to what ends Chaucer and his work are portrayed and interpreted in 15th- and early 16th-century England. Lerer argues that the later poets, working amidst political instability and uncertain patronage, create a mythology that sees Chaucer enjoying a privileged position under assured patronage. Ch. 6 (176–208) deals with both Hawes and Skelton. Hawes and Skelton use Chaucer as a citation; rather than look to him as a source, in the way that Lydgate does, they invoke his name (177). Hawes sees Chaucer as a poet enshrined by the new print technology in a way to which he himself aspires. This concern with book production is reflected in Hawes's frequent use of terms that echo the processes of printing. Denied the laureate status given to Skelton, Hawes looks to the book as the vehicle by which to achieve a posthumous fame (178–9). It is possible to read PP as a 'self-conscious retrospective on a century of literary practice' (184): the elaborate images met by Graunde Amoure recall Lydgate's work, but are different from it by their 'engraved, incised, golden, and monumental quality' (185). Lydgate seeks through aureation to recapture the past; Hawes uses aureation to create a 'metallic uncorruptability,' parallelling the physical type of the press, that will carry his work into the future (186).
Numerous references to Hawes and his work in a discussion of the influence of the deceitfulness inherent in courtly life on courtly literature and literary compilations. Lerer specifically addresses Hawes's work in a section entitled 'The discomfort of Stephen Hawes' (49–57). Hawes's poetry is that of 'secret correspondence and illicit love,' and it is thematically based around the 'confrontation of the public courtly body with the private reading self' (50). Hawes may look back to a 'literary past,' but he is very conscious of the realities of his diminished status in the 'political present' of Henry VIII. CL takes as its theme the poet's failure as a courtier (51). Hawes's model for expressing the duplicity of courtly life is based on Pandarus in Troilus and Criseyde (53). CL deliberately references PP (55–6). The activity of reading as a personal 'comfort' and as a public 'pastime' represents the private and public aspects of the 'courtly self' (56). In a section entitled 'The wiles of the woodcut' (71–86), Lerer refers to the significance of Wynkyn de Worde's reuse of a specific woodcut, to the debate between Hawes and Skelton, and to Hawes's place in the de Worde circle of authors: see Lerer, 1376, for discussion of this material. Welys's use of extracts from Hawes's work in his manuscript compilation is considered and central to the anthologist's purpose which is to comment on the nature of royal power (113–17; 129ff).


Considers the repetition of a woodcut, number 1009 in the Hodnett catalogue, 1320, of a woman passing a ring as a love token to a man in several Wynkyn de Worde books dating between about 1509 and 1520. Lerer reproduces the woodcut from the various editions (397–403). The printings concerned are the 1509 and 1517 editions of PP, the Troilus and Criseyde edition of 1517, the CL edition of about 1515, Undo Youre Dore (de Worde's title
for *The Sqyrr of Lowe Degre*) which is likely to have been printed after 1517 and prior to 1520, and *The III Leues of a Truelove* which dates to about 1515 (381–4). [Lerer conjecturally bases his dating of the last two items on de Worde’s typefaces and on the progressive wear marks shown by the woodcut (384).] The significance of the woodcut in PP is not immediately apparent (384). [See further discussion in this annotation below.] In the printings of CL and *The III Leues* the woodcut incorporates a snatch of verse that may be based on lines from John Skelton’s *Phyllype Sparowe* (386–7). The rivalry between Hawes and Skelton is an instance of the way in which writers, and their printers, use such public feuds to mark their ‘social roles’ and seek ‘royal patronage and public readerships’ (388). It is possible that the reference to Skelton’s work in the CL woodcut is a joke by de Worde for those aware of the argument between Hawes and Skelton. This would be consistent with de Worde’s special involvement with Hawes’s opus. (389–90). It is likely that the ring in the woodcut is, in fact, a ‘truelove gift.’ If this is the case, the woodcut would resonant with lines 1991–95 of PP. This could explain the otherwise puzzling presence of the woodcut in de Worde’s 1509 and 1517 editions of PP (391–2). The Wellys anthology (Oxford, Bodleian Lib., MS Rawlinson C. 813) includes some stanzas from Hawes as well as references to the truelove gift (392). The repetition of the woodcut in several de Worde printings may cause it to carry various critical associations for contemporary readers (393–6). Lerer considers the Wellys anthology further at a number of points in 1375.


Ch. 6 is entitled ‘Skelton and Hawes’ (224–77). Hawes is the most Lydgate-like of the English Chaucerians. He is an inferior poet to Skelton (224). It is possible that while Skelton is absent from the court during 1503–12, Hawes takes his place as the favoured poet (225). Spearing considers Hawes’s work (252–60). Hawes is very serious in his belief that ‘great poets ... write obscure allegory’; he believes that Lydgate is a prime example of a poet working in allegory (252). The allegories of Hawes’s poems, however,
are not usually obscure; the meaning of PP is ‘nearly always perfectly clear, often ...
tediously so’ (253). The poem’s apparent privileging of an active over a contemplative life suggests a shift from a medieval to a renaissance outlook (253–4). The educational scheme it presents has also lost the medieval division of the clerk from the knight. Hawes is best in PP in ‘moments of romantic picturesqueness’ that genuinely recall Lydgate (254). The allegory of CL is obscure (255); Spearing discusses the poem’s allegory (255–60). Hawes seems to believe that the works of Chaucer, Gower, and Lydgate contain prophecies personally relevant to himself; this suggests that he may be mentally unbalanced (257). Hawes also seems to believe that some of his own poems include prophecies, of which he was not aware at the time of writing, about his future (259).


A close reading of CL, and the known historical facts, finds that it is not the obscure poem it has been thought to be. In fact, it is a ‘political allegory’ verified by the surviving historical evidence (3). The poem suggests that Hawes suffered, at the hands of the king’s enemies, because of his loyalty to the young Henry VIII. PP and EV also show Hawes’s Tudor leanings (14–18). Hawes’s placement of a political message within a love allegory shows him to be a more important renaissance artist than previously conceded (19–21).


References to Hawes are concentrated in Ch. 4, ‘Patronage and Pedigree: The Dream Visions of Stephen Hawes’ (56–72). Hawes’s poetry tells us that he suffered both from an unrequited love and the political intrigues against him. CL is intended to tell his lady of his love for her and, with her help, to regain his position in the king’s household (56). The lady in question is Mary Tudor. If one considers EV, PP, and CL in chronological order,
one can see that they become increasingly ‘more particular and personal ... more literal and actual.’ This progression tracks the growth of Hawes’s ‘infatuation with the princess’ (59). [The remainder of the chapter details the supporting evidence for the identification of Hawes’s beloved with Mary Tudor.]


In his early career Hawes exhibits the 15th-century concept of the poet and poetics, but as he progresses he moves to a ‘quite different’ position. His major poems are a link between the poetics of the Middle Ages and that of the Renaissance (133). Hawes shifts from seeing the poet’s role as ‘enluminer’ to that of ‘vates,’ and this can be observed in a comparison of *EV, PP* and *CL*. There are strong common elements between these poems and they seem to draw on a small group of sources (134). Ebin discusses the three poems (134–62). *EV* is the most straightforward of the three in its description of the path to salvation (134–5). *PP* seems similar, but is substantially different (135). Hawes stresses in *PP* that poetry leads to truth, preserves worldly fame, and forms the basis of all learning (139). *CL* addresses the apparent contradiction that poets are involved in the processes of the world despite their ‘recognition of its insubstantial nature’ (145). In doing this Hawes reworks the meaning of some of the critical terms he inherits from the 15th century, and adds new ones (145–7). Hawes moves beyond Lydgate’s view of a poet as one who ‘enlumines’ to a vision of the poet as a ‘prophet ... divinely inspired’ (147).


A discussion of Hawes’s influence on Spenser in an argument that it is by this influence that Spenser deliberately brings moral seriousness into the romance genre. Kaske
maintains that even those critics who concede that Hawes is an influence on Spenser mistakenly emphasize PP at the expense of EV in their analysis. The second half of EV is mined by Spenser in Bk 1 of the Faerie Queene for 'genre and purpose, ... some themes, characters, and episodes, and ... the whole outline of the quest.' Spenser greatly improves on the 'style and technique' of his source (122). Cullen, 1355, is wrong, as other critics are also, to underestimate the influence of EV on Spenser's poem (122–3). EV showed Spenser how to use the Italian romances as source material and yet write a morally acceptable work (123). The character of Spenser’s Una as a representation of a romance Sapience-figure derives principally from Sapience in EV; the allegorical representation of Una as the beloved comes from Clennes (127–8). Kaske considers further parallels between EV and Bk 1 of the Faerie Queene (128–36).


Wynkyn de Worde printed three editions of EV, two during Hawes’s lifetime, in 1509 and 1520, and a third in 1530. The posthumous edition reveals numerous editorial changes when compared with the first edition. It is not possible to be certain that all of these changes were first made in the third edition as only a fragment of the second edition has survived (57–8). Nevertheless, these changes may be made by de Worde in an effort to make the work more saleable once he is free of the constraints applied by the author (68). See Edwards on the relationship between Hawes and de Worde, 1363–8.


See Copeland, 1097.
Early in CL, Hawes links references to Jonah, Moses, and Charlemagne in a way that might seem strangely incongruous (177–8). A consideration of this linkage, including an examination of the literary background of its elements and their probable sources in Chaucer and Lydgate, suggests that Hawes does not see it as incongruous. He takes a schema, which in its original context has a ‘general and objective’ signification, and translates it, in ‘typical Renaissance fashion,’ to the specific and individual setting of his poem (187).

Hawes takes a different approach to celebrating the accession of Henry VIII from that chosen by John Skelton and Thomas More. In particular, Hawes is unusual in that he, as well as praising Henry VIII, pays tribute to the late Henry VII (65). This difference is partly explained by the fact that Hawes was dependent on royal patronage from Henry VII, and so it is in his interest to stress a ‘continuity from reign to reign’ on the accession of Henry VIII. More and Skelton had not had employment from Henry VII, and so they do not share Hawes’s pecuniary motivation (66). More and Skelton, however, may also have reasons of conscience that lead them to be ‘not only critical of the old king but also ambivalent towards the new’ (66).

PP is discussed in an argument about rhetoric as a tool of male power (255–9).

Brief references. Bale’s entry for Hawes might be based solely on the printed editions, and shows a lack of any detailed acquaintance with Hawes’s work (319–20).


As the power of the Tudor monarchy increases under Henry VII and Henry VIII, a tendency grows for all but the most favoured members of the court to be excluded from the business of government. Writers of the Tudor period often complain of their exclusion from the court (794). Hawes’s access to the inner chamber in which Henry VII ran his administration is unusual. *JM* is a product of Hawes’s ‘courtly position.’ Hawes’s other work is absorbed with notions of ‘secrecy and obscurity’ and their connection with the power of poetry and politics (795). The lover’s quests for the lady in Hawes’s poetry are ‘fantasies of aspirations towards intimacy.’ Hawes may be a victim of Henry VIII’s decision to staff the privy chamber with his ‘personal friends’ (796); if so, this would go some way to explain the allegory of *CL* (796–7).
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