

Karen Pratt / Bart Besamusca / Matthias Meyer / Ad Putter (eds)

The Dynamics of the Medieval Manuscript

Text Collections from a European Perspective



V&R Academic

Open-Access-Publikation im Sinne der CC-Lizenz BY-NC-ND 4.0

© 2017, V&R unipress GmbH, Cöttingen

ISBN Print: 9783847107545 – ISBN E-Lib: 9783737007542

Karen Pratt / Bart Besamusca / Matthias Meyer /
Ad Putter (eds)

The Dynamics of the Medieval Manuscript

Text Collections from a European Perspective

Edited with the Assistance of Hannah Morcos

With 22 figures

V&R unipress

Bibliographic information published by the Deutsche Nationalbibliothek

The Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliografie; detailed bibliographic data are available online: <http://dnb.d-nb.de>.

ISBN 978-3-7370-0754-2

You can find alternative editions of this book and additional material on our website: www.v-r.de

© 2017, V&R unipress GmbH, Robert-Bosch-Breite 6, 37079 Göttingen, Germany / www.v-r.de
This publication is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-Non Commercial-No Derivatives 4.0 International license, at DOI 10.14220/9783737007542. For a copy of this license go to <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>.

Any use in cases other than those permitted by this license requires the prior written permission from the publisher.

Cover image: A hermit at work on a manuscript; *Estoire del Saint Graal*, France, c. 1315–1325, London, British Library, Royal MS 14 E III, fol. 6^v, © British Library Board.

Contents

Acknowledgements	9
Karen Pratt / Bart Besamusca / Matthias Meyer / Ad Putter	
Introduction	11
Bart Besamusca (Utrecht University)	
The Patron and the Implied Readership of The Hague, Koninklijke Bibliotheek, MS 76 E 5	41
Gerard Bouwmeester (Utrecht University)	
Size Does Not Matter: On Characterising Medieval Multi-Text Codices . . .	57
Margaret Connolly (University of St Andrews)	
What John Shirley Said About Adam: Authorship and Attribution in Cambridge, Trinity College, MS R.3.20	81
Paolo Divizia (Masaryk University, Brno)	
Texts and Transmission in Late Medieval and Early Renaissance Italian Multi-Text Codices	101
Daniël Ermens (Utrecht University)	
Views on the Oudenaarde Verse Book	111
Karl G. Johansson (University of Oslo)	
The <i>Hauksbók</i> : An Example of Medieval Modes of Collecting and Compilation	131

Kate Koppy (Marymount University) The Findern Codex and the Blog <i>In the Middle</i> : Understanding Middle English Vernacular Manuscripts through the Lens of Social Media in the Twenty-First Century	147
Florian Kragl (Friedrich-Alexander-Universität, Erlangen-Nürnberg) Codifying Genre: The <i>Dresdener Heldenbuch</i>	165
Kathy M. Krause (University of Missouri-Kansas City) Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, fonds français 378 and the Gendered Visages of Allegorical Narrative	179
Matthias Meyer (Universität Wien) / Nicola Zotz (Bayerische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Munich) How to Name a Story? Rubrics – Headings – Titles	203
Hannah Morcos (King’s College London) <i>Sens</i> in Dialogue: The Manuscript Contexts of the <i>Fables Pierre Aufons</i> . . .	217
Tamara Pérez-Fernández (University of Valladolid) Shared Exemplars and the Creation of Miscellanies in the Manuscripts of <i>Troilus and Criseyde</i>	241
Karen Pratt (King’s College London) The Dynamics of the European Short Narrative in its Manuscript Context: The Case of Pyramus and Thisbe	257
Wendy Scase (University of Birmingham) ‘Looke this calender and then proced’: Tables of Contents in Medieval English Manuscripts	287
John Scattergood (Trinity College Dublin) London, British Library, MS Harley 913 and Colonial Ireland in the Early Fourteenth Century	307
Thea Summerfield (Utrecht University) ‘Aprendre e enseigner’: The Contents of Cambridge University Library, MS Gg.1.1	327
Rachel Sweet (King’s College London) No Text is an Island: The <i>Chastelaine de Vergi</i> ’s Exemplarity in Context . .	347

Dieuwke van der Poel / Cécile de Morrée (Utrecht University) Authorial and Editorial Roles in Song Manuscripts of the Devotio Moderna	367
Contributors' Biographies	389
Index of Manuscripts	395

Margaret Connolly (University of St Andrews)

What John Shirley Said About Adam: Authorship and Attribution in Cambridge, Trinity College, MS R.3.20

The scribe John Shirley copied many short Middle English poems, including several by Geoffrey Chaucer, and is often either the earliest or the only copyist to provide authorship ascriptions. Cambridge, Trinity College, MS R.3.20 uniquely preserves the single stanza known as ‘Adam Scriveyn’. Since the identification of Adam Pinkhurst as the scribe of the Hengwrt and Ellesmere manuscripts of the *Canterbury Tales*, these seven lines of verse, and Shirley’s claim that they are addressed to Chaucer’s ‘own scribe’, have received renewed critical attention, and Shirley’s reliability has again been questioned. This essay reassesses Shirley’s Chaucerian ascriptions, paying close attention to the Trinity manuscript and its later reception.

Adam scriveyn, if ever it thee bifalle
Boece or Troylus for to wryten newe,
Under thy long lokkes thou most have the scalle, [scaly skin disease]
But after my makyng thow wryte more trewe;
So ofte adaye I mot thy werk renewe,
It to correcte and eke to rubbe and scrape,
And al is thorough thy negligence and rape. [haste] (Benson (ed.) 1987: 650)

In medieval manuscripts texts are frequently presented without titles or authors’ names, and where such information is offered it is not always reliable or consistent. Modern readers expect to be given authorial and titular details, but textual scholars sometimes struggle to provide this for medieval works. A case in point is Geoffrey Chaucer’s shortest poem: few short verse texts can have received quite as much scholarly attention as this single rhyme royal stanza traditionally referred to as *Adam Scriveyn*, quoted here from the *Riverside Chaucer* (Benson (ed.) 1987), which is where most readers will encounter it. The notion that in these lines Chaucer named his own scribe, and upbraided him for poor workmanship – perhaps seriously, perhaps in jest – has exercised a long fascination amongst critics, and there have been many suggestions regarding the identity of the ‘Adam’ in question. Early twentieth-century scrutiny of medieval records revealed various individuals with this Christian name. Aage Brusendorff (1925:

57) noted a Smithfield tenant in the early 1370s with the name 'Adam Chaucer' and wondered whether this might signify that Adam the scribe was a relative of the author. Ramona Bressie (1929: 383) combed through the list of fourteenth- and fifteenth-century scribes then being compiled at the University of Chicago and found only one scrivener named Adam: Adam Stedeman, who was employed to write the will of a London goldsmith in 1384. A week after Bressie published her findings in the *Times Literary Supplement* John Manly (1929: 403) wrote to the paper pointing out that another possible contender, Adam Acton, mentioned in the records of the Collegiate Church of St George at Windsor, was actually a limner, not a scrivener. Shortly afterwards Bernard Wagner (1929: 474) spotted a third Adam, Adam Pinckhurst, in the records of the Scriveners' Company. Although 'Adam' might be a surname rather than a forename, no real-life figures with this surname have been suggested. In fact, after this flurry of activity in the late 1920s, attempts to discover 'Adam sciveyn' in the records ceased. Perhaps because no progress was made in identifying Adam, later critics argued that no real personality had been intended, and that instead Chaucer had alluded figuratively to the biblical Adam, the world's first man. This line of interpretation seems to have begun with Russell Peck (1975: 467), who recalled:

... that other Adam Sciveyn, who gave the names to all the creatures and wrote the first chapter of the book in which we are all characters, whose careless act of negligence and rape [haste] left us all, through that inborn human propensity for error, to labor and scrape out our living correcting mistakes.

It was extended by Robert E. Kaske (1979: 115), who suggested more fully that Chaucer was writing satirically in the tradition of *clericus Adam*, and by Jane Chance (1985: 118), who traced irony and allegory in the stanza and judged it to be 'a highly compressed, humorous account of Original Sin and Redemption'. Other critics such as John Scattergood (1990 and 2006) focused on genre to locate the poem in a long tradition of *Sirventes*, in which creative literary artists chide the transmitters of their art. Having gone quiet for seventy-five years, the matter of Adam's identification was electrified in 2004 with Linne Mooney's announcement at the New Chaucer Society Congress in Glasgow that she had matched the hand of the scribe of the Hengwrt and Ellesmere manuscripts of the *Canterbury Tales* with that of a copyist who had worked for the Mercers Company.¹ Moreover, since this copyist had signed his name when taking the oath as he joined the Scriveners Company of London in the 1390s, she could name him as Adam Pinkhurst (Mooney 2006). Her discovery fitted neatly with

1 In July 2004 the announcement made the headlines, see 'The Scrivener's Tale: how Chaucer's Sloppy Copyist was Unmasked after 600 Years', *Guardian*, 20 July 2004, <http://www.theguardian.com/uk/2004/jul/20/highereducation.books>.

the pre-existing belief, derived from *Adam Sciveyn*, that Chaucer had a scribe named Adam, and it seemed that the puzzle of identification was finally resolved.

Although Mooney's celebrated discovery has largely been accepted, since the publication of her 2006 article some dissent has been voiced about her findings.² One objection that has been raised against her identification of Adam Pinkhurst as 'Chaucer's scribe' is that her argument is overly reliant on literary evidence (Gillespie 2008: 271). There are no documentary sources which connect Adam Pinkhurst with Chaucer (at least, none has yet been discovered). Instead, a nominal connection is made between copyist and poet by reference to the single-stanza poem, *Adam Sciveyn*, and its suggestion that Chaucer's 'own' scribe, the man responsible for copying *Boece* and *Troilus*, was named Adam. As a consequence there has recently been a heightened level of interest in *Adam Sciveyn*, and a renewed scrutiny of its manuscript context.³

If the seven-line poem offers a slender base for the weight of interpretation it has been made to bear, its textual tradition is similarly slim. The *Index of Middle English Verse* (Brown and Robbins (eds) 1943: 120) listed two witnesses, but did not make clear that in Cambridge, University Library, MS Gg.4.27 the poem is a later addition, copied from Thomas Speght's edition of 1598 by the antiquary Joseph Holland when the manuscript was in his possession around 1600.⁴ In fact there is only one fifteenth-century manuscript witness: Cambridge, Trinity College, MS R.3.20.⁵ Here the poem occurs towards the end of the manuscript as it is now constituted, in the penultimate gathering, which is the last one made of paper. It is written on page 367, a recto leaf, where it occupies the bottom third of the page, filling the space left after the conclusion of the previous item; overleaf (p. 368), on the final page of this quire, are two short extracts from Lydgate's *Fall of Princes* and a Latin couplet.

It might be noted that the text in Trinity, R.3.20 is different in many small respects from that offered by the editors of the *Riverside Chaucer*, who have silently added modern punctuation, regularised the use of 'u' and 'v', and changed the unfamiliar thorn ('þ') to 'th', for the benefit of their undergraduate readers.⁶ In manuscript the stanza appears thus:

2 See Fletcher 2007 and 2010; Roberts 2011.

3 Gillespie 2008; Olson 2008; Edwards 2012.

4 This misleading reference has been deleted from the entry in *A New Index of Middle English Verse* (hereafter *NIMEV*); see Boffey and Edwards (eds) 2005.

5 James (1900–1904: II, 75–82) lists the manuscript's contents; Lyall (1989: 19–20) discusses its physical composition with particular reference to its watermarks. A detailed account of the manuscript is given by Connolly (1998: 69–101). James's catalogue is now available online at <http://trin-sites-pub.trin.cam.ac.uk/james/viewpage.php?index=1373> and a full digitisation of the manuscript is to be found at http://trin-sites-pub.trin.cam.ac.uk/manuscripts/R_3_20/manuscript.php?fullpage=1&startingpage=1.

6 In the following transcription from Trinity R.3.20 and other transcriptions throughout this

Adam . scryveyne / if euer it þee byfalle
 Boece or Troylus / for to wryten nuwe /
 Vnder þy long lokkes / þowe most haue þe scalle
 But affter my makyng / þowe wryt more truwe
 So offt adaye. I mot þy werk renuwe /
 It to . corect and eke to rubbe and scrape /
 And al is thorough . þy necglygence and rape / (p. 367)

Although the poem was printed in John Stow's 1561 edition of *The Works of Geoffrey Chaucer*, the printed copy may be discounted as an independent witness. Stow owned Trinity, R.3.20: his annotations appear in the margins of the manuscript, and he used it as a partial exemplar when compiling a written copy of John Lydgate's poetry in 1558 (now London, British Library, Additional MS 29729).⁷ It seems certain that Stow also used Trinity, R.3.20 as his source when printing the *Adam Scriveyn* stanza three years later:

Adam Scriuener yf euer it the be falle
 Boece or Troiles for to write new
 Under thy longe lockes þ[o]u must haue the scalle
 But after my mockyng thou write more true
 So ofte adaye I mote thy werke renew
 It to correcte and eke to rubbe and scrape
 And al is thorow thy negligence and rape.⁸

It will be apparent that the wording of both manuscript text and printed text is almost identical: aside from spelling variations, and the substitution of 'th' for 'þ', there are only two differences of substance in Stow's version. The first is that Adam is described in the first line as 'Scriuener' rather than 'scriveyn', and the second is that 'mockyng' has replaced 'makyng' (line 4).

The copy of *Adam Scriveyn* in Trinity, R.3.20 is therefore the poem's only witness, and the information given there offers unique insight into its authorship and composition. The manuscript was copied c. 1430 but the volume as it now stands is not complete: at some point, possibly when it was in John Stow's possession, it was broken into three parts, of which Trinity, R.3.20 is the third; the other parts survive in the collections of Lambeth Palace and the British Library.⁹

essay, I have retained Shirley's spelling, capitalisation, word division, and use of þ, u/v, and i/j. Abbreviations are expanded and shown within square brackets. Manuscript punctuation is represented diplomatically, with a full stop used for a medial point, and a forward slash (/) for the virgule. In transcriptions of Shirley's running headers an upright stroke (|) is used to indicate how the text breaks across the double-page opening.

7 See Connolly 1998: 182–85.

8 John Stow's edition of 1561, STC 5075, sig. 3R3v, is quoted from the facsimile by Brewer (ed.) 1969.

9 London, Lambeth Palace Library, MS Sion College Arc. L.40.2/E.44 and London, British Library, MS Harley 78, fols 80^r–83^v.

When complete, this massive volume began with a Middle English prose translation of Guillaume Deguillaume's *Pèlerinage de la vie humaine*, with Chaucer's hymn to the Virgin, 'An ABC', embedded within that text. Then followed a large amount of verse by John Lydgate, including most of his Mummings, many of Chaucer's shorter poems, a substantial number of French ballades and rondeaux, some prose, and some material in Latin. The fact that we have only a single manuscript copy of *Adam Sciveyn*, transcribed some three decades after Chaucer's death, naturally gives rise to doubts about the intrinsic reliability of this text as a source of biographical and historical information. How trustworthy is the attribution of this stanza to Chaucer, given that it only surfaces some thirty years after his death? And how much weight should be put upon its naming of a scribe who apparently worked closely with its author?

Key to this question of authenticity is the status of the manuscript's copier, John Shirley. Shirley was a permanent member of the retinue of Richard Beauchamp, Earl of Warwick; in the first decades of the fifteenth century he served amongst Warwick's military retinues in Wales and France, and from the early 1420s he is designated as the earl's secretary. By the 1430s Shirley was living in London, in the precincts of St Bartholomew's Hospital, an area where members of the Beauchamp family had houses and old Beauchamp retainers spent their retirement. Shirley's scribal work survives in several fifteenth-century manuscripts, including three significant anthologies of English poetry: London, British Library, Additional MS 16165; Cambridge, Trinity College, MS R.3.20; and Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Ashmole 59. Because of the large number of poems by Lydgate and Chaucer that these manuscripts contain, and because the poems' headings frequently contain ascriptions of authorship and details of the circumstances of their composition, Shirley's importance has long been recognised. John Stow regarded him as the careful preserver of this poetry, and in the nineteenth century Frederick Furnivall described Shirley as the 'greatest authority for the authorship of the minor poems of his time'.¹⁰ Walter Skeat (1894–1897 (ed.): I, 25) accepted many of Shirley's attributions when defining the canon of Chaucer's shorter poems in 1894, and almost a century later Peck (1983: 5) described Shirley's attributions as being 'held in highest regard', noting that Shirley's testimony 'upholds the genuineness' of eleven of Chaucer's short poems, including *Adam Sciveyn*.

An alternative, less positive, view of Shirley's attributions was first voiced by John Manly (1913: 226), who commented: 'Is there any instance in which in-

10 For Stow's comments regarding Shirley's tomb at St Bartholomew's, see Fraser 1994: 347; Furnivall 1871.

formation given by Shirley has, when tested, proved to be correct?¹¹ Rossell Hope Robbins (1973: 1062), cataloguing the ‘Chaucerian Apocrypha’ for *A Manual of the Writings in Middle English*, described Shirley as ‘among the first to link spurious secular poems with the prestige name of Chaucer’. Derek Pearsall (1970: 74), writing principally about Shirley’s copies of Lydgate’s poems, characterised Shirley’s attributions as ‘long gossiping headings, like a publisher’s blurb, in which he tells something of the provenance of the work and recommends it to the reader’. In relation to reliability this is a neutral comment, and Pearsall (1970: 75) went on to describe the information that Shirley provides about Lydgate as ‘invaluable’. ‘Gossip’, though, carries a whole range of negative associations: gossip is unauthorised, unofficial, and liable to be untrue, or at best a mixture of truth and lies in which the two cannot reliably be separated. This interpretation of Shirley’s ‘gossiping headings’ informs the suggestion by Julia Boffey (1985: 66) that the attributions of some of the French poems in Trinity, R.3.20 to William de la Pole, Earl of Suffolk, might have been ‘cooked up’ by Shirley himself.

In fact a sort of double-think has long characterised attitudes to Shirley’s reliability as a witness. Close examination of the texts that he copied reveals his idiosyncratic spellings (including ‘eo’ for ‘e’, and a habit of doubling certain sets of consonants such as ‘ch’ and ‘th’). His texts quite often display a degree of variation from other copies of the same works, with substitutions of different word choices, or the incorporation of doublets; this may even happen between copies of the same texts written by Shirley himself.¹² Various explanations have been offered to account for this maltreatment of text, usually centring on Shirley’s imagined great age and consequent infirmity (he was supposedly ninety when he died in 1456). But a line has generally been drawn between Shirley the unreliable copyist and Shirley the invaluable witness. Thus Aage Brusendorff (1925: 234) wrote:

while the textual value of Shirley’s collections is negligible they have a real importance through their notes about the authors. In striking contrast to his careless habits in transcribing texts Shirley practically never wavers in his ascriptions of certain poems to certain writers, and accordingly he becomes an exceptionally important witness in the matter of authorship.

This double-think is deftly summarised by Seth Lerer (1993: 124), who comments: ‘Part of the problem, therefore, in assessing Shirley’s work is the critical desire to trust his attributions coupled with the editorial desire to dismiss his incorrect transcriptions.’

11 Manly’s comment was occasioned by Edith Rickert’s discovery of the identity of Sir Philip (de) la Vache, subject of the Envoy to ‘Truth’; see further discussion below.

12 For discussion of the duplication of texts between his three anthologies, see Connolly 1998: 153–58.

Only comparatively recently has there been any attempt to uncouple these opposing desires, and to join attitudes to Shirley together in a different way to claim that Shirley is unreliable *both* as a textual copyist *and* as an ascriber of authorship. Lerer lays the grounds for doing this, with his account in *Chaucer and his Readers* of how a particular image of Chaucer (and Lydgate) was constructed by fifteenth-century scribes such as Shirley. With specific regard to *Adam Scryveyn*, Lerer (1993: 121) claims: ‘Shirley may have responded to many familiar things in *Adam Scryveyn*; but he just might have created them, as well.’ In other words, Lerer suggests that Shirley (the unreliable copyist) might have been inspired by the figure of the errant scribe, Adam; or, he might have invented that figure for himself. A. S. G. Edwards (1997: 315) has complained about Shirley’s ‘often egregiously anecdotal rubrics’ that are often the main or only source for knowledge of the occasion of the poems in question. He comments: ‘The very circumstantiality of detail in some of these accounts has at times been held to lend them authority. And there seems no way of directly challenging what they claim, though they may merit more scepticism than they have generally received’. And with Julia Boffey (1998: 203) he has drawn attention to the fact that a number of ‘Chaucerian’ texts have *not* been accepted into the canon, despite Shirley’s attributions of Chaucer’s authorship. Focusing on the poems entitled ‘*Pe cronycle made by Chaucier*’, in Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Ashmole 59, and the ‘*Balade of a Reeve*’ and ‘*The Plowman’s Song*’, in British Library, Additional MS 16165, they comment that ‘the actual quality of the information he [i. e. Shirley] transmitted remains largely untested and has not been treated with very much consistency’.

Very recently the question of Shirley’s reliability as an attributor has been raised again, this time in relation to *Adam Scryveyn*. This is a radical move, because *Adam Scryveyn*’s place in the Chaucer canon has not previously been questioned; in fact the *Riverside Chaucer* states clearly that ‘No-one has doubted Chaucer’s authorship’.¹³ Lerer’s comments about the fifteenth-century invention of Chaucerian authority, in which he contends Shirley played a major role, undoubtedly paved the way for this approach, but it is interesting, if a little perverse, that the move to oust *Adam Scryveyn* from the Chaucer canon has come along precisely at the point when the identity of Chaucer’s scribe may have been revealed. In her article ‘Reading Chaucer’s Words to Adam’, Alexandra Gillespie (2008: 275) expands upon Lerer’s interpretation of the poem and ponders the possibility that its Chaucerian authorship might not be genuine, but her attention focuses mostly on its heading, which she regards as ‘an unlikely choice of title for Chaucer’. Edwards pays closer attention to the poem itself in a short essay

13 Benson (ed.) 1987: 1083, in the Explanatory Notes to the short poems written by Laila Z. Gross. Mize (2001: 352) judges the poem to be an integral part of the Chaucer canon.

‘Chaucer and “Adam Scriveyn”’, where he expresses doubts about its authenticity in terms of its verse form and lexis, as well as the dramatic situation that it describes. Yet the force of his argument depends on questioning the reliability of the poem’s ascription to Chaucer (which brings us back to the title again), and a sense of ‘the uncertain authority of Shirley’s attribution’ is developed through a series of insistent comments: ‘Shirley has not been seen as uniformly reliable as an attributor’; ‘a number of poems he ascribes to Chaucer ... have never gained canonical acceptance’; ‘other poems with which he is associated have excited similar unease in terms of their attribution’; ‘there are other grounds for being doubtful about Shirley’s attributional reliability...’ (Edwards 2012: 135). There is much rhetoric here, but not perhaps much substance. The number of works, both poetry and prose, that Shirley ascribes to Chaucer is, in total, fifteen (if items he copied repeatedly are counted only once), yet the number that have never gained canonical acceptance is only three. Shirley is the sole authority for the attribution of six of Chaucer’s shorter poems: ‘The Complaint of Mars’; ‘The Complaint of Venus’; ‘Gentillesse’; ‘The Complaint Unto Pity’; ‘The Complaint to his Lady’; and ‘Adam Scriveyn’. Were we to decide that Shirley’s witness was inherently untrustworthy, all of these short poems might have to be expelled from the Chaucer canon.

In order to assess the value of Shirley’s claims about ‘Adam Scriveyn’ it is necessary to look more closely at his other statements about Chaucer. This discussion will be confined to the manuscripts which are written by Shirley’s own hand, and will not include those manuscripts thought to be copied from now-lost Shirlean exemplars by the next generation of London scribes.¹⁴ Although these Shirley-derived volumes are important witnesses, they cannot show exactly what Shirley said, since they are at one remove (at least) from their creator, and therefore open to undetectable omissions, alterations, and elaborations by other hands.

BL, Add. 16165’s copy of *Boece* is headed ‘Boicius de consolac[i]o[n]e prosed in Englissh by Chaucier’ (fol. 4^r). The attribution of authorship could scarcely be clearer: the running headers displayed across the double-page opening read variously: ‘Boicius | In prose’; ‘Boicius . in prose | By Geoffrey Chaucier’; ‘Boicius . in prose | By Chaucier’; ‘Boicius in prose | By Chauciers a Geffrey’; ‘Boycius . de consolac[i]o[n]e | In . proose . by Chaucier’.¹⁵ In the colophon Shirley notes that the text was ‘translated by þe moral and famous Chaucyer which first enlumyned

14 For example, British Library, Additional MS 34360 and British Library, MS Harley 2251, copied by the Hammond scribe, and others, such as British Library, MS Harley 7333, which reproduce Shirley’s annotations and characteristically long headings; see Connolly 1998: 170–89.

15 This variety of running header is used throughout the text; those cited here are from folios 4^v–5^v, 5^v–6^r, 9^v–10^r, 11^v–12^r, and 89^v–90^r respectively.

pis lande with retoryen and eloquent langage of oure rude englisshe moders tonge'; and he repeats these sentiments in the volume's verse preface which describes *Boece* as 'Laboured by Geffrey Chaucier / Whiche in oure wolgare [vulgar, i.e. English] hade neuer his pere / Of eloquencyale Retorryke'.¹⁶ The preface names the anthology's major texts and their authors, but notes its other contents only as 'oþer balades moo þer beon' (line 87) [there are more]. Amongst these other shorter works is an incomplete copy of the narrative section of *Anelida and Arcite* which Shirley entitles 'Balade of Anelyda' and describes as 'made by Geffrey Chaucyer' (fol. 256^v); yet a mostly complete copy of the complaint section of this poem that occurs earlier in the manuscript is not attributed to him.¹⁷ Neither are the poems 'Balade of Complaint' on folio 256^v and 'Prouerbe' on folio 246^v attributed to Chaucer, though both have been suggested as his and they continue to appear in editions of his works.¹⁸ These examples are clear-cut; more problematic is the running header 'Balade by Chauc[er]' on folio 244^v, set above the second and third stanzas of the poem which began overleaf on folio 244^r: 'Hit is no right alle oþer lustes to leese', sometimes referred to as 'Balade of a Reeve'.¹⁹ Further down folio 244^v begins another poem, whose first line is 'Of alle þe crafftes oute blessed be þe ploughe' ('The Plowman's Song'); this poem continues onto folio 245^r after which there is a space that would accommodate a third stanza, never supplied; folio 245^r has no running header.²⁰ Both poems are entitled simply 'Balade', and neither is attributed to any author, in contrast to the preceding item in the manuscript which is ascribed to 'Halsham Esquyer', and the next English poem which is attributed to Richard, Earl of Warwick. The running header on folio 244^v might be interpreted as referring to either poem, but neither has been accepted as Chaucer's work. In terms of the integrity and authority of Shirley's attributions of material to Chaucer, this is the single point where the witness of BL, Add. 16165 is ambiguous.

There are eleven poems ascribed to Chaucer in Trinity, R.3.20 and its now separated partners: 'An ABC' (in Sion College Arc.L.40.2/E.44); 'Complaint unto

16 The colophon is on folio 94^r; these lines (29–31) from the verse preface are on folio ii^v.

17 The narrative section of *Anelida and Arcite* is the last text in the manuscript, on folios 256^v–258^r, ending incompletely at line 192 due to the loss of further leaves; lines 66–126 are also missing due to the loss of a leaf between folio 257 and folio 258. The complaint section is copied on folios 241^v–243^v, with some small omissions and misordering of lines and stanzas.

18 However, 'Balade of Complaint' appears in the marginal category of 'Poems Not Ascribed to Chaucer in the Manuscripts'; see Benson (ed.) 1987: 657 and 660. Skeat ((ed.) 1894–97: I, 1091) decided that 'Balade of Complaint' was by Chaucer but later changed his mind; Shirley's copy is the only witness. The claim for Chaucer's authorship of 'Prouerbe' comes from Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Fairfax 16 and London, British Library, MS Harley 7578, see Skeat (ed.) 1894–97: I, 1191.

19 *NIMEV* 1635, which cites another copy in British Library, MS Harley 7578, fols 15^{r-v}.

20 *NIMEV* 2611; this is the only copy.

Pity'; and 'Complaint to His Lady' (in Harley 78); and in Trinity, R.3.20 itself: 'Anelida and Arcite' (the complaint only); 'Complaint of Mars'; 'Complaint of Venus'; 'Fortune'; 'Truth' (copied twice); 'Lak of Stedfastnesse'; 'Gentilesse'; 'Adam Scriveyn'.

The copy of 'An ABC' occurs on folios 79^r–81^v of the now detached first section of the anthology (Lambeth Palace Library, MS Sion College Arc. L.40.2/E.44) where it is part of *The Pilgrimage of the Lyfe of the Manhode*, a translation of Guillaume de Deguileville's *Le Pèlerinage de la vie humaine*.²¹ There is no *incipit* or *explicit*, but Shirley has written 'Chauc[er]' in the margin of folio 79^r.²² A second detached section, comprising four leaves that have been individually cut from what was probably the anthology's thirteenth quire, survives as part of Harley 78 (fols 80^r–82^r). Here Shirley copies *The Complaint unto Pity*, proclaiming Chaucer's authorship in an elaborate headnote: 'And nowe here following begynneþe a complaint of pitee by Geffrey Chaucier þe aureat poete þat euer was fonde in oure vulgare to fore hees dayes' [before this time], and in the first running header: 'Balade of pite | By Chaucier' (fols 80^v–81^r).²³ When this poem ends, on folio 82^r, Shirley immediately copies another, *A Complaint to his Lady*, though he does not use that (or any other) title, and the only indication that this is a separate work is that a faint dividing line, punctuated with a small rose-like design, has been drawn before its first stanza.²⁴ The running headers continue to read: 'þe balade | Of pitee' (fols 81^v–82^r); 'þe balade of pitee | By Chauciers' (fols 82^v–83^r); 'þe balade of pitee' (fol. 83^v), indicating that Shirley seems to have regarded this (initially at least) as one single work, all by Chaucer. He is the sole authority for this second poem, which survives only in this manuscript, in London, British Library, Additional MS 34360 (a volume known to derive from Shirley's copies), and in Stow's edition of 1561. *The Complaint unto Pity* is more widely attested, in nine manuscripts and Thynne's edition of 1532, but the ascription to Chaucer is found only in this manuscript and its derivative, BL, Add. 34360.

In Trinity, R.3.20 the first item that Shirley ascribes to Chaucer is a copy of the complaint section of *Anelida and Arcite* (pp. 106–11). In contrast to the situation in Shirley's earlier manuscript, BL, Add. 16165, where he ascribed the 'narrative' portion of the poem to Chaucer but not the complaint, here the complaint section is all that is copied, furnished with a lengthy introduction:

21 NIMEV 239.

22 Three other manuscripts and Speght's 1602 edition also cite Chaucer's authorship, see Benson 1987: 1185.

23 NIMEV 2756.

24 NIMEV 3414. The title is that used in the *Riverside Chaucer*.

Takeþe heed sirs I prey yowe of þis compleynt of Aneleyda Qweene of Cartage. Roote of trouthe and stedfastnesse þat pytously compleyneþe / vpo[u]n þe varyance of daun Arcyte lord borne of þe blood Royal of Thebes . englysshed by Geffrey Chaucier / In þe best wyse . and moost Rethoricyous þe moost vnkouþe metre . coloures and Rymes . þ[a]t euer was sayde . tofore þis day redeþe and preveþe þe sooþe

It is notable that Shirley uses the term ‘englysshed’ rather than ‘made’, strongly suggesting that he believed that Chaucer had translated the poem. No source has been discovered, but at least one critic has discerned parallels with French poetry, and the context of Trinity, R.3.20 with its many French ballades and other translated works, would support this supposition.²⁵ Only one other manuscript ascribes the poem to Chaucer.²⁶ His authorship is also proclaimed by Lydgate who mentions it in the prologue to the *Fall of Princes*, a poem begun c. 1432, not long after Trinity, R.3.20 was copied: ‘Off Aneleyda and of fals Arcite / He made a compleynt, doolful & pitous’.²⁷

The other seven Chaucer poems occur in two clusters of four (one item, *Truth*, occurs in each cluster). The first cluster occupies most of what is now the manuscript’s ninth quire: here Shirley copies ‘Complaint of Mars’, ‘Complaint of Venus’, ‘Fortune’, and ‘Truth’, unambiguously ascribing all of them to Chaucer. The ‘Complaint of Mars’ is not so entitled by Shirley.²⁸ Instead it is introduced with a long prose rubric that describes the poem’s content, author, and commission:

Loo yee louers gladeþe and comforteþe you . of þallya[u]nce etrayted bytwene þe hardy and furyous Mars þe god of armes and Venus þe double goddessse of loue made by Geffrey Chaucier . at þe comandement of the reno[m]med and excellent prynce my lord þe duc John of Lancastre

Furthermore, the running headers consistently refer to the poem as ‘þallyance bytwene Mars and Venus’.²⁹ The only time that Shirley uses the phrase ‘Complaint of Mars’ is in a subheading, set alongside line 155. As he does not use the term ‘complaint’ before this point, it is possible that when he uses the term again in the explicit on page 139 (‘Þus eondeþe here þis complaint’), he might have been referring only to this section of the poem.

25 James Wimsatt (1978: 68) detected ‘extensive and deeply grounded’ parallels between this poem and Machaut’s chant royal: ‘Amis, je t’ay tant amé et cheri’.

26 In London, British Library, MS Harley 372, the scribe wrote ‘Chaucer’ opposite the poem’s last line (l. 350). There are thirteen manuscripts, though one contains only an extract, and the poem was also printed by Caxton; see *NIMEV* 3670.

27 Bergen 1924, I, *Prologue* lines 320–21.

28 *NIMEV* 913.

29 Across the openings of pp. 132–33, 134–35, 136–37; the running header on pp. 130–31: ‘Parable by | Occlve’, refers to Hoccleve’s *Letter of Cupid* which concludes on p. 130.

The explicit takes the form of a long prose rubric which also doubles up as the introduction to the next poem, the ‘Complaint of Venus’:

Pus eondeþe here þis complaint whiche . some men sayne was made . by my lady of york
doughter to þe kyng of Spaygne / and my lord of huntyngdo[u]n . some tyme duc / of
Excestre / and filowing begynneþe . a balade translated out . of frenshe in to englishe /
by Chaucier Geffrey þe frenshe made . s[ir]. Otes de Graunto[s]me . knight. Savosyen

The running header to the ‘Complaint of Venus’ (again it might be noted that Shirley does not use this title), reads: ‘Balade made by Chauc[er] | At þe reverence of a lady þ[at] loved a knyght’ (pp. 140–41).³⁰ The poem’s explicit (p. 142) reads: ‘Hit is sayde þat. Graunso[m]me made þis last balade for Venus resembled to my lady of york aunswering þe complaynt of Mars’. Here certain claims are made more forcefully than others: Chaucer’s authorship of the English balade is unambiguously asserted, and the poem’s French origins and author are equally clearly acknowledged.³¹ The other information given is qualified in both instances by the phrases ‘some men sayne’ and ‘hit is sayde’. Although the Explanatory Notes in the *Riverside Chaucer* (Benson (ed.) 1987: 1081) state that Shirley treats the ‘Complaint of Venus’ as a continuation of the ‘Complaint of Mars’, this ignores the separate rubrics and different running headers that he provides for each poem in Trinity, R.3.20.

It is often Shirley’s habit to combine the explicit of one poem with the incipit of the next. The explicit to the ‘Complaint of Venus’ is joined to the introduction of the next item, ‘and here filoweþe a balade made by Chaucier . of þe louer | and of dame Fortune’; this is the poem ‘Fortune’, again, not a title used by Shirley who gives only the running header: ‘Dialogue . by twene . þe lover and fortune’ (p. 143).³² On page 144, the running header changes to read: ‘Balade ryale. By Chaucer’, which metrically might relate to either ‘Fortune’, which concludes on this page, or ‘Truth’, which is copied next.³³ Shirley further introduces ‘Truth’ as ‘Balade . þ[a]t Chaucier made on his deeth bedde’, a remark much derided by John Manly, who contended that Shirley’s failure to copy the poem’s envoy showed that he knew little about it. Yet the possibility that more might have followed at this point cannot be excluded; page 144 is the final leaf of the manuscript’s twenty-second gathering, and one of the few points in the Trinity manuscript where text and quire endings coincide. The twenty-third quire which now follows also bears an earlier quire number (1, i. e. the roman numeral .i. with

30 NIMEV 3542.

31 Oton de Grandson (c. 1340/50–1397) was a knight and poet from Savoy; see the entry in the digital *Archives de littérature du Moyen Âge* (ARLIMA), http://www.arlima.net/mp/oton_de_grandson.html.

32 NIMEV 3661.

33 NIMEV 809.

a long tail resembling a 'j'), and although the catchword on page 144 matches the start of Lydgate's text on page 145, this seems to be a later addition of Shirley's; the page is also patched at the bottom right corner, removing the evidence of any earlier cancelled catchword.

The second cluster of Chaucer poems occurs in what is now the twenty-third and penultimate gathering of Trinity, R.3.20. After the conclusion of Lydgate's 'A Procession at Corpus Christi', Shirley copies 'Lak of Stedfastnesse', 'Truth', and 'Gentillesse', one after the other; then after some other short items he gives one stanza from *Troilus* and, after some other items, finally, 'Adam Scriveyn'. 'Lak of Stedfastnesse' (on pp. 356–57) is introduced elliptically as 'Balade Royal made by oure laureal poete of Albyo[u]n in hees laste yeeres', but the running header across these pages reads more concretely: 'Balades . . by Chauc[er] | made'.³⁴ The second copy of 'Truth' (pp. 357–58) is described simply as 'Balade by Chaucier', with exactly the same title used for 'Gentillesse' (pp. 358–59); the running header on page 358 (which might refer to either poem), also reads 'Balade . by. Chauc[er]'. It might be noted that the heading that Shirley provided for 'Truth' has been extended by Stow's hand to read 'Balade by Chaucier *on his dethe bede*', repeating information that Shirley gave earlier on page 144. Finally, Shirley quotes a single stanza beginning 'A whestone is no kerving . instrument', to which he correctly gives the heading 'Pandare . to. Troylus', though he does not cite Chaucer by name.³⁵

Lastly, in Shirley's latest anthology, Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Ashmole 59, there are three texts that are unproblematically ascribed to Chaucer: 'Gentillesse'; 'Fortune'; and 'Complaint of Venus'. Shirley's attributions here mostly repeat or echo claims made in Trinity, R.3.20. In Ashmole 59 the copy of 'Gentillesse' is embedded within Henry Scogan's 'Moral Balade' (fols 25^r–28^r); in the margin of folio 27^r Shirley adds the note: 'Geffrey Chaucier made þeos thre balades next þ[a]t folowen', meaning that the next three stanzas, inserted as lines 105–25, are Chaucer's poem.³⁶ Shirley offers rather more information about 'Fortune' in this instance, stating that it is 'a compleynte of þe plentyff ageinst ageinst [*sic*] fortune translated oute of Frenshe in to Englishe by þat famous Rethorissyen Geffrey Chaucier' (fol. 37^r).³⁷ The heading to 'Complaint to Venus' also foregrounds its French origins: 'Here begynneþe a balade made by þ[a]t worpy knight

34 NIMEV 3190.

35 These words, spoken by Pandarus to Troilus, occur in *Troilus and Criseyde*, Book 1, lines 631–37. Shirley cites the same stanza in San Marino CA, Huntington Library, MS Ellesmere 26.A.13, but there mistakenly attributes it to Gower.

36 Scogan's poem is NIMEV 2264.

37 The running headers on fols 37^v–38^r read 'Plentyff & Fortune | By Chaucier'. The envoy on fol. 38^v is also labelled as 'Lenvoye by Chaucyer' though in fact it is a rewriting of the envoy usually found at the conclusion of 'Complaint to Venus'.

of Savoye in frenshe calde s[ir] Otes Graunso[u]n . translated by. Chauciers' (fol. 43^v). Although there are minor differences in what is said, none of these comments change substantially what Shirley has already told us in Trinity, R.3.20. More puzzling is one further piece in this manuscript to which he attaches Chaucer's name. This collection of nine stanzas on folios 38^v–39^v appears to be a kind of summary of the *Legend of Good Women*, as its lengthy headnote suggests:

Here nowe folowe þe names of þe nyene worshipfullest Ladyes þ[a]t in alle cronycles and storyal bokes haue beo founden of troupe of constaunce and vertuuous or reproched womanhode by Chaucier.

Skeat (1894–1897 (ed.): I, 53) claimed that the fault here lay with the title: 'It does not really mean that the *poem itself* is by Chaucer, but that it gives a brief epitome of the "Cronicle made by Chaucier" of "the nyene worshipfullest Ladies"'. Yet Shirley's running header on folio 39^{r-v} also describes the text as 'þe cronycle made by Chaucier', so it is hard to escape the conclusion that he, unlike all modern critics, believed this work to be the poet's.

I do not accept the general charge of Shirley's unreliability and it seems that most of the time most scholars have been content to accept the information that he offers. For example, Chaucer's authorship of *Boece* is not doubted: even though Shirley's copy (BL, Add. 16165) is one of only two manuscripts that attribute the work to him, *Boece* is nevertheless 'universally accepted as Chaucer's on the basis of internal evidence, early borrowings, and later ascriptions'.³⁸ There are few instances where Shirley's attributions can be confirmed by other manuscript witnesses, but what he says about authorship or context may sometimes be verified or at least supported by historical fact or evidence that is external to his manuscripts. For example, Shirley's statement that the 'Complaint of Venus' was not an original poem, but a translation from French, and further, that the French was written by Oton de Grandson, knight of Savoy, is substantiated by known historical detail about Oton and the identification of his *Cinq Ballades* as Chaucer's source.³⁹ Furthermore, if we look closely at all of Shirley's comments, we shall perceive a hierarchy of information in what he says, which varies from a straightforward telling of facts, through neutrally descriptive comments, down to the repetition of hearsay (without necessarily any endorsement). So, in the instance of 'Venus', Shirley introduces the poem confidently with the statement of authorship and translation, but closes it with a more elliptical remark: 'Hit is sayde þat Graunsomme made þis last balade for

38 The other copy is Cambridge, Pembroke College, MS 215, where an inscription in a later hand, recently identified as that of William Worcester (c. 1415–83), states: 'Istud opus est translatum per Chawcers armigerum Ricardi 2di'; see Wakelin 2002 and Machan 2008. See Benson (ed.) 1987: 1003.

39 See Scattergood 1994 (1996).

Venus resembled to my lady of York aunswering þe complaynt of Mars'. 'Hit is sayde' is a slippery comment here, paralleled by Shirley's use elsewhere of 'some men sayne' (both implying that he himself does not concur with these claims). Finally, it is sometimes the case that Shirley's witness has been misrepresented. Material copied by Shirley (with no ascription of authorship) has sometimes been included in the Chaucer canon on the basis of some 'evidence' drawn from elsewhere (or even, occasionally, none at all). The very fact that Shirley transcribed a poem seems sometimes to have been taken as an indication that the poem might have been by Chaucer, even when Shirley says nothing about such origins. In such cases, when the material has later been judged inauthentic, Shirley has somehow been blamed for an attribution that he did not make in the first place.⁴⁰

With regard to *Adam Scriveyn* it is instructive to look again at the poem in its manuscript context, and to remind ourselves what it is that John Shirley actually says about it. Alexandra Gillespie (2008: 275–76) and others have rightly pointed out that the heading to *Adam Scriveyn* is not authorial. Instead it is an editorial invention that may be traced back from its formulation in the *Riverside Chaucer*, through the filter of John Stow, to what John Shirley says in Trinity, R.3.20. Thus when the stanza is presented in the *Riverside Chaucer* (the place where most people will encounter it), it is given the heading: 'Chaucer's Wordes Unto Adam, His Owne Scriveyn' (Benson (ed.) 1987: 650). The Textual Notes at the back of the *Riverside* record the alternative title offered by John Stow in 1561: 'Chaucers woordes vnto his owne Scriuener' (Benson (ed.) 1987: 1188). Only the Explanatory Notes (also at the back of the book) indicate the form that the heading has in Trinity, R.3.20: 'Chauciers words, .a. Geffrey unto Adame his owen scryveyne'.⁴¹ So buried in the very small print at the back of the *Riverside Chaucer*, are the forms of the heading that were used in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries; but the one chosen to head the actual poem in the modern anthology does not exactly match either of these.

In any case, a careful examination of the appearance of *Adam Scriveyn* on page 367 of Trinity, R.3.20 reveals that Shirley's original heading to the poem was rather different.⁴² Instead of writing 'Chauciers wordes a Geffrey vn to Adame his owen scryveyne' all in one go, Shirley originally wrote only the middle section of

40 As, for example, with the two texts 'Balade of Complaint' and 'Prouerbe' in BL, Add. 16165, discussed above. See also the text referred to as 'Chaucer's Prophecy', a group of couplets that circulated in early prints of Chaucer's works under that title; Shirley copied part of this text in Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Ashmole 59, in both English and Latin, but without any reference to Chaucer; see further Boffey and Edwards 1998: 213.

41 Benson (ed.) 1987: 1083; even so the heading is slightly misquoted.

42 For a freely accessible digital image of page 367, see http://trin-sites-pub.trin.cam.ac.uk/manuscripts/R_3_20/manuscript.php?fullpage=1&startingpage=1.

that statement, ‘a Geffrey vn to Adame’. This is apparent from the difference in the colour of the ink – that used for this middle section is paler than the darker ink used for the surrounding words; the paler ink also better matches the ink used in the stanza itself, and in the final stanzas of the preceding poem immediately above. The centred placement of these words ‘a Geffrey vn to Adame’ fits with Shirley’s general practice when offering short headings, of which there are many other examples in this manuscript.⁴³ Only long, discursive headings are aligned to the left margin; in the case of the most lengthy these may take up several whole lines.⁴⁴ So the heading to *Adam Scriveyn* originally read simply:

a Geffrey vn to Adame

and was subsequently changed to read:

Chauciers wordes a Geffrey vn to Adame his owen scryvene

What is the significance of this? The significance, it seems to me, is that when Shirley originally copied this stanza he gave it the short heading ‘a Geffrey vn to Adame’ because the information contained there was, for him, entirely sufficient. Shirley himself knew the full identity of both Geffrey [Chaucer] and Adame [Pinkhurst], and he knew this because he had received the poem from a reliable source. The later additions, in a different ink, spell out these identities for a different, less knowledgeable audience. A very close parallel to this may be found in another poem that Shirley copied in BL, Add. 16165. This is a virelay of sixty-one lines beginning ‘I can not half þe woo compleyne’, whose heading offers the information that this was a ‘Balade made of Isabelle, countasse of Warr- and Lady Despenser by Richard beauchamp Eorlle of Warrewyk’ (fols 245^v–246^v; *NIMEV* 1288). However, close examination reveals that this lengthy heading was originally a curt ‘Balade’: Shirley subsequently added the details of circumstance and authorship using smaller, more cramped letters. In this case too Shirley is the only authority, so there is no means of checking the veracity of the attribution, though, given his long and well-documented association with Richard Beauchamp, there is also no reason to doubt the truth of what he is saying.

The case for Shirley’s reliability (as an attributor of authorship) rests on the assumption that he had ‘some privileged access to information’.⁴⁵ In the case of Richard Beauchamp that privileged access was based on personal and contemporary acquaintance, and the same may be said of Shirley’s knowledge of Lydgate. Chaucer was long dead by the time Shirley was copying Trinity, R.3.20, and yet Shirley still offers information about the authorship, historical context,

43 The headings to ‘Truth’ (p. 357) and ‘Gentilesse’ (p. 358) are centred in this way.

44 As with the heading to the complaint section of *Anelida and Arcite* on page 106.

45 Boffey and Edwards 1998: 207, in relation to Chaucer.

and circumstances of composition of various poems supposed to be by the poet. On what basis was Shirley able to do this? Had he himself known Chaucer? Shirley was reputedly ninety when he died in 1456, and so would have been in his mid-thirties when Chaucer died in 1400. It is chronologically possible that he had personal knowledge of Chaucer, but no documentation exists to corroborate this. Indeed, at present we know of no records that clearly name Shirley prior to his participation in the earl of Warwick's military retinue in Wales in 1403.⁴⁶ His association with a London milieu is usually regarded as dating from the late 1420s onwards, and this is certainly the period of his life which is mostly richly documented. However, another document from October 1403 places Shirley not just in Warwick's employment but also in the orbit of London for at least some of his time because he acted as Beauchamp's trusted agent at the Exchequer, responsible for collecting monies to pay the earl's troops at Brecon.⁴⁷

It is usually assumed that Shirley's copying of poems by Chaucer in the 1420s and 1430s in both BL, Add. 16165 and Trinity, R.3.20 depended on a supply of materials from members of Chaucer's family – either his son Thomas Chaucer, or perhaps Alice Chaucer. But it is perhaps more likely, or at least *just as* likely, that Shirley might have known scribes who had worked for Chaucer, and that they might have shared copying materials with him. Until now it has not been possible to sketch the identity of any such Chaucerian scribe, but Mooney's naming of Adam Pinkhurst raises a new possibility in this regard. The latest datable document that she can trace in Pinkhurst's hand is an entry for 1410 in Letter Book I.⁴⁸ This raises the theoretical possibility that Shirley and Pinkhurst might have known each other in the first decade of the fifteenth century and perhaps for some years later (no evidence for the date of Pinkhurst's death has been uncovered). Pinkhurst could have been the supply route for Shirley's acquisition of any number of the Chaucerian poems that he copies. If these were items that represented juvenilia (or senilia), which had not been thought worthy of copying until interest in Chaucer reached an elevated state after his death, they might well have existed only in copies made by Pinkhurst which had not been further circulated.⁴⁹ Such a scenario would also help to explain why the textual tradition of these shorter poems can now only be traced back to John Shirley. Not, as Lerer

46 Kew, The National Archives, PRO C.81/1358, no. 4b; the document records Warwick's request for letters of protection for his men and names John Shirley amongst the esquires. There are two references to a John Shirley amongst the patent rolls for 1399 and 1400, but I cannot be sure that this is him; see Connolly 1998: 14–16.

47 Kew, The National Archives, PRO E.403/578 m.1, see Connolly 1998: 17.

48 Mooney and Stubbs 2013: 83.

49 The possibility that 'Chaucer's Chronicle' might have been genuinely by Chaucer, but 'prentice work or the product of incipient senility', is allowed by Boffey and Edwards (1998: 206).

(1993: 121) suggests, because Shirley invented them, but because he was their first point of public appearance, there having been no earlier tradition of copying them. Scattergood has noted that it might be significant that Chaucer's poem about a copyist should be preserved by another copyist, John Shirley, and Lerer (1993) has interpreted this significance as evidence of reader response, claiming that Shirley might have written the poem himself.⁵⁰ Yet rather than inferring invention on Shirley's part we might be more alert to the possibilities of exchange and interaction afforded by the multiple environments in which he moved, and principally – in regard to what he might know about Chaucer – his potential knowledge of that network of London scribes whose existence is being brought to light through the work of Linne Mooney, Estelle Stubbs, and Simon Horobin.

Reference List

Manuscripts

Cambridge, Trinity College, MS R.3.20
 Cambridge University Library, MS Gg.4.27
 Kew, The National Archives, PRO C.81/1358, no. 4b
 Kew, The National Archives, PRO E.403/578 m.1
 London, British Library, Additional MS 16165
 London, British Library, Additional MS 29729
 London, British Library, Additional MS 34360
 London, British Library, MS Harley 78
 London, British Library, MS Harley 372
 London, British Library, MS Harley 7578
 London, Lambeth Palace Library, MS Sion College Arc.L.40.2/E.44
 Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Ashmole 59
 Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Fairfax 16

Primary Texts

Benson, Larry D. (ed.). 1987. *The Riverside Chaucer* (Oxford: Oxford University Press)
 Bergen, H. (ed.). 1924. John Lydgate, *Fall of Princes*. Early English Text Society, Extra Series, 121–24 (London: Oxford University Press)
 Brewer, Derek S. (ed.). 1969; repr., 1976. *Geoffrey Chaucer, The Works 1532: With Supplementary Materials from the editions of 1542, 1561, 1598 and 1602* (London: Scolar)
 Machan, Tim William (ed.). 2008. *Chaucer's Boece*. Middle English Texts 38 (Heidelberg: Winter)

⁵⁰ Scattergood 1990: 500, repeated in 2006: 117.

- Skeat, Walter W. (ed.) 1894–97. *The Complete Works of Geoffrey Chaucer*. 7 vols (London: Oxford University Press), I: *The Romaunt of the Rose and Minor Poems* (1894)
- Stow, John (ed.). 1561. *The Works of Geoffrey Chaucer*. 1561 (London)

Secondary Texts

- Boffey, Julia. 1985. *Manuscripts of English Courtly Love Lyrics in the Later Middle Ages* (Woodbridge: D. S. Brewer)
- Boffey, Julia, and A. S. G. Edwards. 1998. “Chaucer’s Chronicle”: John Shirley and the Canon of Chaucer’s Minor Poems’, *Studies in the Age of Chaucer*, 20: 201–18
- Boffey, Julia, and A. S. G. Edwards (eds). 2005. *A New Index of Middle English Verse* (London: British Library)
- Bressie, Ramona. 1929. ‘Chaucer’s Scrivener’, *Times Literary Supplement*, 9 May, p. 383
- Brown, Carleton, and Rossell Hope Robbins (eds). 1943. *The Index of Middle English Verse* (New York: Columbia University Press)
- Brusendorff, Aage. 1925. *The Chaucer Tradition* (Oxford: Clarendon)
- Chance, Jane. 1985. ‘Chaucerian Irony in the Verse Epistles “Wordes Unto Adam,” “Lenvoy a Scogan,” and “Lenvoy a Bukton”’, *Papers in Language and Literature*, 21: 115–28
- Connolly, Margaret. 1998. *John Shirley: Book Production and the Noble Household in Fifteenth-Century England* (Aldershot: Ashgate)
- Edwards, A. S. G. 1997. ‘John Shirley and the Emulation of Courtly Culture’, in Evelyn Mullally and John Thompson (eds), *The Court and Cultural Diversity: Selected Papers from the Eighth Triennial Congress of the International Courtly Literature Society* (Cambridge: D. S. Brewer), pp. 309–17
- . 2012. ‘Chaucer and “Adam Sciveyn”’, *Medium Aevum*, 81: 135–38
- Fletcher, Alan. 2007. ‘The Criteria for Scribal Attribution: Dublin, Trinity College, MS 244, Some Early Copies of the Works of Geoffrey Chaucer, and the Canon of Adam Pynkhurst Manuscripts’, *Review of English Studies*, 58: 597–632
- . 2010. ‘What Did Adam Pynkhurst (Not) Write?: A Reply to Dr Horobin’, *Review of English Studies*, 61: 690–710
- Fraser, A. (ed.) 1994. *A Survey of London Written in the Year 1598 by John Stow* (Stroud: Alan Sutton; reprinted from the 1912 edition)
- Furnivall, F. J. 1871. *The Athenaeum*, Feb. 18, 1871, p. 210
- Gillespie, Alexandra. 2008. ‘Reading Chaucer’s Words to Adam’, *The Chaucer Review*, 42: 269–83
- James, M. R. 1900–1904. *The Western Manuscripts in the Library of Trinity College Cambridge: A Descriptive Catalogue*, 3 vols (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press)
- Kaske, R. E. 1979. ‘Clericus Adam and Chaucer’s Adam Sciveyn’, in Edward Vasta and Zacharias P. Thundy (eds), *Chaucerian Problems and Perspectives: Essays Presented to Paul E. Beichner* C. S. C. (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press), pp. 114–18
- Lerer, Seth. 1993. *Chaucer and his Readers* (Princeton: Princeton University Press)
- Lyall, R. J. 1989. ‘Materials: The Paper Revolution’, in Jeremy J. Griffiths and Derek Pearsall (eds), *Book Production and Publishing in Britain, 1395–1475* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), pp. 11–29

- Manly, John M. 1929. 'Chaucer's Scrivener', *Times Literary Supplement*, 16 May, p. 403
- . 1913. 'Note on the Envoy of *Truth*', *Modern Philology*, 11: 226
- Mize, Britt. 2001. 'Adam, and Chaucer's Wordes Unto Him', *The Chaucer Review*, 35: 351-77
- Mooney, Linne R. 2006. 'Chaucer's Scribe', *Speculum*, 81: 97-138
- Mooney, Linne R. and Estelle Stubbs. 2013. *Scribes and the City: London Guildhall Clerks and the Dissemination of Middle English Literature 1375-1425* (York: York Medieval Press)
- Olson, Glending. 2008. 'Author, Scribe, and Curse: The Genre of Adam Scriveyn', *The Chaucer Review*, 42: 284-97
- Pearsall, Derek. 1970. *John Lydgate* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul)
- Peck, Russell A. 1983. *Chaucer's Lyrics and Anelida and Arcite: An Annotated Bibliography 1900 to 1980* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press)
- . 1975. 'Public Dreams and Private Myths: Perspective in Middle English Literature', *Publications of the Modern Language Association of America*, 90: 461-68
- Rickert, Edith. 1913. 'Thou Vache', *Modern Philology*, 11: 209-25
- Robbins, Rossell Hope. 1973. 'The Chaucerian Apochrypha', in Albert E. Hartung (ed.), *A Manual of the Writings in Middle English 1050-1500*, vol. IV (New Haven, CT: The Connecticut Academy of Arts and Sciences), pp. 1061-1101, 1285-1306
- Roberts, Jane. 2011. 'On Giving Scribe B a Name and a Clutch of London Manuscripts from c. 1400', *Medium Aevum*, 80: 247-70
- Scattergood, John. 1994 (1996). 'Chaucer's *Complaint of Venus* and the 'Curiosite' of Graunson', *Essays in Criticism*, 44: 171-89; reprinted in John Scattergood (ed.), *Reading the Past: Essays on Medieval and Renaissance Literature* (Dublin: Four Courts), pp. 226-39
- . 1990. 'The Jongleur, the Copyist, and the Printer: The Tradition of Chaucer's Wordes unto Adam, His Own Scriveyn', in Keith Busby and Erik Kooper (eds), *Courtly Literature: Culture and Context* (Amsterdam: John Benjamins), pp. 499-508
- . 2006. 'The Jongleur, the Copyist, and the Printer: The Tradition of Chaucer's Wordes unto Adam, His Own Scriveyn' (revised version of Scattergood 1990), in John Scattergood (ed.), *Manuscripts and Ghosts: Essays on the Transmission of Medieval and Early Renaissance Literature* (Dublin: Four Courts), pp. 115-27
- Wagner, Bernard M. 1929. 'Chaucer's Scrivener', *Times Literary Supplement*, 13 June, p. 474
- Wakelin, Daniel. 2002. 'William Worcester Reads Chaucer's *Boece*', *Journal of the Early Book Society*, 5: 177-80
- Wimsatt, James. 1978. 'Guillaume de Machaut and Chaucer's Love Lyrics', *Medium Aevum*, 47: 66-87