

REFLECTIONS OF SOME MANUSCRIPTS OF NICHOLAS LOVE'S *MYRROUR OF THE BLESSED LYF OF JESU CHRIST*

By A. I. DOYLE

It will be thirty-five years ago that I first met Elizabeth Jones in the Anderson Room of Cambridge University Library over its Additional MS 6578 of Love's *Myrroure* which she was then studying for her London M.A. and which she hoped to re-edit eventually. Before she published her dissertation in a revised form in 1974¹ it had become obvious, because of the ever-growing number of known manuscripts, that complete collation of every one would be impracticable and unlikely to be profitable in proportion to the time it would take. Her actual examination of a considerable number of copies led her to think that, by good luck, Cambridge U.L. Add. 6578 and 6686 afforded the best available text, more faithful to the original than that printed previously by L.F. Powell.² Until someone else follows her steps and further pursues the detailed textual, linguistic and codicological relationships of the extant manuscripts and printed editions, it may be useful if I offer a few observations on the superficial evidence concerning the origins of certain copies, with corrections to what she and I have said about them, directed particularly to the circumstances of reproduction and dissemination of one of the leading works in Middle English.

As Elizabeth showed, there is no need to think that Nicholas Love was of northern birth, and people of his surname were associated with both the Coventry and London Charterhouses.³ It is possible he was the Augustinian friar of the same names who, as lector, in 1389 was authorised to go to Rome, and the prior of that order at York with the same fore-name in 1400,⁴ who could have transferred to the stricter rule of the Carthusians in time to become rector and then prior of Mountgrace in 1409-10. It may be that the *Myrroure* was completed before he took either office or entered the new foundation from another Charterhouse, and even that he had begun it before entering the order. The contacts implied by "at the instance and the prayer of somme devoute soules" are perhaps more than we might expect of a Carthusian. It would also seem from this phrase that it was not commissioned by someone notable like Archbishop Arundel, who would have been alluded to obliquely at least in the *Proheme*. The audience or readership is envisaged as primarily regular religious, yet not specifically Carthusians, and expressly also women, while the wider public of "lewed men and wommen and hem that ben of symple understanding" for English books is acknowledged.⁵ The combating of Lollardy, especially in the *Short Treatise* and *Devout Prayer* at the end, has something of the

air of an afterthought about it, apt in the years culminating in Arundel's decrees of 1407-9, but there is no clear reference to his control of scriptural translations. The wording of the Latin *Memorandum* which occurs in many but by no means all of the copies of the *Myrrour* is at once more and less precise than has been appreciated.⁶ It tells us only that it was circa 1410 that "originalis copia huius libri . . . presentebatur" to Arundel at London "ad inspiciendum et *debite* examinandum antequam fuerat libere communicata" (my italics). It is not merely couched retrospectively: the indefinite date shows it must have been written a good deal later when presumably the unrestricted circulation of the book had been challenged. It goes on to record not only the requisite approval but also a positive mandate for publication to edify the faithful and confute the Lollards. That Arundel was given fraternity of Mountgrace in 1409 may indicate when this event occurred.⁷ Some years may therefore have elapsed before the *Memorandum* was thought desirable and much free communication of the *Myrrour*, so encouraged, could have happened in the meantime.

If this interpretation is correct the significance of Add.6578 is somewhat altered.⁸ The *Memorandum* on f.2v is conspicuously an addition by a different (though similar and contemporary) hand to that of the chapter-list and *Attende* note (concerning the letters N and B in the textual marginalia for sources) which immediately precede it, without their coloured decoration, with a prefixed paraff sign (cc) by the same additional pen and ink superimposed on descenders of that decoration, and with a + sign in the adjacent margin. The hand of the *Memorandum* also occurs in the following body of the book, on ff.23v-4v where it supplies certain Latin marginalia which are not underlined in red as the others there and elsewhere are, and on the top outside corner of f.43r with the note "deficiunt Rubricae in [hoc?] quaterno", this being the first page of quire f, in which (ff.44-9) the English chapter rubrics are now written in the allotted spaces by another hand, differing from that of the main copyist of the text responsible for the rest of the rubrics, and in a different shade of red. It thus seems that the scribe of the *Memorandum* was engaged in completing the matter of the work after the ordinary functional decoration, which had been left partly unfinished. The second rubricator who supplied the deficiency so noted also inserted part-rubrics in the preliminary chapter-list.⁹

Below the *Memorandum* in much smaller writing, slightly different ink yet possibly the same hand and certainly contemporary, is "caue de istis verbis gude pro gode / Item hir pro heere in pluralitate", and this is echoed by similar small annotations to the text: on f.5r against "hir herte" there is "here" in the margin, on 7v "meyn" is glossed "mene" in the margin and "gude" in the text changed to "gode", on 3lv "sight" rendered as "sight". The incidence of such spelling modifications, perhaps meant as examples since they are by no means exhaustive for the pages covered, is not maintained in the rest of the book, but there are many other neat corrections by what is probably the same hand, such as insertions of missing letters or words and marks where a paraff is omitted (e.g. ff.36r, 93v, 101v, 118v). This scrupulousness about minutiae

only supplements that of the original scribe,¹⁰ for his freedom from substantial omission and error is implied in consequence. Any corrections before his completion of copying must have been made even more discreetly. Probably in the reviser's hand the word "hic" occurs repeatedly in the margins, not obviously related to particular corrections and so presumably recording progress, either in underlining (on f.22v in red) or correction or else of re-transcription (35v, 36v, 40v, 50v in black).

Not all of this revision need have been done within one short period but it looks uniform and it is reasonable to suppose that it envisaged this copy being employed, with some changes of spelling, as an exemplar for further copies, which were also to include the *Memorandum*. It is not impossible that Add.6578 was the original copy presented to and returned by Arundel circa 1410, or that the scribe of the *Memorandum* or reviser was the author himself, but if so it may have been after an interval during which this copy, in its original state, had already served for reading and copying. For it is not likely that once the *Memorandum* had been added to a manuscript it would be omitted in a derivative, and there are a considerable number of extant copies which seem to have never included it, some of very early date. Nicholas Love died in 1424, with which the writing of the *Memorandum* and revisions in Add.6578 is perfectly compatible. The writing of the main copyist is a very steady squat anglicana of comparable character yet with a couple of more modern forms (simple a and secretary final s) which might fit a younger man. He also wrote the chapter-list and *Attende* note on a preliminary bifolium (which may mean that it was somewhat of an after-thought) in the same greenish-yellow ink, and at the head of its last page (f.2v) the inscription "Iste liber est de domo Assumpcionis beate Marie in monte gracie" is in a hand of similar aspect, although with enhanced ascenders and descenders as well as a couple of more formal letter choices (two-compartment a and secretary g), and slightly different ink. That this inscription is close in date to the copying of the book can hardly be in doubt, and the formula of other known and certainly later Mountgrace *exlibris* instances is different.¹¹ Its abnormal placing must be on account of the margins of the facing first page of the text having been filled with an illuminated vinet of which offset traces are visible on f.2v, the original f.3 having been removed at some time and replaced by a post-medieval supply of the missing matter.¹² From traces the vinet may have included the initials of Nicholas Love, as do two other early copies but there was not spare space for any sizeable picture. The remaining illumination of the major initials, at part beginnings, is of good quality, as is the penwork flourishing of subsidiary initials both in the text and the preliminary bifolium, and the membrane of the whole book. It was therefore more costly than the plainest fair copy that might be made in or for a Charterhouse, though the style of writing is more utilitarian than what is often found with similar decoration in vernacular books of this period, c.1410, probably produced in the metropolitan book-trade. It is not inconceivable that Add.6578 was written in the provinces and illuminated in the metropolis to make it more presentable, and that the Mountgrace ownership inscription

was added on its return to the author's house.

The style of writing of Add.6578 is in fact not unlike that of Cambrai Bibliothèque Municipale MS 255, a copy of the English translation of Suso's *Horologium Sapientie* with the colophon "Scriptum finaliter in monte graciae die Mensis Maij Anno domini M.CCCC.^o xix Deo gracias", which also occurs in Aberystwyth, National Library of Wales, Porkington MS 19, of the same work.¹³ The force of "finaliter" is most apposite for the translator's work, and neither of the extant transcriptions need be his own fair copy. Elizabeth Salter argued that Nicholas Love adapted the *Devout Prayer* which appears at the end of most copies of the *Myrroure* from this translation of Suso's work;¹⁴ if so, it must either have been known to him well before 1419 or only added to his text after that date, which seems to me too late. Add.6578 includes it in the main hand and ink, not as an obvious addendum. If the Suso was, as the colophon implies, being translated over a longish period at Mountgrace there is no difficulty; whether Love himself could have been the translator requires stylistic comparison and accommodation of the fact that the latter addresses his *Seven Poyntes of Trewe Wisdam* to a lady of eminence as her "chapeleyne" which in the literal sense was not possible for a Carthusian, though such a term could be used obsequiously, and we cannot be sure what might be permissible in literary and spiritual relations with a patroness, for instance.¹⁵

Linguistically neither Cambrai 255 nor Porkington 19 are northern: the latter is Essex, according to sampling by Professors McIntosh and Samuels; another copy of the *Seven Poyntes*, in a volume which belonged in the fifteenth century to Beauvale Charterhouse (Notts.), Douce 114, is in two hands of which the first, placed in Nottinghamshire by its spelling, is very like that of Cambrai, while the second belongs again to Essex.¹⁶ It seems likely that the latter was the language of the source, overlain when the first copyist was influenced by accompanying texts and environment. What may be the same first hand is found in manuscripts with a variety of English dialects, south-eastern, north midland and northern, so, if it was one man's, he took what was in front of him and perhaps the preferences of his superiors at the time.¹⁷ It is therefore of interest that the language of Add.6578 of the *Myrroure* is predominantly Essex too, with only certain North Midland features ("mykel", "gude", "luf", "awne") such as the reviser noted for modification by subsequent copyists. We must remember that the initial community of a Charterhouse was recruited from previous foundations, commonly at a distance, and the members were rarely just local in origin. Moreover, books might be made elsewhere or by the temporary transfer of a scribe.

Cambridge University Library Add.6686 is said by the Edinburgh Dialect Survey to repeat the same complexion as 6578 and Elizabeth Salter was persuaded that its text was derived directly therefrom. Superficially it is obvious that the wording and sequence of the preliminaries, chapter headings and endings all agree, and they both contain marginal notes found in few other copies.¹⁸ 6686, of which only section I (pp.1-234) is in question, since the other sections were connected later,¹⁹ is a larger and finer copy than 6578,

elaborately ruled in ink in two columns and written in a good bastard anglicana, carefully punctuated, with illumination of high quality showing stylistic developments of the second decade of the fifteenth century yet not in the main stream of metropolitan work. One vinet (p.190) includes three void shields, from which it may be inferred that the limner did not know the precise destination of the book save that it was for an armigerous person or body, or else he assumed from the expense it must be so. Its inclusions of the additions and corrections of 6578 and close correspondence of its language ("quite staggeringly so" in McIntosh's words), together with an ascription of the work to Nicholas Love as monk of Mountgrace not found in 6578 (although a later marginal note there about him may imply it),²⁰ incline me to think it a provincial product not much later, for someone in direct contact with the author or Mountgrace.

Although Arundel's approbation c.1410 was sought before the book was freely communicated, a restricted communication to devout souls such as those for whom it was written is not thereby excluded and may indeed be implied. Copies which seem never to have contained the *Memorandum* may be or descend from such a previous issue and may correspond to the state of the unrevised form in Add.6578 or even an earlier version. The Foyle manuscript (Beeleigh Abbey, Maldon, Essex) which has the ownership inscription of Sibil de Felton, abbess of Barking from 1394 to 1419, not only lacks the *Memorandum* but has the *Attende* note twice, abbreviated before the *Proheme* of the text and also in full at the end of the preceding chapter-list in another hand, suggestive of a subsequent supplementation from a different exemplar, and Elizabeth discovered that it includes an alternative Passion narrative (which survives in some later copies) which could represent the author's preparatory efforts.²¹ Professor Samuels has diagnosed the spelling of the main scribe as S.W. Essex, and other, linguistically mixed, anglicana hands share the copying in a succession of manners more that of a communal than a commercial product of the best metropolitan type like another book of the abbess's, Bodley MS 923 of the *Clensyng of Mannes Sowle*; yet the illumination of the Foyle manuscript is of the same style (Margaret Rickert's I), i.e. c.1400-10 for the metropolis, from which Barking was hardly isolated.²² Lavish illumination of the same style and period is also seen in Takamiya MS 8, written in a textura of a kind common in English scriptural manuscripts at this period when the Lollard versions must have been being constantly copied commercially in the area of the metropolis.²³ As it was given away by Joan Countess of Kent, widow of the founder of Mountgrace, before her death in 1442 it is possible that it was presented to her or made for her from an early exemplar at the author's initiative. The choice of a superior script (hierarchically) suggests a special respect for the text or recipient, or both. The absence of armorials in English manuscripts of this quality and period does not appear to be significant for the status of their owners. They may have been more often incorporated, or added, later in the fifteenth century, not always for people of the highest ranks. Bodleian MS e mus. 35, which does have the arms of Neville and Beaufort remaining from a fuller, damaged,

display with illumination of a rather more developed style (perhaps c.1415-30), may have belonged to Joan Countess of Westmorland or her brother Thomas Duke of Exeter, who died in 1440 and 1426 respectively. This copy, the first item in the volume, has a chapter-list and *Attende* but not the *Memorandum*. It is written in a fine *anglicana formata* or bastard of southern orthography, although subsequent hands for other items show some northern characteristics.²⁴

It is obvious that most *Myrrour* copying, both before and after the *Memorandum* was added, must have been done far away from Mount-grace, and chiefly in the main centres of vernacular book-production by scribes and limners habituated to it. If provincial spellings crop up, they may be survivals from the exemplar or even the original but they may be, too, traces of a copyist's earlier training.²⁵ The copies with consistently pronounced dialect features, such as Bodley 131, written by John Morton probably at York in the second quarter of the century,²⁶ or Glasgow University Library Gen. 1130, including the arms of Willoughby of Eresby in mid-century illumination and of Nottinghamshire language²⁷ - both without the Latin preliminary notes and both, from their other contents, probably meant for religious readers - are clearly distinguishable from what appears to be the usual metropolitan model of the *Myrrour* - a model not wholly standardized however, nor normally cheap. Though the contents will commonly include the *Myrrour* itself with the Short Treatise and Devout Prayer appended, a list of 64 chapters, with part-divisions for the days of the week, preceding, the *Attende* note between chapter-list and *Proheme*, the *Memorandum* coming after it²⁸ there or separately at the end of the whole work, Latin side-notes of the initials N[icholas] and B[onaventura], other source-references and marginal commentary, nevertheless one or more of these elements may be missing (from the outset, not only by later loss) or displaced, sometimes possibly by choice or convenience (such as lack of space)²⁹ but probably often because of the content and order of the exemplar being copied. As we have seen, there may have been traditions of the text ante-dating the *Memorandum*, and perhaps the chapter-list, or *Attende* and corresponding side-notes, or the Devout Prayer, descending from different recensions of the author's work,³⁰ while the same effects could stem from decisions or failings of later copyists; and such defects observed could be made up from alternative exemplars. It is notable however that some distinct patterns are found repeatedly, and equally notable that when we find as we do, symptomatically of the commercial situation, particular scribes each making more than one copy of the work, those by one individual do not conform to a single pattern of those elements, or to the same textual wording, or to a standard lay-out and page dimensions.

Cambridge University Library Mm.V.15, where the chapter-list and *Attende* are on a separate preliminary bifolium (as in Add.6578) and from frame, membrane, writing and decoration a probable after-thought, is all in a slightly awkward *anglicana formata* at 32 lines per page, which Mr J.J. Griffiths has suggested is the same hand as that of Oo.VII.45(1) of the same library, a portion only of a much grander half-finished copy at 37 lines a page and with marginalia not in the corresponding passages of Mm. As the illumination of Mm

is in Rickert's style I, i.e. again of the first decade of the century, whereas that of Oo is in style II, i.e. c.1425-50, it is not surprising if they were not utilising the same exemplar and that they were done to different specifications.³¹ Huntington Library HM 1339, however, which Mr Griffiths has also suggested (much more arguably) as by the same hand, has the same number of lines as Mm, both *Attende* and *Memorandum* at the end of a chapter-list integral to the volume, and is a distinctly cheaper product, on poorer membrane, less evenly written and with only blue and red decoration.³²

Three copies in the hand of Stephen Dodesham (who ended his life as a Carthusian at Sheen in 1482 but who must have been very active as a scribe before as well as after entering religion, from the later 1420s onwards)³³ differ in several respects. Trinity College, Cambridge, B.15.16, a manuscript Elizabeth particularly admired, has 33-line pages, no *Attende*, yet the *Memorandum* at the very end; the illumination is of the second quarter of the century and, like the membrane and writing, of high quality. Bodleian Library Rawlinson A.387B is of poorer material, preparation, writing and decoration, probably later in the scribe's career, with 28-31 lines per page and both Latin notes after the chapter-list. Glasgow University Library, Hunterian T.3.15, with a contemporary ex-libris of Sheen and attribution to Dodesham dated 1474/5, has better membrane and illumination and, except for the chapter-list and following two Latin notes in long lines, is in two columns of 26-30, the writing closer in quality as well as style to Rawl. than to the neater Trinity. Amongst the marginalia of Hunterian are some found in Add.6578 and 6686 but not in Trinity B.15.16, evidence possibly of textual descent or conflation by Carthusian channels.

The two-column lay-out of Add.6686 and Hunterian T.3.15 is not unparalleled, in a few larger copies,³⁴ but long lines are normal, even in some big ones. Most commonly copies are of a middling size, on good membrane (only a minority involving paper), well-written (predominantly in anglicana formata), quite expensively decorated, and not containing any other work. As we increasingly recognize in them more hands of copyists and limners of other manuscripts we may be able to get nearer to discerning the relative roles of the executants and acquirers of such books and what intermediaries and processes lay between them, which, for want of really explicit evidence, is still so mysterious, both the process whereby a new work was "*libere communicata*" and that by which anyone might obtain a copy of something new to him, through what we call the book-trade. If any articles of Middle English literature established themselves early enough in the fifteenth century as so well-known and frequently in demand that it was worth a stationer's paying for costly copies in advance of actual purchasers, rather than waiting passively for orders, Nicholas Love's *Myrrour of the Lyfe of Christ* was surely one, especially if, after Arundel's mandates, it was thought of as replacing the Lollard Gospels. (The Brut chronicle is another.) It is not to denigrate the *Myrrour* to say that an illuminated copy could have served a comparable function with that of the first-communion or confirmation present of a more recent era, more devout than our own, in which the book-trade saw its opportunities. Books of hours of course already and increasingly

had that function, supplied to a large extent from overseas. The surviving copies of the *Myrrour* do not suggest that it was ever subjected to the same degree of standardisation until Caxton, De Wrode and Pynson began to print it, from 1486 onwards, repeatedly.³⁵ The early editions were of folio format, illustrated, even some copies on membrane, aiming at, one may guess, the top end of the market, but in the sixteenth century they were reduced to quarto (though retaining most of the pictures),³⁶ no doubt for a wider public. The woodcuts served some of the same functions as the illumination in the manuscripts: to sub-divide the text and to give a more than ordinary value to the book. A bequest by a London merchant, Thomas Pettit, in 1498 of his book of parchment written with gold letters called *Speculum Vite Christi*,³⁷ supports the latter hypothesis: they did not merely distinguish it visually from any other books he had, yet that would itself be quite possibly true. Except for a comparatively few and mostly early copies, the many more Brut chronicles which were produced at a lower level of craftsmanship for similar owners by metropolitan scribes in the course of the fifteenth century afford a contrast, in almost everything but the high incidence of imperfection in the survivors, owing to wear and tear, which points to a high rate of total loss in each case. The use of membrane, treatment as heirlooms, and post-reformation Catholic piety may have mitigated the effects on copies of the *Myrrour*. The evidence of medieval ownership and influence is that the author's and archbishop's desires achieved a much wider success than the remaining copies show, and the latter that it was done predominantly through the book-trade.

NOTES

- 1 Nicholas Love's "Myrrour of the Blessed Lyf of Jesu Christ", *Analecta Cartusiana* 10 (Salzburg, 1974).
- 2 *Ibid.* p.21.
- 3 *Ibid.* pp.23-4, and E. Zeeman, "Nicholas Love - a Fifteenth-Century Translator" *RES*, n.s. 6 (1955) pp.113-27.
- 4 F. Roth, *The English Austin Friars 1249-1538*, 2 vols. (Cassiciacum 6-7, New York, 1966, 1961) II, pp.243*, 265*.
- 5 Cf. J. Hogg, "Mount Grace Charterhouse and late medieval English spirituality", *Collectanea Cartusiensia* 3, *Analecta Cartusiana* 82:3 (Salzburg, 1980) pp.18-21.
- 6 Printed by Salter (1974), pp.1-2; Hogg, pp.19-20: "liber" in the former should be "libere" as in the latter.
- 7 Hogg, p.21, n.64.
- 8 Cf. Salter (1974), p.11.
- 9 The red paraffs and underlining were not provided on many pages intermittently throughout; running titles were done alternately by the main and another hand but with no obvious regularity. In both operations the unit seems to be a bifolium or page, not a quire. The supplier of the missing rubrics has a secretary hand of a type one might expect in the 1420s and may not have done his job at once.
- 10 Cf. E. Zeeman, "Punctuation in an early manuscript of Love's *Myrrour*", *RES*, n.s. 7 (1956) pp.11-18.
- 11 "Montis gracie liber", "Liber montis gracie", "Liber domus montis gracie".
- 12 In an imitation medieval hand which, from its hints of legal anglicana, may be sixteenth or seventeenth century.
- 13 Salter (1974), p.33, cites the year as 1319, following the *Catalogue Général des Manuscrits des Bibliothèques Publiques de France: Départements*, vol. 17 (1891) p.88, which omits one C.
- 14 E. Zeeman, "Two Middle English versions of a prayer to the Sacrament", *Archiv* 194 (1957) pp.113-21.
- 15 A Carthusian, Gerard Boot, no doubt from the Perth Charterhouse, robbed on his way back to Flanders in 1450, was said to be confessor to the Queen of Scotland (Mary of Gueldres): *Proceedings & Ordinances of the Privy Council*, ed. N.H. Nicolas, vol. 6 (1837) p.100. Prelates like Thomas Langley, Bishop of Durham, professed themselves to be the king's "simple chaplain", i.e. in effect "humble servant".
- 16 I am indebted to Professor McIntosh for reviewing the question on several occasions. The two stints of the first hand in Douce sandwich that of the second, which begins and ends within pages of the *Seven Poyntes* (ff.90r line 8-109r line 11), evidently in collaboration. Unfortunately no other

copies are known of the preceding translations of saints' lives for comparison of the language. Both portions of Douce 114 were ed. by C. Horstmann, *Anglia* 8 (1885) pp.102-96; 10 (1888) pp.323-89. The English "compiloure" of the lives (of which the Latin texts were in some contemporary Carthusian libraries) offers an "Apologetik" for his style, "as umwhile soperen, operewhile norben - but þe cause why, nedib not to be tolde" and says that he did the work at the bidding of his prior, but addresses a potential audience or readership of men and women, including clerks.

- 17 St John's College, Cambridge, C.25 of *The Orchard of Syon* (not before 1415) - see ed. P. Hodgson & C.M. Liegey, vol. 1 EETS 258 (1966), frontispiece - and Takamiya MS 16 (Phillipps 10634), *The Master of Game* (not before 1406), of which I have seen only one opening in reduced facsimile in sale catalogues, are palaeographically close if not identical, and so is a fragmented Latin and English volume acquired by an abbot of Rievaulx in the middle of the century, Corpus Christi College, Oxford 155 + B.L. Cotton Vitellius D.V + Vespasian D.XIII ff.181r-201v, with a variety of languages according to Professor McIntosh, including Yorks. and S.E. Lincs. Dominus Johannes Watton may have been the scribe of this. Groupings on grounds of such script-likeness of course require more discussion of the relative effects of schooling and individuality.
- 18 E.g. in chapter 9, and on f.51v of 6578 "Item de abstinentia" in the lower margin is also in the lower margin of 6686 p.97.
- 19 Not only are the ruling, writing and decoration etc. distinct but the number 20 (for 1520?) with a cryptic monogram (based on *h*) occurring only on the lower margins of the last section, Hilton's *Scale Book I* etc., implies separate ownership. This and the previous section, *The Pistyl of Love* (Contemplations of the Dread and Love of God, or *Fervor Amoris*), however, manifest spelling-systems which suggest that the volume was put together in the North or N. Midlands. On p.120 of the *Myrroure* an early sixteenth-century hand notes the mention of Hilton's work, which may imply cross-reference.
- 20 The ascription "Explicit Compendium Nicholai Love Montis Gracie Monachi" was added, and later erased, below the colophon on p.233, where it can be mostly made out under ultra-violet light. In 6578 on f.79v a fifteenth-century hand responsible for some other annotations has written adjacent to a mention of the Lollards "Nota bene prior lufe"; cf. the marginal reference to "prior Norton" in the Mountgrace manuscript of the Book of Margery Kempe, ed. S.B. Meech, EETS 212 (1940) p.xxxvi. On p.36 of 6686 "Dan Adam" is mentioned.
- 21 E. Salter, "The manuscripts of Nicholas Love's *Myrroure of the Blessed Lyf of Jesu Christ* and related texts", *Middle English Prose: Essays on Bibliographical Problems*, ed. A.S.G. Edwards and D. Pearsall (New York, 1981) pp.118, 126.
- 22 Cf. O. Pächt and J.J.G. Alexander, *Illuminated Manuscripts in the Bodleian Library, Oxford*, vol. 3 (Oxford, 1973), p.68, no.769; M. Rickert, in *The Text of the Canterbury Tales*, ed. J.M. Manly and E. Rickert, vol. I (Chicago, 1940) pp.565, 567-8.
- 23 Again I have seen only a sale-catalogue reduced facsimile of two pages.
- 24 Cf. Salter (1974), p.14 (not Beauchamp, a mistake of the *Summary Catalogue of Western Manuscripts*, nor quartered) and (1981), p.120; Pächt and Alexander, p.82, no.939. M and N in the lower corners of p.xvi might stand for Margaret Neville, Thomas's wife, who is said to have died before

- him: G.E. Cokayne and V. Gibbs, *Complete Peerage*, vol. 5 (1926) pp.203-4.
- 25 Cf. Salter (1974), p.13 n.49.
- 26 *Summary Catalogue*, vol. 2 pt i (Oxford, 1922), pp.152-3, no.1999. Among notes at the end "to peter warke ld." confirms the various other indications, that being the local name for the Minster fabric.
- 27 N.R. Ker, *Medieval Manuscripts in British Libraries*, vol. 2 (Oxford, 1977), p.925, but the arms are rather those of Robert, lord Willoughby 1409-52, than his father, William, and their placing at the beginning of Adam the Carthusian's *Soliloquium* suggests a connection with Axholme or Beauvale Charterhouse. The repetition of the same pair of works in two other manuscripts - see Salter (1974), p.16 n.61 - points to a limited, perhaps local, descent.
- 28 Salter (1974), pp.1-2, prints them in reverse order.
- 29 Someone wishing to add the *Memorandum* to a copy of the work already written with insufficient space between the *Attende* and *Proheme* might naturally put it at the very end, and so thereafter.
- 30 The presence or absence of the concluding couplet "Jesu lorde thy blessid lyf/helpe and conforte our wrecchid lyf", *Index of M.E. Verse* no.1728, and *Supplement*, may be another piece of evidence.
- 31 Oo has gaps of 13-14 lines ruled but blank between chapters, scarcely suitable for illustrations and perhaps meant for additional meditative rubrics. Mm is much rewritten in its text in the same sort of anglicana as is Pennsylvania Univ. Lib. Eng. 3 of *A Myroure to Lewde Men and Wymmen*, ed. V. Nelson, *Middle English Texts* 14 (Heidelberg, 1981) and has, erased, on f.138 the same note "usque huc" as occurs in B.L. Harley 45 of that work (*ibid* p.51), indicative of systematic correction and possible transcription, by a small team of scribes specialising in Middle English books, perhaps.
- 32 Formerly Ingilby, Ripley Castle, Yorks.: *Historical Manuscripts Commission*, report VI, app. p. 353. Salter (1974), p.8 n.35, disposes of the alleged Mountgrace connection.
- 33 I first sketched his apparent oeuvre in the Lyell lectures at Oxford, accompanied by an exhibition, in 1967. M.B. Parkes, *English Cursive Book Hands* (Oxford, 1969) illustrates Hunterian MS.T.3.15 as pl.6 (ii); and in his revised ed. (London, 1979), p.25, lists some further attributions, of which B.L. Add.10053 is mistaken. Others continue to come to light, and await an adequate commentary. He was professed at Witham by 1462 and later re-professed at Sheen.
- 34 Cf. Salter (1974), p.15 n.58.
- 35 E.G. Duff, *Fifteenth Century English Books* (Oxford, 1917), no.48-51; A.W. Pollard and G.R. Redgrave, *Short-Title Catalogue of English Books 1475-1640* (London, 1926), no.3259-67.
- 36 E. Hodnett, *English Woodcuts 1480-1535* (rev. ed., Oxford, 1973) pp.5, 141-50.
- 37 Michael L. Zell, "Fifteenth- and sixteenth-century wills as historical sources", *Archives* 14 (1979), pp.67-74. For other instances of ownership

besides those cited by Salter (1974), pp.17-18, see my *Survey of the Origins and Circulation of Theological Writings in English in the 14th, 15th and early 16th Centuries* (Cambridge Ph.D. 1953), vol.1, pp.150-8, to which additions can now of course be made; the preceding account of the manuscripts not only needs amplification but much correction in respect of dating and localisation: cf. Salter (1981), pp.123-6, for a more inclusive list of manuscripts, where however the dating still needs revision.