



# Imagining the Author in Late Medieval England and France: The Transmission and Reception of Christine de Pizan's *Epistre au dieu d'Amours* and Thomas Hoccleve's *Letter of Cupid*

by Rory G. Critten

*Although it seems likely that Hoccleve's translation of Christine de Pizan's Epistre au dieu d'Amours was motivated by his desire to emulate her success as an author, this article shows that his Letter of Cupid played at best a limited role in establishing his literary reputation. While Christine could exercise a degree of control over the copying of her text, Hoccleve could not, and, as a result, his poem was circulated anonymously and often in damaged or truncated forms. This discrepancy is read as revelatory of differences between the modes of authorship available to Middle French and Middle English poets. Hoccleve's status as a victim of the literary culture in which he wrote is not unequivocal, however, since the indeterminate attitude toward women that characterizes the Letter may have been a quality with which he deliberately imbued his text: thanks to his firsthand knowledge of the London book trade, Hoccleve was well placed to appreciate the potential popularity of such a versatile poem. Since the Letter is extant in ten non-autograph copies, it appears that a measure of that popularity was realized, even if the personal fame that might have accompanied it remained elusive.*

Adonc me pris a forgier choses jolies, a mon  
commencement plus legieres, et tout ainsi  
comme l'ouvrier qui de plus en plus en son  
euvre se soubtille comme plus il la frequente,  
ainsi tousjours estudiant diverses matieres,

mon sens de plus en plus s'imbuoit de choses  
 estranges, amendant mon stille en plus grant  
 soubtilleté et plus haute matiere, depuis l'an  
 mil III<sup>c</sup>III<sup>xx</sup> et XIX que je commençay jusques  
 a cestui III<sup>c</sup> et V ouquel encore je ne cesse.

REVIEWING her poetic career in the *Livre de l'advison Cristine* (1405), Christine de Pizan (c. 1364–c. 1431) thus identifies 1399 as the year in which she began to write in earnest (111).<sup>1</sup> Internally dated to May Day 1399, the *Epistre au dieu d'Amours* is the earliest witness we have to this shift in direction. Presented as a letter written from the God of Love “a tous noz vrays loyaulx servans subgez” (6) (to all our true, loyal servant-subjects), the *Epistre* is a witty but trenchant attack on men who mistreat and misrepresent women.<sup>2</sup> The poem, which concludes with the mock banishment of all those who unfairly “blasment, diffament et acusent” (773) (blame, defame, and accuse) women, also contains a forceful rejection of Ovid's *Ars Amatoria* (365–78) and Christine's first recorded criticism of Jean de Meun's continuation of *Le Roman de la rose* (389–406). Weighing in at over 800 lines, the *Epistre* is the author's first long text. Although she had previously tackled the anti-feminism of her contemporaries in several of her early lyrics, it thus constitutes Christine's first sustained treatment of this issue and anticipates her subsequent contributions to the famous *Querelle de la rose*.<sup>3</sup> The popularity of the poem is suggested by Christine's decision to include the text in the three major versions of her collected works produced by her Parisian scriptorium and by its impact on poets such as Alain Chartier (c. 1385–1440) and Charles d'Orléans (1394–1465); indeed, the influence of the work may be said to stretch into the following century since Christine's innovative use of the vernacular letter form and the assem-

<sup>1</sup> Citations of the *Advison* are given by page number from *Le Livre de l'advison Cristine*, ed. Christine Reno and Liliane Dulac (Paris: Champion, 2001). Henceforth they will be noted parenthetically within the text. “Then I started to forge pretty things, lighter when I began, and, just as the craftsman hones his skill through practice, so by always studying diverse subjects, my mind became ever more imbued with rare things, improving my style, making it subtler and its subject grander, from 1399, when I began, until this year of 1405, in which still I have not stopped.” All translations from Middle French in this essay are my own.

<sup>2</sup> Citations of the *Epistre* are given by line number from *Poems of Cupid, God of Love: Christine de Pizan's Epistre au dieu d'Amours and Dit de la Rose*; Thomas Hoccleve's *The Letter of Cupid*, ed. and trans. Thelma S. Fenster and Mary Carpenter Erler (Leiden: Brill, 1990), 33–89. Henceforth they will be noted parenthetically within the text.

<sup>3</sup> See Fenster and Erler, *Poems of Cupid*, 3–9.

bly of gods section with which the text closes have been shown to anticipate later developments in French Humanist writing.<sup>4</sup>

By 1402 at the latest the *Epistre* had found its way to England. It was one of a number of Christine's poems that Henry IV received either via the estate of the Earl of Salisbury or from the poet herself. The poems Christine had been sending to Salisbury since his visit to France in 1398 passed to the crown upon the Earl's execution at Cirencester in 1400.<sup>5</sup> As she explains in the *Advison* (112–3), these texts met with Henry's approval and prompted him to invite her to join his court in England. Christine was apparently unwilling to accept the new king's offer, but she did want to ensure the prompt return to Paris of her son, Jean de Castel, who had been staying with Salisbury's family in England before the Earl's demise. This she eventually secured in late 1401 when, after sending further copies of her work to Henry, Jean was given leave to depart for France, ostensibly to conduct his mother back to England. Christine's success in this delicate affair provides a powerful reminder not only of her diplomatic skill but also of the perceived worth of her work in England.<sup>6</sup> Moreover, after the king had so publically flattered the poet's talents, her failure to appear on the English literary scene left a well-defined space for a native poet to fill. It is evidently in response to this state of affairs that in 1402 Thomas Hoccleve (c. 1367–1426) produced an abbreviated English version of the *Epistre*, a poem that editors from Furnivall onwards have called *The Letter of Cupid*.<sup>7</sup>

<sup>4</sup> See Charity Cannon Willard, "A New Look at Christine de Pizan's *Epistre au dieu d'Amours*," in *Seconda miscellanea di studi e ricerche sul quattrocento francese*, ed. Jonathan Beck and Gianni Mombello (Chambéry-Torino: Centre d'études franco-italien, 1981), 71–92.

<sup>5</sup> My account of Christine's dealings with Salisbury and the English court at this time draws on J. C. Laidlaw, "Christine de Pizan, The Earl of Salisbury and Henry IV," *French Studies* 36 (1982): 129–43.

<sup>6</sup> From Christine's account of this episode it appears that she used her works as bargaining chips in her negotiations with Henry: "Je . . . dissimulay tant que mon dit filz peusse avoir, disant grant mercis et que bien a son commandement estoie. Et a brief parler, tant fis a grant peine et par le moien de mes livres que congié ot mon dit filz de me venir querir par de ça pour mener la, qui encore n'y vois" (*Advison*, 113, emphasis mine) (I kept my thoughts to myself until I could have my aforementioned son, saying that I was very flattered and that I was truly at his command. And, to cut a long story short, by virtue of great persistence and by means of my books I ensured that my aforementioned son was given leave to come looking for me here to take me back there, where still I have not been).

<sup>7</sup> See *Hoccleve's Works: The Minor Poems*, ed. Frederick J. Furnivall and I. Gollancz, rev. ed. Jerome Mitchell and A. I. Doyle (1892–1925; rev. ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1970), 72. The poem is given a variety of English, French, and Latin titles in the extant manuscripts, reflecting the medial position it occupies between late medieval England's literary languages. The non-autograph copies tend to prefer a Latin title similar to that

Like the *Epistre*, Hoccleve's *Letter* marks an important moment in its author's career. It is the English poet's earliest datable text, and it counts among the first in a series of works in which the poet seeks to establish himself as a writer who might be supported by the new Lancastrian regime.<sup>8</sup> Hoccleve's construction of his authorial identity in this poem has been analyzed most extensively by Ethan Knapp, who devotes the second chapter of his *Bureaucratic Muse* to a consideration of the *Letter*.<sup>9</sup> Reviewing late medieval attitudes to literary translation, Knapp argues that Englishing Christine offered Hoccleve an important opportunity both to "make an instant claim to poetic authority" and to associate himself with the latest fashions from Parisian writing circles.<sup>10</sup> What is more, Knapp goes on to demonstrate, Christine provided a model after which Hoccleve could construct his own differently gendered authorial identity: as a member of the first generation of married lay clerks, he suggests, Hoccleve faced a similar set of problems to those Christine encountered as a woman writer.<sup>11</sup> Although Knapp is sensitive to a range of differences in tone and content between the *Epistre* and the *Letter*—he concludes, for instance, that Hoccleve is more skeptical than Christine regarding the integrity of the textual and gender archetypes on which both authors draw—the question of reception is left largely untouched in his account. This is a topic that deserves closer attention, I would like to suggest, for the divergence between the afterlives of these

---

given in Tanner 346: "Incipit Littera Cupidinis dei Amoris directa Subditis suis Amatoribus" (f. 41r). Bodley 638 gives an English title, however, calling the text "The Boke of Cupide god of Loue" (f. 11v). Fairfax 16 provides the poem with a Latin incipit and explicit (ff. 40r, 47r) but gives the work an English running title and an English entry in its table of contents (f. 2r). Hoccleve himself entitles the poem, "Lepistre de Cupide," in the autograph copy of the text preserved in Huntington HM 744 (f. 39v), but in Durham, University Library MS Cosin V. iii. 9, which transmits the autograph copy of his *Series*, Hoccleve has his friend refer to "thepistle of Cupyde" at the point in the second section of this work where the poem is discussed (f. 24v). Full citations of the manuscripts containing the *Letter* are given below. As no one medieval title dominates in the early transmission of Hoccleve's text I have opted to retain Furnivall's easily recognizable modernization of the poem's English title.

<sup>8</sup> Three contrasting perspectives on Hoccleve's complicated relationship with the Lancastrian party are offered in John M. Bowers, "Thomas Hoccleve and the Politics of Tradition," *The Chaucer Review* 36 (2002): 352–69; Lee Patterson, "'What is me?': Self and Society in the Poetry of Thomas Hoccleve," *Studies in the Age of Chaucer* 23 (2001): 437–70; and Derek Pearsall, "Hoccleve's *Regement of Princes*: The Poetics of Royal Self-Representation," *Speculum* 69 (1994): 386–410.

<sup>9</sup> Knapp, *The Bureaucratic Muse: Thomas Hoccleve and the Literature of Late Medieval England* (University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2001), 45–75.

<sup>10</sup> *Ibid.*, 53–54.

<sup>11</sup> *Ibid.*, 71.

poems is particularly stark. While the artistic and political successes of Christine's text have already been pointed to, consideration of the extant manuscripts of the *Letter* reveals that any claims the English author made to poetic authority in this text most likely fell on deaf ears. The primary purpose of my essay is to examine why this should be the case.<sup>12</sup>

Commentary on the *Letter* has until now focused almost solely on the copy of the poem transmitted in the autograph collection of Hoccleve's verse that is now part of San Marino CA, Huntington Library MS HM 744. Editorial work on Hoccleve's texts has shown, however, that the autograph manuscripts produced by the poet toward the end of his life had a limited effect on the subsequent transmission of his texts: both J. A. Burrow and Roger Ellis trace the extant non-autograph copies of the Hocclevean works they edit to earlier, now lost, authorial copies of his poems not to the surviving autographs.<sup>13</sup> In order to obtain

<sup>12</sup> The question has been touched upon by Bowers, who suggests that the *Letter* may have become unpopular with the Lancastrians soon after its composition as the "French courtliness that [Hoccleve] sought to imitate quickly came to resemble the francophile enthusiasms of the Ricardian court during the 1390s" ("The Politics of Tradition," 358). While Hoccleve's supposed francophilia may have played some role in blocking his installment as a Lancastrian laureate, works of French literature remained among those texts most frequently copied and sought after throughout the fifteenth and into the early sixteenth centuries (see, among other studies, Elizabeth Armstrong, "English Purchases of Printed Books from the Continent, 1465–1526," *English Historical Review* 94 [1979]: 268–90; and M. J. Barber, "The Books and Patronage of a Fifteenth-Century Prince," *Book Collector* 12 [1963]: 308–15). Indeed, Hoccleve's *Letter* is extant in some eleven manuscripts copied at a variety of locations, ostensibly making it one of the poet's most popular works. It thus seems that we will have to look beyond putative Lancastrian francophobia in order to explain the failure of the *Letter* to contribute to an enhancement of Hoccleve's reputation as an author. Finally, while in his *Series* Hoccleve worries about the damage done to his reputation by his apparent descent into madness in the 1410s, this does not appear to have curtailed the circulation of his self-ascribed *Regiment of Princes* (extant in over forty manuscripts). It thus seems reasonable to assume that popular knowledge of the poet's mental illness is unlikely to have had a negative impact on the reception of the *Letter*.

<sup>13</sup> See "My Compleinte" and *Other Poems*, ed. Roger Ellis (Exeter: Exeter University Press, 2001), 10–18; and *Thomas Hoccleve's Complaint and Dialogue*, ed. J. A. Burrow (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999), xviii–xxviii. Linne R. Mooney likewise argues that the manuscript she has recently identified as an autograph of Hoccleve's *Regiment of Princes*, London, British Library MS Royal 17 D. xviii, is a revised authorial copy of a previously released version of the *Regiment*. See Mooney, "A Holograph Copy of Hoccleve's *Regiment of Princes*," *Studies in the Age of Chaucer* 33 (2011): 280–86. For reference, then, the autograph manuscripts of Hoccleve's poetry are currently thought to be Durham, University Library MS Cosin V iii. 9 (contains Hoccleve's *Series*), San Marino, CA, Huntington Library MSS 111 and 744 (contain copies of all Hoccleve's extant shorter verses), and the recently discovered autograph of the *Regiment*, London, British Library MS Royal 17 D. xviii. These manuscripts have recently received a thorough and illuminating reassessment, in David Watt, *The Making of Thomas Hoccleve's Series* (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2013).

the clearest picture of the form in which Hoccleve's early readers are most likely to have encountered the *Letter* we must thus look to the non-autograph versions of the work. In what follows I shall use the evidence provided by these copies of Hoccleve's poem and the manuscripts that contain them in order to reconstruct this encounter insofar as is possible. Critics of the *Letter* have traditionally referred to the *Epistre* with a view to establishing either the relative quality of the works<sup>14</sup> or the extent to which Hoccleve's poem remains true to Christine's proto-feminist agenda.<sup>15</sup> By contrast, and as a complement to Knapp's study, I propose a comparison of the late medieval and early modern reception histories of these poems with a view to revealing a crucial difference between the modes of vernacular authorship available to two contemporaneous writers of French and English poetry: whereas Christine was able to control the transmission of her text to a considerable degree, Hoccleve was not; the *Letter* was copied by the poet's scribes and readers in response to their own interests and priorities and was thus subject to quite radical processes of rearrangement and truncation. In so proceeding, I temporarily bracket off points of contrast between the *Letter* and the *Epistre* that are evident on the level of the line. Central to my initial argument is the assumption that these works have more in common than the expectations aroused by the languages in which they are composed. A more profound understanding of the divergent literary and material contexts in which these texts were reproduced, trans-

<sup>14</sup> John V. Fleming considers the *Letter* to be a more scholarly version of the *Epistre*, for instance, whereas Glenda K. McLeod argues that Hoccleve's translation-adaptation is a naïve simplification of Christine's poem. See Fleming, "Hoccleve's 'Letter of Cupid' and the 'quarrel' over the 'Roman de la Rose,'" *Medium Ævum* 40 (1971): 21–40; and McLeod, "A Case of Faux Semblans: *L'Epistre au dieu d'Amours* and *The Letter of Cupid*," in *The Reception of Christine de Pizan from the Fifteenth Through the Nineteenth Centuries: Visitors to the City*, ed. Glenda K. McLeod (Lewiston, NY: Edwin Mellen, 1991), 11–24.

<sup>15</sup> Jerome Mitchell holds that the *Letter* "is at least as feminist in outlook as its French source," whereas Diane Bornstein writes that Hoccleve "undermined the purpose of the *Epistre*," making the text "a parody of feminism rather than a judicious, courtly defense of women." See Mitchell, *Thomas Hoccleve: A Study in Early Fifteenth-Century English Poetic* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1968), 53; and Bornstein, "Anti-Feminism in Thomas Hoccleve's Translation of Christine de Pizan's *Epistre au dieu d'Amours*," *English Language Notes* 19 (1981): 14. Ellis and Dhira Mahoney have more recently maintained that the proto-feminism of Christine's text survives in Hoccleve's version, albeit in a more diluted form. See Roger Ellis, "Chaucer, Christine de Pizan, and Hoccleve: *The Letter of Cupid*," in *Essays on Thomas Hoccleve*, ed. Catherine Batt (Turnhout: Brepols, 1996), 29–54; and Dhira B. Mahoney, "Middle English Regenderings of Christine de Pizan," in *The Medieval Opus: Imitation, Rewriting, and Transmission in the French Tradition*, ed. Douglas Kelly (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1996), 405–27. One explanation for these differences of opinion may be that, as we shall see, the changes Hoccleve makes to Christine's text assume different meanings in different reading contexts.

mitted, and read will allow us better to gauge Hoccleve's achievement in the *Letter* and in his work more generally. It is thus to a consideration of the non-autograph manuscripts of this poem that I wish now to turn.

Non-autograph copies of *The Letter of Cupid* are preserved in eight fifteenth-century manuscripts. These are Oxford, Bodleian Library MSS Arch. Selden. B. 24, Bodley 638, Digby 181, Fairfax 16, and Tanner 346; Durham, University Library MS Cosin V. ii. 13; Cambridge, University Library MS Ff. i. 6 (the Findern Manuscript), and a manuscript executed by John Shirley: Cambridge, Trinity College MS R. 3. 20. Sixteenth-century copies of the poem are preserved in London, British Library MS Additional 17492 (the Devonshire Manuscript) and Edinburgh, National Library of Scotland Advocates MS 1. 1. 6 (the Bannatyne Manuscript). Two of these manuscripts transmit imperfect copies of the *Letter*: Digby 181 is missing the opening seventy lines of the poem because its first folio has become detached,<sup>16</sup> and the copy of the text in the Findern Manuscript lacks twenty stanzas at its close.<sup>17</sup> The Devonshire Manuscript contains four stanzas from the *Letter* that were copied into the end of the codex alongside a selection of other verses extracted from a handful of popular Middle English texts. As Burrow notes, this transmission history makes *The Letter of Cupid* one of Hoccleve's most widely copied texts,<sup>18</sup> and at first glance it may seem that the poet's decision to produce an English version of Christine's work did indeed help him to bolster his reputation as an author as Knapp argues that he desired it to do. A closer look at the manuscripts reveals, however, that the readers represented by these versions of the *Letter* do not appear to have been interested in or even aware of Hoccleve's authorship of the work: only Shirley's Trinity College MS R. 3. 20 attributes the poem to its author, "Thomas Occlue of þoffice of þe priue seel" (p. 116), calling the *Letter* "A Gode Parable made by Occlue" in the running title under which it presents the text.<sup>19</sup> In itself this dearth of attributions is not

<sup>16</sup> For a detailed description of Digby 181, see Daniel Moser, "A New Collation for Bodleian Digby MS 181," *Papers of the Bibliographical Society of America* 82 (1988): 604–11.

<sup>17</sup> Henry Bradshaw's nineteenth-century collation of the Findern manuscript assumes that the copy of Hoccleve's poem it contains was once complete and that a gathering of four leaves containing its closing stanzas has been lost. Richard Beadle and A. E. B. Owen, however, find no material evidence to support the argument that a quire has been lost and conclude that the poem may never have been copied into the codex in full. See Beadle and Owen, *The Findern Manuscript: Cambridge University Library MS. Ff.i.6* (London: Scolar Press, 1977), ix.

<sup>18</sup> See J. A. Burrow, *Thomas Hoccleve* (Aldershot: Variorum, 1994), 13. Burrow notes that the poem also appears once to have been contained in Warminster, Longleat House MS 258.

<sup>19</sup> Fairfax 16 contains Stowe's later attribution of its text of the *Letter* to Hoccleve (ff. 2r,



surprising, since the Chaucerian and Lydgatean pieces that are regularly anthologized alongside the *Letter* are also often presented without mention of their authorship. Indeed, three of the manuscripts that transmit Hoccleve's poem—MSS Bodley 638, Cosin V. ii. 13, and Tanner 346—contain no original attributions at all. In 1532, however, William Thynne's inclusion of the *Letter* in his *Workes of Geffray Chaucer* began a tradition of false ascription that had a demonstrable influence on the subsequent manuscript transmission of the *Letter* and would remain strong into the eighteenth century.<sup>20</sup>

Thynne's motives in compiling his 1532 *Chaucer* have been hotly debated, and it remains unclear whether he intended to produce a complete and exclusive works of the author or a printed book that reflected the content of the manuscript miscellanies popular during the previous century.<sup>21</sup> Kathleen A. Forni has thus proposed that we might adopt a compromise position between these two polarized interpretations of the book; she suggests that Thynne's edition should be understood as a "transitional" project that anticipates the exclusivity of modern collections of authors' works without aiming to attain this completely.<sup>22</sup> It

---

40r, and 47r). A modern hand attributes the poem to "Chaucer or Occlve" in the Findern Manuscript (f. 71r).

<sup>20</sup> Writing in 1568, Bannatyne attributes the poem to "Chauseir" (f. 274v). A close relationship has been perceived between the Bannatyne text of the *Letter* and the version included in Thynne's *Chaucer*, but Bannatyne's copy of the poem probably did not descend from this version directly (see Ellis, "My Compleinte," 275). For the suggestion that the medieval extracts in the Devonshire Manuscript were copied from an edition of Thynne's collection, see Richard C. Harrier, "A Printed Source for the Devonshire Manuscript," *Review of English Studies* 11 (1960): 54. The sticking power of Thynne's association of the *Letter* with Chaucer's oeuvre is demonstrated in George Sewell's 1718 preface to his modernization of the poem, in which Sewell presents the original as Chaucer's, rejecting claims current since Stowe's time that it may have been written by Hoccleve (reproduced in Fenster and Erler, *Poems of Cupid*, 222–23).

<sup>21</sup> Walter W. Skeat, for instance, insisted that Thynne's intentions were clearly revealed in the full title he gave to his book—*The Workes of Geffray Chaucer newly printed, with dyuers workes which were neuer in print before, &c.*—where he took Thynne's "dyuers workes" to mean "dyuers workes [of various authors] which were neuer in print before." Francis W. Bonner, on the other hand, has suggested that Thynne's intention was to provide a complete *Works of Chaucer* in the modern sense but that he was misled by inaccurate patterns of attribution in the manuscripts available to him. R. F. Yeager likewise asserts that Thynne's volume "seems a product of choice, not chance," arguing that the texts Thynne presents as Chaucer's reflect consistently the editor's conception of the author as one who is "amorous, gentle, naïve, and without irony." See Skeat, *Chaucerian and Other Pieces* (Oxford, 1897), ix; Bonner, "The Genesis of the Chaucer Apocrypha," *Studies in Philology* 48 (1951): 461–81; and Yeager, "Literary Theory at the Close of the Middle Ages: William Caxton and William Thynne," *Studies in the Age of Chaucer* 6 (1984): 163–64.

<sup>22</sup> See Forni, *The Chaucerian Apocrypha: A Counterfeit Canon* (Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 2001), 41–43.

is easy to understand how *The Letter of Cupid* could have fallen under the umbrella of Chaucerian authorship in the editorial climate Forni describes. As Burrow points out, Hoccleve associates himself with Chaucer both implicitly, by adopting the rhyme royal verse form perfected by his predecessor, and explicitly, by having his Cupid refer to "our legende of martirs" (316), thereby clearly aligning his narrator with Chaucer's God of Love in *The Legend of Good Women*.<sup>23</sup> In the redaction of his *Letter*, Hoccleve thus draws on models of vernacular authorship provided by Chaucer as well as by Christine. Modern readers typically interpret the incorporation of intertextual allusions such as these as evidence of a poet's skillful attempts secure himself a place in the literary tradition to which he would belong. In Hoccleve's case, however, the imitation of Chaucer staged in the *Letter* appears perhaps to have been too good, for the name of the authority he invokes so convincingly in his poem eventually comes to displace his own in the history of its transmission.

Further evidence of Hoccleve's failure to access his reader in the terms he sets out in his personal copy of the *Letter* is provided by the non-autograph scribes' treatment of the text itself. Only two of the ten extant non-autograph copies of the poem present the stanzas in the order they are given in the autograph, and six of them disrupt the order of the poem significantly. The Bodley, Digby, Durham, Findern, and Tanner texts rearrange the poem's stanzas identically in blocks of twenty and ten. Numbering the stanzas after the order given in the autograph copy, these manuscripts present the poem in the following order: stanzas 1-19, 30-39, 50-59, 20-29, 40-49, and 60-68 (the Durham manuscript lacks 1-10; Findern lacks stanzas 29, 40-49, and 60-68). This prompts Ellis to suggest that the archetype shared by these copies

had ten stanzas per leaf, with a blank final leaf, and swapped the third and fourth bifolia of the quire of eight leaves on which the text was copied (the fourth bifolium must have been reversed).<sup>24</sup>

Fairfax 16, the sixth manuscript in this group, presents a particularly idiosyncratic rearrangement of the poem (stanzas 1-6, 17-19, 30-36, 7-16, 57-59, 20-26, 37-39, 50-56, 27-29, 40-49, 60, 63-64, 61-62, and 65-68). Ellis has demonstrated, however, that the ordering of the poem it presents is the result of a further complication in the transmission of

<sup>23</sup> See Burrow, *Thomas Hoccleve*, 13. Citations of the autograph copy of the *Letter* are given by line number from Ellis, "My Compleinte," 93-111.

<sup>24</sup> Ellis, "My Compleinte," 275.

the archetype used by the five manuscripts already mentioned and not, as he had previously argued, a scribal reinterpretation of the poem.<sup>25</sup>

Because it disrupts the flow of the argument and results in at least one clear break in grammatical sense, the reorganization of the text in all six of these copies can represent neither an authorial arrangement of the work prior to the composition of the autograph nor a scribal interpretation of Hoccleve's text (the Fairfax copy of the poem contains clear breaks in sense at its juxtaposition of autograph stanzas 6 and 17, 16 and 57, 26 and 37, and 49 and 60. One clear break in sense occurs in the other five manuscripts in this group, which also juxtapose autograph stanzas 49 and 60). The fact that these ruptures should have apparently passed unnoticed by the poem's scribes is noteworthy, particularly in manuscripts such as Bodley 638, whose scribe—Lyty or Lity, as he signs himself—makes careful corrective marks next to his texts when he discovers that he has copied individual lines or whole stanzas in the wrong order.<sup>26</sup> The compromising effect this jumbling of stanzas has on a more attentive reader's enjoyment of the poem is clear.<sup>27</sup> Finally, the autograph text is scarcely better represented in the three manuscripts that present the *Letter* in an order approximating more closely that found in MS HM 744. These are MSS Arch. Selden. B. 24 and Trinity College R. 3. 20, which present the poem in an identical order to that found in the autograph, and the Bannatyne Manuscript, which differs from Hoccleve's personal copy only in its swapping of autograph stanzas 61–62 and 63–64. As Ellis notes, on the level of the line, these manuscripts often fall further from Hoccleve's final version of the *Letter* than do the six manuscripts that disorder the text. Arch. Selden. B. 24 flattens out the sowing metaphor given in the autograph and the six disordered copies of the poem in lines 10–11, swaps "deynous or proud" at autograph line 150 with "sly qweynte and fals" at autograph line 152, and gives "but 3it þe fend that ageyn stoden wold" where the autograph has "And nad the feend been no more she wolde" at line 357. Likewise, Trinity College MS

<sup>25</sup> *Ibid.*, 275. For the earlier argument, see Ellis, "Chaucer, Christine de Pizan," 43.

<sup>26</sup> See, for example, Lity's rubricated corrections to his disordered copying of *Anelida and Arcite* on ff. 10v–11r of Bodley 638. He corrects the copying of lines out of order elsewhere in this book on ff. 6r, 54r, 75v, 82r, and 127r.

<sup>27</sup> While there is only one clear break in grammatical sense in the Tanner, Bodley, Digby, Durham, and Findern copies of the poem, the flow of the work is nevertheless seriously disrupted in the version of the text preserved in these manuscripts. For example, the passage in which Cupid first discusses the matter of anti-feminism in literature (autograph stanzas 28–33) is broken up in these manuscripts, the stanzas that introduce the topic (autograph 28–29) being positioned ten stanzas after the discussion of Ovid's *Remedia Amoris* in these copies (autograph stanzas 30–33).

R. 3. 20 has “who þat hem trusteþe ofte gyled shal he be” for the autograph’s line 111, “Whoso hem trustith hangid moot he be,” and Bannatyne, as well as omitting autograph line 397, has “bewar wemen of thair fikilnesse,” “is blissit of God to quhon sone belongith,” and “thou luver trew thow madin mansueit” for “Yee strah do foorth take noon heuynesse,” “Next God the best freend is þat to man longith,” and “Thy martirdom ne may we nat foryete” (autograph lines 327, 412, and 423).<sup>28</sup>

The modern reader who turns to the non-holograph copies of the *Letter* hoping to find evidence of the poem’s contribution to a growing sense of its author’s fame is thus afforded little to go on. The text’s survival in ten non-autograph manuscripts indicates that it must have held some attraction for late medieval readers, however, and consideration of the works alongside which it frequently appears in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries indicates that this was a function not of Hoccleve’s negotiation of his own poetic authority but of his poem’s broader thematic preoccupations with female fidelity and the demise of courtliness. Indeed, by setting the *Letter* alongside such texts as Chaucer’s *Troilus* (in Arch. Selden. B. 24, Cosin V. ii. 13, and Digby 181), Sir Richard Roos’s version of *La Belle dame sans merci* (in Fairfax 16 and the Findern Manuscript) and the *Legend of Good Women* (in Arch. Selden. B. 24, Tanner 346, Fairfax 16, and Bodley 638), the compilers of the codices containing the non-autograph copies of the poem establish a complex set of intertextual dialogues, providing readers with a focus of interest that is an attractive alternative to the questions of poetic authority with which Hoccleve seems particularly to have been preoccupied in his redaction of the work. One possible explanation for the relatively broad transmission of the *Letter* may be its capacity to participate in a particularly wide variety of such textual conversations; for while late medieval readers appear to have valued Hoccleve’s poem for the contribution it makes to contemporary debates regarding the status and treatment of women, codicological evidence suggests that compilers disagreed regarding the attitude it manifests toward these issues. The sense Bannatyne attributes to the poem seems clear from his decision to include the *Letter* under the general heading of “ballatis of the prayiss of wemen and to *the reproche* of vicious men” (f. 268v); it is presented here between poems that warn women against “menis subtell slicht” (f. 269r) and in which broken necks “or sum evill deth” are wished upon all those who speak ill of women (f. 275r). In Digby 181, however, the same quire in

<sup>28</sup> See Ellis, “*My Compleinte*,” 275 (editorial punctuation omitted).

which Hoccleve's text is anthologized also includes two anti-feminist pieces now attributed to Lydgate that are given the descriptive titles *The Pain and Sorrow of Evil Marriage* and *Examples Against Women* by the poet's modern editor.<sup>29</sup> Although manuscript context cannot be considered to determine the reception of any given poem absolutely, it is clear that the two starkly different reading contexts provided for the *Letter* in these manuscripts throw different aspects of the poem into relief. It would seem, then, that one reason for the relative popularity of the *Letter* lies in its semantic availability, a quality that allows it to bear at least two broadly divergent patterns of emphasis.

Two particularly interesting responses to the indeterminacy of the *Letter* are found in the Findern and Devonshire manuscripts. Both these codices include significant contributions by female scribes and manifest an interest in the conduct and representation of relationships between men and women that is at once keener and less polarizing than that evidenced in the Bannatyne Manuscript and Digby 181. Writing on the Findern anthology, for instance, Kara A. Doyle highlights the way in which the presentation of the *Letter* in combination with Roos's version of *La Belle dame sans merci* serves to encourage the adoption of a skeptical attitude not only toward the discourse of *fin' amors* but also toward clerical misogyny; readers of the Findern Manuscript, Doyle suggests, were capable of detecting and appreciating a ludic element in both these texts.<sup>30</sup> This spirit of critical detachment also seems to have been shared by the contributors to the Devonshire Manuscript. As Elizabeth Heale's study of this codex has shown, the contributors to the Devonshire book often engaged in witty exchanges of notes and verses in which the male perspective on the experience of love offered here in the poems of Thomas Wyatt and his contemporaries became the object of playful speculation.<sup>31</sup> Many of these additions to the codex can be attributed to the book's identified female scribes, but this is not always so, and the sympathetic interest in the female experience of love evident in the annotated passages Heale analyzes appears to have been shared by several of Devonshire's male contributors. This is the case in ff. 89v–92r of the manuscript, which are written in the hand of Thomas Howard, the

<sup>29</sup> *The Minor Poems of John Lydgate*, ed. Henry Noble MacCracken, 2 vols. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1911–1934), 2:456–60 and 442–45.

<sup>30</sup> See Doyle, "Thisbe Out of Context: Chaucer's Female Readers and the Findern Manuscript," *Chaucer Review* 40 (2006): 243–44.

<sup>31</sup> See Heale, "Women and the Courtly Love Lyric: The Devonshire MS (BL Additional 17492)," *Modern Language Review* 90 (1995): 269–313.

ill-fated lover of Henry VIII's niece, Margaret Douglas.<sup>32</sup> These folios contain a selection of extracts from popular Middle English works such as *Troilus and Criseyde*, *Anelida and Arcite*, and Roos's *Belle dame* that were ostensibly collected in order to present a positive image of women in love. Among the Devonshire extracts, some of which Howard alters in order to serve his purpose, stanzas 50, 10, 11, and 44 from Hoccleve's *Letter* are included.<sup>33</sup>

In his reduction of the *Letter* to four stanzas sympathetic to women, Howard's use of Hoccleve's poem represents an extreme example of the interpretative modes of anthologization at work in the manuscripts previously mentioned. Such an approach to the poem demonstrates Howard's conviction that the *Letter* still had something to say more than one hundred years after its composition and this, importantly, at the same time as poets such as Wyatt were making their name. Nevertheless, if the copying of the poem into the Devonshire Manuscript proves that interest in Hoccleve's text endured well into the sixteenth century, this extractor's use of the work also marks a late stage in the process whereby the complex argument of the original poem is broken down and the text becomes entirely detached from its author. Of course, the *Letter of Cupid* is far from being the only non-Chaucerian work to be absorbed by the Chaucer corpus as this begins to take shape over the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries; nor is it the only late medieval poem to have been mangled and abbreviated in transmission. It is potentially telling, however, that Hoccleve's poem does not avoid this fate in spite of the careful intertextual negotiations by means of which the poet attempts to define a space within which his authorial voice might speak and be heard. It remains unclear what immediate gain Hoccleve might have achieved from the *Letter*. Perhaps it secured him a hearing at court on which he could later capitalize when he presented his *Regiment of Princes* to Henry V, then still Prince of Wales, sometime between late 1410 and Henry's accession on 9 April 1413. By the middle of the fifteenth century, however, it appears that Hoccleve's authorship of the poem had ceased to be of relevance to its readers: in all the manuscripts and printed copies produced after this point the poem is either unattributed or misattributed to Chaucer. This prompts the question: why does

<sup>32</sup> I follow the identification of the hands in the manuscript given in Helen Baron, "Mary (Howard) Fitzroy's Hand in the Devonshire Manuscript," *Review of English Studies* 45 (1994): 318–35.

<sup>33</sup> On these extracts, see Ethel Seaton, "'The Devonshire Manuscript' and Its Medieval Fragments," *Review of English Studies* 7 (1956): 55–56.

Christine's version of this poem succeed in boosting its author's reputation in both the short and the longer term where Hoccleve's poem appears to fail? The answer that I wish to propose here breaks down into two parts and has less to do with potential differences between the content or quality of the poems than with the way in which the works were transmitted and the divergent modes of reading engaged by the languages in which they were written.

With reference to the first of these points, it may be noted that, unlike Hoccleve, Christine famously exercised a considerable degree of control over the transmission of her poetry throughout the most productive period of her career. As well as being the year in which the poet wrote the *Epistre*, 1399 also marked the point at which Christine began to compile her *Livre de Cristine*. The first version of this collection survives in three copies: Paris, Bibliothèque nationale MSS fr. 604 and fr. 12779, and Chantilly, Bibliothèque du Château MSS 492–93 (now bound separately, but originally contained in one volume). It brings together works written by the poet before 1402, the completion date given for the collection in two of the manuscripts, and, in the case of the Chantilly anthology, a selection of texts composed and added subsequently.<sup>34</sup> Christine copied MS fr. 12779 and the Chantilly book in her own hand, and MS fr. 604 is a close copy of the Chantilly codex, as analysis of the layout of two books and the textual variants they share demonstrates.<sup>35</sup> The *Epistre* is included in all three of these presentation manuscripts and in the subsequent expanded versions of the *Livre* that Christine copied or had copied in 1406–8 for the Duke of Orleans (now bound separately as Paris, Bibliothèque nationale MSS fr. 835, 606, 836, 605, and 607) and in 1413–14 for the French queen, Isabeau of Bavaria (now London, British Library MS Harley 4431). As J. C. Laidlaw's studies of these codices have shown, each time she reissued her *Livre*,

<sup>34</sup> Laidlaw suggests that at one time MS fr. 604 also included the five extra texts added to the Chantilly manuscript in the period 1402–5. MS fr. 12779 also contains one later work, the *Dit de la Pastoure* (1403), which was added after the completion of the main part of the *Livre*. See J. C. Laidlaw, "Christine de Pizan: An Author's Progress," *Modern Language Review* 78 (1983): 534.

<sup>35</sup> In 1980 Gilbert Ouy and Christine Reno identified the principal scribe of fr. 12779 as Christine herself. See Ouy and Reno, "Identification des autographes de Christine de Pizan," *Scriptorium* 34 (1980): 221–38. In their more recent summary of the manuscript situation, Ouy and Reno add the Chantilly anthology to the corpus of presentation copies in which the poet is thought to have been her own scribe. It is their opinion that the Chantilly manuscripts originally constituted one volume and that the volume served as the exemplar for MS fr. 604. See Gilbert Ouy, Christine Reno, and Inès Villela-Petit, *Album Christine de Pizan* (Turnhout: Brepols, 2012), 176 and 200.

Christine took the opportunity to reedit her texts and improve the manner of their presentation.<sup>36</sup> In the case of the *Epistre*, for example, this meant the poet's addition of an anagram of her name, Creintis, at the close of the text prepared for the second version of the book.<sup>37</sup> Christine was thus able to maintain control over the form in which her poem was produced throughout her lifetime, and, what is more, the authoritative copies of the texts she left in the successive editions of the *Livre* provide a clear point of reference for copies of her work thought not to have been produced under her direct supervision. Of the two surviving unauthorized manuscripts containing the *Epistre*, the closeness of the relationship between the texts preserved in MS fr. 640 and the Chantilly anthology has already been noted; despite its obvious deficiencies, the copy of the poem contained in London, Westminster Abbey MS 21 appears likewise to be derived from a version of the text that is "very like" the one preserved in MS Harley 4431.<sup>38</sup>

Christine's close involvement in the production of copies of her work situates her in a tradition of self-publication in France that stretches back at least as far as the single-author codices produced by Guillaume de Machault (c. 1300–1377) and Jean Froissart (c. 1377–c. 1405),<sup>39</sup> and Hoccleve's decision to produce autograph copies of his works toward the end of his life perhaps indicates a desire to adapt this model of authorial conduct to an English context.<sup>40</sup> It is possible, in any case, that by the later 1420s Hoccleve was aware that misordered copies of his verses were circulating and that he planned to issue authorized copies of his texts at this point in his career in the hope of ensuring the absence of such errors from future reproductions.<sup>41</sup> As I have intimated, however,

<sup>36</sup> See Laidlaw, "An Author's Progress," and "Christine de Pizan: A Publisher's Progress," *Modern Language Review* 82 (1987): 35–75.

<sup>37</sup> See Fenster and Erler, *Letters of Cupid*, 79.

<sup>38</sup> *Ibid.*, 25.

<sup>39</sup> On these codices and their antecedents, see Silvia Huot, *From Song to Book: The Poetics of Writing in Old French Lyric and Lyrical Narrative Poetry* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1987), especially 211–337.

<sup>40</sup> J. A. Burrow has argued that, like Chaucer, Hoccleve was familiar with the poetry of his French contemporaries. He may also have been aware of their practices of self-publication. See Burrow, "Hoccleve and the Middle French Poets," in *The Long Fifteenth Century: Essays for Douglas Gray*, ed. Helen Cooper and Sally Mapstone (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997), 35–49.

<sup>41</sup> Compare Mooney, who notes that "Hoccleve copied out a complete set of his writings towards the end of his life, presumably to preserve an accurate series of texts as exemplars for posterity," in "Vernacular Literary Manuscripts and their Scribes," in *The Production of Books in England 1350–1500*, ed. Alexandra Gillespie and Daniel Wakelin (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011), 199. It is perhaps worth noting that Hoc-



the reception of the autographs is difficult to gauge. Their influence on the textual tradition of Hoccleve's works is negligible and, moreover, their integrity does not appear to have been respected. If the two Huntington manuscripts were intended to constitute an authorized collection of Hoccleve's minor works, then they became separated early in their history.<sup>42</sup> Indeed, it is questionable whether Huntington MSS HM 111 and HM 744 would have been identified as single-author codices at all, together or in isolation. As Burrow asserts, the four citations of Hoccleve's name scattered across these two books would probably not have provided sufficient cause for a fifteenth-century reader to attribute all of the texts in these anthologies to him.<sup>43</sup> The idea that an English-language author could stand as the guarantor of both the textual and codicological integrity of his book had yet to be established, and the highly innovative nature of Hoccleve's autograph project must therefore be acknowledged.<sup>44</sup> In the final instance, however, it appears that late medieval readers' unfamiliarity with the kind of Middle English books Hoccleve was engaged in producing at the end of his career may have led to their sidelining in the textual tradition of his works.

Christine and Hoccleve wrote for audiences that came to the books they read with significantly different expectations. In fifteenth-century England, where their audiences overlapped, these expectations ap-

---

cleve's largest autograph production, his *Formulary*—now London, British Library MS Additional 24062—was produced with a similar aim in mind: it anthologized a wide selection of model administrative texts that were to be replicated by the poet's successors at the Privy Seal.

<sup>42</sup> See John M. Bowers, "Hoccleve's Huntington Holographs: The First 'Collected Poems' in English," *Fifteenth-Century Studies* 15 (1989): 27–51. Whereas Huntington MS 111 survives as an independent book, the Hoccleve material now in Huntington HM 744 was rebound with a collection of English devotional and catechetical items, probably in the third quarter of the fifteenth century. See J. A. Burrow and A. I. Doyle, *Thomas Hoccleve: A Facsimile of the Autograph Verse Manuscripts* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), xxvi. Burrow and Doyle cast doubt upon Bowers's theory that the two Huntington manuscripts originally formed one book (xxvii), a skepticism shared by Watt in *The Making of Thomas Hoccleve's Series*, 67.

<sup>43</sup> Burrow, "Hoccleve and the Middle French Poets," 42.

<sup>44</sup> See Bowers, "The First 'Collected Poems,'" and, more recently, A. S. G. Edwards "Fifteenth-Century Middle English Verse Author Collections," in *The English Medieval Book: Studies in Memory of Jeremy Griffiths*, ed. A. S. G. Edwards, Vincent Gillespie, and Ralph Hanna (London: The British Library 2000), 101–12. It is worth pointing out by contrast that the massive compendium of the verse of Hoccleve's close contemporary Eustache Deschamps (c. 1346–1406) that is now Paris, Bibliothèque nationale MS fr. 840 was completed after that poet's death, indicating a clear interest among his followers in the preservation of his French-language corpus. On MS fr. 840, see M.-H. Tesnière, "Les Manuscrits copiés par Raoul Tanguy: un aspect de la culture des grands officiers royaux au début du xv<sup>e</sup> siècle," *Romania* 107 (1986): 28–368.

pear to have been determined by the languages in which the authors wrote and the poetic and codicological traditions with which they thereby associated themselves. Although Christine necessarily broke new ground in her self-presentation as a woman writer, the path had already been laid for at least one important aspect of her work, her self-publication. Hoccleve's autograph project represented a new development in English-language literature; his audience was unprepared to receive a work of this nature in English and thus appears to have missed the poet's design. In this connection we might be justified in thinking that Hoccleve ultimately proved a victim of the literary culture he attempted to modify. Indeed, the poet's influence on the development of English literature as a whole is rather limited given the aspirations to which a text such as the *Letter* points.<sup>45</sup> With the exception of George Ashby (c. 1385–1475), whose *Prisoner's Reflections* (1463–68) appear at several moments to echo Hoccleve's *Complaint* (1419–21), Hoccleve is without an obvious literary heir, and none of his works are reproduced in print before the eighteenth century.<sup>46</sup> Before we jump to the conclusion that the *Letter* fails completely, however, it is important to recognize the work's modest popularity: the number of extant copies of the poem suggests that it could function in a broad variety of manuscript contexts. There is no reason to suggest that this aspect of Hoccleve's success was unplanned. After all, the split reactions to the *Letter* that we have seen in the extreme cases of the Bannatyne and Digby manuscripts of the poem are anticipated by Hoccleve in the debate he stages between himself and his friend in the *Dialogue* section of the *Series* (1419–21). During this discussion, the friend asserts that the *Letter* has displeased the poet's female readership, and Hoccleve's narrator expresses his surprise at this reaction (750–91).<sup>47</sup>

We have known for some time now that Hoccleve, as well as being his own scribe, also assisted in the production of a copy of Gower's *Confessio Amantis*.<sup>48</sup> A further connection with the book trade is suggested

<sup>45</sup> On Hoccleve's failure to secure his legacy, see Bowers, "The Politics of Tradition."

<sup>46</sup> On Ashby's debt to Hoccleve, see Robert J. Meyer-Lee, "Laureates and Beggars in Fifteenth-Century English Poetry: The Case of George Ashby," *Speculum* 79 (2004): 702–4. On the first printed edition of Hoccleve's poetry, see J. A. Burrow, "An Eighteenth-Century Edition of Hoccleve," in *Chaucer in Perspective: Middle English Essays in Honour of Norman Blake*, ed. Geoffrey Lester (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999), 252–66.

<sup>47</sup> The *Dialogue* is cited by line number, from J. A. Burrow, *Complaint and Dialogue*, 33–72.

<sup>48</sup> See A. I. Doyle and M. B. Parkes, "The Production of Copies of the *Canterbury Tales* and the *Confessio Amantis* in the Early Fifteenth Century," in *Medieval Scribes, Manuscripts*

by a marginal note that Hoccleve adds to f. 36r of Huntington MS 744 in which he explains that the text copied at this juncture was “*faicte a linstance de .T. Marleburgh*” (composed at the request of T. Marleburgh), Thomas Marleburgh being Master of the guild of Limners and Text-Writers by 1423 and a prominent member of the community of book producers based in Paternoster Row.<sup>49</sup> What I would like to suggest is that the indeterminacy of the *Letter*—an aspect of Hoccleve’s translation that would seem to have attracted as many medieval compilers as it has divided modern critics—might perhaps best be understood as a quality with which the poet deliberately infused his work in response to lessons that he had learned thanks to his intimate familiarity with contemporary modes of book production.<sup>50</sup> As Alexandra Gillespie has put it, the late medieval codicological culture inhabited by Hoccleve was one that “depended on adaptability rather than adherence to prescribed ideas” in the texts it transmitted.<sup>51</sup> If I am right, then Hoccleve deserves credit for his foresight; for the *Letter* turned out to be an eminently suitable addition to the kind of manuscript collection that would start to circulate with much greater frequency after his death. Although he was unable permanently to affix his name to his translation of Christine, then, Hoccleve was nevertheless capable of composing a work that accurately anticipated both the tastes of his audience and the requirements of late medieval book producers and owners in England. It is at the intersection of these two contingencies that Hoccleve’s impact and achievement can most accurately be judged.

*University of Bern, Switzerland*

---

*& Libraries: Essays Presented to N. R. Ker*, ed. M. B. Parkes and Andrew G. Watson (London: Scolar Press, 1978), 163–210.

<sup>49</sup> Some of the ramifications of Hoccleve’s allusion to Marleburgh here are pursued in John J. Thompson, “A Poet’s Contacts with the Great and the Good,” in *Prestige, Authority and Power in Late Medieval Manuscripts and Texts*, ed. Felicity Riddy (Woodbridge: York Medieval Press, 2000), 94–95.

<sup>50</sup> Compare the analyses of Hoccleve’s ambivalent reworking of Christine’s proto-feminist message in the *Epistre* in Ellis, “Chaucer, Christine de Pizan, and Hoccleve”; and Mahoney, “Middle English Regenderings of Christine de Pizan.” Regarding the impact of Hoccleve’s familiarity with the exigencies of book production on the shapes assumed by his writing, see Watt, *The Making of Thomas Hoccleve’s Series*, especially 65–102. Watt’s monograph came out shortly after this article was accepted for publication. I regret that I have not been able to offer a more profound engagement with his work here.

<sup>51</sup> Gillespie, *Print Culture and the Medieval Author: Chaucer, Lydgate, and Their Books 1473–1557* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006), 51.