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Abstract

This thesis focuses upon John Skelton's poem *The Garland of Laurel*. It considers the poem in its late fifteenth- and early sixteenth-century context, providing an insight into its intellectual and economic conditions of production and reception. It relies upon an examination of its extant material forms as well as of its subject matter.

The thesis considers both the relevance of the poem's subject matter to its period of production and identifies particular contexts for considering its genesis. It examines the manuscript and early printed text versions of the poem, their production, circulation and reception. It looks at the context provided by the popularity and circulation of the form of miscellany and considers Skelton's deliberate use of the form as a model for *The Garland of Laurel*.

Dream poetry and French *dits amoreux* are discussed as alternative influences on the composition of the poem. Attention is given to Skelton's use and adaptation of these genres, particularly to the technique of lyric insertion. In addition, the thesis focuses upon what is known about Howard patronage and sets this in the context of other examples of late medieval female patronage. I provide a new interpretation of Skelton's poem as a work which explores processes of patronage and the changing dynamics of the relationship between writers and patrons in the late fifteenth century.

Skelton's self-representation is also considered in the context of his contemporaries, the early Humanists and French *Rhétoriqueurs*, whose attitudes and authorial activities provide interesting points of comparison. The final chapter examines the making of poetic identity in the context of English literary tradition and in the wider context of foreign relations in the early sixteenth century.
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Introduction

A. Aims.

This thesis examines John Skelton’s poem *The Garland of Laurel* from both generic and historical perspectives.¹ It considers the poem in its late fifteenth- and early sixteenth-century context, providing insights into its intellectual and economic conditions of production, its circulation and reception. This period, unique in the history of textual production, was characterised by the coexistence and concurrent circulation of texts in early printed and manuscript editions. I consider the significance of this context for the composition and circulation of Skelton’s *The Garland of Laurel*, questioning why the poem was written and produced in the ways that it was. I consider Skelton’s development of medieval literary tradition and by considering the relevance of its subject matter and form to the period of production I draw conclusions which are important for our understanding of this particular work.

As Seth Lerer has suggested, Skelton’s poem is a seminal work for understanding the late fifteenth century. Lerer describes Hawes and Skelton as a new courtly dyad, pre-empting Wyatt and Surrey. He suggests, in relation to *The Garland of Laurel*, that ‘texts that have long been dismissed as derivative […], unreadable […], obscurely topical […] or theatrically self-promoting […] are coming to be seen as central to the consciousness of English writers and readers during the first third of the sixteenth century’.² My thesis is founded upon similar assumptions about the importance of Skelton and the late fifteenth century. It broadens the context for discussing Skelton’s work by considering both the literary and practical influences upon *The Garland of Laurel*’s production and reception. It demonstrates the potential contribution studies of his works can make to an understanding of the late medieval period and contributes to the current reinvigoration of Skelton studies.

¹ Skelton’s dates are 1460–c.1529. *The Garland of Laurel* is dated c.1495.
B. The Text

Skelton’s poem exists today in a manuscript miscellany, British Library MS Cotton Vitellius E.x., and in two early printed texts, also in the British Library, STC 22610, A ryght delectable tratys upon a goodly Garlande or Chapelet of Laurell, printed in 1523 by Richard Faques, and STC 22608, The Crowne of Lawrell, the first item in Pithy pleasaut and profitable workes of maister Skelton, Poete Laureate, printed in 1568 by Thomas Marshe. This thesis initially explores the existing material evidence. The content and subject matter of the poem form a second method for investigating the context of its production and reception.

Unlike the most recent studies of Skelton, for example, Greg Walker’s John Skelton and the Politics of the 1520s and his Plays of Persuasion: Drama and Politics at the Court of Henry VIII, which place Skelton in his political, economic and social context, this thesis recognises the interdisciplinarity of medieval studies, and the place of historical criticism in the construction of literary history, but restores the material text to primacy in literary study.

Such an approach has much in common with that of Stanley Fish as well as with that of Lerer. A reading which depends upon the reconstruction of political, intellectual and literary history alone falls short. Fish’s critical assumptions ‘rest on the belief that reading is an activity and that meaning, insofar as it can be specified, is coextensive with that activity, and not, as some would hold, its product’. The response of the reader to the text, the adequacy of the English language, the nature of poetic diction, the problem of poetic and narratorial identity, and the relationship between the arts of poetry and rhetoric, are


literary concerns, debated in the last century, and at the present time, as they are in Skelton’s poetry.

In writing this thesis I have relied upon John Scattergood’s 1983 collection of Skelton’s works and all references in the thesis to *The Garland of Laurel* are based upon this work. Line numbers to Scattergood’s edition are provided in parentheses in the text. Though based upon Dyce’s earlier publications, Scattergood’s edition sought to place Skelton’s works in a new and critical light, revising some of Dyce’s assumptions about Skelton’s authorship. Scattergood, like Dyce, combines the three versions of *The Garland of Laurel* to form one poem, indicating in the endnotes the origin of different parts. While the Scattergood edition of the poem remains the standard text of *The Garland of Laurel* today, I have tried not to allow his compilation to overshadow the significance of the individual versions of the text in my work.

**C. Recent Critical Work**

**i. Manuscript**

Recent critical work which has been of relevance to the writing of this thesis is extensive. The work of Julia Boffey has been invaluable in my exploration of the production and circulation of texts in manuscript and early print culture. In particular, Boffey’s articles ‘English Dream Poems of the Fifteenth Century and Their French Connections’ and ‘The Manuscripts of English Courtly Love Lyrics in the Fifteenth Century’ have provided valuable insights into the activities of readers and owners of manuscripts. More recently, her article ‘“Withdrawe your hande”: The Lyrics of “The Garland of Laurel”, from Manuscript to Print’, has been most timely and pertinent and has complemented my

---


7 An edition of *The Garland of Laurel*, which is similar to that provided by Scattergood, is found in F. W. Brownlow, ed., *The Book of the Laurel: John Skelton* (Newark: University of Delaware Press; London: Associated University Presses, 1990). This work is more than an edition of a single poem, however, and focuses on the difficulties of producing an edition of a work written in the late fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries which survives in several versions.
approach to *The Garland of Laurel* and my discussion of the context of Skelton’s works.  

Similarly the work of John J. Thompson has proved influential in my consideration of compilers and their activities. His articles on Robert Thornton and the Thornton manuscript in Lincoln Cathedral Library provided a model of scribal practice and a picture of Thornton as the compiler of miscellanies. Thompson focuses on the circulation of romance material in Yorkshire and Thornton’s literary interests, on the probable relationships between neighbouring texts in the miscellany, its plan of organisation and the problems of its scribal presentation. Margaret Connolly provides a recent study of John Shirley which illuminates the scribal practices of a manuscript collector, compiler and transcriber. Thompson and Connolly have provided important models for my own discussion of the production and reception of the British Library Cotton manuscript.

My thesis initially focuses upon the production and reception of the extant physical texts of *The Garland of Laurel*. The particular difficulties presented by the manuscript make a full collation impossible, but I provide a list of the contents of the manuscript for reference alongside my discussion in Chapter One. I consider the implications of both the content of the manuscript and the order of the contents for Skelton’s poem. I consider the state of the manuscript, the possible owners, patrons or collectors of its contents and I consider other comparable manuscripts. Particular attention is given to the possible dating of Skelton’s poem in relation to the manuscript collection.

Of particular interest has been Scattergood’s consideration of Skelton’s occasional poems, in particular the manuscript context for his poem about the Earl of

---


Northumberland and the Percy family. Scattergood also considers Skelton’s relationship with other patrons, with printers, the court and the wider London audience. Scattergood describes the London provenance manuscripts and considers their connection with John Stow and other possible collectors.

A. S. G. Edwards and Carol M. Meale have also produced work of relevance to the London manuscript culture and consider the status of manuscript and print at the time of the introduction of printing. They focus on the identity of book producers and the differences between book and manuscript production. They consider the nature of collections in the context of new markets and the individualising of texts, sometimes with woodcuts or printers’ ornaments. They highlight the changing nature of the relationships between printers and patrons, printers and authors, and the audiences for the texts they produced. They consider specific acts of textual dissemination and the collaborative ventures undertaken by those producing texts, exploring networks of commercial possibilities. Invaluable reference works for both Chapters One and Two have been William A. Ringler’s two bibliographies (the *Bibliography and Index of English Verse in Manuscript 1501–1558* and the *Bibliography and Index of English Verse Printed 1476–1558*).

### ii. Early Printed Texts

The work of Boffey, Thompson, Edwards and Meale has been significant in considering the relationship between manuscript and print culture but has also been influential in my examination of the differences which exist between the early printed texts and the manuscript version of *The Garland of Laurel*. In the thesis I consider the significance of each version of the poem in the context of coexisting manuscript and print culture, the relationship between traditional manuscript production and the early stages of the English book trade, commerce in manuscript books and the introduction of print.

---


technology. I treat each printed text in turn, carefully considering exactly what they contain, in order to speculate upon possible motives for production and ownership, the connections between production processes and the people involved in them. Variations in language, omissions and additions, use of illustrations and title pages also have implications for the reception of this text.

This thesis takes time to focus upon the printers of these texts, Richard Faques and Thomas Marshe, as well as upon other printers contemporary with Skelton. I have attempted to provide a complete list of their printings and to consider how unusual Skelton’s texts are as products from their presses. This research was made considerably easier throughout the brief period during which the University of Kent had trial access to Early English Books Online. I also owe a debt of thanks to Jenni Nuttall who patiently e-mailed searches from Eureka at Oxford University of the Online Short Title Catalogue. These records have enabled me to consider what is known about the printers of all of Skelton’s works, how popular his works were in print, and his potential markets and relationships with his printers. I consider the locations of printers and the significance of the survival of their texts. In particular I reflect upon the implications of this for the subject matter of The Garland of Laurel and the issues such a context raises.

I also consider the relative numbers of Skelton’s works appearing in manuscript and print, and their indications of ownership and readership. I speculate about trends in book publishing, the relationship of the numbers of manuscript copies of Skelton’s works to the quantity and date of printed versions of those works, and the significance of whether or not they appear in Pithy pleasautant and profitable workes (1568), the first printed edition of Skelton’s collected works. I look at the use of illustrations and woodcuts in printed texts produced from presses associated with Skelton’s works and I consider how typical, or atypical, the printed editions and illustrations of The Garland of Laurel are. This work has been influenced by Christianson’s essay, and others, in Jeremy Griffiths and Derek Pearsall’s excellent collection, Book Production and Publishing in Britain 1375–1475. Invaluable to this work have also been the standard reference volumes for the subject area, the Short Title Catalogue of English Books 1475–1640; and works by E.

Hodnett, E. Gordon Duff, Henry R. Plomer, Ruth Samson Luborsky, Elizabeth Morley Ingram, Ronald B. McKerrow, and F. S. Ferguson.15

A comparison and consideration of the different extant versions of Skelton's poem, their relationships to each other and the differences between them, can provide today's reader with valuable insights into the production, transmission and consumption of Skelton's works in general. Such work can also begin to reveal the production and reception context for Skelton's *The Garland of Laurel* in particular. An investigation of manuscript and printed texts in these ways enhances our understanding of the writing of Skelton's poem and helps us to discover more about its textual history.

The thesis reflects upon the changing status of the book and of language and considers manuscript and print in terms of the forms texts took, why they might have been fashionable and who read them. The emergent picture of the book trade places Skelton's works in a climate of literary growth and change, in the context of foreign book trade relations and the London trade markets, and reveals that his works are influenced by the coexistence of manuscript and print media. It has been greatly influenced by Sandra L. Hindman's work *Printing the Written Word*, a book which is based around a series of case studies divided into three sections: Printers, Authors and Readers.16 It looks at the social, economic, political and intellectual contexts for print, relating it to manuscript culture. It considers the inter-relatedness of the author, publisher, printer, shipper, bookseller and reader in the period 1450–1520. Hindman's argument runs counter to Eisenstein's famous thesis.17 She sees many of the presumed innovations of print culture already present in scribal culture, as do other more recent critics. The fifteenth-century printed book, its methods of production and its patterns of reception are understood as owing much to the manuscript book which continued to be made and used alongside its printed counterpart. Her study tries to integrate the book into society by looking, for example, at the relationship between the book and its makers and between the book and its readers, and it very strongly influenced my perception of the early print period and its

15 These works are cited in the Bibliography.


relevance to studies of Skelton.

iii. Miscellany
The third chapter of this thesis considers manuscript miscellany in more detail and the activities of compilation which unavoidably conditioned the way in which Skelton thought about the composition, structure and reception of *The Garland of Laurel*. It examines two medieval miscellanies and a representative sixteenth-century collection in detail, and considers what trends they reflect and what they reveal about compilation. In particular it draws attention to the survival of lyrics in manuscripts.

The approaches of Christianson and Hindman, alongside those of Scattergood, Edwards, Boffey and Thompson, highlight and emphasise the significance of the changing contexts for textual production. The relationships between audience, textual production and circulation, combined with the different existing versions of *The Garland of Laurel*, led me to focus upon the form of miscellany, popular during the fifteenth century.

Zumthor’s explanation of *mouvance* and its significance, discovered in a work by Martin Irvine, for a short time became pivotal to my consideration of the relationship of surviving copies of *The Garland of Laurel*.\(^\text{18}\) In its models of textuality, it first provided me with a framework for some of my thoughts about miscellany, textual layout and variations between versions of texts. It led me to a consideration of how variant texts can gloss each other and generate discourses beyond the boundaries of the text. It focuses upon frameworks, in particular the dream framework, as a meta-poetic device for the process of writing in Chaucer’s work.

Also of specific relevance to notions of miscellany – in the context of book markets, vernacularity, order, preservation, compilation, morality, history and devotion – was Nichols’ and Wenzel’s *The Whole Book: Cultural Perspectives on the Medieval*

This study of the uses and significance of medieval miscellany is exciting in its wide-ranging and discursive scope. It seemed particularly relevant to a study of Skelton’s *The Garland of Laurel* which imitates the popular form of miscellany. Like the manuscript miscellany in which it is contained, Skelton’s poem is additive. It is full of varied subject matter and seemingly unconnected episodes. It is a long poem, fragmented and made up of many different sections which seem to have been brought together randomly and bound by a narrative thread. Different languages, genres and forms constitute the variety of the poem as a whole.

Scattergood’s work concerning Skelton’s use of lyrics, highlighting the connection between his short lyric poems and his reputation, has also been of relevance to my third chapter. As well as drawing upon the connections between collections of lyrics and preservation, he focuses upon the status of the lyric tradition. His interests are closely aligned with interests in miscellany and anthology and are especially significant to a consideration of the lyrics in *The Garland of Laurel*. Scattergood’s interest in the significance of lyrics is also shared by Boffey, both in her recent article in *Trivium* and in another article which places English lyrics in the context of English printers. These articles focus upon different types of lyrics and traditions of lyric publication in English poetry, creating a context for Tottel’s 1557 miscellany. Boffey considers how lyrics survive, Caxton’s anthologies and manuscript anthologies, and the influence of French texts on English writing. She considers special uses of lyrics, reasons for choice of lyric, fashion and taste, and how anthologies of lyrics or single lyrics may have circulated.

My third chapter attempts to consider the popularity of the miscellany form, authors’ perceptions of it, and its development from manuscript to print. Particular focus is given to Skelton’s adaptation of the form of miscellany and his self-representation in the texts. I consider the structure and the narrative content of *The Garland of Laurel* in terms of miscellany and move away from using ‘miscellany’ as a term to designate a collection of

---


various pieces of writing, and towards using it as a way of understanding the internal workings of a single work, giving further insight into its intellectual conditions of production. I argue that miscellany is a dominant influence on the production and reception of The Garland of Laurel and I consider miscellany’s popularity, types of miscellanies that were produced, practices of compilation, reception and the growing emphasis upon collections of works by single authors. I think about what kinds of reading practices and texts were typical of Skelton's potential late fifteenth- and early sixteenth-century audience. As well as Nichols and Wenzel's work, and Boffey's and Edwards's research in these areas, D. R. Carlson, perhaps the most prolific writer on Skelton, has produced influential work. He focuses upon the relationship between Skelton’s work and miscellany, the circulation of his work in collections, and different versions. In particular, his article on Skelton’s Latin Writings has been of use, but his book English Humanist Books: Writers, Patrons, Manuscript and Print 1475–1525 has also been influential in more than one way to the writing of this thesis.22

iv. Objections to Miscellany

The genre of dream vision is often used as the explanatory framework for The Garland of Laurel and the idea challenges the notion that miscellany was the primary influence upon the text. Many of the characteristics attributed to the influence of miscellany may also be attributed to that of dream vision. In my consideration of dream poetry I have relied upon the research and advice of my supervisor Peter Brown. His accounts of Chaucer’s Book of the Duchess and his recent work Reading Dreams have proved influential and inspiring.23 Editions of works by Derek Pearsall and a parallel-text translation of Machaut's La Fonteinne Amoureuse by R. Barton Palmer have also been invaluable.24

John Scattergood, A.C. Spearing, Derek Pearsall, and Julia Boffey have also provided

work which was influential to my consideration of Skelton’s use of dream vision. Boffey’s consideration of dream poems illustrated the connections between them and a variety of textual production, including collections of works. Her interests in the owners and readers of these collections, their tastes and social networks, were especially pertinent to thoughts about Skelton’s poem and possible reasons for his use and adaptation of the genre.

Spearing’s and Scattergood’s works in this field, during the last four decades, have also been significant to my consideration of Skelton’s use of dream vision and its relation to the poetic tradition. Their work conventionally relates the dream poem tradition to that of Fame, and in these terms defines The Garland of Laurel as a celebratory and retrospective poem about Skelton’s career as a poet. Both critics emphasise Skelton’s claims for Fame as different from those of Chaucer; both suggest that Skelton’s poem reflects a concern about England and the English literary tradition. They focus upon the new status of the poet writing in England and changing audiences, and the nature of perpetuation, both of text and of personal identity. They emphasise that The Garland of Laurel considers poetry and the poetic craft reflexively. These attitudes towards Skelton’s use of dream vision add much to my argument about the centrality of Skelton’s concerns about reputation, book production and textual circulation. They pave the way for a full consideration of how Skelton adapts the genre of dream poetry for his own purposes. In particular I consider how The Garland of Laurel draws upon and differs from its generic models, how it adapts dream vision for its own ends, and why miscellany is a stronger influence upon its composition.

v. The French Tradition

In addition to dream vision the influence of the French dit amoreux genre also raises objections to the predominant influence of the miscellany form. The lyrics to the Howard ladies in Skelton’s poem, a pivotal feature of both dream poetry and miscellany,

which provided the strongest evidence for the influence of miscellany, have a precedent in the lyric insertions of the *dits amoureux*, particularly popular between 1475 and 1525. These inserted lyrics, framed by the narrative, are the poem’s most striking feature. They highlight patronage activity in the poem, particularly Skelton’s relationship to the Howards. I consider how Skelton adapts the technique of lyric insertion, why he does so, and what in particular his lyrics have to say. I examine Skelton’s adaptation of the *dit amoureux* genre and the extent to which he was influenced by the French tradition. In particular I consider the popularity of French literature and its audience in England in the late fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries and I examine the processes and structures of a representative French example. I consider what Skelton may have had in common with his French contemporaries and why he was influenced by French literary tradition.

In my exploration of why these lyrics are placed within the narrative of *The Garland of Laurel*, several works have proved useful. A comprehensive survey of uses of lyrics in French verse has been carried out recently by Maureen Barry McCann Boulton, covering a wide range of narrative poems during the early and later medieval period. This has been of invaluable use, both as an introduction to the French *dits amoureux*, and for thinking about the possible purposes of the lyrics in Skelton’s poem. Sylvia Huot’s work on Old French lyrics, as well as her other work on *Le Roman de la Rose*, has also been significant in the writing of this thesis.

The work of Boulton, Huot, Scattergood and Boffey has influenced my consideration of the lyrics in *The Garland of Laurel*. The inserted lyrics tell us about the poem and its literary context, producers, patrons, readers. I identify particular French *dits* which may have influenced the subject matter of *The Garland of Laurel* and which provide a challenging and innovative model for Skelton’s work. In *The Garland of Laurel*, lyrics draw attention to the status of the poet and his new professional role and Skelton’s poem most closely draws upon the technique of lyric insertion in its representation of patronage relations. They emphasise the necessity of self-fashioning and the changing

---


dynamics between producers and consumers. Skelton’s representation of patronage relations in *The Garland of Laurel* shows a new equality and reciprocity related to the changing context for the production and reception of literary works. An exploration of these themes is critical to the understanding of both the poem and its wider context and suggests that miscellany is still a stronger context for interpreting the poem than the French tradition. Also influential have been the works of Gordon Kipling and Marina Belozerskaya on Anglo-Burgundian fashion and the works of Cynthia J. Brown and Jennifer and Richard Britnell on the *Rhétoriqueur* poets. These critics tentatively place Skelton in the context of his European contemporaries and current affairs more generally. They relate the activity of writing poetry, and new uses of language, to political schemes and wider concerns about national identity.

vi. Patronage

Critical research on Skelton’s relationship with the Howards and on late fifteenth-century patronage has been extensive. I have assembled enough evidence to suggest that Skelton’s patronage relations were conventional, if newly represented in his poem. The work in my thesis, and the work of many other critics, is indebted to the research of Melvin J. Tucker. His articles, published in *English Language Notes* and the *Renaissance Quarterly*, consider the setting of *The Garland of Laurel* at Sheriff Hutton and Skelton’s connection with the ladies there. The first concentrates on the identification of the ladies and the symbolism of the garden and chamber in the dream. The second focuses upon an argument for the individual dating of each lyric and a further explanation of the relationship of each lady to the Howards. Tucker illustrates affinities of family, property and patronage amongst the women and considers the implications for an updating of the poem. Carlson was influenced by Tucker’s work when he wrote his
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article considering the inclusion of the lyrics, the additive nature of the poem, the
Howards and autobiography in the text.31

Skelton’s new representations of patronage relationships and the processes of patronage
emerge as a key concern of the poem. The representation of the ladies in the lyrics and the
use of the lyrics, as well as additional passages which address the King and Wolsey at the
end of the poem, focus the reader upon issues of patronage, and the themes of ‘work’ and
‘reciprocity’. Both patrons and author create identities for themselves and each other
through their reciprocal works. I identify and further explore the relationship between
processes of work, audience and the identities of patron and poet, conferred through that
work. Skelton’s image in this poem is carefully constructed around considerations and re-
definitions of the processes of patronage and the literary remodeling of the relationship
between patron and writer.

As other critics have done I focus upon the Howard ladies. I consider who they actually
were, their relationship with each other and their connections with Skelton. I retrace their
relationships and their networks in the context of my speculations about the intention and
circulation of the poem. In addition to this, however, in order to consider how
conventional Skelton’s representation of female patrons is, I also consider other examples
of female patronage. I investigate the context for female patronage in the late fifteenth and
early sixteenth centuries, by considering the roles and actions of other prominent women,
such as Lady Margaret Beaufort, whose lives are closely documented, living before and
after the late fifteenth and early sixteenth century. I consider the identities they created for
themselves and the reasons behind their self-fashioning. Pertinent to my research have
been Jones and Underwood’s recent volume on Lady Margaret Beaufort, and June Hall
McCash’s work on late medieval women patrons.32 Carol M. Meale has also produced
significant and interesting work on female patrons and their book-owning habits.33

31 D. R. Carlson, ‘Appendix I: The Stages of the Composition of the “Garland of Laurel”’, Studies in
32 M. K. Jones and M. G. Underwood, eds., The King’s Mother: Lady Margaret Beaufort Countess of
Richmond and Derby (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992); J. H. McCash, ed., The Cultural
33 C. M. Meale, ed., Women and Literature in Britain, 1100–1500. Cambridge Studies in Medieval
Literature (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993); C. M. Meale, ‘Patrons, Buyers and Owners:
Book Production and Social Status’, in Book Production and Publishing in Britain, ed. Griffiths and
Pearsall, pp. 201-38.
The female patrons in *The Garland of Laurel* are shown to be involved with Skelton’s acquisition of fame and with the production of the poem itself. The poem parallels and explores the processes of weaving, embroidery and textile production alongside the processes of book production and textual production. This sets up a wider context for a consideration of Skelton as a poet and the production, transmission and consumption of *The Garland of Laurel*. To consider such representations of individuals and their actions is a necessary part of understanding textual production and circulation of his works, the changing position and role of the individual in the late fifteenth century.

My interpretation of the poem as a work about the processes of patronage, providing an example of real, potential and ideal patrons, is a new and exciting approach to Skelton’s *The Garland of Laurel*. In particular I take into account Brownlow’s *Book of the Laurel* and recent American theses which focus on Skelton’s desire for poetic fame. My argument, while acknowledging the relevance of these studies, displaces the importance of fame with the significance of establishing a lasting relationship between the author’s name and his works. As earlier studies have done, mine depends upon a consideration of Howard family patronage, but it focuses more closely on how these relationships are represented and utilised by Skelton.

vii. Authorship

The picture of the patronage relationships which Skelton presents in *The Garland of Laurel* focuses the reader upon the image of the author. Skelton is shown to exist in the rich context of late fifteenth-century literary relations, negotiating his position through patrons, printers, and his audience. Skelton also locates himself in terms of the great literary traditions of the past, as represented by the works of Gower, Chaucer and Lydgate. I consider that Skelton’s use of a persona in *The Garland of Laurel*, his fictional and real representations of himself as an ‘author’, is in this poem a unique key by which he equates

---

his fictional dream self and patrons with the real writer of *The Garland of Laurel* and ladies of the Howard household. Much of my early work on authorship was influenced by a paper that I wrote for the *Changing Identities* Conference, held at the University of Kent in February 2001.

David Lawton’s work on Skelton’s use of persona and the fifteenth century provided a starting point for my investigations of his self-representation in *The Garland of Laurel*. J. A. Richardson’s *Falling Towers* also considers Skelton’s use of persona, self-fashioning and the degeneracy of the contemporary world. It is about national infancy, the ends of cultural epochs and thresholds of new ages and considers how authorial imagination is shaped by tradition’s decay. Richardson’s work is unique in the way it considers the role of the poet in the late fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries and reflects in interesting ways upon Skelton.

In addition to these articles about Skelton and personae I have relied upon the ideas of Michel Foucault, and those of Laurence de Looze, whose work on pseudo-autobiographical texts has influenced the research of many scholars of both French and English literature. Amongst these is a work by A. C. Spearing, which draws together thoughts about authorship, dream poetry, anthologies and a consciousness about textuality. Spearing’s article served well to draw together many threads of my argument but both these works have contributed to my thoughts about the ‘real’ Skelton. Seth Lerer’s work too has been influential in a consideration of Skelton’s authorship.

My consideration of Skelton’s exploration of authorship has also been influenced by the work of Mary Erler who has considered the uses and conventions of the woodcuts in the

---

38 Spearing, ‘Dreams in “The Kingis Quair”’.
1523 version of *The Garland of Laurel*. Erler focuses upon visual traditions of representation, authorial iconography, and the relationship between illustration and text. Her assessment of woodcut images in Skelton’s printed texts leads her to suggest that the author is involved in a visual inventiveness, that he is a public figure, poetically promoting himself with a publisher’s advertisement. She considers the relationship of poet to printer, and of both to their audience, and in this way her study of visual additions to texts complements a wider range of work.

Vincent Gillespie’s ideas about Skelton suggest, similarly, that he is a self-conscious artist. He focuses on the role of the court poet in contrast to that of the prophetic poet and considers how the ideals articulated in *The Garland of Laurel* relate to notions of laureation, virtue and the prosperity of the commonwealth. He thinks about the Burgundian influence upon Skelton and the value of poetry to the state, discussing Skelton as a ‘Vox Clamantis’ and the growing significance of the poet’s role in the late fifteenth century. Gillespie’s views move away from a consideration of Skelton as a medieval poet and begin to re-contextualise him. The final stages of my chapter begin to place Skelton and his attitudes alongside those of Humanists at the English court. The work that I could do in relation to these writers was limited by the fact that few works by writers of these groups exist in translation. Other critics are only just beginning to produce work which will open exciting possibilities for research into the relationship between Skelton and his European contemporaries. The unique work of Carlson on the Humanists suggests many fruitful paths for further research on Skelton and his position amongst these writers. For example, Carlson considers how Humanism brought changes to the reciprocal uses patrons and writers made of each other, often for self-fashioning ends. This work is similarly to that produced by Cynthia J. Brown on the

---


Skelton has a unique and innovative approach to his poetry and concerns himself with the changing context for the production of literary texts, showing an acceptance of a new role and responsibility for the poet and poetry. Skelton’s *The Garland of Laurel* seems to reflect a new literary moment, and Skelton can perhaps be thought of as a second-generation medieval poet. Skelton’s poem touches upon domestic and foreign concerns. It focuses upon Skelton and his patrons and printers, and contextualises them through book trade and textile production, commercially and domestically. It identifies them both as consumers and producers, in symbiotic relationships. However, the text also works on a political level in which processes of production are subject to economic and foreign pressures. It engages with political and national concerns about the dangers of reciprocal relationships and the value of independent identity.

Skelton’s authorial status has been the topic of many general as well as specific studies. *The Garland of Laurel* seeks to make prominent Skelton's role and status as a poet writing in English at this time, considering his authority, virtuosity and use of tradition. *The Garland of Laurel* is a seminal work for an understanding of Skelton and other poets working in the late fifteenth- and early sixteenth-century literary context. It celebrates Skelton's literary achievements and simultaneously makes the reader highly aware of the difficult and changing context for textual production.
D. Synopsis of the Chapters

In the preceding sections I have indicated the aims and scope of my thesis and have summarised the context and usefulness of current critical research. Here I summarise the argument of the thesis chapter by chapter.

Chapter One considers British Library MS Cotton Vitellius E.x., the only manuscript version of *The Garland of Laurel*. The chapter opens with an account of the particular difficulties involved for the modern reader using this manuscript. I provide a list of its contents, identify these where possible, and attempt to consider evidence within the manuscript for its compilation and ownership. Particular focus is given to dating the manuscript and the chronology of the compilation of Skelton’s poem. I consider the evidence for ownership and circulation of Skelton’s manuscript works, particularly in London, and propose potential types of audience and owner for the items in the manuscript. In particular I focus upon the activities of London compilers and collectors. I consider why Skelton’s poem appears in this manuscript and I provide an account of the state of his poem in the manuscript, its presentation and selection, and what this tells us about potential readers.

Chapter Two also focuses upon the material texts, the two early printed text editions of Skelton’s *The Garland of Laurel*. It describes these two texts, the differences of their content, layout, and illustrations, and it explores the significance of the print media for Skelton and his relationship with his printers. I consider how typical these works are from the presses of those printers, their potential readers, and the economic factors which may have influenced their production by Skelton and the printers.

Chapter Three, rather than looking at the material forms of the text, begins to consider literary tradition and the contexts which may have influenced the subject matter and form of the poem. It considers the extent to which the idea of manuscript miscellany provides a context for interpreting and exploring the production and reception of *The Garland of Laurel*. The chapter takes representative examples of medieval manuscript miscellany and a sixteenth-century example, considers compilers and trends in compilation, and draws attention to the survival of lyrics in such forms. It attempts to
consider the popularity of the miscellany form, authors’ perceptions of it, and its development from manuscript to print. I consider the possible influence and impact of miscellany on Skelton’s composition of *The Garland of Laurel* and its thematic unity.

Dream poetry is the focus of the fourth chapter, more often used than miscellany as an explanatory framework for Skelton’s poem. The chapter considers the extent to which the genre influences Skelton’s composition and ways in which Skelton adapts the genre for his own purpose. It compares two representative dream vision poems of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries with Skelton’s poem. Similarly, the fifth chapter considers the influence and impact of the French poetic tradition on Skelton. It takes as its focus the *dit amoreux* genre, characterised by lyric insertion, and considers Skelton’s development and adaptation of the genre. Particular focus is given to the lyrics in Skelton’s poem. The chapter considers the popularity of French literature and its audience in England in the late fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries and examines the structure and processes of a representative example. It draws a comparison between this poem and *The Garland of Laurel* in order to highlight Skelton’s adaptation of the genre and literary technique. It considers what Skelton may have had in common with his French contemporaries and why he was influenced by French literary tradition.

Chapters Four and Five highlight Skelton’s position in relation to potential patron figures and Chapter Six focuses upon Skelton’s relationship with the Howard ladies. Drawing on the work of Tucker it identifies the Howard ladies and considers how typical Skelton’s representations of these patron figures are in the context of other examples of female patronage in the late fifteenth century. It considers particular female patrons connected to Skelton and what is known about their patronage activity in an effort to expand upon what can be inferred from Skelton’s representation of his connections with the Howard family. Most importantly the chapter advances a new argument that *The Garland of Laurel* is not a poem directly about Skelton’s fame and reputation but is a work concerned with the processes of patronage by which these may be acquired.

The penultimate chapter, Chapter Seven, is a response to the prior conclusions drawn about changing patronage relationships. Its focus upon the author figure, Skelton’s self-representation in *The Garland of Laurel*, and takes into account and builds upon my
examination of production contexts and literary tradition. It tentatively relates some of
Skelton's authorial activities to the attitudes and concerns of the early Humanists and
considers the making of poetic identity in the wider context of foreign relations in the early
sixteenth century and English literary tradition. The thesis ends with a concluding chapter
which discusses directions for future research.
This thesis is concerned with Skelton's poem *The Garland of Laurel*. To develop an understanding of any work it is necessary to consider the cultural context in which it was produced and received. Skelton wrote in a period during which manuscript and print production of texts coexisted and texts circulated in both media. It is a particularly interesting period in which to make a study of textual production and reception. However, less well understood are its implications for the nature, circulation and reception of Skelton’s works. Of particular interest are the textual frameworks in which early copies of Skelton’s poems surface. Often they are components of larger collections or in miscellanies by various authors.

The only manuscript version of *The Garland of Laurel* survives as a fragment in London, British Library, MS Cotton Vitellius E.x. In the present chapter a careful consideration is made of this manuscript miscellany and its contents in order to reveal something about the reception and provenance of Skelton’s poem. Firstly attention is given to what is known about the compilation of the manuscript and its physical state. Compiled during the sixteenth or seventeenth century, and damaged by the Cotton fire, the miscellany provides no direct evidence of audience or reception at the time *The Garland of Laurel* was written. The chapter foregrounds the general difficulties which the manuscript presents for its modern reader.

In the second part, the chapter provides a detailed account of the manuscript’s contents and highlights identifiable items of interest and evidence for potential networks of readers and owners in the late fifteenth century. Great care is taken to evaluate *The Garland of Laurel* in relation to its companion pieces, to derive information about the reception of the poem in the Renaissance and to perceive those textual features indicative of earlier practices. In the third part, this chapter provides an account of Skelton’s poem *The Garland of Laurel* as it appears in the Cotton miscellany and focuses upon its possible date of composition, something critical to the chapters which follow. The chapter ends with an account of what
is known more generally about Skelton’s works still extant in manuscript form in order to develop a sharper sense of the types of audience for Skelton’s works.

A. MS Cotton Vitellius E.x.:
Compilation and Problems

Cotton Vitellius E.x. is not a medieval manuscript miscellany and much of the evidence which manuscript scholars have traditionally relied upon to confirm the issues surrounding the production and reception of particular items is lacking. While it contains many medieval texts it also contains many late fifteenth-century and sixteenth-century items, and was probably compiled during the late sixteenth or early seventeenth century. It can best be described as composite. Its complex history, diverse contents and interesting structure raise particular difficulties for a consideration of this manuscript and the place of Skelton’s poem within it.

The manuscript was compiled by Sir Robert Cotton (1568–1631) who founded a library in the late sixteenth century.1 His antiquarian tastes had been developed by his teacher William Camden (1551–1623).2 Henry Howard, Duke of Norfolk (1540–1614) became one of his patrons and shared scholarly interests led to friendship and the loaning of books between them. Cotton also had connections with the Scottish royal family and was a member of the Stuart parliament.3

Cotton is renowned for rearranging manuscripts, practices which today meet with disapproval but which were considered acceptable at the time. He took apart old manuscripts and re-incorporated the material into new compilations and new bindings.

---

2 DNB, x, p. 28. As well as manuscripts Cotton collected coins, seals, charters, maps and other rarities and was a leading figure in a network of European scholars. His collection includes Anglo-Saxon manuscripts, monastic registers, books of the Bible, lives of saints and martyrs, genealogies and heraldic material, histories, annals and chronicles, and state papers relating to English affairs.
He added his own headings and annotations to items in manuscripts, later copied as catalogue headings. He often removed articles from manuscripts and distributed them in others. He carefully supervised all rearrangements and re-bindings himself, including the cutting and trimming which was a necessary part of these operations. While many manuscripts were acquired from other owners and came into the Cotton collection after Sir Robert's death, some were acquired directly by Cotton and these frequently contain marks of his ownership. When in 1629 Cotton was suspected of harbouring a seditious tract, was arrested and his library closed down, the investigators recorded that a good deal of material in his library was unbound and unstitched. Bundles of papers, mainly official documents, but also about forty manuscripts of chronicles, sermons, and biblical books were described as being 'in loose leafe' presumably awaiting binding or rearrangement. Many items consequently disappeared, were lost or were taken away.

Cotton Vitellius E.x. contains a number of sixteenth-century items but it is possible that some of its items may have come from a number of different original medieval manuscripts. Groups of leaves within it, having their own provenance, may have been bound together before they reached Cotton's hands. For example, two items in the manuscript have been identified in a catalogue of the collection of the younger Henry Savile of Banke before 1621 when they passed into Cotton's hands.

In addition to Cotton's compiling activities, the manuscript which contains *The Garland of Laurel* was affected by the notorious fire at Ashburnham House in 1731. Fire damage enhances the difficulties of looking at the manuscript today and may have contributed further to its composite nature. C. G. C. Tite, quoting from *A Report from the Committee Appointed to View the Cottonian Library: Appendix A* (London, House of Commons, 1732), tells us that the recommended procedures after the fire included:

Volumes written on paper were to be disbound, washed with water 'till the Stains disappear, and then shifted into Water, in which Allum has been dissolved, in order to strengthen and fortify them; afterwards to be hung on Lines till dry, and then bound again'. As to manuscripts written on vellum, those damaged by water were to be dried leaf by leaf while the pages of those 'closed together by

---

5 Cotton Vitellius E.x. does not contain any of Cotton's ownership marks.
the Fire [were] to be separated with an Ivory Folder ... the glewy Substance which has been fried out upon the Edges, [to] be taken off by the Fingers carefully, in order to prevent its infecting and corroding the rest"...8

Many paper manuscripts were again broken up and rebound in an attempt to prevent mould setting in. Even later in the manuscript’s history, Sir Frederic Madden (1801–1873), antiquary, palaeographer and head of the Department of Manuscripts at the British Museum, flattened and bound thousands of loose leaves, interpretations and reconstructions, often bearing no relation to their original Cottonian compilation.9 It is likely Cotton Vitellius E.x. was also affected by this work.10

Fire and water damage have resulted in the loss of much of the material in Cotton Vitellius E.x. and it is consequently in a nineteenth-century binding, measuring 32 x 26 x 5cms. Each page has been remounted separately.11 The pages are blackened and damaged around the edges, some more badly than others. Those pieces written with large margins have remained more intact than those with narrow margins. Many items have lost their first and last lines, some have lost first stanzas or their concluding passages; smoke has obscured and faded the script that is left making some texts illegible. The first printed catalogue of the manuscripts of the Cotton library, in 1696, predated the fire and was compiled by the Reverend Thomas Smith, librarian to Sir John Cotton, eldest grandson of the library’s founder, Sir Robert Cotton.12 In its margin, the Cotton Vitellius E.x. entry is annotated with the words, ‘About 150 Pieces of Leaves of this Book are preserv’d; but so much of them burnt away, that they are entirely useeless’ [sic].13 The fire consumed the manuscript from the spine and while most pages are burnt away at the edges, the middle section contains some folios which are completely blackened (ff. 111r-118r). It is unclear whether or not these correspond to a medieval gathering. Such damage suggests that this section may have been separate from the rest of the manuscript at the time of the fire, perhaps unbound. Original folio

8 Tite, Manuscript Library, pp. 38-9.
9 DNB, xxxv, pp. 291-2.
10 Ibid., xxxv, pp. 291-2; Wright, Cotton As Collector, p. 5.
11 London, British Library, MS Additional 62577 provides an account of the repair and binding of the Cottonian manuscripts after the fire. It lists the Cotton manuscripts and describes the progress made in repairing, binding and inlaying the collection, from the year 1839. Folio 24r, describes ‘Vitellius E.x.-miscell, hist. poetica’ as ‘T. inlaid and rebound [the binder and repairer was Mr Tucket], Sept. 1844.’ Similarly, London, British Library, MS Additional 62576, lists the injured Cottonian Manuscripts and memoranda of repairs for 1837 – 1840, and describes f.6. ‘Vitellius E.x. – Forty-six leaves lost, the text damaged but may be used.’ f. 96.
12 Tite, Catalogue, p. 1.
numbers are in sequence throughout the book, suggesting that the miscellany as we have it today is the one compiled for Cotton's library, whether or not the badly burned section was loose or temporarily removed.

The history of this manuscript is such that the modern reader ought not to be surprised by the difficulties it presents, its eclectic mix of contents and its chaotic appearance. Information about the structure and early reception history of the manuscript and the texts within it, normally available to readers of early manuscripts, is withheld because of Cotton's role, the damage caused by the Ashburnham House fire, and the ongoing conservation process the manuscript has withstood. Evidence of handling and annotation has been burned away and smoke damage has obscured hands and texts; indications of an earlier order and the gatherings of those texts have been lost, no evidence remains to indicate the original size of each page or section, whether or not the pages were trimmed or where the gatherings may have been and how many there were; the original bindings, if there were any, are lost and no records of their appearance exist. The reception histories of the texts within Cotton Vitellius E.x. are submerged, and in some cases lost forever.

B. An Account of the Contents

i. Items in the Manuscript

Cotton Vitellius E.x. is intrinsically and unconsciously miscellaneous; it is a unique post-medieval fabrication and not a medieval manuscript miscellany.\(^\text{14}\) It is written in a variety of hands, contains a wide range of subject matter, is multilingual, and gathers together material from several different centuries. Joseph Planta, Keeper of Manuscripts at the British Museum from 1776, and its principal librarian from 1799, created a catalogue of the Cotton manuscripts in 1802 and noted then that Cotton Vitellius E.x. consisted of two hundred and seventy-two folios and contained twenty-six separate

\(^{14}\) The term miscellany is explained in more detail in Chapter Three but at this point I wish to draw the reader's attention to a distinction between the type of miscellaneity in this manuscript and that 'intentional' miscellaneity which I later locate in Skelton's poem.
pieces of interest. No catalogues of the Cotton collection have been produced since 1802, no scholarship exists on Cotton Vitellius E.x., and the online description of the manuscript at the British Library relies upon Planta’s earlier work. These descriptions of the manuscript provide little information useful for identifying the items within it. While my account of the manuscript is still deficient, here I bring together for the first time as extensive an account of its content as it has been possible to make. I refer the reader to Appendix 1 for detail in addition to that given below.

The works in Cotton Vitellius E.x. can be broadly identified as belonging to the ecclesiastical, the royal and the political spheres of action. However, they are not grouped as such and appear randomly mixed within the manuscript. For example, ecclesiastical related works appear on folios 79r-84v; 110v-120v; 121r-132v; 145r-163v; 164v-169v; 190r-191r; 226r-234v; 235r and 235v. Works relating to the royal sphere are included on folios 3r-61v; 79r-84v; 85r-109v; and 236r-239v. Political material, including material relating to English affairs, appears on folios 72r-76r; 133r-144v; 170r-183r; 184r-189v; 192r-207v; 208r-225v; 240r-243v. In addition, some items in the manuscript can not be categorised so easily and do not fall into clearly defined areas of interest. For example, folios 62r-71v contain a French poem, *Les Rues de Paris*, unidentified; and folio 77v contains the Latin poem, *Alia Carmina Latina*. At the beginning of the manuscript, folios 1r and v provide a selective list of contents written in a post-fifteenth century hand, in Latin, highlighting works which were considered to be of interest.

**i.i Ecclesiastical**

The ecclesiastical works include papal letters (ff. 79r-84v); works relating to ecclesiastical law (ff. 110r-120v), and some letters by Gilbert Stone (ff. 121r-132v), in a hand from 1450. Stone’s letters are mainly concerned with the time of Henry IV, but those in Cotton Vitellius E.x. concern the time of Edward III, and include letters written...
between the Archbishop of Arundel and Oxford University and correspondence concerning Thomas Merke, the Bishop of Carlisle who lost his see when Richard II lost his throne.\(^{19}\) Gilbert Stone was Chancellor to Bishops Robert Wyville, Ralph Erghum and Richard Clifford.\(^{20}\) Towards the end of his career in 1408, he compiled a collection of some of the letters he had written on behalf of these bishops as well as a number that he had written at the request of various friends and other patrons, and in his own name. They were originally compiled as a formulary, and were chosen as specimens of style. His letter collection is one of the most interesting to survive from that period and provides explicit evidence about the profession and art of eloquence found in letter collections.\(^{21}\)

Cotton Vitellius E.x. also contains a copy of a speech given in Rochester, ‘Rossensi’, about the election of a prior (ff. 145r-146v) and two Latin sermons, one given at Stekyswold in the Lincoln diocese (ff. 147r-163v), and the other (ff. 164v-169v), dated 1481. Additionally the manuscript contains ecclesiastical documents of record, on ff. 190r-191r and ff. 226r-234v. The first of these documents relates to the confirmation of privileges to the Monastery of Lewes in Sussex and was written by Radulphus or Ralph Acton. Acton was a fourteenth-century English theologian and philosopher about whom little is known, but his writings include the *Commentarii in Epistolas Paulinas* and *Homiliae in quattuor Evangelia*. Two of his manuscripts are preserved in Lincoln College in Oxford, the first written in an early fifteenth-century hand the second a gift of one of the founders of the college in 1427.\(^{22}\) The second records are the founding Statutes of Jesus College, at Rotherham, in the fifteenth century the fifth largest town in the West Riding of Yorkshire. Jesus College was founded by Archbishop Thomas Rotherham (Thomas Scott of Rotherham, 1423–1500).\(^{23}\) It was just one of many benefactions he made during his lifetime. The original statutes date from 8th February 1483, but the first foundation stones were laid on 12th March 1482 and Royal Licence


\(^{20}\) DNB, xviii, p. 1299.

\(^{21}\) C. K. Everitt, ‘Eloquence as Profession and Art: The Use of the “Ars Dictaminis” in the Letters of Gilbert Stone and his Contemporaries, c.1300–c.1450’ (Unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Oxford, 15th October, 1985), p. iii and Everitt’s bibliography. The letters can be found in MS Bodley 859 (Gilbert Stone’s letter collection, ff. 1-42b); MS Selden supra 65 (letters to the Pope from English bishops, the University of Oxford and others c. 1400, ff. 73-85); and in Cotton Vitellius E.x. (re: Edward III). Harley MS 670 provides an interesting comparison, containing a *Treatise on Dictamen* (ff. 3-36), also c. 1450. Salter, Pantin and Richardson, eds., *Formularies*, ii, 440-3.

\(^{22}\) DNB, i, pp. 68-9.

for it was secured on 22nd January 1483, just two months before the death of Rotherham’s patron, Edward IV. Rotherham endowed the college for a provost, three fellows (teaching grammar, music and writing) and six scholar-choristers and bequeathed it one hundred and ten volumes on his death in 1500. These statutes provided ‘the most elaborate programme for educational reform ever produced in the North of England during the entire Middle Ages’.

Thomas Rotherham was Chancellor of England until deprived of the office by Richard III, and was Bishop successively of Rochester, from 1468 to 1472, and Lincoln, from 1472 to 1480, Archbishop of York, from 1480, and Chancellor of Cambridge University. He was also Keeper of the Privy Seal, from 1467 to 1474, and special ambassador to France more than once. Rotherham was a benefactor not only of Cambridge University Library, but of Lincoln College in Oxford, which he rescued from complete destruction and re-founded, and of Pembroke College, Cambridge. He is remembered as one of the greatest educational patrons of his age and bequeathed hundreds of books in manuscript and print to these colleges and libraries. Many contained material relating to his Chancellorship.

Cotton Vitellius E.x. also contains drawings of tombs. One is that of Gregorius, prior of Bridlington, and the other the tomb of George of Ripley, both located at Bridlington

---

25 J. Raine, ed., *Testamenta Eboracensia: Or, Wills Registered at York, Illustrative of the History, Manners, Language, Statistics, &c., of the Province of York, from the year MCCC downwards*, Publications of the Surtees Society (London: J. B. Nichols & Son, 1836-1902), pp. 138-48. Extracts from the will of Thomas Rotherham, in Latin, ‘the most noble and striking will of a medieval English bishop in existence’, reveal that he was also generous in death. Rotherham bequeaths chalices and pattens, pixes, vestments, crosses, basins, spoons, altar-cloths, mitres, missals, antiphonals and many other things. He also leaves bequests to his church in York, to a church in Luton, to the church of the parish of Ripley, to the church of Rochester and to the new college of Cambridge (Collegio Novo Cantabrigiae).
27 Dobson, ‘Educational Patronage’, pp. 65, 71; Oates, ‘Cambridge University Library’ , pp. 276-7; Emden, *Biographical Register*, iii, pp. 1593-6. Emden records that, amongst his other offices, Rotherham was an envoy to treat with Charles of Burgundy for perpetual peace or league, appointed 29 February 1472. This is of interest given the inclusion of Burgundian and French material in the manuscript.
30 Wright, *Cotton as Collector*, pp. 40-60, considers Cotton’s interests in funerary monuments.
in East Yorkshire, f. 235.31 Bridlington was a Lancastrian shrine associated with the Beaufort family.32 Elias Ashmole, founder of the Ashmolean museum, Oxford, used Cotton Vitellius E.x. in 1671 to make a sketch of Ripley’s tomb, which now survives in Oxford, Bodleian Library MS Ashmole 972, f. 300, part of a collection of chronological and autobiographical notes, a collection which was to serve as an aide-mémoire.33 Ripley who died in 1490 was an alchemist and theologian.34

i.ii Royal

The most striking of the royal items in the manuscript is the fragment of the Mémoires du Pierre de Fenin (ff. 3r-61v), in French. This is the first item in the manuscript and one of the folios is illuminated. Pierre de Fenin, born of a noble family in Artois about the end of the fourteenth century, died on the 6th June, 1433. Records of his death describe him as, ‘escuyer, jadis pannetier du roy nostre sire (Charles VI), et prévost de ceste cité (D’Arras)’. However, there is also a record of a descendant called Pierre de Fenin, who died in 1506, and mention of him is found ten years after the death of the pannetier of Charles VI.35 The chronicle in Cotton Vitellius E.x. might be attributed to either man. It contains the History of France, 1407–1424, (Annals of France and Burgundy, 1407–1424), and concerns Louis, duc d’Orleans, brother of King Charles VI. In its entirety Fenin’s Mémoires include: ‘1. La description du pas d’armes tenu à

31 Gregorius was perhaps associated with Prior John of Bridlington who wrote Latin prophecies. See MWME, v, p. 1522; S. L. Jansen and K. H. Jordan, eds., The Welles Anthology: MS Rawlinson C. 813 A Critical Edition (Binghamton and New York: Medieval and Renaissance Texts and Studies, 1991), p. 40. The Prophecy of John of Bridlington was one of the longest and most elaborate of the prophecies in the fourteenth century. The Bridlington Prophecy is interesting because of its relation to other later prophecies. Its material is adapted in The Cock of the North and The Prophecy of the Fishes. Its material includes details of events from the accession of Edward III to preparations for the battle of Crécy; chronicles the years 1344–1360; and foretells the Black Prince’s reign as king of England and predicts his reign as king of France. See also Chapter Three, notes 54 and 65.

32 M. K. Jones and M. G. Underwood, The King’s Mother: Lady Margaret Beaufort Countess of Richmond and Derby (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992), p. 23. It is of particular interest due to Skelton’s connections with Margaret Beaufort and the royal household.


34 DNB, xvi, pp. 1202-3; Josten, ed., Elias Ashmole, ii, 758 note 1; p. 755 note 2.

Bruges en 1463, par Ph. De Lalain. 2. La description du banquet donné à Lilleen 1453, par Philippe-le-Bon.... 3. Les funérailles de Charles VII. 4. L’entrée de Louis XI à Reims et son sacre. 5. L’entrée de Louis XI à Paris.' However, the fragments of the work in Cotton Vitellius E.x. begin in the year 1411. The folios containing the first four years have been lost. Additionally the manuscript version ends in the year 1424, three years before the final part of the printed edition.

Fenin’s Mémoires in Cotton Vitellius E.x. contain references relating to English affairs, references to the marriage of King Henry V of England to Katherine of France, and references to his death, (f. 46v). The manuscript also contains further items relating to other English and French royals. Folios 79r-84v, for example, contain some letters of King Edward III, 1327–1377; folios 85r-109v contain fragments of notes and letters in French (covering the period between c.1350–c.1450); and there are some letters of King Henry VI on folios 236r-239v.

i.iii Political

The political items in the manuscript include a song about the Salic Laws, (ff. 72r-76r), (unidentified) and two alphabetical poems, in English and Latin, by George Buchanan, who is remembered for his radical political ideas (ff.76v-77r).36 He was an internationally famous poet, a tutor to royalty, and his works were printed by the best European printers. His first book was a modest translation of an English grammar by Thomas Linacre, published alongside a school text which cornered the French market. He gifted Glasgow University library many humanistic texts, had many friends in the Pléiade and his works also appeared in the anti-League poets’ 1590 anthology published anonymously. The Paraphrases of the psalms and his history of Scotland were bestsellers, but most familiar today are his anti-Marian vernacular political polemics, for example, De jure regni and Historia.37 The two small poems in Cotton Vitellius E.x. are unidentified, probably simple works of grammar.38

36 DNB, iii, p. 186.
38 Wright, Cotton as Collector, p. 313. Cotton had three main collections of Buchanan’s poems. I have been unable to identify these alphabetical works in collections of Buchanan’s poems.
The manuscript also contains a political dialogue, (ff. 133r-140r), ‘Colloquium inter R. Caesaris-burgi (Cherbourg) praesulem, et cubiculairium suum, de rebus aulicis sub initio regni Edw. IV’; a political sermon dated 1483 (ff. 141r-144v) and two parliamentary speeches or sermons (ff.170r-183r), concerning Edward V (d. 1483), and Richard III (d. 1485). These are followed on folios 184r-189v with Sir John Fortescue’s Dialogue between the Understanding and Faith. Fortescue was the Chief Justice of the Court of the King’s Bench in Henry VI’s reign in 1442, and was appointed to Edward IV’s council in 1471. His writings reflect foreign policy from this period, especially relations between France and England, for example, his Governance of England, one of the most interesting treatises of English political thought, discussed the limitation of royal resources during the 1470s.

Fortescue’s work is complemented in the manuscript by The Libel of English Policy, ‘The Bible [sic] of English Policy; exhorting all England to keep the narrow sea environ’ (ff.192r-207v), another work in English with courtly and patriotic themes. This poem has been described by Scattergood as ‘one of the most remarkable poems produced in the fifteenth century’. The poem is thought to have been written after the siege of Calais by the Duke of Burgundy, and the invasion of his territory by the Duke of Gloucester in August 1436, and before the death of the emperor Sigismond in 1437. The material is slightly later than that in Fenin’s Mémoires. It is a poem which argues for a change in policy and makes a coherent political argument representing the views of Staplers and Merchants whose livelihoods were threatened by the attack on Calais.

and the embargos imposed on English goods. The poem also tries to define the English nation and its place in Europe, its relationships and its separateness, and expresses scorn and resentment against foreigners. The poem continued to be popular well into the sixteenth century and in Cotton Vitellius E.x. the poem appears without its marginal commentary in Latin and English extant in other manuscript versions.

The Garland of Laurel, following these two items, is placed towards the end of the manuscript on folios 208r-225v. In the manuscript the poem itself is generously spaced and its huge margins have allowed it to remain intact. It is described in the contents list as ‘Some poems in English about some heroines of England’, drawing attention to its own Englishness, and in Planta’s catalogue entry as ‘A poem in the form of a dialogue between Pallas and the Queen of Fame, Skelton and Occupacyoun, with stanzas to the Countess of Surrey, Lady Elizabeth, Ly Myrryel, Ly Dakers, +c...’. Like Fortescue’s poem, the word ‘dialogue’ suggests that it has a serious and perhaps didactic intention. In addition to its argumentative vigour and distinguished miniature descriptions of the ladies, Skelton begins his work with a withered and twisted oak tree (ll. 18-21), perhaps representing the state of England after the Wars of the Roses; he includes a description of the gates of Anglia, through which many foreigners and people from diverse counties are trying to pass (ll. 568-860) and he incorporates a nationalistic envoy at the end of his work, unashamedly sending his book out into a world where it will testify to the glory of the English language (ll. 1521-1602).

It is also interesting to consider that the poem may have been included in Cotton’s compilation for its topical value. Skelton was an important and well-known figure at court during the reigns of Henry VII (1485–1509) and Henry VIII (1509–1547) and a significant amount of his poetry was related to affairs there. It is clear that The Garland of Laurel reflects not only political concerns but some of the personalities at the court, and some of the social and economic factors concerning literary production in the early sixteenth century.

---

The Garland of Laurel is followed on folios 240r-243v by The Whole Prophesie of Scotland, (the Prophecies of Thomas of Erceldoune), an English poem in rhyming couplets. This poem survives in five manuscripts, every version different from the others, sometimes with romances and sometimes with prophecies. Prophecy was a popular genre, used for political and religious commentary in the fourteenth century. The best surviving text is that in the fifteenth-century Thornton Manuscript, Lincoln Cathedral MS 91. The other texts may be found in Cambridge University Library MS Ff. 5. 48; British Library MSS Cotton Vitellius E.x., Lansdowne 762 and Sloane 2578.48

The work seems to have been included in the Cambridge manuscript, as well as in Cotton Vitellius E.x. for its historical and political value. In Cotton Vitellius E.x. the prophecy is written in a large, thick script of the mid-fifteenth century, with an incipit and colophon in red ink. The text begins in double columns of twenty-nine and thirty lines. After this it is written straight across the page, each line consisting of two lines of verse separated by a red line or red paragraph-mark. The text is written without a break but every alternate line of verse is defective or missing due to fire damage.49 Its language suggests that a scribe from the southern half of the country was copying a text which has retained its northern features.50

This is followed on folios 244r-251v by a fragment of Bartolus of Sassoferrato’s treatise De Tyrannia, divided into twelve sections. Bartolus was a famous jurist of the early Italian Renaissance. Details of his life are scant, but it is known that he was born at Sassoferrato in the Duchy of Urbino in the year 1314. He began law studies at Perugia about 1327 and finished them at Bologna, taking his doctor’s degree there at the age of twenty. He was professor of Law at Pisa from 1339 to 1343 and then at Perugia until his early death in 1357.51 Bartolus probably wrote De Tyrannia towards the end of his life, inspired by the four years of fighting between the Holy See and the tyrants of the papal territories.52 He takes tyranny as his subject, defines the phenomenon as he finds it, and shows the juristic consequences that follow from it. He writes in plain Latin and continually refers to canon law. He wrote for an audience versed in the manipulation of

49 Ibid., i, p. 14.
50 Ibid., ii, p. 15.
52 Ibid., p. 124.
the texts of the civil and the canon law and with those texts constantly at hand. It was a work written to be used, not enjoyed for pleasure. The essay on tyranny belongs to the group of his writings described as *tractatus*, treatises upon a variety of definite legal problems, and Bartolus's commentaries are of as great a weight as the text of the law itself.\(^5\)

ii. Tentative Provenance

Many of the items in Cotton Vitellius E.x. are of significant interest. With a few exceptions, they mainly pertain to ecclesiastical, royal and political or English matters, they all relate to the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, and letters and verse items are particularly prominent in the manuscript. Additionally the manuscript contains items relating to shared geographic locations, most prominently areas in Yorkshire and Oxfordshire, but also shared dioceses, such as Lincoln, Canterbury and London. These connective threads are suggestive of earlier manuscript collections, or gatherings of some of this material, and encourage associations with particular important figures or groups of readers, compilers or collectors. They suggest that at some stage in its history disparate parts of this manuscript may have been combined together in a personal book or books.

The high number of ecclesiastical items in Cotton Vitellius E.x. might suggest a churchman was a significant owner, or patron, of parts of this manuscript before they came into Cotton's possession. The manuscript reflects the interests of an earlier educated owner, with knowledge of government, the court and academic institutions.\(^4\) In particular, inclusion of the founding statutes of Jesus College, Rotherham, suggests that Thomas Rotherham could have been such a figure. This might explain the inscription on folio 2v, the remains, burned and crossed out, of an early *ex libris* '…>Thomas …> Booke'. His

---


\(^4\) A literary manuscript, Canterbury, Cathedral Archives, MS B2, provides an interesting comparison when considering the possibility that the contents of Cotton Vitellius E.x. indicate an ecclesiastical owner earlier in its history. I considered this manuscript because it is one of the few manuscript miscellanies included in the collection at Canterbury Cathedral Archives, containing articles written by several scribes, dating from between the late fifteenth and seventeenth century. It is a large folio book which draws together eleven different manuscripts of legal, administrative and ecclesiastical nature. It contains similar items to the Cotton manuscript, therefore, and also includes some poetry. It is largely in Latin, and includes archiepiscopal documents, letters of petition, a treatise on rights and prerogatives of the archbishop of Canterbury, Acts of the Dean and Chapter, Visitation records, a Chancery lawyer's book, a copy of the Sandwich Custumal, and a version of the Lydd Custumal. Interestingly two chronicles in Anglo-Saxon are also included, one being the *Gesta Servatoris*. An account of the manuscript can be found in, Paul Lee, 'The Compilation of a Seventeenth Century Kentish Manuscript Book, its Authorship; Ownership and Purpose', *Archaeologia Cantiana*, 115 (1995), 389-411.
educational patronage and benefactions, described above, show that his interests extended to acquiring and bestowing manuscript books. Rotherham’s connections with York, with the colleges of Oxford and Cambridge, and his involvement in foreign affairs at court, are also well documented and might explain how many other items came to appear in the manuscript. Such associations, for example, are interesting in the case of *The Garland of Laurel*, which Skelton locates at Sheriff Hutton, the Yorkshire seat of the Howard family. Skelton was laureated by the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge, and also had connections with the royal court.

*The Garland of Laurel* is one of very few items in the manuscript about which something definite is known concerning its provenance. Skelton’s poem, along with Pierre de Fenin’s *Mémoires*, appears in a catalogue of the collection of the younger Henry Savile of Banke, (1568–1617). Much of Savile’s early life was spent in Yorkshire and, while there is little evidence of his manuscript collecting activities, antiquarian interests and correspondence, compared to the evidence that exists for Camden or Ussher, it is known that he gathered several hundred manuscripts himself, adding to a collection made in the first place by his father and grandfather.

Savile owned manuscripts which came from Canterbury, Eynsham, St. Albans (one perhaps owned by John Stow) and Warwick. A large number came from the North,

---

55 N. Pevsner, *Yorkshire: The North Riding* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1966) pp. 18-32, 338-40. Sheriff Hutton village lies on the first ledge of the Yorkshire moor and is dominated by the ruins of the castle which during the fifteenth century belonged to the Howard family. Pevsner describes it as ‘a most dramatic craggy ruin’ but it was still ‘princely’ in 1535 when Leland saw it. Sheriff Hutton was first granted a licence to crenelate in 1382. Sheriff Hutton is a prestigious location for Skelton’s poem and enhances the potential significance of ecclesiastical Yorkshire references in the manuscript. Later chapters of this thesis focus upon the Howard family. Sheriff Hutton Castle was located in the forest of Galtres, a royal forest north-east of York, near to the village of Skelton, perhaps another punning reference made by the poet. Skelton makes reference to Galtres in *The Garland of Laurel*. It was later chopped down by Henry VIII to build a fleet of ships and lay between the road to Bridlington and the road to Scarborough.


57 Watson, *Henry Savile*, pp. 4-6.
including four houses in York, Alnwick, Bridlington, Durham, and Ely. It is thought he may have obtained these from Daniel Foxcroft, John Dee, John Stow, William Clarke and Robert Hare.\(^5\)\(^8\) The largest identifiable single source for his manuscripts, however, was through John Nettleton, one of the John Nettletons of Hutton Cranswick in the East Riding of Yorkshire.\(^5\)\(^9\)

Netleton was a major Yorkshire collector of the sixteenth century, about whom little is known. Savile owned thirty-one manuscripts identified as having come from Nettleton and it is thought that many of these had come to John Nettleton’s father straight after the dissolution of the monasteries, including Byland, Fountains and Rievaulx.\(^6\)\(^0\) Savile did consider selling his collection within his lifetime, and did give away a few volumes, although the greater part was dispersed in his will. Cotton was given a manuscript in 1609; the Bodleian was given a manuscript in 1612; two dozen manuscripts exist in the collection of Thomas Howard, Earl of Arundel, now with the other Arundel manuscripts in the British Library; manuscripts also exist in Dublin, York, and Westminster Abbey.\(^6\)\(^1\)

Yorkshire and Oxfordshire connections in the manuscript are strong but there are additional important indications of earlier provenance relating to London. Folio 2r, for example, a fragment measuring c.17 x 12 cms, contains an elaborate coat of arms drawn in pen and ink, coloured, with traces of gold. It shows a shield, which has a black background with three red cinquefoils, sable three cinquefoils gules pierced of the first. Two supporters are placed at the sides, standing on an island of green. Above these is a black helmet topped with a crown, out of which a bearded and horned goat’s head, with a serpentine body emerges, surrounded by blue mantling.\(^6\)\(^2\) The coat of arms is

---


\(^5\)\(^9\) Watson, Henry Savile, pp. 7-8. A great-great-great aunt of Savile’s married a Nettleton of Thornhill in the West Riding, a much more prominent family than that of the East Riding, but in an East Anglian Book of Hours is the \textit{ex libris} of John Nettleton of Hutton Cranswick and more than one collector of this name from different families is unlikely.

\(^6\)\(^0\) \textit{Ibid}, pp. 1-2, 9.

\(^6\)\(^1\) \textit{Ibid}, pp. 10-12.

\(^6\)\(^2\) The owner of the shield is unknown but it is very similar to one contained in London, British Library MS Additional 6113, ff. 161-2. This manuscript contains the names of nobles and ‘others that were with the nobles present with Edward III. The IX Year of his reign at Paris...in the warres of Fraunce ...’. Folio 161v shows the shield, no. 35, of Sir John [...] the father, who had one baronet, nine knights, forty-three esquires and eighty others. Though similar, its background colour is gold.
unidentifiable, but on the recto of the folio, alongside the *ex libris* ‘...> Thomas ...> Booke’, appears the signature of John Stow.63 

Stow (1525–1605) was a well-known London collector, knew many Elizabethan antiquarians, and was involved with the production of many chronicles, including the *Survey of London* and the *Annales, or a Generall chronicle of England*.64 His hand can be found in many medieval manuscripts containing works by Chaucer and Lydgate. He collected anthologies, and works from such collections, compiled by John Shirley, a scribe and editor with London connections, c.1366–1456.65 He also added to and adapted material collected and printed by William Thynne. Thynne’s family were connected with the Tudor royal household and Eltham Palace, where for some time Skelton had acted as tutor to the young Henry VIII and later moved in court circles. They were held in favour by the king but the family made an enemy of Wolsey by sheltering Skelton in their house at Erith in Kent, while he was writing *Colin Clout*.66 Stow collected Skelton’s works in manuscript and in print and edited the first edition of his poems.67 

Stow’s signature, combined with the known Savile provenance of some items in the manuscript, his connections with Savile and his interest in Skelton and chronicle material, indicate that at some time parts of this manuscript were in his hands, perhaps the parts which included *The Garland of Laurel* and Fenin’s *Mémoires*.68 Additionally it is known that one of the two existing early printed texts of *The Garland of Laurel* also bears his initials. The manuscript copy could have been used as a source for the printed text under Stow’s direction or, less likely, the printed text could have been used as a source for the manuscript version.69 

One final indication of possible provenance appears on the back of folio 207v, the folio before the start of *The Garland of Laurel*, which appears to have been folded like a 

63 Tite, *Early Records*, p. 169; Watson, *Henry Savile*. Watson and Tite believed that folio 2 is thought to have originally belonged with folios 3-61 because folios 2 and 14 have similar watermarks. I can not identify a watermark on folio 14.  
64 Hudson, ‘John Stow’, p. 54.  
68 The unidentified French poem, *Les Rues de Paris*, which follows Fenin’s *Mémoires*, also provides an account of the streets of Paris and may have been of interest to Stow.  
69 See Chapter Two.
letter. An inscription reads ‘Unto my coussyn John Ryche man of London mercerunte
taylor of London, this will be delyvered’, suggesting that the material before The
Garland of Laurel, including The Libel of Englyshe Policye, may have been in Ryche’s
hands at some time before it came to Cotton.

John Ryche, like John Stow, was a member of the Merchant Taylors’ Company. Many
manuscript miscellanies, with London provenance, were associated with the Merchant
Taylors’ Company, or with guilds, and it is known that Thomas Rotherham was
involved with the Guild of the Holy Trinity at Luton, and with the Luton Guild Book.
Potentially, therefore, it appears that a network of merchants, guildsmen or churchmen
may have been involved in gathering together some of the texts now contained within
Cotton Vitellius E.x. Cotton may have been working during the late sixteenth and early
seventeenth century with items that came from earlier Rotherham or Stow related
collections.

Cotton Vitellius E.x. presents many problems for its modern reader. Due to its poor
physical state, and Cotton’s involvement in its compilation, little evidence survives of
its early reception, or for the original production circumstances of the items contained
within it. However, its internal evidence still provides the modern reader with a wealth
of material which is sufficiently suggestive to allow some tentative speculations to be
made about its earlier textual histories. The issues raised by the manuscript about
readership and ownership, and about traditions of textual production and reception,
provide themes for the following chapters of this thesis. In the next section of this
chapter I consider the manuscript version of The Garland of Laurel and what it tells us
about the reception history of this particular poem.

70 C. M. Clode, ed., The Early History of the Guild of Merchant Taylors of the Fraternity of St. John the
Baptist, London, with Notices of the Lives of Some of its Eminent Members, 2 vols (London: Harrison,
1888), i, p. 404, Appendix 31. John Ryche’s name is included in a list of Freemen dated 27th
April, 1582; Hudson, ‘John Stow’, p. 53. Stow was admitted to the Merchant Taylors’ Company in 1547.
71 Sotheby’s, Catalogue of the Bute Collection of Forty-Two Illuminated Manuscripts and Miniatures
(London: Sotheby’s, 1983), pp. 80-7. The Luton Guild Book is sumptuously illuminated and contains
many miniatures. It was the official copy of the membership list of the Guild of the Holy Trinity at Luton,
prepared at the foundation of the Guild by Edward IV and Thomas Rotherham in 1475 and was kept by
the Guild until 1547. The Guild was well-endowed and became, in effect, a fashionable royalist
association in memory of Edward IV, members meeting annually for processions and feasts and coming
from as far as London, Norfolk, and Canterbury. The Luton Guild Book was auctioned in 1983. The great
wealth and social prestige of the guilds in the fourteenth century is attested to by J. W. McCutchan, ‘A
Solempne and a Greet Fraternitee’, Publications of the Modern Language Association of America, 74
(1959), 313-17.
C. The Poem in the Manuscript

i. A Unique Version of the Text
Despite its fire-damaged pages, *The Garland of Laurel* is one of the most intact works in the manuscript compilation, perhaps due to its generous spacing and huge margins. These suggest that the poem may have been handled as an unbound fragment for some time before being bound. Its layout suggests that the person who wrote it was confident about the sense, format and content of the poem. The hand is small and neat, both elegant and bold, with a vertical slant. The text is interspersed with capital letters and large headings, which divide it into sections. In the manuscript the poem is divided into nine capitula, not copied in either of the early printed texts. It is possible to tell that the capitula markings are original because space has been left for the large initials which follow them. The whole poem is copied with an awareness of its own importance and elegance, and with a consciousness of the traditions from which it emerges.

The manuscript version of *The Garland of Laurel* is unique but compared with the other remaining versions of the poem, the early printed texts of 1523 and 1568, it is incomplete. The manuscript may therefore be an early and unfinished version, or a later version copied selectively from other sources. It may pre-date or post-date the early printed texts around which datings for the poem’s composition are usually based.

In the manuscript, lines 1-245 survive marked as quire A, about twenty lines to a page, and as they appear in the printed texts. The other two quires, marked D and E, contain lines 721-1135, (414 lines in total). Original folio numbers indicate that these quires were all that existed of the poem when it was bound into the Cotton manuscript. The missing quires, B and C, potentially contained lines 246-720 (474 lines in total), and lines 1136-1602, also missing from the Cotton manuscript version, may have formed a final quire, E.

---

72 An account of the poem’s narrative is provided in Appendix 2.
73 Brownlow, *Book of the Laurel*, pp. 30-6. The manuscript hand appropriately bears similarities to the scribal copy of *A Lawde and Praye Made for oure Sovereigne Lord the Kyng*, London, Public Records Office, MS E 36/228, f.67, thought to be Skelton’s autograph copy.
74 Ibid., p. 18.
although there is no indication that such a quire ever existed. The *Admonet, En Parlement à Paris, Out of Frenshe into Latyn, and Out of Latyn into Englysshe*, variant endings, are always treated differently in surviving versions of the poem, sometimes omitted and sometimes included as completely separate works so it is highly possible that the scribal copy of the poem in Cotton Vitellius E.x. never had a final quire E.

To support this suggestion further, the poem’s ending in the manuscript is stable and it closes at a significant moment. It ends after the lyrics to the ladies have been presented and Skelton comes before the Queen of Fame, who declares him deserving of laureate fame. In the manuscript the lyrics serve as a final focal point for the narrative of the poem, emphasising the ladies’ presence and diminishing the importance of Skelton’s poetic achievement. It appears that the scribe used the poem’s natural narrative framework to bring his version of the poem to a close. It is possible that the further ending may not, at that stage, have existed, or that if it did the scribe may not have been aware of it. If a further ending did exist and he was aware of it, he may have chosen solely to emphasise the Howard ladies in his version of the poem or he may have considered the ending of the poem superfluous. Skelton may have been so well known by the time the scribe produced his version of the poem that he felt the emphasis on Skelton’s poetic authority and renown was unnecessary. Alternatively, the end of the poem may have been lost long before the scribe acquired a copy, or the ending may have been omitted simply because of time pressure or personal taste or requirements in the copying. The extraction of bits of Skelton’s work reflects his own techniques of textualisation and is perhaps a mark of a mature reception.

The list of contents in Cotton Vitellius E.x. and the catalogue descriptions of the poem, as well as the manuscript’s emphasis through layout, reflects the fact that the lyrics have always been used as representative samples of the subject matter of *The Garland of Laurel* as a whole, and have traditionally provided a focal point for its interpretation. In the manuscript they appear alongside other works relating to England and English history. Their manuscript layout and context may be one reason why cataloguers have seized upon the women as focal points. Each lyric is spaciously laid out on an individual folio, and the ladies are emphasised with flourishes to their names and initials and with grand titles, for

---

75 The passages missing in quires B and C of the manuscript version also focus the reader’s attention on Skelton’s self-image, techniques of self-representation and his reflexivity about writing for a living. Together, these important episodes narrate Skelton’s journey to the Queen of Fame’s court, drawing attention to the theme of Skelton’s fame and reputation and revealing the traditions which influenced his composition. These too could have been omitted deliberately, rather than lost.
example, ‘To the ryght noble Countes of Surrey’. Each stanza begins with a large flourished letter and each lady acquires individual importance. The short structure of a lyric, their particular charm and readable quality, make them significant and easily extractable parts of the poem. They are, in fact, a non-representative two hundred and fifty lines of over sixteen hundred. As I argue later in this thesis, the poem is not a tribute to the Howard ladies but is an exploration in a dream framework of how fame and reputation may be acquired and sustained by a poet in the late fifteenth century.

Particular prominence is given in the manuscript to Elizabeth Howard, the Countess of Surrey. She is the first lady to be addressed and her lyric is the most formal of the eleven. Skelton’s approach to her is humble and tentative and he pays tribute and gives thanks to her noble generosity. In addition to the preliminary citation in the list of contents in Cotton Vitellius E.x., which emphasises the presence of the Howard ladies, is the phrase ‘Super heroica commendacione’, written alongside capitulum IX in the manuscript. This occurs immediately before the first lyric to the Countess of Surrey, which suggests that the copyist or later compiler thought of the lyrics as tributes within the poem, as if any audience might have heard of these remarkable ladies or their family. The other ladies addressed are Elizabeth Howard and Muriel Howard, daughters of the countess; Lady Anne Dacre, a daughter by an earlier marriage; Margery Wentworth, a half-niece; Margaret Tylney, a sister-in-law and Isabel Pennel, her daughter; Jane Blenner-Haiset, Margaret Hussey and Gertrude Statham, wives of men connected to Howard family properties and business (ll. 836-1085). The purpose of focusing attention upon the eleven noble ladies, all associated with the Howard household, as I go on to argue, offers the reader a patronage scenario for the poem’s circumstances of production.\footnote{M. J. Tucker, ‘The Ladies in Skelton’s “Garland of Laurel”’, Renaissance Quarterly, 22 (1969), 333-45.}

**ii. Dating folios 208-25 and Skelton’s Poem**

Brownlow identifies a watermark on folio 208 of *The Garland of Laurel* which together with the scribal hand for that text, points to the late fifteenth century as a likely period for the production of this manuscript version of Skelton’s poem.\footnote{Brownlow, Book of the Laurel, pp. 25-7.} The poem’s narrative itself provides an astrological date of 1495 for the events of the dream vision. Brownlow gives serious consideration to Skelton’s astrological description at the beginning of the poem, but achieves only doubtful conclusions about its veracity.
Evidence that 1495 could be a real composition date is scant, and the birth and death dates of the recipients of lyrics contained within the poem make this early astrological date an unlikely, if tantalising, choice for a possible date of composition.

Melvin J. Tucker argues to the contrary that *The Garland of Laurel* was composed over a long period of time rather than in a given year, and he focuses upon the individual dating of the lyrics contained within the poem, which are addressed to ladies associated with the Howard household, in order to argue that the lyrics pre-exist the narrative.\(^7\)\(^8\) Carlson explores the idea that the composition falls into three stages, at the earliest the lyrics, then the narrative frame and lastly the bibliographic material, supplemented by constant revisions, new additions and reworkings.\(^7\)\(^9\) It has been suggested that the poem was written over a thirty-five year period from 1492 to 1523, an argument lent credence by the mention of the writing of *Collyn Clout* in *The Garland of Laurel*, completed perhaps as late as mid-1523, and by the fact that Whittinton borrows from *The Garland* for his Grammarian tracts.\(^8\)\(^0\) Carlson also suggests that its laureate genre indicates that it may have been written to justify Skelton’s achievements at the times he was awarded his laureate degrees in 1488, 1492 and 1493.\(^8\)\(^1\)

Scattergood’s research, complementing Carlson’s, illustrates that Skelton’s poems are often an accumulation of material, including explanatory and justificatory glosses and annotations, and that the circumstances of composition of *The Garland of Laurel* contribute to a ‘not … particularly unified or cohesive performance’.\(^8\)\(^2\) In this thesis I advance the hypothesis that *The Garland of Laurel* was written over a long period of time, added to and augmented, and that it was structured around the lyrics, its central

---

\(^7\)\(^8\) Tucker, ‘The Ladies’, p. 342. The ladies and the dates of their lyric compositions are: Elizabeth Howard, Countess of Surrey, before her death in 1497; Elizabeth Howard, pre-marriage 1500; Muriel Howard, pre-her marriage in 1500; Lady Anne Dacre, after her marriage in 1492; Margery Wentworth, pre-October 22\(^\text{nd}\) 1494 when she was married; Margaret Tylney, pre-marriage, date unknown; Jane Blemner-Haiset, pre-her death in 1501; Isabel Pennel, pre-marriage, date unknown; Margaret Hussey, pre-her death in 1492; Gertrude Statham, post-her marriage in 1482, probably c. 1490; Isabel Knyght, post-her marriage, date unknown. See also Brownlow, *Book of the Laurel*, pp. 30-3.


\(^8\)\(^1\) Carlson, ‘Stages of the Composition’, p. 102.

core. However, I believe that the bulk of the poem was composed and finished by circa 1495.

The manuscript version of *The Garland of Laurel* provides no indication of its early reception history, its readers or its context, though it is easy to date. Given the focus upon the Howard ladies, it is likely that the version in Cotton Vitellius E.x. was written as a coterie work and intended, at least early in its compositional history, for a select audience, perhaps in Yorkshire or London. These assumptions are upheld by what is known about other manuscripts containing works by Skelton.

D. Skelton Manuscripts and their Audience

Manuscripts, susceptible to greater intervention than early printed books by compilers, owners and editors, can provide a disproportionate amount of information about Skelton’s audience at the time his writings circulated in both manuscript and print. What follows is a preliminary survey, in addition to the information supplied above about Cotton Vitellius E.x., of the audiences implied by a range of manuscripts in which Skelton’s works appear.

It is known that three of Skelton’s extant manuscripts were sent to King Henry VIII but it is also clear from the evidence of existing manuscripts containing his poems that Skelton’s audience extended beyond London.83 Copies of Skelton’s works are often contained alongside other items of distinct London origin, aimed at those visiting the city on business. Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Rawlinson C. 813, for example, contains a large fragment of Skelton’s *Why Come Ye Nat to Courte?* and includes a selection of items associated with the court and metropolis.84 Its marks of ownership reveal that the manuscript had both provincial and city owners and associations, and that the preferences of its first owner, in whose hand most of the manuscript is written,

---

included works by Skelton.\textsuperscript{85} It was compiled by Humphrey Welles, a member of parliament late in the reign of Henry VIII and suggests that Skelton’s works circulated within London and outside of London. For example, its links to Staffordshire suggest anti-Wolsey sentiment reached outside of the merchant class and outside of London.\textsuperscript{86}

Similarly London, British Library, MS Harley 2252 has London connections. It belonged to a citizen and mercer of London, who was connected to fellow merchants and individuals at the royal court, and who was trading as a bookseller specialising in printed books in 1520. This manuscript includes copies of Speke Parott and Collyn Clout, both anti-Wolsey poems. The manuscript suggests that a coterie circulation of poems opposing Wolsey existed amongst the politically aware book-owning class.\textsuperscript{87} Harley 2252 contains a different manuscript version of Collyn Clout from London, British Library, MS Lansdowne 762, an occasional selection reworked to refer to Wolsey’s fall from power. It is bound with other fragments of verse prophecy and the manuscript is suggestive of the disorganised circulation of recensions of Skelton’s satires and the adaptability of manuscripts to changing circumstances.\textsuperscript{88}

London, British Library, MS Harley 367 contains the unique text of Skelton’s Ageynst Garnesche, an insult to Sir Christopher Garnesche, clearly intended for circulation at court where he was known.\textsuperscript{89} Similarly, The Garland of Laurel seems to have been directed towards the Howard family, or a similar network of readers. In its present manuscript form, for example, its layout and content have been adapted and made appropriate to a particular owner or distinct social group. Julia Boffey’s work provides evidence that manuscripts were passed around, read and copied, between families and countries.

\textsuperscript{85} Scattergood, ‘London Manuscripts’, pp. 175-6. Marks of ownership include a cipher of the name of Humphrey Wells (born before 1502); the name of Master William Chatwyn, his father-in-law who had court connections, is mentioned in a doggerel letter sent to Anthony Chatwyn his brother-in-law. A number of other names are mentioned in doggerel letters too, all fellows living in the vicinity of Ingestre, Staffordshire.

\textsuperscript{86} Chapter Three, part A ii, contains an extensive discussion of this manuscript. See also A. S. G. Edwards, ‘Skelton’s English Poems in Print and Manuscript’, in Sources, Exemplars, and Copy-Texts: Essays from the Lampeter Conference of the Early Book Society, ed. W. Marx, Trivium, 31 (1999), 87-100 (p. 25).

\textsuperscript{87} Edwards, ‘Skelton’s English Poems’, p. 95

\textsuperscript{88} Ibid., p. 97

\textsuperscript{89} Scattergood, ‘London Manuscripts’, pp. 174-7. Like Cotton Vitellius E.x., it is connected with John Stow. Edwards, ‘Skelton’s English Poems.’, p. 97. The Garland of Laurel and Ageynst Garnesche are both coterie poems, addressing courtly figures, while also being insistently self-referential.
especially by nobility. This may have been the fate of the manuscript version of *The Garland of Laurel* which possibly existed in an unbound state for some time. The unstable tradition of textual production is also evident in the case of *Mannerly Margery Mylk and Ale*, which similarly exists in more than one version in manuscript. It is contained within the Fairfax manuscript and on the verso of the final flyleaf (f. 77v), of Caxton’s *Dictes or Sayeings of the Philosophres* (1477). Like *The Garland of Laurel* it seems to have existed in different recensions at different times.

London, British Library, MS Royal 18. D. 2, an enormous and decorative volume, illustrates connections between Skelton and the earls of Northumberland, the Percy family, with its copy of Skelton’s *On the Deth of the Erle of Northumberland*. In decoration and presentational style this manuscript is comparable to London, British Library, MS Additional 26787, which contains a very high quality copy of Skelton’s *Speculum Principis*, written as a presentation copy for Prince Henry. Splendid and expensive manuscripts like these contrast with less elegant manuscripts such as London, Public Record Office, MS E. 36/228, ff. 7-8, a holograph copy and not a presentation copy of Skelton’s *A lawde and prayse made for Our Sovereigne Lord the Kyng*, also known as *The rose both white and rede* and *The boke o f the rosiar*.

It seems that manuscript circulation of Skelton’s works was a belated aspect of his career and that his poems moved from print into manuscript rather than first appearing in manuscript form. A. S. G. Edwards confirms this and argues convincingly that coterie circulation was enforced on a number of Skelton’s political poems by printers, as a kind of early censorship. Printers seem to have been cautious about which works by Skelton they printed until after 1528, when *A Replycacioun* was printed, as it was not in their interest to print controversial works. It seems that Skelton may have been forced to make distinct choices between manuscript and print as media for presenting his works.

---


92 Edwards, ‘Skelton’s English Poems’, p. 97. See also, A. F. Marotti, *Manuscript, Print, and the English Renaissance Lyric* (Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 1995), pp. 75-6, 94. Marotti’s chapter, ‘Sex, Politics and the Manuscript System’ considers the large number of poems circulating in manuscript which were libellous or worthy of public political criticism and comment. He suggests that the manuscript system was a safer place than print for such works and that such works were associated particularly with male environments such as universities and the Inns of Court.
While a high proportion of his works appear in manuscript, many more appear in print, published outside of courtly culture and addressing wider more generalised audiences. I consider Skelton's works in print in more detail in the next chapter.93

Individual works by Skelton, as well as the manuscripts in which they are contained, can also reveal much about their own production context, and by implication about the production context of The Garland of Laurel. For ease of reference and comparison the tables in Appendix 3 list Skelton's works in manuscript and print, the forms they take and the numbers extant. Table A illustrates the survival of manuscript copies of Skelton's works, the title of the work, its date if known, its location and the total number of extant manuscript copies. Table B shows the extant printed forms of works surviving in manuscript: the work, the number of printed versions, their dates, printers and the collection – if any – in which it is contained.

Few manuscripts of Skelton's works survive, especially in comparison with Lydgate and Chaucer manuscripts. In most cases, as the folio numbers indicate, Skelton's manuscript works survive as parts of collections of diverse items, such as Lansdowne 762, and Harley 2252.94 It is common for there to be only one surviving manuscript copy of works, while comparatively few works survive in manuscript form at all. Surviving manuscript works, for which dates are known, seem to date from the late fifteenth and early sixteenth century. They are only speculatively dated when the Skelton item relates to current events of the period, such as the death of the Earl of Northumberland or, as in the case of The Garland of Laurel, related to a zodiacal phenomenon.95

Of the surviving manuscript works a high proportion also appears in print, though only eleven of Skelton's works appeared in print during his lifetime.96 Less than half the total of the manuscript works, that is Sorrow at Parting, Satire on Gallants, Prayer to the

94 These manuscripts, like Cotton Vitellius E.x., have distinct London origins and individual compilers, but date from a different period. In these manuscripts the contents are diverse, ranging from testaments and letters, to oaths, tracts, articles, prophecies and visions, bills and receipts, cures, mnemonics for remembering the church year and saints' days, lists of kings of England, advice on husbandry, methods for making calculations, an unfinished metrical romance, prophetic poems and poems about London, some chronicles and epitaphs. Cotton Vitellius E.x. is not miscellaneous in this way and its contents reflect Cotton's personal interests. Its items are not grouped by genre.
95 See section C ii. above on the dating of the poem.
Trinity, Mannerly Margery Mylk and Ale, the Maner of the Worlde Nowadays, A Lawde for oure Sovereign and Against Garnesche, do not appear in print. A Lawde for oure Sovereign appears in Exchequer records and may never have been intended for public view; similarly Against Garnesche, directed specifically at one courtier, would have been of little interest outside court circles. Other works left out of print may have been short and considered insignificant, they may have been unpopular or their authorship may have been doubtful.

Skelton’s works, dating from the period in which for a short time manuscript and print production co-existed, seem to have appealed to a diverse audience. His poetry was published in both manuscript and print and appealed to the king, to nobility, and to people in and around the city of London, and further afield. It was also incorporated into miscellanies of works gathered together by compilers and collectors, which often provide indications of its appeal and reception. It is therefore not unusual that The Garland of Laurel appears in a sort of manuscript miscellany, alongside a variety of other works, and in two different surviving early printed editions. However, unlike many of these manuscript miscellanies, I have shown that Cotton Vitellius E.x. is a book which presents many problems to a modern reader trying to uncover evidence for its circumstances of production.

While the whole miscellany tells us little about the background history of Skelton’s poem, or about any of the texts it contains, the manuscript version of the poem is still significant and offers the reader some clues as to its reception and the intentions of the scribe. The next chapter undertakes to consider the differences between this manuscript version and the two early printed versions of the poem, and, like the manuscript, the differences between the printed texts raise interesting questions about what kind of reader they may have been intended for. The manuscript version draws attention to the Howard ladies and obscures the focus upon Skelton which is brought to bear in the printed versions. While there is not enough evidence to confirm that the Howard ladies were Skelton’s patrons, the manuscript version’s selectivity, and the connections between Skelton, the Howards and Cotton, suggests that this is a likely conclusion to draw.

This thesis continues to consider Skelton’s readers and patrons and focuses upon female patronage in Chapter Six. It also considers Skelton’s self-representation, his concern
with his reputation and the circulation of his works in Chapters Four and Seven. There are important distinctions to be drawn between readers, compilers and patrons, but their different roles can illustrate important trends in the production and reception of texts and can throw light on the reception of this particular text.
This chapter continues to focus upon the extant material remains of *The Garland of Laurel*. Complementing the manuscript chapter, it considers the two early printed text versions of the poem. In addition, considerable time is given to exploring the significance of print media for Skelton and his relationship with his printers.

Two early printed texts of *The Garland of Laurel* exist; both are different from each other and from the manuscript version. They are *STC 22610, A ryght delectable tratysse upon a goodly Garlande or Chapelet of Laurell by mayster Skelton Poete laureat studyously dyvyssed at Sheryfhotton Castell. In ye foreste of galtres, where in ar comprysyde many & dyvers solacyons & ryght pregnant allectyves of syngular pleasure, as more at large it doth apere in ye pieces folowynge*, printed in 1523 by Richard Faques; and *STC 22608, The Crowne of Lawrell, the first item in Pithy pleasant and profitable workes of maister Skelton, Poete Laureate. / Nowe collected and newly published. ANNO 1568. Imprinted at London in Fletestreate, neare unto Saint Dunstones churche by Thomas Marshe.* These are described in detail below.

The differences between the two printed versions of the poem are significant and this chapter focuses upon the nature of those differences. It also considers how and why the printed texts differ from the manuscript version. The chapter sets out to consider the implications of all differences for a study of the production and reception of *The Garland of Laurel* and what they tell us more generally about late fifteenth-century textual production. A consideration of individual printed texts can reveal information similar to that revealed by a study of a manuscript. In their own distinctive ways, printed texts reveal their circumstances of production, information about printers, booksellers and audience. The relationship between manuscript and printed versions of the same work, or between several printed versions, can provide information about dates of composition, identifications of ownership, circulation habits, geographic location of the works and knowledge of the ways in which they were read. It further enables a
scholar to test, substantiate and discuss hypotheses about the textual history of Skelton’s poem.¹

A. The Garland of Laurel: Early Printed Texts

i. A ryght delectable tratyse

Faques’s *A ryght delectable tratyse* (1523), emulates the layout of the manuscript copy in Cotton Vitellius E.x., seemingly altered only to fit the requirements of the printed page. It is printed in quarto, in three founts of black letter, and a fount of Roman, and a great primer for titles.² It could not have been made by copying the existing manuscript alone because it contains many sections which are not included in the manuscript version of the poem. While this is the case, it omits nothing which the manuscript contains. Faques’s version appears to be complete in itself, with sections numbered inclusively A to F.

The *Tratyse* survives in a single leather-bound volume with a crest on the front cover, the crest of the royal library of George III, now in the British Library. It contains only Skelton’s *The Garland of Laurel*. The volume was very likely intended for a prestigious reader, certainly royalty at the later date when it was bound into its leather cover.³ The poem — perhaps originally in loose leaf form — is clearly not a cheap production. It has been carefully printed and its layout is elegant and illustrated with woodcuts. It appears to have continued to appeal to antiquarians and academics for this reason. It may now be a unique copy because high demand for the entertaining and pleasing text, circulating only in a flimsy form, may have led to the destruction or loss of other copies.

On the inside cover the volume includes a description which has been cut and pasted from a bookseller’s catalogue, describing the fine points of the volume for the buyer:


¹ A publication history of *The Garland of Laurel* is provided in Appendix 7.
³ See footnote 8, and the following discussion below, with regard to the owner of the volume before it entered the collection of George III.
2421. *A ryght Delectable Tratise upon a goodly Garlande, or Chaplet of Laurell, by Maister Skelton, Poete Laureat, Studyously dyvysed at Sheryfhotton Castell, in ye Foreste of Galtres, where in ar comprysyde many and dyvers solacyons & right pregnant allectyves of syngular pleasure, as more at large it doth apere in ye pieces following, b.1. imprynted by me Richarde Faukes, dwellyng in Duram Rent, or els in Powlis Chyrche-yard, at the sygne of the A.B.C. 1523.*

N.B. The above extremely rare Volume of Skelton’s, contains upon the back of the Title the Author’s Portrait at full length, with a Branch in his Hand, and two neat wooden Prints of the Queen of Fame and Dame Pallas; in it also, Occupation is desired by the QUeene of Fame [sic], to expound “parte of Skelton’s Bokes and Baladis;” in this Poem, several Pieces of Skelton’s are mentioned, which have hitherto escaped without notice, in particular, *his Comedy of Achademios*, translated from Cicero’s Familiar Epistles; it is undoubtedly one of the scarcest Books in the English Language, and is [sic] is presumed that no other Copy is known to exist.

The additional *nota bene* is interesting and emphasises that this was a rare and prized book, of interest for antiquarians or academics. The entry tells us that the text was lot 2421 in an auction of the Bibliotheca Pearsoniana, sold by T. and J. Egerton on April 24th 1788 for seven guineas and one half. A copy of the catalogue of the auction exists in the Bodleian Library, revealing that Thomas and John Egerton were a firm of booksellers and that the book came from the library of the deceased Thomas Pearson
This catalogue originally belonged to Francis Douce (1757–1834), the antiquary and keeper of manuscripts at the British Museum, who bequeathed part of his extensive personal collection to the Bodleian. The catalogue reveals that Faques’s text was sold on the tenth day of the sale, in the third of four lots of English poetry. Douce marks in the margins of his catalogue the buyers and prices for the books and next to lot 2421 records the name Brand.

The ownership of Faques’s *Tratyse* by Brand is supported by an ex-libris inside its cover which reads ‘J. Brandam. F.S.A. Coll. Linc. Oxon’. John Brand (1744–1806) was an antiquary and topographer whose library included rare books and manuscripts. He graduated from Oxford in 1775 and was elected a fellow of the Society of Antiquaries (F.S.A.) on 29th May 1777. In 1784 he was elected resident secretary to the society and was re-elected to that office annually until he died, when his library was sold at auction and Faques’s *Tratyse* entered the royal collection. These associations are particularly suggestive and significant in light of the Lincoln College, Oxford references in Cotton Vitellius E.x., and the Cotton and Stow connections between items in the manuscript.

The title page following the bookseller’s description, (f.Alr), has seven lines of text followed by the woodcut illustration of an author figure, different from the one

---

4 T. and J. Egerton, *Bibliotheca Pearsoniana: A Catalogue of the library of Thomas Pearson, Esq. (DECEASED) Containing A Very Extensive Collection of the Best and Rarest Books in Every Branch of English Literature. INCLUDING Mast of the Writers on the History, Antiquities, Topography and Heraldry of Great Britain and Ireland; Foreign History, Voyages and Travels, Natural History, Books of Prints and some Missals; also the most compleat Assemblage of English Poetry, Old Romances and Dramatic Writers, that have been ever brought to Public Sale. WHICH WILL BE SOLD BY AUCTION BY T. and J. EGERTON, BOOKSELLERS, At their ROOM, in SCOTLAND YARD, Opposite the ADMIRALTY, On Monday, the 14th of April, 1788, And the Twenty-two following Days, (Sundays excepted). To be viewed on Wednesday, April 9th, and to the Sale, which will begin each day punctually at Twelve o’Clock. CATALOGUES, Price ONE SHILLING, may be had at the Place of Sale; also of Mr. OWEN, Temple Bar; Mr DAVIS, Holborn; Mr. SEWELL, Cornhill; Mess. ROBSON and CLARK, Bond Street; and of Mess. EGERTON, Whitehall. (London: 1788). Pearson can not be identified. This catalogue is bound with two other catalogues in a 19th century binding. The other catalogues are for the sale of the library of John Henderson, Esq., (late of Covent Garden Theatre), dated February 1786 and for the sale of the library of Richard Wright, M. D. Fellow of the Royal Society (deceased), dated April 1787.

5 *DNB*, xv, p. 256.

6 T. and J. Egerton, *Bibliotheca Pearsoniana*, p. 1761. Lot 1485, on day eleven, Friday 25th April, was Skelton’s *Pithy, Pleasant, and Profitable Works* 1736. Lot 1976, on day nine, was Fawkes’s *Poems and Translations*.

7 Other recorded names of buyers include Douce; Haworth; Malone; Mr. Brand; Bindley; Dodd; L. Charlemont; Reed; S. J. Hawkins; Mr. Beloc; Scase; Stevens.

8 *DNB*, vi, pp. 213-14. The volume may have entered the royal collection in 1806, or after that date, during the last fourteen years of the reign of George III.
described above in the bookseller's entry. The seven lines of text, the first two in bold type, do not appear in Marshe's edition of the poem:

A ryght delectable tratyse upon a goodly Garlande or Chapelet of Laurell by mayster Skelton Poete laureat studyously dyvyseyd at Sheryfhotton Castell. In ye foreste of galtres, where in ar comprysyde many & dyvers solacyons & ryght pregnant allectyves of syngular pleasure, as more pere in ye pièces folowynge, b.I imprynted by me Richarde Faukes, dwellyng in Duram Rent, or els in Powlis Chyrche - yard at the synge of the A.B.C. 1523.

These words, from 'A ryght delectable tratyse' to 'in ye pièces folowynge', which also do not appear in the manuscript, form the first part of the poem in the more recent Scattergood edition of the text. While their addition to Scattergood's text reflects a modern interest in the activities of printers and book-sellers, their presence in Faques's text illustrates the need felt by authors in the late fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries to represent and associate themselves with their own works. The concerns of printers to associate themselves with the books they produced and protect their merchandise from other printers who might sell the text in a different version, from a different press, are also evident elsewhere in Faques's text and are issues I discuss further in the final chapter of this thesis.

On folio A1v is the woodcut described in the bookseller's description, which I discuss further below, and the poem begins on folio A2r with the words 'Arectyng my syght' with a woodblock type letter 'A' decorated with three flowers. Each new stanza begins with a capital letter and is distinguished with a marker in the text. At the bottom of folio A2v are two woodcuts, side by side, rather overshadowed by the larger woodcuts in the text, but nevertheless of interest. Illustrations of these two woodcuts appear in Appendix 8 C, the rare woodcut which interested the bookseller appears in Appendix 8 B, and I consider these woodcuts in more detail below and in the final chapter of this thesis.

The text finishes on folio E4v with three lines of ordinary text, a gap, then four lines of text, the last of which is centred:
Here endith a ryght delectable tratyse upon a goodly
garlonde or chapelet of laurel dyvvysed by mayster Skel
ton Poete laureat.

Inpryntyd by me Rycharde faukes dwellydg in duram
rent or els in Powlis chyrche yarde at the sygne of the
A.B.C. The yere of our lorde god. M.CCCCC.

xxiii. The . iii. day of Octobre.

Beneath these lines appears a printer’s device, which I also consider below.9

Due to its layout and the inclusion of so many woodcuts, especially those of the author
figure, it is possible to suggest that STC 22610 may have been adapted for particular use
or status in this period.10 In a similar way to commissioned manuscript production, the
layout of a printed text might reflect the demands and expectations of readership. Books
could have been bespoken by particular customers, (a flourishing part of the book
trade), or could have been made to attract a potential unknown reader.11 In the case of
this Faques text, it is possible that a reader commissioned the inclusion of the woodcuts.
The structure of The Garland of Laurel is additive, or accretive, and images and lyrics
are incorporated into it with ease. It binds together a variety of material and genres in
ways which emulate collecting practices.12 Such a work would have been of interest to
academics, compilers and collectors, to an élite audience who wished to purchase fine
books, and to an aspiring audience hoping to purchase a printed text which emulated
manuscript production, not only in its content and subject matter but also in its structure
and in the appearance of its typeface.

---

9 Appendix 8 D.

10 C. M. Meale, ‘Patrons, Buyers and Owners: Book Production and Social Status’, in Book Production
and Publishing in Britain 1375–1475, ed. J. Griffiths and D. Pearsall (Cambridge: Cambridge University

42 (pp. 431-2). See also K. Harris, ‘The Role of Owners in Book Production and the Book Trade’, in

12 The structure, form and content of The Garland of Laurel and collecting practices are discussed in
more detail in Chapter Three.
Manuscripts may therefore have had a special status in the early years of printing as models for other literary activity. If Skelton’s *Garland of Laurel* addressed a private and élite audience in an accessible form, this might account for this luxurious 1523 printed text and the elegant manuscript copy. If the *Tratyse* addressed the audience at court, or the Howard ladies, an élite audience may have been just as interested in purchasing printed texts as manuscripts by the early sixteenth century. It does not appear unusual that works of Skelton’s which survive in manuscript also survive in individual printed copies, such as Faques’s 1523 version of *The Garland of Laurel* and it is likely that such texts might have been produced for a particular person to personal specifications. It is possible that the printed versions replicated traditions of patronage and marketed themselves on the back of previous patronage. Perhaps the printer may have been cashing in on the fact, or implication, that this poem had worthy patrons or readers, in order to sell his work to an aspiring audience.

There are further differences in *STC* 22610 from the manuscript, which are suggestive of audience. The *Linguistic Atlas of Late Mediaeval English (LALME)* illustrates the geographic origins of word forms by a comparative process. The words ‘zodyake’, ‘revercyd’, ‘warre’, ‘frythy’ and ‘mose’ in the early printed text, appear as ‘zodiak’, ‘revercid’, ‘war’, ‘frytythy’ and ‘moose’ in the manuscript as part of a fairly standard morphology. Interesting oddities, however, include ‘Ryde’ and ‘ryn’ in the manuscript which appears as ‘ryde’ and ‘rinne’ in the 1523 printed version (1.196), neither form common at all, but slightly more usual in the area of the Yorkshire Ridings, and unlikely to be of London origin. Likewise ‘Sithe’ for ‘since’, ‘hundrethe’ for

---


14 *Ibid.*, p. 218. For example, Hellinga comments that several merchants are known to have been connected with the patronage of some of Caxton’s and Wynkyn de Worde’s books.

15 C. J. Brown, ‘Text, Image and Authorial Self-Consciousness in Late Medieval Paris’, in *Printing the Written Word*, ed. Hindman, pp. 103-42. Brown’s article discusses the publication history of André de la Vigne’s *La Ressource de la Chrestienté*, later known as the *Vergier d’honneur*, from manuscript to print, with particular attention given to the presence, and subsequent adaptation and use, of the presentation miniature, the illustration of the dreaming narrator, and acrostics identifying its royal patron; D. R. Carlson, ‘Formal Translation: Thomas More’s Epigrams before and after 1518’, in *English Humanist Books: Writers and Patrons, Manuscript and Print*, 1475–1525 ed. D. R. Carlson (London: University of Toronto Press, 1993), pp. 142-62. Carlson discusses the use Humanist writers made of liminary verse to advertise themselves, their connections with other poets, and to share the prestige of publication, pp. 148-9.

'hundred' and 'theder' for 'thither' are not particularly common and are more common in the North. However, it is impossible to tell from these texts whether the scribe/printer is copying his exemplar accurately or translating it into his own dialect, and Skelton texts may be too late for an accurate use of LALME.\(^\text{17}\)

ii. The crowne of Lawrell

Equally important in this consideration of the readership and ownership of versions of *The Garland of Laurel* is *The crowne of Lawrell*, the first poem in the 1568 collection of Skelton's works, followed in this text by the *The Bouge of Courte*. Marshe's version of Skelton's poem was clearly intended for a very different audience and use from Faques's version. Information written into *Pithy pleasaunt and profitable workes of maister Skelton, Poete Laureat. Nowe collected and newly published ANNO 1568. Imprinted at London in Fletestreate, neare unto Saint Dunstones churche by Thomas Marshe* tells us that the book was in a sale, during the nineteenth century, at Roxburgh when it fetched thirty-one pounds and ten shillings.\(^\text{18}\) Today it is in a modern leather binding and measures 9.5 x 14.5cms. The shield of the Right Honourable Thomas Grenville, an eighteenth-century book collector and statesman, is on the front cover.\(^\text{19}\)

The title page describes Skelton's works as 'pithy', 'pleasaunt' and profitable', an advertisement which perhaps appealed to a particular type of reader looking for instructive, serious and pleasing reading material. The poems are collected together in this form for the first time and the 'newness' of the publication is emphasised. Emphasising their novelty value was a significant factor in their successful publication and print often lent collections of works prominence and prestige in this way. During the sixteenth century, printed collections became an increasingly popular way of taking a writer's works to a broad geographic and social range of people. A collection could emulate a manuscript compilation, appealing to traditional reading tastes, but it could also preserve a writer's works and, by implication, record his poetic output and

\(^\text{17}\) Thanks are due to Jenni Nuttall for her help with *LALME*. With some degree of variation, the scope of the *Atlas* covers the century 1350–1450.

\(^\text{18}\) The Roxburgh Club, a gentleman's dining society, had an association with Madden and undertook the publication of medieval texts. See also Appendix 5, table B, *Magnificence*.

\(^\text{19}\) *DNB* xxiii, pp. 132-3. Thomas Grenville, 1755–1846, statesman and book collector, was owner of the famous Grenville library. He was educated at Christ Church, Oxford, and had many military and political appointments. He acted as an ambassador in negotiations with the United States, Vienna, and Berlin, enduring shipwreck and many political defeats. He was a book collector all his life, and was eventually appointed a trustee of the British Museum, to whom he left the majority of his books, upwards of 20,000 volumes. This was chiefly printed material, including diverse and valuable collections.
reputation for future generations. The title page of the 1568 edition, as I discuss below, emphasises the laureate status of Skelton as a poet but also states the place of publication and name of the printer, who perhaps thought to swell his own reputation alongside Skelton's. It seems particularly appropriate that this edition of Skelton's collected works contains *The Garland of Laurel* as its first item because it is a poem which itself emphasises the poetic glory and fame of the poet. In addition, on the verso of the title page, there may also be examples of liminary verse, a popular means by which writers used their peers' reputation to enhance their own in the early sixteenth century. There is a short poem in Latin, followed by Thomas Churchyard's 'If Slouth and tract of time [...] that thus such honour gaet' between the title page and table of contents. The index, which lists thirty-three works, comes between the title page and the page on which *The Garland of Laurel* starts and is headed 'Workes of Skelton newly collected by I.S. as foloweth'.

The initials of John Stow are particularly interesting in light of his previously identified connection with Cotton Vitellius and Savile, and his repute as a collector of manuscripts of Skelton's works. It appears that Marshe may have copied Skelton's poems from such a manuscript collection and that he also copied Stow's initials which recorded his role in the manuscript compilation. This may have been done unknowingly or may have been purposeful, in order to make his printed text appear more authentic to the reader, and consequently to increase sales of his book. Marshe's use of John Stow's initials and reputation suggests that he may have been targeting readers who enjoyed manuscript compilations and who wanted to acquire good copies of manuscript works.

---

20 A. F. Marotti, *Manuscript, Print, and the English Renaissance Lyric* (Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 1995), pp. 215-17, 256-8. Marotti pays particular attention to Tottel's publication techniques, his use of titles, address to the audience, and rise in popularity of collections in print. He goes on to note the reception history of posthumous editions of works by Donne and Herbert, Skelton and Gascoigne, Sidney, Spenser, Shakespeare and Daniel and the reception of collected editions of living authors such as Drayton, Jonson and Daniel.


23 See Chapter One, B ii, pp. 38-40.
The Garland of Laurel starts without title or introduction on folio A1r, beginning immediately ‘Arectynge my syght ...’. This may indicate that by 1568 the poem was so well known that it did not need any introduction, or it may indicate that at some point during the formation of the codex this information was lost or omitted. It is not until folio B.1r that a title for the poem as a whole appears at the top of the page, ‘Of Lawrell’, followed on its verso by ‘The Crowne’ which then continues throughout the poem until its end. The crowne of Lawrell contains no illustrations and there are usually four stanzas to a page, twenty-eight lines, although after folio B5r there are often twenty-five or four rather than twenty-eight lines.

The text has catchwords at the bottom right hand corner of each page and also has hands drawn in at intervals, pointing to important sections of the text. This text was clearly not intended as a luxury item but as a copy which could be easily used by readers. Additions to Marshe’s text, marking out passages of interest, also suggest that Skelton’s work was considered serious reading matter. On folio B5v are a number of printed Latin notes in the margin which have been cut off and on folio B7r the additional printed words ‘Interpolata ... adversarium’ are italicised and centred, followed by another ten lines of italicised text, and another set of marginal notes partially trimmed off. Other interesting features which could be suggestive of a learned approach to the text include the organisation of words into a cone pattern on folio C7r and the parallel text on folio D4r, perhaps a marker indicating the end of a section of verse.

In addition to the elements of the text which are designed to aid a studious reader, the text by Marshe ends with some Latin (‘Ad Serenisssimam [...] honorificatissimo’) at the bottom of folio D6r and ‘L’autre envoy’ in Latin and English on folio D6v, which are omitted by Faques. Marshe’s text does not contain the extracts with which Faques finishes his version, which include Skelton’s ‘Admonet’ to the trees, the Latin passage ‘Fraxinus ...engree’, the French En parlament à Paris, ‘Out of frenshe in to latyn’ and ‘Out of latyne in to Englysshe’. However, these extracts appear much later as a separate poem in Marshe’s collection. Clearly both printed texts were intended for an audience who could read French and Latin, and these endings illustrate that while Skelton emphasises English is an important language, he often uses it to paraphrase his meaning, as if adapting his text for a wider and less cosmopolitan audience.

24 Item twenty-one, printed between The boke of thre fooles and Epitaphes of two knaves of dise.
Five lines included by Faques, and the passage ‘A grant for foy dort’, are not accounted for by Marshe. Brownlow suggests that this final section was moved by Stow, who supplied the missing lines from Faques’s 1523 text, complete with errors, and the second envoy which addresses the poem to the king and Wolsey. However, it is more likely that Skelton went on adding to his poem over a period of time and that some of these end sections were attached as supplements to the text, reminding people who owed him money that they should pay him and acknowledging continuing patronage and support for his work in the most public way.

iii. Further Differences between the Three Versions

Further differences between the two printed texts and the manuscript version of the poem are evident in the presentation of the lyrics. The manuscript version of the poem ends with the lyrics to the ladies but both printed texts contain a substantial amount of additional material. In Marshe’s text the lyrics to the ladies, which begin on folio B8v, continue to acknowledge the individual importance of the Howard ladies, but are clearer than in the 1523 text, and more like the manuscript copy. The lyrics appear in a different format from that given them by the manuscript scribe and from that chosen by Faques. In Marshe’s text the lyrics written ‘To maistres Margaret Tylney’ and ‘To maistres Margaret Hussey’ run in two parallel columns on the page, preceded and followed by the other lyrics in the centre of the page, undivided. In Marshe’s text, therefore, the lyrics retain more of the prestigious and individual layout of their manuscript counterparts. The lyrics, in all three texts, draw attention to the potential circumstances of patronage surrounding their production and reception. While in the 1568 edition of the poem the layout of the lyrics more closely resembles their manuscript layout, this may be due to the lessening costs of printed book production and the increased numbers of that book likely to have been produced, given its status as a collection of works. Marshe’s 1568 work must have been intended for a wider geographic and social audience than the version of the poem produced by Faques.

Changes to individual lines, word order and variant lines are also common. The format of the lyrics, and Skelton’s short lines, sometimes lend themselves to being printed in

---

this way and it is more economical in terms of paper and print use. By contrast, while the manuscript presents each lyric singly and centrally laid out, (except for that to Margaret Tylney which appears in parallel columns, though still with a folio to itself), Faques's text divides some of the lyrics into parallel columns, presenting lyrics to different ladies side by side. For example, 'To mastres Margery Wentworth' runs parallel with 'To mastres Margaret tylney' on folio D2v; 'To mystres Jane blenner haiset' runs parallel with 'To mystres Isabell pennell' on folio D3r; and 'To mystres Margaret hussey' runs parallel with 'To mystres Gertrude Statham' on folio D3v.

Differences are also evident in both the printed versions of the text in the layout of the ladies' titles. In Faques's text they appear in the ordinary bold type, not so greatly emphasised as they are in the manuscript, and not set apart from the text as in the Marshe version, which is again close to the manuscript layout. The lyrics in the Faques text, however, still start at the top of a clean page with 'To the ryght noble Countes of Surrey'. 'To my lady elisabeth howarde' follows on straightaway on the same page beneath the first lyric and finishes on the next page. The lyrics follow without gaps and are not given a page each as in the manuscript. Faques splits the first line of 'To mystres Jane blenner haiset' into two lines, and he includes dividing lines // // between each 'chuk' and 'jug' in 'To Isobel pennel' which Marshe does not. Faques also differs from Marshe in his presentation of the lyric 'To Gertrude Statham' by dividing into two what in Marshe's version form the fourth, tenth and eleventh lines. The last lyric, 'To mystres Isabell Knyght', on folio D.iv.r, returns to the single column format and the poem continues uninterrupted, until later in the Faques text, when folios E3r and E3v, folios F1v, F3r, and E4r are also partially divided into two columns.

The lesser emphasis given to the lyrics in the printed texts is only one difference of many between them and the manuscript version of the poem. Both printed texts include lines omitted from the manuscript copy. The section 'Forthwith there rose amonge the thronge [...] But goodly maystres, one thynge ye me tell' (ll. 246-720), appears in both the early printed texts but not in the manuscript copy. This is an important section of the poem which narrates part of Skelton's journey to the Queen of Fame's court. Omitted from the manuscript, therefore, is the section in which Skelton is judged by a

---

26 In Faques's text this section appears as folios Avi.recto-Ciii verso, in Marshe as folios Av recto-Biv verso. In the manuscript these lines were potentially in quires B and C, which no longer exist. It is unclear whether or not they may have been deliberately omitted at any stage in the history of the manuscript version of the poem. See Chapter One, C.i.
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selection of great poets and speaks to Chaucer, Gower and Lydgate. Their approval is fundamental to the recognition of his poetic achievement. In this section he also sees the numerous and diverse people bringing gossip and rumour to the Queen of Fame. A further section is omitted in which Skelton is led by Occupacyoun across a wall, from which he can see the gates of Anglia, grandly embellished with precious stones, supporters and an inscription. On the outer side of the wall thousands of people beg in vain for Fame’s acknowledgement. Skelton passes from here, through a garden enshrouded with mist, to a laurel tree which contains a phoenix. Such sections seem to indicate that Skelton’s fame, and the emphasis placed upon it in the poem, were of little interest to the compiler of the manuscript, or that he did not have access to these lines. However, both printed texts include this section which is vital if the narrative is to be fully perceived, and for emphasis to be placed upon Skelton’s great poetic achievements. The medium of print more fully emphasised the importance of authorial role, lasting reputation and the growing validity of English as a literary language in the late fifteenth and early sixteenth century.

Differences also exist between the two early printed texts. Marginalised in the Faques text are the words ‘Cacosinthicon ex industria’, folio C1v, which form a line in their own right in Marshe’s version of the text on folio B4r, and Faques also omits one other line, on folio C2v (‘Whose skales ensilvred again the son beames’), which appears in Marshe on folio B5r, as an extra line in the stanza, perhaps an alternative line. This suggests that Marshe must have had access to another copy of the text which was neither the manuscript nor Faques’s version. Similarly, Faques omits a stanza from folio B2v, which Marshe includes on folio A8r.27 Faques’s text also includes different titles to the stanzas from Marshe’s text. In Marshe’s text a single-line space is left between the stanzas. Title headings, written in smaller type, such as ‘The queen of Fame to Dame Pallas’, sometimes, but not always, fill this gap. In Faques’s text, the titles are centred in bold type throughout, emphasised by larger script and single line, just as the manuscript emphasises by the size of script. Faques leaves no spaces, however, between the stanzas and headings and the text is unbroken on the page. Finally, the coded name of Skelton’s

27 ‘Poeta Skelton to Maister Gower – Maister Gower I have nothyng deserved [...] is glad to please and loth to offend’.
enemy, Roger Stathum, appears perfect on folio C4r of Faques's text and in Marshe's
text on folio B7r, and not several times crossed through as it is in the manuscript.28

These differences may have been made to make the printing process more economical
and some of them are mistakes or expansions made in the copying of one version to
another. They show that Marshe's text could not have been based solely on Faques's
earlier text of *The Garland of Laurel* because it contains more than Faques's text does.
Both printed texts also contain material additional to the manuscript suggesting that
neither could have been based solely on that. There must have been other versions of
*The Garland of Laurel* in circulation during the late fifteenth and early sixteenth
centuries. Similarities between the texts, however, suggest that they could have been
made to specific requirements based on one copy or that a particular style of copying
poetry was in fashion or deemed particularly appropriate to the content or form of
Skelton's poem.

iv. The Significance of Difference

The differences between the early printed texts and the manuscript – particularly evident in
the lyrics and the endings – are plentiful and suggest interesting possibilities about their
respective moments of production, their possible circulation and potential audiences. In
every edition of the poem the layout seems to be an authoritative and significant
component, directing the poem towards different kinds of audiences.

Both Marsh and Faques produced versions of *The Garland of Laurel* which may have
appealed not only to aspiring or prestigious readers, but also to antiquarians and
collectors. Faques's version would not have been cheap to produce and was most likely
a bespoke text because its illustrations seem to be adapted in unusual and specific ways.
As well as woodcuts, the printed texts contain additional words, drawing attention to the
author and printer of the work, emphasising Skelton's poetic achievement and his
relationship with his printers. I consider this further below. Omissions in the printed
texts seem to be accidental because they are single stanzas, lines or words, rather than

pp. 236-8. Roger Statham was the husband of Gertrude Statham. Skelton inserts into his poem an
obscure Latin satire on 'an adversary', whom Occupacysoun names 'Envious Rancour', revealed to be
Roger Statham. Edwards speculates that Skelton and Statham, both in the service of the Countess of
Surrey, were rivals for Gertrude's love.
the careful omission of complete sections of verse as in the manuscript. Both editions have marginalia which are designed to aid the reader and include multi-lingual variations, indicating an educated reader. These inclusions perhaps illustrate the changing literary context, the broadening recognition of the importance of English as a literary and administrative language and the changing demands of readers.

The differences and similarities reveal how the poem has developed, changing each time it was reproduced through omissions, additions and presentation. The poem is a hybrid performance, bringing together, presenting, and re-presenting a variety of material aimed at different audiences at different times, as if it were a stage production. Paul Zumthor’s notion of *mouvance* highlights this potential for hybridity and fluidity found in the production of medieval texts:

> any work, in its manuscript tradition, appears as a constellation of elements, each of which may be the object of variations in the course of time or across space. The notion of *mouvance* implies that the work has no authentic text properly speaking, but that it is constituted by an abstract scheme, materialised in an unstable way from manuscript to manuscript, from performance to performance.\(^{29}\)

Zumthor considers textual variation and instability at the level of the signifier in medieval texts. In the same way that any text is subject to endless supplements, repetitions and rewritings through gloss or commentary, so the form of Skelton’s *The Garland of Laurel*, in those versions left to us, mutates and transforms itself in a repeated series of responses to readers, printers, patrons, and audiences, as much today

---

as in the early sixteenth century, thereby performative not only in content and contexts but also in its layout.30

The idea of mouvance which seems so pertinent to this consideration of manuscript and printed versions of Skelton’s The Garland of Laurel is one which validates the activities of scribes and printers and takes into account human intervention in the production and reception of texts. While it is at odds with recent editorial practice, which has sought to stabilise the text, as in Scattergood’s version of the poem, it is a notion which is useful in focusing upon the demands and actions of a late fifteenth- or early sixteenth-century audience, and those meeting the demands of this audience in the production of texts. It leads me now to consider further the role of printers and their relationship with Skelton in the production of The Garland of Laurel.

B. Skelton and Print31

i. Skelton and his Printers
Skelton’s works in print have always attracted much critical attention perhaps because, as A. S. G. Edwards remarks, Skelton made ‘particularly interesting and unusual’ use of print during his career. He considers the numbers of Skelton’s works appearing in print and suggests that Skelton made distinct choices between manuscript and print.32 While some of Skelton’s works appeared in manuscript and continued traditions of coterie circulation, as I discuss in the previous chapter, many of Skelton’s works published during his lifetime, and posthumously, appeared in print.

30 M. Irvine, “‘Bothe Text and Gloss’: Manuscript Form, the Textuality of Commentary and Chaucer’s Dream Poems”, in The Uses of Manuscripts in Literary Studies: Essays in Memory of Judson Boyce Allen, ed. C. C. Morse, P. B. Doob, and M. C. Woods (Kalamazoo: Western Michigan University Press, 1992), pp. 81-120 (pp. 81-119). Irvine’s essay takes Zumthor’s theory as a starting point for considering why such differences and similarities exist between medieval texts. Irvine’s argument concentrates on the visual and physical form of manuscripts or texts as significant in itself. His essay investigates the ways in which the physical features of manuscript books, specifically page layout designed to present text and gloss in a system of signification unique to authoritative texts, provide a model of textuality that Chaucer exploits in his dream poems.

31 A complete list of Skelton’s English works in print is provided in Appendix 5.

Skelton found printers in London, including the king’s printers, who were interested in publishing his works. Little good printing was done during the sixteenth century except by royal printers; quality print, fine paper, decorated pages and rich presentations all cost money which only wealthier audiences could afford. In addition duties had to be paid on imports. That printed texts of Skelton’s works were produced by these printers suggests that Skelton's works were aimed at the financially prosperous, London-based audience or those closely associated with the book trade and commerce of that city.

London was a centre for the printed book trade in England after 1475 but the printed book trade on the continent thrived during the 1450s and 1460s. Rapid multiplication of copies of books in this period shows that there was a flourishing bespoke trade and an equally strong second-hand trade to counterbalance it. University trade was significant, particularly with the advent of Humanism, demanding that new texts be produced, or old texts be produced and adapted for the new age. Secondary programmes of embellishment and indications of patronage also provide strong evidence for reception in the period. Importation of books to England appears to have been strongly related to individual contracts and eventually wholesale book trading was evidence of cultural internationalism.

The book trade with which Skelton was involved existed in the central area of London, around St Paul’s Churchyard. From the mid-fourteenth century, this area was an enclosure, with six public entries all around the Cathedral: Paul’s Alley, Canon Lane, Paul’s or Cheap gate, St Austin’s gate, Paul’s Chain and the main entry from Ludgate. At the western end of the Cathedral was Peter College which extended to Crede Lane; the northeast end was mainly residential, Paternoster Row was on the north side and Cheapside in the northeast; St Paul’s Churchyard Street was on the south side. Within the enclosure were two major open spaces. Sermons, proclamations and pronouncements of public interest took place at the northeast end and in the west city

---


35 Harris, ‘Role of Owners’, pp. 164-5.


37 *STC* iii, appendix 3 E provides an account of the layout of this area.
events were held, such as the review of armour belonging to the city. The two areas corresponded to two parishes, respectively St Faith’s parish and St Gregory’s parish, which fell within the churchyard. There were various kinds of shops in this area and it was highly secularised. Two types of shop related to printing. Substantial houses existed, situated all around the churchyard, in which printers could reside and carry on business. There were also many booths around the cathedral which were merely shops, with no accommodation for living or printing. In addition there seem also to have been ordinary book stalls. Duff suggests that competition from the foreign book trade and booksellers focused the trade in London in this area after 1475, but that it had earlier been an area favoured by scribal culture.38

Below I consider Skelton’s printers and booksellers individually, including Faques and Marshe, and list their locations when known. The locations of printers were indicated by signs of their business, which moved with the printer.39 A master printer, with his own establishment, might have had journeymen (servants) and apprentices working for him, but a 1523 act restricted printers to employing no more than two foreign journeymen, while apprentices had to be English. Many printers were involved with smuggling or dealing in foreign or controversial books and proceedings were often taken against them.40

Evidence provided in wills left by printers and stationers from 1492 to 1630 illustrates the close associations of printers and booksellers as a guild or brotherhood. They intermarried and widows were regarded as rich matrimonial prizes; they became executors and overseers of each other’s wills, and witnessed wills for each other. Wills also illustrate the wealth of the Stationers’ Company and provide biographical details about individuals and the history of the book trade more generally.41

Skelton’s works were printed during his lifetime by a number of different printers, whereas his contemporaries who used print chose only one printer, for example Stephen Hawes used Wynken de Worde, and Alexander Barclay used Pynson. A. S. G. Edwards remarks

---

38 Duff, A Century of the English Book Trade, p. xvii.
39 Ibid., p. xviii.
40 Ibid., pp. xx-xxiv. For Kele see p. 83; for Lant p. 88; for Tab p. 155.
on how unusual it was for a writer of this period to allow his work to be disseminated to
different printers to the extent that Skelton allowed.\textsuperscript{42} Skelton allowed de Worde, Pynson,
Faques, and Rastell to print his works during his lifetime, as discussed below. Later John
Day, the foremost printer of Elizabeth I’s reign, printed his works.\textsuperscript{43} This might suggest
that Skelton sought a wider audience for his works outside of courtly culture.\textsuperscript{44} It seems
highly possible that Skelton’s printers were known to each other and collaborated in
producing texts to a greater extent than has been considered. They may have targeted
similar audiences and cross-fertilised ideas, co-operating with or rivalling each other.

Skelton’s \textit{The bowge of courte}, printed by Wynkyn de Worde in 1499, was one of the
first contemporary poems to be printed. De Worde inherited his printing materials and
Westminster premises from Caxton and in 1509 styled himself ‘Printer to the Lady
Margaret the King’s mother and the King’s grandmother’. He was located in
Westminster, 1492–1500, near the Abbey called Westminster / in Caxton’s house;
1501–35 in Fleet Street at the Sun; 1508–9 in Paul’s Churchyard at the Sign / Image of
Our Lady of Pity.\textsuperscript{45} It is claimed that in 1504 de Worde printed a work by Skelton now
lost, \textit{The Nigramansir}, and in 1521 he published \textit{Elynour Rummyng} which survives. He
is an interesting printer to consider, given his concern with bringing contemporary work
to print, and he printed political and instructional poems, directing his work to a
particular audience, revealing an awareness of potential marketing strategies.\textsuperscript{46} An
awareness of marketing is also evident in Pynson’s publishing activity towards the end
of Skelton’s career when he printed Skelton’s \textit{A Replycacioun}, perhaps because
Skelton’s political thought in this work seems clearly voiced for the establishment.\textsuperscript{47}

Pynson’s first printed book is dated November 1492, one of a hundred books he printed
in the last decade of the fifteenth century. He was a printer, bookseller and bookbinder
in London, from 1490 to 1529, in the parish of St Clement Danes without New Temple
Bar, 1500; without Middle Temple Bar in 1495; without Temple Bar in 1500; within
New Temple Bar in 1501; in the parish of St Dunstan’s at the George from 1502 to 29;

\begin{itemize}
  \item Edwards, ‘Skelton’s English Poems’, p. 89.
  \item \textit{STC} iii, Index 1, pp. 38-9, 187.
  \item \textit{Ibid.}, p. 90
\end{itemize}
in Fleet Street at the George in 1503 and 1523; and in Fleet Street in 1523, 1527 and 1529. He also styled himself King's Printer and Printer to the City of London.48 Between 1500 and 1529, when he died, he printed about three hundred more books. While his total output was about half that of Wynkyn de Worde, in 1508 he was appointed printer to Henry VIII. When Pynson died, Robert Redman took over the business and he was succeeded by William Faques (Fawkes, Fakes, Fax) as the king's printer, three of whose books are dated 1504 and are of admirable quality.49 It was Faques's son Richard who printed a version of The Garland of Laurel, in 1523.

Skelton's association with Richard Faques (Fawkes, Fakes, Fax) is less explicable, for he was not a substantial printer and bookseller. His printing spanned the years from 1504 to 1537, so his production of Skelton's texts takes place within Skelton's lifetime and throughout the middle of Faques's printing career.50 Faques had two shops and was located in Paul's Churchyard, from 1509? to 13, and from 1521? to 30; at the Maiden's Head; dwelling at the ABC; within the Austin Friars (near the Dutch Church), c.1515; in Durham rents (without Temple Bar). He is recorded as having been married to Amelyne Faxe.51 He published few English verse texts, all of which pre-date The Garland of Laurel. His market niche was for vernacular religious prose and routine proclamations and statutes. In 1513 he printed Skelton's Ballad of the scottyshe king, and a pamphlet account of the English victory at Flodden, clearly occasional pieces.52 This is Skelton's earliest extant ballad. It is less easy to explain his printing of The Garland of Laurel, especially since Faques was not a substantial printer and it seems to have been aimed at a high status market. Edwards suggests that its anomalous status may have made it unpopular with printers and that given this Faques may have had little to lose by printing it.53 Perhaps Faques hoped to make money from the publication because Skelton's name was known at court.

Table B in Appendix 4 lists the works produced from Faques's printing press, from 1504

48 STC iii, Index I, p. 140

49 A Guide to the Exhibition in The King's Library Illustrating the History of Printing, Music Printing, and Book Binding (London: Clowes, 1939); STC, iii, p. 61. Also see H. R. Plomer, Wynkyn De Worde and His Contemporaries from the Death of Caxton to 1535: A Chapter in English Printing (London: Grafton, 1925), pp. 183-4. Plomer describes his proclamation on the currency as a document whose 'beauty is manifest', with representations of different coins in the margins, and several different founts; also as 'an artist in typography, more so than any printer that had yet been seen in England.'

50 Datings provided by the Short Title Catalogue are vague and the chronologies it offers are tentative.

51 Duff, A Century of the English Book Trade, pp. 44-5.


53 Ibid., p. 91.
to 1537, in chronological order, under the categories of date, title, and the STC number. A letter beneath the date indicates printing location when known. There are thirty-nine texts in total printed by Faques over this thirty-three year period. Faques produced fourteen books in the first decade of the sixteenth century, seven in the second decade, fourteen in the third and two in the final decade of his printing career. Two texts are undated. Few years were fruitless but there is a five year gap after 1530 and a five year gap from 1513 to 1518, when it seems that nothing that he produced survives. These books include Gui de Saliceto’s *Salus corporis salus anime* (12th December, 1509); the *Tratyse upon a goodly Garlande* (3rd October 1523); *The arte and science of arismetique* (13th March 1526); and *The Myrroure of oure lady* (1530).\(^{54}\) This last was issued at the expense of the Lady Abbess of Syon Monastery.\(^{55}\) Of less secure dating are *The parlment of devyllles*; the *Batayle between Englannde and Scotlande*; *The beaute of women*; the *Horae ad usum Sarum*; *A ballad of the scottyshe king*; *A devout intercescion and praier to our saviour Jesu Christ*; *A gloryous medytacyon of Ihesus crystals passyon*; *Statuta I Henry VIII*; and Aristotle’s *De cursione lune*.\(^{56}\)

Of the texts which Faques produced in London, where further details of publication are known, seven were produced in ‘Durham Rent’, and sometimes additionally described ‘or elles in Poules chyrcheyard, at the sygne of the ABC.’ One of these, the *Missale ad consuetudinem insignis ecclesie Sarum* (1511), is connected to the cemetery of St Paul’s in London, ‘comorantibus in cymiterio sancti pauli, London’. It appears that de Worde and Faques may have acted as its sellers as well as its printers, but it also has other connections, with both Parisian and London printers.\(^{57}\) Only one other Faques text has Parisian associations, the imprint of the *Hore beate maria virginis ad usum Sarum* (1521), which was printed in Paris ‘per J. bignon pro R. Fakes Londondioii sic librario’, with Faques’s own printers’ device.\(^{58}\) It appears that Faques, despite his small output and seeming

---

\(^{54}\) Illustrations from texts printed by Faques can be seen in Appendix 9. Illustration A is of Guide Saliceto’s *Salus corporis salus anime* (1509); illustration B is from *The Myrroure of oure lady* (1530).


\(^{56}\) E. G. Duff, *Hand-lists of English Printers 1501–56*, 4 vols (London: Bibliographical Society, 1895), i. Listings of the works of Pynson, R. Copland, J. Rastell, P. Treveris, W. Rastell, and T. Godfray can be found in vol. ii; the works of Kele and Lant in vol. iii; the works of R. Redman, R. Wyer, J. Day, W. Copland in vol. iv. See also Appendix 9, illustration C, from *A devout Intercescion and praier to our saviour Jesu Christ*, and illustration D from Aristotle’s *De cursione Lune*.

\(^{57}\) See Appendix 4, table B.

\(^{58}\) Duff, *A Century of the English Book Trade*, p. 13. J. Bignon, a Paris printer, worked from c.1516 to c.1544. He was first at the sign of La Heuze in the Rue St Jacques and later in the Rue Judas. Appendix 9, illustration E.
relatively low status, worked on a wider commercial scale than some of his contemporaries may have done in the early decades of printing. A comparison with table A in Appendix 4, which lists works from Marshe’s press, shows how limited was the number of texts produced from Faques’s press.

As well as his French associations, Faques collaborated with English printers and booksellers and is associated with other signs in London. The *Anno xix henrici vij Statuta bonum publicum* ..., for example, dated 1504, is described as having been printed in London, ‘within Seynt helens by Guillam Faques the Kyng prynter’.\(^{59}\) Another text, *Omelia origenis* (1505), is recorded as having been printed at the request of a teacher and a lawyer called William Menyman, by Faques and Richarde Whityngton in Abchirche Lane. As well as Whityngton, R. Faques and his father William were associated in 1528 with R. Wyer in printing and selling *De cursione lune* by Aristotle.

Edwards compares Faques’s publications with those of John Rastell, who also printed Skelton’s works, and suggests that Rastell’s publications were more ambitious and varied than those of Faques.\(^{60}\) Rastell was a barrister and printer in London and had a lucrative business publishing legal texts. He also printed vernacular prose and verse texts and drama, including works by Chaucer and Thomas More. He had a printing relationship with Peter Treveris, a printer in Southwark, dwelling at the Sign of the Woodhouses, 1526, who was also associated with Skelton’s works. Rastell had a house in Cheapside, dwelling at the Fleet Bridge at the Abbot of Winchcomb’s place (in 1510); on the south side of St Paul’s from 1512 to 15; dwelling on the south side of Paul’s Church beside Paul’s Chain in 1512?; before the south door of Paul’s in 1515?; in Cheapside next to Paul’s Gate (at the Mermaid) from 1520 to 29 (1525–33); at an unknown sign in Cheapside, next to Paul’s Gate, from 1519 to 36. His son William was also a printer in London from 1529 to 1534: in Fleet Street against the conduit in 1531; in Fleet Street in St Bride’s Churchyard from 1533 to 34.\(^{61}\) Of Skelton’s works they printed the small collections of lyrics, *Certayn bokes* (1527), *Dyvers balletys and dyties solacyous* (1528), and much later Skelton’s play *Magnyfycence* (1530).\(^{62}\) In 1538 they
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\(^{59}\) *STC* iii, Index 1, pp. 97-9. King’s printers were originally printers of statutes and proclamations but the title was often adopted by printers without any royal intervention.


\(^{61}\) *STC* iii, Index 1, pp. 142, 171.

also published Philip Sparow and Ware the hawke, suggesting posthumous attempts to establish a market for Skelton’s more controversial works.63

In addition to these printers Skelton’s works were also printed by Colwell; Copland; Godfray; Kele; Kynge; Lant; Marshe; Toy; Treveris; Veale; Wyght; Walley; Wyer and Tab; whose careers I outline below. Their associations with Skelton’s works are shown in Appendix 5, Table B. Thomas Colwell was a printer in London from 1560 to 75 and succeeded to the printing house of Robert Wyer, dwelling in the house of R. Wyer at the Sign of St John the Evangelist beside Charing Cross; in St Bride’s Churchyard over against the north door of the church; and in Fleet Street beneath the conduit of the Sign of St John the Evangelist.64 In 1567 Thomas Colwell was responsible for printing The Merie Tales of Skelton, a text which was associated with Skelton though perhaps not written by him.65 Robert Wyer was a printer and bookseller at the sign of St John the Evangelist, at Charing Cross, in premises that formed part of the rentals of Norwich House, probably not far from where Villiers Street is now situated. It has been suggested that he was initially a servant to R. Faques (Fawkes).66 He printed one hundred books but only eleven are dated. His son Nicholas, active from 1562 to 1566, was possibly a contemporary of Thomas Colwell, but no books have been found printed by him before 1560.67

Robert Copland, who produced Skelton’s Colyn Cloute, the boke of Phyllyp Sparowe, Why come ye nat to courte, and Ware the hawke, amongst other texts, was a translator, author and printer in London from 1508 to 1548. He was a servant to Wynkyn de Worde from whose house he issued his first imprint. There is a unique possibility that he was a kind of editor in de Worde’s office, but he began independent work as a printer in 1515.68 He also issued with M. Fawkes A Devout treatyse called the tree and twelve frutes of the holy goest.69 His second address passed to William Copland, possibly a son and perhaps the printer of some of the items attributed to Robert at the end of his life. He was recorded in Fleet Street from 1514 to 1517?, at the Sun; at the Rose Garland

64 STC iii, Index 1, pp. 43-4, 191.
65 STC 22618, Merie tales Newly Imprinted and made by Master Skelton, printed by T. Colwell, 1567.
67 Ibid., pp. 3, 11. See also Duff, A Century of the English Booktrade, p. xxvi.
68 Plomer, Wynkyn De Worde, p. 179.
69 Duff, A Century of the English Book Trade, p. 46. Duff, unlike other bibliographers, suggests that Michael Fawkes is a relative of William and Richard Faques.
from 1515 to 47; and dwelling by Fleet Bridge. William was a printer in London from 1545 to 68 but many of his publications are undated. He was recorded in Fleet Street at the Rose Garland; in St Martin’s parish in the Vintry upon the Three Crane Wharf; in St Martin’s in the Vintry upon the Three Crane Wharf in Thames Street; and in Lothbury (within Cripplegate and Moorgate) over against St Margaret’s Church from 1563 to 67. In 1546 he married Joanna Tydeswell of St Bride’s Parish and in 1556 he came before the Privy Council and was bound to deliver all copies he had printed of Cranmer’s Recantation to be burnt.

Thomas Godfray printed in London from 1531? to at least 1536; from 1531 to 34 at Temple Bar, and in the Old Bailey, 1534? or pre-1531. His dated texts have no addresses. He acquired textura from Pynson, which afterwards passed to Richard Lant, a printer in London from 1537? to 1561. Godfray printed Skelton’s Colyn Clonte and Lant printed Ware the hawke, The tunnyng of Elynow Rummyng, Speke Parrot, Of the deth of the noble pryncy kynge Edward the Fourth, and A ballade of the scotysshe kynge. Lant’s career is unclear and his output was meagre, so the fact that he produced so many of Skelton’s texts is interesting. Addresses associated with him are in the Old Bailey (in St Sepulchre’s / Pulcher’s Parish) from 1542 to 46; in Paul’s Churchyard in 1545; in Aldersgate Street from 1552? to 53?; in Paternoster Row in 1553?; in Smithfield (in the parish of St Bartholomew’s Hospital), in 1559.

John Kyng (king) was also a printer in London from 1554 to 1561 at least, in Creed Lane from 1554? to 57; and in Paul’s Churchyard at the Swan from 1559 to 1561. Kyng was associated with the early works of Thomas Marshe, who printed the 1568 version of The Garland of Laurel. Thomas Marshe (Marsh, Marche) was a printer in London from 1554 to 1587, and was the father of Edward and Henry Marshe, a Stationer and Printer respectively. Marshe was granted a patent in 1572 for Latin school books, which passed to the Stationers’ Company after his death and he also had a life interest in the titles of some Books of Prayer. He was located in Creed Lane in 1554? (there with J. Kyng before this date); in Fleet Street from 1554 to 87; dwelling at the Prince’s Arms, (and at the hither

---

70 STC iii, Index 1, p. 45.
71 Duff, A Century of the English Book Trade, pp. 32-3.
72 Ibid., pp. 69, 102.
73 Ibid., p. 97.
74 STC iii, 197, 200.
Temple gate), from 1554 to 55; and near to St Dunstan’s Church from 1556 to 1587.75 From Creed Lane he printed the *Proper new book of Cookery* and Skelton’s *Certayn bokes* with J. Kynge. After 1555 he worked independently and by 1573 he was printing works ‘cum privilegio’, with privileges which protected his rights to print certain texts, an early form of copyright.

Table A in Appendix 4 lists the works that were produced from the printing press of Thomas Marshe between the dates 1554 and 1584. There are 122 texts in all, listed in rough chronological order, under the categories of date, title, and the *STC* number. A letter beneath the date indicates printing location when known. The majority of his texts were produced ‘in Fletestreate’, ‘at the Signe of the Prynces armes’ and ‘neare to S. Dunstones Churche’. One work dated 1558, *An Exposicion after the maner o f a contemplacion upon the li psalme*, was printed at this location for Michel Lobley who was ‘dwelling in Poules Church yarde at the signe of S. Michel’. In addition to his connections with other printers of Skelton’s works, Marshe also collaborated with John Kingston and with Richarde Tottill to produce texts.76

In addition to printers, Skelton’s works also became associated with particular booksellers. Cooperation between printers and book sellers seems to have been common and is recorded in title pages and through printers’ devices in early printed texts. The kinds of works that printers produced and that book sellers wanted, however, were confined to the types of texts that they knew they could sell. Audience demand and the wealth of the market were factors influencing their printing activities. Richard Kele was a bookseller in London from 1540 to 1552, in Lombard Street near unto the Stocks, 1540; dwelling at the Long Shop in the Poultry under St Mildred’s Church from 1543? to 45; dwelling in Lombard Street at the Eagle from 1547 to 52 (‘near unto the Stocks Market’). He was the son of Thomas Kele, a stationer of Canterbury, who in 1526 occupied John Rastell’s house, the Mermaid. During 1543, along with Lant and others, he was imprisoned in the Poultry Compter for printing unlawful books. Most of the books that bear his name came from the presses of Robert Wyer and William Copland. These include *Why come ye not to courte?*, *Colin Clout* and the *Boke of Phyllip Sparowe*, issued hastily in octavo form.77

77 Plomer, *A Short History*, pp. 60-1.
Anthony Kitson was also a bookseller in London, c. 1553–78, dwelling in Paul’s Churchyard at the Sun and Robert Toy was a bookseller before 1534 until circa 1556 in Paul’s Churchyard and at the Bell. Abraham Veale sold books, 1550–95, dwelling in Paul’s Churchyard at the (Holy) Lamb until 1586 and John Wyght (Wight, Wayght, Whyte) was a bookseller in London 1549–89, also in Paul’s Churchyard, 1551–89; dwelling at the Rose, 1551–4; dwelling at the [...] 1559–61; dwelling at the (great) north door of Paul’s, 1578–89. Throughout the 1550’s *The Book of Phyllyp Sparowe* was printed twice by John Day, in 1554 for Abraham Veale and in 1558 for Anthony Kitson. Also named are John Walley, a bookseller 1542–86 at least, in Foster Lane (within Aldersgate), 1547–86, and at the Hart’s Horn, c. 1549, 1550?, 1553; and Henry Tab, a bookseller from at least 1523–48 when he was in St Faith’s parish, in Paul’s Churchyard at the Sign of Judith, 1542–45. It is possible that he was also a printer from 1547 and he has associations with Richard Lant.

Skelton’s associations with printers and booksellers in or around St Paul’s Churchyard were numerous and varied. These printers were often printing the same works by Skelton at different times in their careers. It is known that sometimes competition between printers for buyers and the rights to publish a text was fierce and often ended in legal dispute, but it is equally possible that printers had opportunities to share risks and profitable business ventures and to cross-fertilise ideas.

Skelton’s works were in high demand and he may have been working in his best interests by dealing with more than one printer. It seems that no single printer was prepared to back him because he was too great a risk. Marshe and Faques, for example, were very different kinds of printers, and were working two decades apart from each other, but both showed an interest in *The Garland of Laurel*. Their interests in producing the work were likely very different and their audiences may also have been different. Especially significant is the fact that by 1568 Skelton was dead and the risks Marshe took in printing works which some readers may have found offensive, or which were unmarketable, were less than the
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78 *STC* iii, pp. 91, 101, 170, 173, 183. See also Index 3. E., p. 241. Wight, Toy, Tab and Kitson are all associated with the north or northeast corner of the churchyard where its charnel houses and tenements were. Toy, Tab, Faques, Kynge, and Veale were all associated with St Faith’s parish, the north and east. Rastell was in St Gregory’s parish in the southwest.

79 Ibid., pp. 176, 167.

potential risk Faques may have faced.

During his lifetime Skelton’s reputation seems not to have been enough in itself to guarantee printers’ willingness to publish his works. While openly acknowledged as a distinguished poet during his lifetime by men such as Caxton and Erasmus, printers were still cautious about printing his more satirical works, which were appearing in manuscript. In 1490, in his preface to the Eneydos, Caxton mentioned Skelton’s learning with deference. He described Skelton as ‘Suffycyent to expowne and englysshe every dyffyculte’ in his text, because ‘he hath late translated the epystlys of Tulle and the boke of dyodorus syculus, and diverse other werkes oute of latyn in to enlysshe not in rude and olde language but in polysshed and ornate termes craftely [...] I suppose he hath dronken of Elycons well’.81 In 1499 Erasmus called him ‘That incomparable Light and Ornament of British Letters’.82 There is much evidence that Skelton attracted attention and that he was at the centre of what he felt was important, present in London and at court. By 1510 he had established a reputation as a pre-eminent satirist and after his death in 1539 he became a well-known figure of myth and fantasy, popular continually for about a century.83 After this time Skelton was, by turns, celebrated and disliked.84

The 1568 version of Skelton’s collected works printed by Thomas Marshe, Pithy pleasaunt and profitable workes of maister Skelton Poete Laureate nowe collected and newly published, certainly works hard to make distinctive claims about Skelton’s reputation. Edwards remarks that the title itself affirms his literary identity, which emerged alongside his literary works from the 1520s onwards, especially those works in print. ‘His insistence on his status as a distinctive kind of poetic presence is one that is reflected in the care with which he seems to have selected particular modes of publication.’85 Pithy pleasaunt and profitable workes is unusual because it was printed long after Skelton’s death and is the first attempt by a publisher to consolidate Skelton’s

82 Ibid., p. 43.
83 STC 22618, Merie tales Newly Imprinted and made by Master Skelton, printed by T. Colwell, 1567, was one work which responded to this interest in Skelton.
poetic achievement. More than this, however, the concept of the collected works of a single English author had little precedent. The collection affirms Skelton’s poetic achievement and set out to illustrate the distinctiveness of his identity. The commonness of his works in print prior to the 1560s suggests that his reputation was recognised by a number of different printers, even if, during his lifetime they were cautious about publishing works like his major satires.

*Pithy pleasaut and profitable workes* is one of four collections of Skelton’s works still extant. Two shorter collections are the earliest and date from no later than the 1520s; both were printed by Rastell: *Agaynst a comely coystrowne, STC 22611,* and *Dyverse ballettys and dyties solacyous, STC 22604.* Both of these collections contain lyrics which have no extant manuscript precedent. The 1545 collection, *Here after foloweth certayn bokes cąpyled by mayster Skelton. Speke parrot, The deth of kyng Edward the fourth. A treatyse of the Scottes. Ware the hawke, The tunnyng of Elynour Rummynge,* contains these five longer works. They differ from the 1568 printed volume by Marshe because it attempts to be complete, and collates thirty-three of Skelton’s works. I will comment later in this thesis on the possible significance of these author-based collections in the light of earlier and contemporary all-inclusive collections, the later concerns and achievements of Renaissance collectors such as Tottel, and the influence, impact and importance of anthologies and trends in book publishing.

Skelton’s collected works are specifically associated with his name and contain material written only by him. Such self-representation may be associated with the technological changes in textual production and dissemination at the end of the fifteenth century. Writers were increasingly aware of how difficult it was to defend their own works, pre-copyright, and to ensure that their name remained associated with their books during their lifetime and after their death. I consider this further below and in later chapters of this thesis.
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86 However, it should be noted at this point that *The Garland of Laurel* itself contains an attempt by its author to include a compendious list of his own works. This is in keeping with the idea that there is no single date of composition and that the poem was added to over a long period of time.

87 Edwards, ‘Skelton’s English Poems’, pp. 88, 99. Edwards thinks the earliest is Thynne’s 1532 edition of Chaucer’s ‘Works’ followed in 1557 by Rastell’s ‘The English Works’ of Thomas More. In both cases these collections were prompted by forms of national and familial piety. Complete works were also published by Hoccleve, Charles d’Orleans and John Awdelay.

88 Ibid., pp. 91-2.

89 Table A, Appendix 5, shows the printed collections of Skelton’s works.

90 C. J. Brown, “The Interaction Between Author and Printer: Title Pages and Colophons of Early French Imprints”, *Soundings: Collections of the University of California Library,* 23 (1992), 33-53.
As well as the publication of collections of his works, many individual works by Skelton were printed. As I mention above, table B in Appendix 5 lists Skelton’s English works in their early print forms. Nearly all of these texts by Skelton were printed during the sixteenth century. The earliest print dates from 1499 and was de Worde’s *The Bouge of courte*. In 1513 *A ballad of the scottyshe kyng* was printed by R. Faques, followed in 1521 by another de Worde publication, *The tunnyng of Elynour Rummyng*. Then in 1523 Faques published *The Garland of Laurel*. These latter works date from the same decade as the early collections of Skelton’s works. It is interesting to note that Faques and de Worde printed these poems early in the history of the appearance of Skelton’s works in print, and that they were the only works that they printed. They are single text editions, something which appears to have been relatively uncommon for printers of Skelton’s works. In some cases we can suspect that there were originally more publications of individual works than remain today, but in general publications of Skelton’s works seem to have been issued with steady regularity in print, by other printers, through the first half of the sixteenth century.

Many of Skelton’s works that do not appear in manuscript appear as printed copies and nearly all of these appear in the 1568 edition of *Pithy pleasaunt and profitable workes* and in the other collections. The same printers are recurrently printing different works in different decades and there is a clear distinction between the works which appear only in manuscript and those which appear in both media or only in print. Evidence suggests clear choices were made by Skelton and his printers about which works would appear in print and when. It appears that Skelton’s works remained highly popular for a long period of time, even after his death, and were guaranteed to make money for their printers. While print and manuscript survival of his works is small, which could indicate either a wide circulation in which texts fell apart from use, or a narrow circulation which required the production of few texts, his popularity and subject matter suggest that probably the circulation of his texts was wide and that consequently few copies survive.
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91 Chapter One, D; Edwards, ‘Skelton’s English Poems’, p. 97.
92 *The Merie Tales of Skelton*, which was printed after his death, perpetuated the myth culture around the figure of the priest-poet and kept him alive in popular culture. It is unclear whether or not Skelton had any hand in writing this text. See notes 64 and 82 above.
ii. Illustrations: Woodcuts, Ornaments and Printers’ Devices

Ornamentation of books and their printers’ devices also reveal much about the production and reception of works in print. They reveal trade links and signs of competition within the English book trade, and between it and the foreign book trade. The new print trade opened new economic links to different areas of Europe, including the Netherlands, Bruges, France and Italy.93 Illustrations also reveal the close working bonds of printers. Woodcuts appeared in books as early as 1461 and were mainly anonymous.94 Generally woodcuts were of poor quality but they helped to sell texts.95 Within texts they were often reused and illustrations were often repetitive and haphazard.96 Occasionally collaboration between illustrator and poet can be seen, but more often cuts do not fit the text.97 After 1536 printers were seen to be using woodcuts to define units of text formally as well as to decorate it.98

Printers organised their book illustration as well as designing, printing and selling their books.99 Faques’s and Marshe’s printings of The Garland of Laurel indicate in their layout and decoration different types of audience and attitudes towards printing the text. Faques’s Tratyse upon the goodly garlande, for example, contains four cuts, described by Hodnett as ‘neither new nor interesting’.100 On the contrary, Faques’s version of Skelton’s text makes particularly splendid use of woodcuts and contains one cut on the title page of two men observing a scholar reading, seated by a window.101 Another of a courtier with a branch and bouquet is labelled ‘Skelton poeta’, adapted from a labours of the month with zodiac signs, is the same design as one in Guy Marchant’s 1498

96 Ibid., pp. 10-14.
97 Ibid., pp. 24-5.
99 Hodnett, Image and Text, p. 27.
100 Hodnett, English Woodcuts, p. 53.
101 This woodcut is reproduced in Brownlow, ed., Book of the Laurel, p. 57. A copy of it and the facing handwritten inscription can be seen in Appendix 8 A.
edition of Sacrobosco's *Sphere mundi*. Title pages were often distributed separately from the book and were posted in booksellers' shops as advertisements. The two large woodcuts, especially that of 'Skelton poeta', which have elicited the most critical comment may have been designed for such a purpose and Mary Erler argues may even have been authorised by Skelton himself. It must be emphasised that this woodcut image of Skelton holding the laurel branch is never reused by Faques or by other printers, despite it being common for printers to borrow and reuse woodcuts, inherit them or buy them second-hand, as well as issue their own new cuts. Erler pays particular attention to this woodcut image of Skelton holding a laurel branch and its emphasis upon the poet's achievements. She suggests that images of Skelton 'spring not from an impulse towards portraiture, but from a combination of traditional

---

102 Luborsky and Ingram, *Guide to English Illustrated Books*, ii, p. 96. Thomas Marshe also used adaptations of cuts for the labours of the months. Faques, Appendix 8 B.


105 I have looked at works by each of the printers associated with Skelton, including all the works by Marshe and Faques on Early English Books Online, and a selection of works by W. and R. Copland, W. de Worde, J. Rastell, R. Lant, J. Kyunge, J. Day and T. Colewelle. I have found no reproduction of this woodcut from *The Garland of Laurel*, 1523. These works are listed by STC number in Appendix 6.

106 Hodnett, *English Woodcuts*, pp. 15-16, 33-8. Pynson took over Caxton's business and is known to have re-used and copied some of de Worde’s blocks, including *Paris and Vienne*, 1500: *Traduction and mariage of the princesse*, 1501; *Bevys of Southhamptowne*, 1503; *Dystruccyon of Iherusalem*, 1513; and *Troylus and Cresyde*. 1526, which all contain cuts from one series, for his 1492 *Canterbury Tales*. He reprinted Lydgate’s *Falle of princes* with nine cuts that had appeared in Jean de Pré’s 1483 edition and at least one block remained in his possession, appearing in Fabyan’s *Cromyles* of 1516 and in the 1527 reprint of Boccaccio. (Cuts from works by Du Pré can also be found in de Worde’s *Missale ad usum Sarum*, 1500, printed for Cardinal Morton. This work also has cuts that previously belonged to Pierre le Rouge). In the 1497 editions of the *Expositio Sequentiarum* and *Expositio hymnorum* and in the Festü dulcissijmi nominis Jhesu are cuts which were copied by Rastell, Wynkyn de Worde and Notary, and by R. Copland and P. Treveris. Also in 1497, he issued the *Horae intemperate beatissime virginis Marie*, which contained two important series of cuts, also used by Wynkyn de Worde and Redman. He also reused a cut which de Worde had used in the pre-1500 edition of *Reynard the Fox*, a cut of Bruin presenting the summons from the King to Reynard. With it he adorned the title page of the Edinburgh copy of Skelton’s *Bowieg of courte*, printed at Westminster. In addition to copying cuts, Pynson was also issuing new cuts. Hodnett, *English Woodcuts*, pp. 18-21 38, 58-62.; Hodnett, *Five Centuries*, p. 17. Hodnett provides details of minor printers who were using de Worde’s cuts, including Peter Treveris, Thomas Godfray. de Worde also used the cuts of other printers over a twenty-five year period. Details are provided in: Luborsky and Ingram, *Guide to English Illustrated Books*, i, p. vii, particularly with regard to *Kalender of Shepherdes* (1508); Hodnett, *English Woodcuts*, pp. 18-22, 39-40, 50-2, 62, 65. De Worde also printed a quarto edition in 1508, which Pynson had issued in 1506. He copied the zodiac cuts for his second edition from Pynson’s 1505 print of Hieronymus de Sancto Marco’s *Oposculum de universali mundi machine*, which, in turn, Notary copied for his edition of the same. Notary’s *Kalender of Shepherdes* was his most elaborate venture in book illustration, containing more than one hundred and twenty-five cuts. In turn Peter Treveris used Pynson’s and Notary’s cuts from the *Kalender of shepherdes*. 
authorial iconography, poetic self-promotion, and publisher's advertisement'. In her article, Erler looks at the connections between illustration and text. She suggests that illustrations provide a better understanding of the way in which the poet wished to present himself, and the publisher's motives in the production of a text which would sell. She suggests that the 'conjunction of these two imperatives shaped his first purchasers' response to Skelton's work in the 1520s'. Erler suggests that Faques himself first saw the connection between the laurel-branch-bearing figure and the laureate poet, affirming the likeness with the words 'Eterno mansura die dum Sidera fulgent [...] Undique; Skeltonis memorabitur alter adonis.' She claims that text, image and word together represent the powerful intention to celebrate Skelton's poetic achievement, and that he himself must have concurred in this. Ultimately it is impossible to tell whether the layout and illustration of the poem in the manuscript and printed texts reflect authorial conceptions, but it is a tantalising thought which I discuss further in my final chapter. It is not so hard to believe, however, that illustration in texts encouraged purchasers and helped to create a lasting impression of the writer or his subject matter.

Faques's Tratyse also contains two companion woodcuts, similar to some in Notary's Legenda aurea. The first is of a woman holding a flower and the second represents a woman holding a candle. Many works by Faques are issued with cuts of a similar
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107 Erler, 'Early Woodcuts', p. 17.
108 Ibid., p. 18.
109 Ibid., pp. 20-3. The Latin words 'Eterno mansura die dum Sidera fulgent, / Equora dumque; tument nee laura nostra virebit, / Hine nostrum celebre et nomen referet ad astra, / Undique; Skeltonis memorabitur alter adonis', which is translated by J. Scattergood, ed., The Complete English Poems, John Skelton (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1983), p. 312, p. 497 notes. 'While the stars remain shining in everlasting day, and while the seas swell, this our laurel shall be green: Our famous name shall be echoed to the skies, and everywhere Skelton shall be remembered as another Adonis'.
110 Erler, 'Early Woodcuts', pp. 20-3. Erler remarks that, while it was probably the printer who first spotted the image in a French book, Skelton must have been directly involved because the woodcut is adapted from the earlier image. It is connected directly with the author by the Latin tag above. By this Skelton conflates the mythic Adonis, the French woodcut's branch-bearing figure, and himself, the living poet. This announces a powerful central intention of the poem, to celebrate Skelton's poetic achievement.
111 Appendix 8 C.
112 Hodnett, English Woodcuts, pp. 70-1. Although the sharing of cuts between Faques and Wyer is of confused dating, Wyer got the cut of the woman with the flower from Faques. It also appears in Macer's Herball (1535). Luborsky and Ingram, Guide to English Illustrated Books, ii, p. 80. Hodnett's image no. 2053, 46'x45'. It is copied by Wyer, STC 546/1; by T. Colwell, STC 3358/2, STC 7563/1, STC 3358a; by H. Jackson, STC 14521/3.
113 Luborsky and Ingram, Guide to English Illustrated Books, ii, 81. Hodnett's image no 2052, 45'x45'. It is copied by Wyer, STC 1697/6, STC 24228/2, STC 7272/62 and by T. Colwell STC 7563/3.
type. These two woodcuts, side by side at the bottom of folio 2v, are placed beneath the headings ‘The quene of Fame’ and ‘To dame Pallas’. These woodcuts illustrate the first appearance of the two ladies in the poem conversing together about the fate of Skelton. They are overshadowed by the larger woodcuts of an author figure bearing a laurel branch, and a reader or scholar at his desk working, mentioned above. The illustrations are important because they illustrate from the beginning of the poem that the women and goddesses present in the narrative will play an important role in Skelton’s eventual acquisition of poetic fame. They also represent the dialogic nature of the work and the judicial process at its centre and are suggestive of the role the Howard ladies will play in the poem and the importance of patronage to the progress of the poet. These are the concerns of Chapter Six. The woodblock illustrations of Faques’s 1523 edition of Skelton’s *The Garland o f Laurel* contribute special meaning to the poem, which I discuss further in the final chapter of this thesis.

Woodblocks had been used to illustrate many texts which pre-date this version of Skelton’s poem. William Faques and Richard Faques, for example, had both used cuts prior to 1513. De Worde had printed at least 360 illustrations over a forty year period and his stock of woodcuts could not have numbered less than one thousand. Between 1515 and the 1520s he was issuing books notable for their illustrations. There was little illustration after the death of de Worde and Pynson until John Day, twenty-five years later. The period from 1536 to 1603 saw exponential growth in new kinds of illustrated books, and new kinds of images including portraits. Before this, however,

---


115 Brownlow, ed., *Book of the Laurel*, p. 73.

116 Appendix 8 A and B.

117 In addition to those illustrations shown in Appendix 9, Faques’s illustrated texts also include: *Here foloweth a lyttel treatyse of the beaute of women newly translated out of Frenshe in to Englishe* (1525); *Universis sancte matris ecclesie filitis ad quos presentes littere peruenierint Iohannes Herryes/Wilemhus Myles / et / Ricardus Chapell gardiani capelle Sancte margarete de Waxbridge London dioecesis* (1527); *Frater Philippus Mulart decretorum doctor sacri et apostolici hospitalis sancti spiritus* (1519); *Missale ad consuetudinem insignis ecclesie Sarum...* (1511); *Henricus dei gratia Rex Anglie et Francie ...* (1504); *Be it Known to all cristen people ... porche of the Cathedral Churche of hareforde* (1518); *These be the articles folowyng the whiche the kynges grace hathe pardoned* (1509); *The Graces Fowlyng be graunted to al the bretherne ... in the cyte of Excester* (1522); *The Romance of King Alexander* (1525); *Venerabilibus et in Christo carissime dilectis gardiano et magistri una...* (1526); *A Ballade of the Scottysshe Kyng* (1513). It seems that a large number of texts printed from Faques’s press included illustrations. The illustrated Faques texts listed here can be viewed on Early English Books Online.

118 Hodnett, *English Woodcuts*, p. 32.

119 Ibid., p. 42.

minor printers of the early sixteenth century did continue to use woodblocks and to enjoy an influence from the continent.121

Other minor printers associated with printing Skelton’s works, who made use of woodblock illustrations in their texts, were Robert Copland, John Rastell, Robert Redman, Peter Treveris, Robert Wyer and Thomas Godfray. Many of their cuts had belonged originally to de Worde and Pynson, and were frequently reused. The undated cut of the author crowned with laurel which appears in Rastell’s edition of Dyverse balletys and dittys solacyous, for example, is repeated or perhaps first occurred in Agaynst a comely coystrowne.122 This image is near identical to those below, only differing in size. Such cuts are common and can be found in works by R. and W. Copland, in Certain bokes, in Why come ye nat to courte, STC 22615/2, STC 22616; in STC 3383/6 and in STC 3385/1. STC 22601, Here after foloweth a lytell boke called Collyn Clout, uses the same cut of a laurel crowned author standing at a desk.123 Other printed works by Skelton are also illustrated. Here after foloweth the boke of Phyllyp Sparowe, for example, printed by R. Copland for R. Kele (1545?), contains a cut of a tomb as a visual finis. It is re-used once in STC 22595, another edition of the poem printed by W. Copland for J. Wyght.124

By comparison with Marshe, working later in the sixteenth century, Faques’s texts, and those works of the other early minor printers which contain illustrations, are strongly pictorial and seem to be most clearly associated with the court or with religion. Most of Marshe’s texts lack this kind of illustration, and rely upon title-page border and other ornaments, which become more architectural in style as the sixteenth century progresses.125 Title page borders, such as those used in Marshe’s texts, were copied from the continent, largely before 1550, and were often adapted from other illustrations of texts. Usually much alteration has occurred, including the removal of initials, dismemberment, additions of monographs, artistic improvements and the correction of royal arms. Few are

122 Hodnett, English Woodcuts, pp. 54-7. See Appendix 10, illustration Y.
123 Appendix 10, illustration X.
125 H. R. Plomer, English Printers’ Ornaments (London: Grafton, 1924), pp. vii-viii. Plomer defines ornaments as the decoration of books as apart from book illustration. For example head and tail pieces (to fill blank space at the beginning and end of text); initial letters; borders to title pages or text and decorative blocks such as woodblock initials.
signed and the drawers and gravers are largely unknown. Frequently these ornaments belonged to the bookseller or publisher, but not to the printer.126

Marshe’s *The true reporte of the forme and shape of a monstrous childe* (1562? / 75?), is accompanied by a drawing of the hideous form; *Horace his arte of poetrie, pistles and satyrs Englished* (1567), has a title page which is elaborated with carytids and shields. The verso contains a poem and the next recto an enormous shield and motto about fame; and *A myrrour for magistrates* (1563), has a similar elaborate sculptured title page, with columns and architectural extravagances. What these texts have in common with others printed by Marshe, including *The firste parte of Churchyaredes chippes* (1575); *Horace his arte of poetrie, pistles and satyrs Englished* (1567); *The Castel of Health* (1561); *Thabridgment o the histories of Trogus Pompeius* (1564); and *Certaine tragicall discourses written out of Frenche and Latin*, by Geffraie Fenton (1567), is that they sustain an interest in presenting the written subject matter as clearly and professionally as possible. Woodblock initials are used to simplify the textual presentation and title pages and printers’ devices lend prominence to the author, printer and subject matter through the shaping or layout of the text. These later texts rely less upon pictorial illustration and more upon clarity of the subject matter in appealing to their readers. It is interesting to note that *Churchyaredes chippes*, like *Pithy pleasaut and profytable workes*, is a collection of poetical works printed by Marshe.

The 1554 edition of *Certain bokes* printed by John Kynge and Thomas Marche makes use of a seemingly uncopied border, displaying figures, flora and fauna, including musicians, men hawking and pilgrims. This is different from the 1545 edition printed by Richard Lant for Henry Tab which contains no large illustrations, and is also different from John Day’s edition which uses a four-piece compartment of delicate arabesque ornamentation.127 *Here after foloweth the boke of Phyllyp Sparowe* by Copland for R. Kele (1545), contains an image on folio 33, of the bird’s tomb, and on folio 1 two wild men fighting each other contained within a border of flowers. Other editions of *Phillip Sparrow* are less illustrated. That printed by Copland for J. Wyght (1554), shares the illustration of the tomb used in 1545, on folio 33, but it also includes an unusual title page border showing flowers which grow up the edges in an almost art deco style. Similarly the 1558 editions of the text, one

---

127 McKerrow and Ferguson, *Title-Page Borders*, p. 75.
printed by John Day for Abraham Veale, the other by John Day for Anthony Kitson, share the title page border which is an elaborate, architectural type monument to the work. Beneath the plinth which is supported by caryatids, however, the texts differ. Copland and Wyght's edition of *Colyn Clout* (1560), however, makes use of a border showing a crudely-cut compartment with, at the head, Christ preaching by a tree stump, with birds flying around. At the side are columns and at the foot Christ, St Peter and other disciples.128 John Day's editions of *Colyn Clout, Phillip Sparow and Whye come ye not to courte*, for Anthony Kitson, Abraham Veale, J. Walley and J. Wyght (all 1560), make shared use of a further different title-page border. Day uses a compartment with arms at the top, parted per fess, sable and argent two curtlaxes in saltire, pointing upward. There are termini of Mars and Venus at the sides; Judith stands with the head of Holofernes below. *Merie Tales* (1567), is illustrated on the title page verso with a picture of St John the Divine, writing his revelations from the island of Patmos, and throughout with several elaborate woodblock initials which resemble those found in Faques's *The Garland of Laurel* (1523). Many of these texts seem to rely upon the use of pictorial image in the title-page border to illustrate the written subject matter but many of them also display the concern with presentation of the written word and layout.

Printers turned to manuscripts for examples of models of types and ornament, layout and design and their designs became increasingly sophisticated as they emulated their models. Flower ornaments and leaves (fleurons) are common and there are two broad categories of ornament of which such small designs compose the first. The second group include wood or metal decorative blocks, which, as we know from the 1553 inventory of the printing office known as the Sun in Fleet Street, were described as pictures and were kept on a small shelf in the printing house.129 These metal and wood blocks were made in the printing houses, which contained foundries, and like woodcuts they were reused and copied without limit.130

Faques's 1523 *Garland of Laurel*, as I mention above, has a woodblock on its title page with a border of printers' ornaments on three sides. The outer border makes use of variations on the fleuron, each unit being about 13 mm in length. The inner border of two sides is made up of a series of units intended to represent the heraldic tincture ermine. This

128 McKerrow and Ferguson, *Title-Page Borders*, p. 15.
is a reproduction on a very small scale of the half ornament that alternates with the half fleur-de-lys in one of the blocks used in Pynson's *Shyp of Folys*. On the last leaf is Faques's device, surrounded by a border built up with whole or portions of the lozenge ornament, arranged within borders of the fleuron unit seen on the front page. The lozenges are slightly smaller than those in Pynson's hands. Faques's *Tratyse* also makes use of decorative floral initials, which like the border designs, are repeated frequently elsewhere.

Printers' devices are also an important feature of early printed texts, which must be considered in relation to Faques's *Tratyse* and Marshe's collected edition of Skelton's poems. The practice of using ornaments and devices to distinguish their work came from the continent and had been used there since 1485. Devices are blocks which represent a printer's sign or his mark. An increase in the use of devices by printers reflects a concern with establishing rights to the printing of a text as print became a more widely used media. The device in Faques's text, and Marshe's use of a device in other texts, helps to place the printing of Skelton's works within the development of English and continental printing.

Most early devices represent a sign at which the printer or publisher worked. These include the Trinity devices of Jacobi Pepwell; the Maiden's head of R. Faques; Rastell's Mermaid; Treveris's wild couple; Wyer's Saint John the Evangelist and Copland's the Rose Garland. Another kind is a device representing a rebus or a pun upon the owner's name, such as the figure of Mars used by Thomas Marshe. Marshe also used as devices a monogram and more rarely a figure of fortune. Other devices refer to personal incidents in the owner's career or make use of monograms and initials with or without a mark, for example the G. F. for Guillaume Faques. Some printers used a portrait device of themselves, others heraldic devices or an emblem. The copying of

---

132 McKerrow, *Printers' and Publishers' Devices*, p. xi. Up to the end of the fifteenth century a total of eleven separate devices only were in use. McKerrow does not question how or why the devices came into use, only what they are. He defines them as 'any picture, design or ornament (not being an initial letter) found on a title page, final leaf or in any other conspicuous place in a book, and having an obvious reference to the sign at which the printer of publisher of the book carried on business, or to the name of either of them, or including the arms or crest of either of them.' Before 1557, however, this definition is not adequate and emblematic forms of device begin to predominate, chosen on the fancy of the printer or publisher, pp. xii-xiii.
133 Descriptions of all these devices and their uses can be found in McKerrow, *Printers' and Publishers' Devices*.
foreign devices by English printers was common and, once in use, devices were often re-cut, adapted to different owners and recast. Due to these practices, devices can be used to date books and recover their history. They often indicate a succession of owners. The fortune device of Thomas Marshe had the letters T.M. which were excised when the block became Kingston’s. Richard Faques altered the spelling of his mane from Faques to Fakes on his device. Fashions influenced the frequency of use and the images on devices but they were also adapted as they changed hands or became outdated.

Faques’s printer’s device appears twice, once in the *Salus corporis* (1509), 100 x 71.5mm, and once in *The Garland of Laurel* (1523), 101 x 72.5mm. It appears on folio E4v and shows two unicorns rampant on a shield with the initials R.F, hung on an arrow, on a background of flowers. The name ‘Fakes’ appears underneath and the whole is surrounded by a border of flowers. It was a copy of that of the Paris bookseller Thielmann Kerver, with an arrow substituted for a tree, and the design on the shield altered to that of the maiden’s head. An element of originality to it is found in the intersection of two triangles, containing at an earlier time the initials in the centre and the word Guillam beneath.

C. Conclusion

Faques and Marshe are interesting examples of two very different types of minor printer. Marshe, in the second half of the sixteenth century, was working on a generally acknowledged wide scale, printing mainly religious works, and later in his life had special rights to print Latin school books *cum privilegio*. Faques’s printing activity seems to have been underestimated. His links with France seem to have provided him with opportunities and influences which other early sixteenth-century printers may not have enjoyed, and his social and familial relationships within the London printing community were strong.

136 Ibid., pp. 167-87.
Skelton had clearly gained some respect amongst the printing community, which was bound together by strong ties. Their sharing of business ventures, risks, profits and competition seems to have extended to the publication of Skelton’s works. However, as A. S. G. Edwards suggests, printers were careful to choose their moments of publication with care, given the sometimes controversial nature of the poetry in question and competition for rights to texts. The printing of Skelton’s works continues alongside coterie circulation, another factor which makes it difficult to reconcile composition and publication dates of many of Skelton’s works.

There seems to have been no reason to delay the publication of *The Garland of Laurel*, and both printers present it to their public proudly, Faques in a bespoke and highly decorative *Tratyse*, Marshe as the first poem in the largest collection of Skelton’s poems at that time, *Pithy pleasaut and profitable worke*. The relation of the printed texts to the manuscript, and to each other, is ambiguous. Their differences and the lack of knowledge about the circumstances surrounding their production create considerable difficulties for the imagining and production of one final version of the poem, attempted with little success by many modern editors and readers. Their different subject matter, decoration and layouts, their omissions and additions and different dates and modes of production encourage the reader to speculate about the textual history of the poem, its readers and owners, its potential circulation and audience.

The printed texts uphold the possibility that Skelton’s *The Garland of Laurel* attracted compilers, collectors and serious readers, especially Marshe’s version which prints the initials of John Stow at the beginning and makes use of Latin and French sections. Marshe also more directly emphasises Skelton’s authorial role and reputation, with his special opening words and his lack of emphasis upon the lyrics. The printed texts also support the idea that the poem was attractive to noble and aspiring readers. Faques’s decorative text also draws attention to the author and may have been bespoke, but it may also have appealed to a broadening geographic and social range of audience, those at court who were perhaps familiar with the Howards, and those outside court circles, in London or Yorkshire perhaps, who may have been familiar with the family or with Skelton in other ways.
Faques and Marshe produced other works which were similar in content and style to *The Garland of Laurel*. In both cases the illustrations and layout of *The Garland of Laurel* are typical of other works produced from their presses. The variations between the three texts of this single poem testify not only to their different periods of production but to the changing demands and responses of audiences and publishers throughout the late fifteenth and sixteenth century.\(^\text{140}\) The three texts reveal that there is potential for there having been many more copies of Skelton’s poem than survive today. Skelton’s work appears to have been adapted for different groups, or different cultures, at different times. It responds to new trends as well as to what was considered traditionally acceptable and popular. This possibility becomes a focus for the next chapters of this thesis.

\(^{140}\) Chapter Seven considers changing authorial responses to texts.
Chapter Three

Miscellany

This chapter, and the next two chapters, focus not upon the physical condition of the existing texts of *The Garland of Laurel* but upon Skelton’s use of form and tradition, and what this can tell us about the production and reception of his text. Skelton worked in a period in which manuscript production competed with the new print medium, a period which challenged literary tradition, conventions of genre and form, and authorship itself. For these reasons Skelton’s literary work is some of the most exciting and significant produced during the late fifteenth century, revealing both use of and respect for old medieval literary traditions, as well as innovation in the adaptation of these forms and genres for new purposes.

In this chapter I consider the extent to which the idea of manuscript miscellany provides a context for interpreting and exploring the production and reception of *The Garland of Laurel*. There has been increased recognition in recent years that miscellany is an

---

1 The word ‘miscellany’, meaning mixture or medley, should not be confused with the term ‘anthology’. By 1615 ‘miscellany’ is defined as ‘separate treatises or studies on a subject collected into one volume; literary compositions of various kinds brought together to form a book’, and by 1638, as ‘a book or literary production containing miscellaneous pieces on various subjects’, see *OED* vi, pp. 498-9. Miscellany has also been defined as ‘a term of palpably false unity which covers what we perceive to be disorder’, by J. J. O’Donnell, ‘Retractions’, in S. G. Nichols and S. Wenzel, eds., *The Whole Book: Cultural Perspectives on the Medieval Miscellany* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1996), pp. 37-51, 169. Usually it describes a manuscript of diverse content but the term does not differentiate between works with random content and those with ordered content; whether the works have one collector or many; it does not take into account any relationships between texts; the relationship between texts and their codicological context; or arbitrary principles of collection and organisation as opposed to clear organising principles, see Nichols and Wenzel, eds., *The Whole Book*, pp. 1-6. ‘Anthology’ differs from ‘miscellany’ in several ways. The word ‘anthology’ was derived from Greek, ‘anthos’ meaning ‘flower’, and ‘logia’ meaning ‘a collection’, derived from the word for ‘to gather’. The word was first applied to a collection of poems or literary works and sometimes to hymnals from 1640, *OED*, vi. However, the term denotes clear governing principles for the material contained within its covers, see J. Boffey, ‘Short Texts in Manuscript Anthologies: The Minor Poems of John Lydgate in Two Fifteenth Century Collections’, in Nichols and Wenzel, eds., *The Whole Book*, p. 73. ‘Anthology’ is a concept associated with a post-manuscript culture and with poetry, whereas ‘miscellany’ may be associated with prose and poetry equally and was initially a product of manuscript culture. The intentions of an author or compiler of an anthology are very different from those of a miscellany compiler or contributor. Anthologies include samples of literature which may be dipped into, but these samples are unified by the thematic intention of the maker, and are aimed at more demanding audiences, a product of the later print period. Miscellany lacks such unity and presents a variety of texts and themes to its reader. Despite such distinctions it remains possible for some anthologies to have manuscript precedents, see Boffey, ‘Short Texts’, pp. 81-2.
important context for considering medieval texts. Cotton’s role in including Skelton’s poem in the later manuscript Cotton Vitellius E.x., and in compiling the whole manuscript as we see it today, might suggest that manuscript miscellany is an inappropriate context in which to think about Skelton’s *Garland of Laurel*. Cotton Vitellius E.x. is not a medieval manuscript miscellany and Cotton’s compilation has erased signs of any medieval manuscript groupings. However, the fact alone that miscellany was a popular form for the production of texts, in manuscript and print, for several centuries, suggests that it is an important context to consider in relation to the production and reception of Skelton’s texts. Manuscript miscellany and activities of compilation may have unavoidably conditioned the way in which Skelton thought about the composition, structure and reception of *The Garland of Laurel*, and the ways in which it was received and interpreted by its early readers.

Firstly, this chapter considers the variety of medieval manuscript miscellany, using as examples Oxford, Bodleian Library MSS Fairfax 16 and Rawlinson C. 813. These manuscripts are representative medieval manuscript miscellanies, with known compilers and owners. I consider the compilers and the trends in compilation reflected by these two manuscripts and the popularity of the miscellany form. These manuscripts, chosen as representative, are also appropriate because they contain many lyrics. Particular attention is given to the survival of lyrics in these manuscripts, and a comparison is drawn later in the chapter with the way in which the lyrics survive in Skelton’s *The Garland of Laurel*. The chapter additionally considers the development of the miscellany form from manuscript to print and the miscellany form in the later sixteenth century. This is explored through a consideration of another representative miscellany, Gascoigne’s *A Hundreth Sundrie Flowres*, which also contains many lyrics.

Secondly, this chapter considers the possible influence and impact of miscellany on Skelton’s acts of composition, how and why he may have adopted this model and its techniques. I consider the structure and the narrative content of *The Garland of Laurel* in this way and move away from using ‘miscellany’ as a term to designate a collection of various pieces of writing, and towards using it as a way of understanding the internal

---

2 In 1996, for example, a conference at the University of Michigan took ‘manuscript miscellany’ as its subject, resulting in a collection of conference proceedings, Nichols and Wenzel, eds., *The Whole Book*. 
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workings of a single poem. I begin to consider authorial perceptions and adaptation of popular literary forms and the use of literary tradition by Skelton.

A. Manuscript and Print Miscellany

i. Bodleian Library MS Fairfax 16

It is likely that Skelton was influenced in his choice of poetic forms and modes by what he thought might appeal to a London audience. As I have discussed in the first two chapters, London seems to have provided an important focus and context for the publication and reception of Skelton's poetry both in manuscript and print. John Stow (1525–1605) produced miscellanies, as John Shirley had done before him (c.1366–1456), which found favour with the complex London audience, in and around the court.3 The fact that Stow was aware of Shirley’s collections testifies to their earlier availability in London.4 There was a broad market for manuscript miscellanies, a form in which Skelton’s works had already widely circulated, as I demonstrated in Chapter Two, but additionally the form of a manuscript miscellany was varied, fluid and flexible, characteristics which may have made it an attractive model for individual works by Skelton.

As the demand for books increased during the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, the manuscript book trade produced – on a speculative basis – relatively plain ready-made collections, which could be selected and bound into larger volumes by the purchaser. The transmission of works in loose form preceded their transcription into miscellaneous collections.5 Equally more expensive multiple copies of texts, for which there was assured demand, were produced. Changes in the nature of patronage, due to the introduction of print, meant that collaborative ventures of the latter kind became increasingly common.6

---

3 For example, London MSS Harley 78 and Harley 367, already mentioned in association with Cotton Vitellius E.x. in Chapter One. Also see below.
Bodleian Library MS Fairfax 16 is a miscellany, produced to order from a London- or Oxford-based commercial scriptorium or bookseller, during the early fifteenth century, for a single owner belonging to the landed gentry. The manuscript consists of five parts, recopied by one scribe from independent, already extant booklets. Described as an ‘elegantly produced fascicular collection of metropolitan provenance’, this manuscript was assembled from booklets which were possibly already extant saleable copies or resident display booklets. Manuscripts based on booklet exemplars brought together diverse works which already enjoyed an existing and established manuscript circulation. Often they presented old but desirable texts by a new process. Fairfax 16 was not a commission, or a deluxe edition, despite its quality parchment, ornaments and commissioned full-page illustration. Its appearance and content suggest that its readers perhaps aspired to own a manuscript similar to the commissioned and deluxe London

7 J. Norton-Smith ed., *Bodleian Library MS Fairfax 16 Facsimile* (London: Scolar Press, 1979), pp. vii, xii-xvi. The border surrounding the illustration of Mars and Venus incorporates the Stanley of Hooton coat of arms, indicating ownership. The owner and commissioner of Fairfax 16 was probably John Stanley Esq. d. 1469, related to Sir Thomas Stanley, ennobled 1456, d. 1459, and the subsequent earls of Derby. Tudor evidence identifies this branch of the Stanleys with an elder branch whose seat was at Hooton. John Stanley had military duties and associations with the royal household. He had personal contact with William de la Pole, Duke of Suffolk, who had a close friendship with Charles, Duc d’Orleans. It is possible that the manuscript came into the family’s possession some time after 1469 and that it was then passed by bequest into a library connected to a religious house, such as Westminster Abbey. The manuscript was bequeathed in 1671 to the Bodleian Library by Charles Fairfax’s nephew, Thomas, the parliamentary general. Intermediate ownership between its leaving the Stanley family and its acquisition by Fairfax is unknown. Notations of ownership, possession or readership which survive are not particularly helpful. Charles Fairfax, the antiquarian, 1597-1673, bought the manuscript at Gloucester on 8 September 1650, presumably from a commercial bookseller. One note of sixteenth-century ownership survives on f. 321v, the signature of Sir Thomas Moyle, d. 1560, one of the General Surveyors of the Court of Augmentation to Henry VIII and Edward VI. The manuscript may therefore have been one of the spoils of confiscation.

8 *Fairfax 16 Facsimile*, pp. xvi-xvii. A contemporary hand provides the table of contents and corrects the text of booklet three, and additional verse material after f. 39v was written in the later fifteenth century by two hands.


10 *Fairfax 16 Facsimile*, pp. vii-viii. Evidence for a booklet production is in the formation of the gatherings, use of blank pages to mark booklet divisions, use of distinct foliations, and the various natures of the textual sources and affinities.


12 *Fairfax 16 Facsimile*, pp. vii, xi-xiii. The illustration is from the hand of the important artist the Abingdon Missal Master (the School of William Abel). The full page decoration of Mars, Venus and Jupiter shows that care has been taken to match text and picture. The structure of the composition is cross shaped. The artist had produced similar religious designs in Oxford, Bodleian Library MS Digby 227, folio 113v and Cambridge, St John’s College MS H.5, folio 2r. He adapts the standard mythological detail. Ornament in the text was provided by the hand of a second scribe and includes red and blue ink.
British Library, MS Royal 18.D.II, which contains Skelton’s *Upon the dolorus dethe and muche lamentable chaunce of the mooste honorable Erle of Northumberlantude* (1498), alongside Lydgate’s *Troy Book* and *Siege of Thebes*, considerably augmented with other material at a later date.¹³

Fairfax 16 is substantially intact, little-damaged, and includes its medieval end-leaves. It consists of 343 leaves in 44 quires, with gatherings programmed in quires of eight. The last quire after folio 182, however, has been made up of one bifolium and two singletons and the penultimate quire is a six with an additional central singleton (f. 333). Its leaf size measures 230 x 165mm and its written area, 95 x 155 mm. It was well trimmed, after 1650 when the manuscript was put into modern boards; it had a seventeenth-century Bodleian binding and a nineteenth-century re-binding, too thorough to enable a reconstruction of earlier bindings.¹⁴ The poetic material in the manuscript is courtly in its concerns, including one poem by Charles d’Orleans (still living at the time of the manuscript’s production), and works by Chaucer, Sir John Clanvowe, John Lydgate, and Thomas Hoccleve. It illustrates fifteenth-century interest in collecting works by Chaucer and his followers.

While the manuscript does not consist of pre-prepared booklets bound together, the influence of the booklet structure is obvious and provides an easy method for describing the content. The first booklet, dated no earlier than c.1425, collects together substantial works by Chaucer, Lydgate, Hoccleve and others, favouring works that are concerned with love and dreams.¹⁵ The booklet’s close similarities with Oxford, Bodleian Library MSS Bodley 638 and Tanner 346 suggest that this was a common type of booklet miscellany drawn on by scriptoria which produced these kinds of manuscripts.¹⁶ Booklet two complements the first booklet and is comprised of shorter poems by Chaucer, Lydgate, Hoccleve and others. It is a closely integrated collection, becoming more miscellaneous and additional as it progresses. Its formation was likely no earlier

---


¹⁴ *Fairfax 16 Facsimile*, pp. ix-x, xvi.

¹⁵ Amongst its contents are Chaucer’s *The Complaint of Mars*, *The Complaint of Venus*, *Anelida and Arcite*, *The Legend of Good Women*, *The Parliament of Fowls*, *The Book of the Duchess* and *The House of Fame*; Lydgate’s *A Complaint of a Lover’s Life* and *The Temple of Glass*; Sir John Clanvowe’s *The Book of Cupid*; Hoccleve’s *The Epistle of Cupid*; Sir Richard Roos (attrib.), *La Belle Dame Sans Mercy*.

than 1430/32. Exemplar booklet three, folios 202r-300r, is not a collection but a complete text of Lydgate’s *Reason and Sensuality*, dated to before c.1412.\(^{17}\) Booklet four also contains a single anonymous work, *How a Lover Praizeth his Lady*, the only manuscript copy to survive (ff. 306r-312v). In contrast, booklet five contains love lyrics, including a collection of twenty ballads, complaints and letters, with no indication of authorship, with the exception of one lyric of Charles d’Orleans, ‘O thou Fortune which hast the governance’.\(^{18}\)

MS Fairfax 16 reveals the significant rise of interest in the collecting together of works by single authors in manuscript miscellany form, something which has become particularly associated with the fifteenth century and post-printing period.\(^{19}\) During the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries the collected works of single authors in England became increasingly popular. Large volumes of the works of Chaucer and Lydgate exist, dating from the 1530s, concentrating on assembling a poet’s major pieces, while often muddling the authorial attributions.\(^{20}\)

Fairfax 16 also displays an interest in the grouping together of material with generic connections. Boffey suggests that such manuscripts grew out of the shared reading tastes of a household, or people connected by other shared interests.\(^{21}\) She claims that early readers may have understood writing such as dream poems and courtly lyrics to form some kind of generically connected body, and that they wanted to preserve these works together.

\(^{17}\) *Fairfax 16 Facsimile*, pp. viii, xxviii. Only one other manuscript version is extant in London, British Library, Add. MS 29729.


\(^{19}\) J. Boffey, ‘The Manuscripts of English Courtly Love Lyrics in the Fifteenth Century’, in *Manuscripts and Readers in Fifteenth Century England: The Literary Implications of Manuscript Study. Essays from the 1982 Conference at the University of York*, ed. D. Pearsall (Cambridge: Brewer, 1983), pp. 3-14 (p. 8); Boffey, ‘Early Printers’, pp. 11-26; A. S. G. Edwards, ‘Lydgate Manuscripts: Some Directions for Future Research’, in *Manuscripts and Readers*, ed. Pearsall, pp. 15-26. Thynne’s printed edition of the works of Chaucer, some apocryphal, was available in 1532. Thynne was connected to London printers and to literary circles at the court of Henry VIII, the milieu in which his lyrics were read and composed. Chaucer’s works, whether lyrics or not, were copied as groups. The large printed collected works of the sixteenth century were a culmination of this process.

\(^{20}\) Edwards, ‘Lydgate MSS’, pp. 21-3. For example, Fairfax 16; Pepys 2006; Rawlinson C.86; Bodley 686; Harley 7333, which contains seven booklets, containing *The Canterbury Tales* and political and historical writings.

in groups where their similarities and shared debts would be easily perceived. Boffey suggests that this manuscript, along with other important manuscript miscellany collections, for example London, British Library, MS Royal 18 D.ii., illustrates this abundance of ‘deliberate bilingual and intertextual reference’, ‘generic and thematic experimentation, and textual dialogue’, drawing on a whole range of French and English models.

Fairfax 16 perhaps also has something in common with the Thornton Manuscript (c. 1440), which now survives in two parts in Lincoln Cathedral Library, Lincoln Dean and Chapter Library MS 91, and British Library Additional MS 31042. This manuscript, also brought together under the direction of a single compiler, and showing the influence of booklet exemplars on a much humbler scale, is thought to have circulated in a household in the Yorkshire region, between groups of friends or family members, growing out of their individual tastes and reading habits. It illustrates particularly well the types of collecting practices which led to the creation of such miscellanies in the mid-fifteenth century.

The compiler, Robert Thornton, brought together a mass of predominantly literary and devotional material, on a considerably ambitious scale. Like the material in Fairfax 16 it is presented with coherence. Romances occupy the first set of gatherings, including the English Prose Life of Alexander and Morte Arthure; a miscellany of religious and devotional items, of varied authorship, fill the next; and the Liber de Diversis Medicinis, a medical compilation, completes the manuscript. The romances seem to have been copied separately onto different gatherings and only later placed together. Some

22 Boffey, ‘English Dream Poems’, p. 114. In this article Boffey also refers to Oxford Bodleian Library MSS Tanner 346, Bodley 638, Arch. Selden B 24; Cambridge University Library MS Gg.4.27 and Longleat MS 258. These manuscripts mainly contain French love visions and dits amoureux, Chaucerian items and items from the later Middle English dits amoureux, pp. 114-15.

23 Ibid., pp. 113-15, 118-19.

24 See my further references below to this manuscript and to the work of J. J. Thompson.


evidence suggests that Thornton compiled his miscellany with a plan of organisation, which indicated his ability to acquire a wide range of materials, but the collection remains miscellaneous because of its diverse themes, arrangement and fillers.\textsuperscript{28} The whole manuscript makes use of distinct decorative styles to enhance its miscellaneous themes.\textsuperscript{29} Additional and blank leaves were used to separate items within the miscellany, later often filled with smaller items or drawings, also in Thornton's hand.\textsuperscript{30}

Thornton also made use of many second-hand sources for his material, including complete collections, commercially produced booklets, unbound and stray leaves from dismembered manuscripts or work in progress by others.\textsuperscript{31} He demonstrates awareness of gathering together and dividing material in a miscellaneous collection, and there is little alteration to the texts of the works. Thornton's activities as a compiler, like those of Stow and Shirley, help to delineate the scribal tastes and habits which shaped the making of miscellaneous manuscript books.\textsuperscript{32} Sixteenth-century collections were often built upon earlier collections. For example, Stow's assembly of fifteenth- and sixteenth-century texts was probably built from an earlier collection of John Shirley. Shirley had been transcribing and collecting literary texts in London in the early fifteenth century, was probably involved with literary sales and acted as an agent. He read, translated, composed, organised and copied material, and owned a large number of books, in Latin, French and English, on a variety of different subjects. His tastes and access to manuscript material, like Thornton's and those of the compiler of Fairfax 16, were wide-ranging.\textsuperscript{33}

The examples of Thornton, Shirley and Stow illustrate the potential diversity of manuscript miscellany but also draw attention to the length of time during which miscellanies were produced and received. Miscellanies allowed readers to share and exchange their reading interests, and preserved particular popular texts in different

\textsuperscript{28} Thompson, 'Compiler in Action', pp. 113-24.
\textsuperscript{31} Hanna, 'Corrected Collation', pp. 122-30.
\textsuperscript{32} S. Lerer, 'British Library MS Harley 78 and the Manuscripts of John Shirley', \textit{Notes and Queries}, 37 (1990), 235.
ways, across several centuries. Detailed study of manuscript miscellanies such as the Thornton Manuscript and Harley 2252, together with an exploration of compiler or scribal interest and habit, provide the modern reader with a network of literary and historical associations which can assist in the reconstruction of the cultural background of literary production.34

Neither Fairfax 16, nor the Thornton manuscript, can easily be compared with Cotton Vitellius E.x. Both are carefully structured and provide a far more detailed snapshot of the production and reception of a medieval manuscript miscellany, including information about the reading tastes of given readers at a particular time in history. Their compilers were working to specific requirements, in the case of Fairfax 16 probably designated by a second party. Despite containing a large amount of miscellaneous material, Fairfax 16 is unified by the hand of the scribe and by the interests of the buyer. The Thornton manuscript is dominated by Robert Thornton’s overall scheme. While these manuscript books provide us with an insight into the interests and habits of a single book owner, or diverse owners, many miscellaneous manuscript books belonging to the post-printing period also suggest that individuals still valued books filled with works of their choice, even after the advent of print.

ii. Bodleian Library MS Rawlinson C. 813

Rawlinson C. 813 provides an interesting contrast to both the manuscripts mentioned above, while also significantly differing from Cotton Vitellius E.x. A focus on this manuscript illustrates further the diversity of manuscript miscellany in the medieval period. If Skelton was influenced by miscellany in his composition of individual poems then it is more likely the structure and form of this type of manuscript which captured his imagination. Rawlinson C. 813 is distinct from Fairfax 16 and Cotton Vitellius E.x. in its presentation and arrangement of subject matter.

The manuscript falls into two unconnected compilations. Firstly it consists of a collection of lyrics, which occupies about three quarters of the manuscript book;

34 C. M. Meale, ‘The Compiler at Work: John Colyns and BL MS Harley 2252’, in Manuscripts and Readers, ed. Pearsall, pp. 82-103 (p. 103).
secondly it contains six political prophecies, comparatively ignored. These two parts separated by flyleaves, folios 1-98 and folios 103-167, were bound together during the seventeenth century.\(^\text{35}\) The overall appearance of the manuscript gives no indication of order or formality, but rather suggests a hasty and haphazard approach to the inclusion of material.

The evidence of watermarks, handwriting, language and spelling suggests that the manuscript compilation dates from the first half of the sixteenth century. Historical allusions fit with the dates 1517-21, and there are some crossings out of papal references, suggesting that the manuscript existed before the 1535 Act of Supremacy. While this is the case it is also possible to date some lyrics accurately to an earlier period, some words and forms indicate pre-fifteenth-century composition and later transcription. The manuscript has therefore been variously dated, from as early as 1520 to as late as 1530 to 1540. Sharon L. Jansen and Kathleen H. Jordan, editors of the facsimile edition, find strong internal evidence for compilation of the miscellany between circa 1517 and 1518 and 1535 and 1538.\(^\text{36}\)

The manuscript is now bound in a late seventeenth-century law binding of leather, 21x16cm. It is written on paper in grey, brown and black ink, in two main untidy scribal hands, in a secretary script, of the sixteenth century.\(^\text{37}\) The paper varies in width according to the length of lines written upon it and the number of lines per folio varies. Pages are numbered throughout, but accurate collation is impossible due to repair and remounting of pages. Folios 1 to 98 are contained within eight quires, though some of these apparently regular quires contain singleton leaves.\(^\text{38}\)

\(^{35}\) W. D. Macray, ed., *Catalogi Codicum Manuscriptorum, Bibliothecae Bodleianae, Partis Quintae, Fasciculus secundus: Viri Munificatissimi Ricardi Rawlinson, J. C. D* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1878), pp. 415-20, gives a list of the contents of the entire manuscript. It also refers the reader to English poems and prophecies elsewhere, see note 46 below.


The language of the manuscript reflects an educated London standard and items within the manuscript suggest that the pieces were compiled by someone with close personal connections with the Tudor court.\textsuperscript{39} Two names occur on folio 98v, a singleton leaf in quire eight, which have recently attracted interest, indicating possible compilers. This singleton leaf, along with the other pages in quire eight, and the whole of the preceding quire, bears faint marks of indentation in the paper, which connects the names upon the leaf with the material of those quires. The names, written in a sixteenth-century hand, continuous with the preceding hand, are those of Welles and Coffyn. The name Coffyn is made clear by other words which appear in Latin and in code, which broken reads:

\begin{verbatim}
homfrei Wellis est possessor huius [s libri] pertinet liber iste ad me cognomine uuellis Si unquam perdatur homfrido Restitutum sit
\end{verbatim}

Humphrey Welles seems to have owned the collection and may also have compiled it.\textsuperscript{40} Like Skelton, Welles had numerous political and personal associations with the Tudor court and may have known William Coffin who, between 1492 and 1538, was a Member of Parliament for Derbyshire and who was also strongly connected to the court.\textsuperscript{41} Little is known about Coffin but some of the lyrics in the manuscript supply further evidence for the probability of Welles’s compilation.\textsuperscript{42} Welles’s striking career survived numerous religious and political changes and, while the items in the manuscript illustrate his intimacy with the court, they also demonstrate such confusion

\textsuperscript{39} Jansen and Jordan, eds., \textit{Welles Anthology}, pp. 1, 67.
\textsuperscript{40} Ibid., p. 2.
\textsuperscript{41} Ibid., pp. 3-5. Welles served as a captain in the French war in 1513; was a member of the Royal Household by May 1515 and attended Henry VIII at the Field of Cloth of Gold, with Sir Griffith ap Rhys. By 1518 he was a gentleman of the chamber; by 1519 a gentleman usher; and Sewer by 1526. He was admitted to the Inner Temple in March 1522. He became Master of Horse to Queen Anne Boleyn in 1534 and to Queen Jane Seymour in 1536. He was styled a ‘knight’ as early as 1520 but dubbed in 1537. In 1534 he was appointed to the treasons committee. His wife attended Anne Boleyn in the Tower and he was a Member of Parliament of July 1536 that attainted Anne. He was recommended by Cromwell for the king’s service in 1538; a Member for Newcastle-under-Lyme in the parliament of 1545 to 1547; the holder of the Clerkship of the Summons before Henry’s death in 1547; the Clerk of the Mint at the Tower, 1557 to 1569. He knew Sir George Griffith and supported Sir Henry Stafford in making sedition in parliament, to whose father he possibly owed his parliamentary election. He died of great sickness in 1538.
\textsuperscript{42} Ibid., pp. 6-7. The eighth lyric, for example, a letter from RW to AC. AC was Welles’s father-in-law by 1533 and London saddlery connections link Coffyn to the RW. The manuscript also mentions the names of Wyllyam Irenmonger, Henry Fenton, and John Whitbye, all of whom are included in the register of the Archdeaconary of Stafford, 1532/3.
in tone, theme and style as to suggest that he was one of the rising middle class, educated but without a background of literary experience or diction.43

The manuscript is different from the miscellanies described above in its overall appearance and in the lack of certainty about its origins. It is very rare in that few large collections of Middle English lyrics now survive, although a few of the lyrics which it contains do appear in other manuscript collections.44 Most of the lyrics are of little literary interest and there is no evidence to suggest that this section of the manuscript ever circulated or existed independently.45 They include a fragment (419 lines) of Skelton’s *Why come ye not to courte*, extracts from Chaucer, Lydgate, Hawes and Wyatt. It is possible Welles may have known Skelton through his connections with the Tudor court, and other poems include courtly lyrics, satires, elegies and love epistles, a few medical recipes, and some bawdy lyrics, borrowed whole or in part from works of well-known poets.46 For example, there are many poor adaptations of verses from Stephen Hawes’s *The Pastime of Pleasure* and *The Comfort of Lovers*.47 Of particular interest, because none of the English songs found in Continental song books has so far been traced directly to a known English source, is the third lyric of the manuscript, ‘I recommende me to yow with harte and mynde’. Some lines from its second quatrain appear in a poem in the Mellon Chansonnier which contains three songs with English words.48

The fifty-one lyrics in the Rawlinson manuscript are varied in content and are drawn from the recent past and contemporary poetry. There is a little range of metrical or

rhythmic patterning and mostly the lyrics are in rhyme royal. What variety there is bears witness to a fifteenth-century interest in mixing together different forms. The compilation as a whole gives no indication of sophisticated technical skill.\(^4\)\(^9\) There is an obvious separation between the lyrics and prophecies, and additionally there are smaller groupings of lyrics, but no prevailing scheme of composition, mood or theme dominates the collection.\(^5\)\(^0\)

The lyrics found in Humphrey Welles’s book have been borrowed and modified, recast and made new by unknown adapters or poets, before and perhaps when they appeared in his manuscript. An important distinction must be drawn between Welles the compiler and whoever adapted the lyrics to satisfy new circumstances. He or she had access to a wide range of sources and the project must have taken a considerable amount of time.\(^5\)\(^1\)

Manuscript collections frequently contained lyrics from a variety of sources and lyric verse was embedded in specific social situations and occasioned by a range of social practices. Arthur F. Marotti comments that sometimes manuscripts preserve, or invent, specific social occasions for lyrics, something of interest to Skelton’s poem, discussed further below. Also he comments that in ‘the system of manuscript transmission, it was normal for lyrics to elicit revisions, corrections, supplements, and answers, for they were part of an ongoing social discourse [...] texts were inherently malleable, escaping authorial control to enter a social world in which recipients both consciously and unconsciously altered what they received’.\(^5\)\(^2\) Writers and audiences responded to lyrics both in the immediate context and in terms of shared socio-cultural assumptions. Many of the lyrics found in Rawlinson C.813 are of this kind. Frequently collections of lyrics were produced in idiosyncratic and personal ways, usually formed of independent gatherings, in different hands, perhaps chosen by the prospective owner for their particular appeal. Sometimes lyrics were incorporated into manuscripts as fillers and often they are anonymous.\(^5\)\(^3\)

\(^{50}\) *Ibid.*, pp. 33-5.
\(^{52}\) Marotti, *Manuscript, Print*, pp. 7, 9, 136.
\(^{53}\) Boffey, ‘Manuscripts of English Courtly Love Lyrics’, pp. 4, 8.
The Rawlinson collection begins with five conventional love poems. These are followed by a didactic poem about a lost soul, a comic epistle, 'my loving frende', and another epistle, from a master to his apprentice. Then there is a proverbial poem and a de casibus poem about a number of historical personages. These are followed by six more love poems (ff.14v-27v), deliberately grouped together, four of which were influenced by Hawes. Then there is an intentional grouping together of three elegies which have a Welsh connection, one to Lobe, Henry VIII's fool; one to Sir Griffith ap Rhys; and one to Lady Griffith, both recognisable historical figures.54

This group is followed by a mock testament based on the courtly theme, a didactic anti-feminist poem, and a conventional love lament. There are several pieces of admonishment against women, varying in tone from satiric to mock didactic and concerned with the theme of transience.55 Several miscellaneous items follow these pieces, including a poem in Latin on the seven deadly sins and the Ten Commandments; medical receipts; two satiric prose pieces and the fragment of Skelton's poem, Why come ye nat to courte.56 The miscellany quickly returns to its groupings of material, however, with nine love poems, including two erotic dream visions. These are separated, by a political piece on the execution of Buckingham (Edward Stafford) from another group of eight love lyrics, which include another erotic dream vision, and two lyrics written by women, related through similarities in form and content.57 The inclusion of the lament for Buckingham, along with the fragment of Why come ye nat to courte, perhaps indicates anti-Wolsey sentiment as well as metropolitan connections.58 The manuscript contains many texts that were influential during the period of crisis and rebellion in Henry VII's reign, suggesting that the compiler had an interest in the politics of the period and an awareness of religious controversy. The political

54 Jansen and Jordan, eds., Welles Anthology, pp. 1, 9-12, 34. Sir Griffith ap Rhys (d.1521), was son of the famous Welsh leader Rhys ap Thomas (1499–1525), who supported the cause of Henry VII and joined forces with him as he marched through Wales on his way to oppose Richard III at the Battle of Bosworth. Sir Griffith ap Rhys married Catherine Howard, daughter of the Duke of Norfolk. Welsh links in the manuscript can also be found in the prophecies, a Welsh form and a Welsh tradition. They had much political power in affirming Welsh allegiance to the Tudor cause. Chronicling the Wars of the Roses, particularly the wars in the north, was a favourite subject of Welsh prophecies.

55 Ibid., pp. 21-2
56 Ibid., pp. 31-2
57 Ibid., pp. xv-xvi, 34.
58 Ibid., p. 9.
prophecies, for example, are a representative sampling of the various types available.59

Material like this in the manuscript, associated with London and court politics, has prompted critics to compare Rawlinson C.813 with other manuscripts of metropolitan provenance, for example, Harley 2252 and Lansdowne 762.60 Harley 2252 contains Skelton’s *Speke, Parrot* and *Colyn Cloute*, alongside *The Annals of London* and two romances, the B version of *Ipomydon* and the stanzaic *Morte Arthur*. In addition to these larger works Harley 2252 contains a poem on Ann Boleyn, lists of the wards, parish churches, monasteries and hospitals of the City of London, items of specific relevance to merchants, copies of letters exchanged between James IV of Scotland and Henry VIII before the Battle of Flodden in 1513, and memoranda connected with the administration of a parish church. Other short items of non-literary interest have been added as fillers.61 Unlike Rawlinson C.813, the manuscript shows little evidence of having been compiled with any great degree of generic or thematic intention. It may have had various compilers during the 1520s and 30s and the driving force behind its compilation was likely more practical than economic or literary.62 Comparisons, however, have shown the Rawlinson manuscript to be unique in its organisation and in its dedication to literary rather than to practical items.63

Most of the poetry in Rawlinson C.813 is love poetry, and the majority of it is courtly in style, like the poetry of Chaucer, or the more aureate style of Hawes.64 The topical poems described above are followed by two lively ballads, one from the romantic folk tradition, interrupted by another conventional love lyric, and another five love poems follow these, including the well-known ‘I have a gentil cok’. ‘Whatt tyme as parys son of king priame’, borrowed largely from Hawes, is then followed by a proverbial and didactic popular poem and by another two love poems. The six political prophecies

61 Meale, ‘Compiler at Work’, pp. 82-103.
62 Ibid., pp. 83, 92-4, 96. Meale attempts to document some of the literary, social and historical conditions which lay behind the compilation of MS Harley 2252. More recently Susanna Fein has contributed similar research by editing a volume of work on London, British Library, MS Harley 2253. S. Fein, ed., *Studies in the Harley MS: The Scribes, Contents and Social Contexts of British Library MS Harley 2253* (Kalamazoo, MI: Medieval Institute, Western Michigan University, 2000).
64 Ibid., p. 22.
follow but appear as quite separate from the lyric compilation. The larger manuscript compilation, therefore, contains within it several smaller collections of material.

iii. Sixteenth-Century Miscellany

Medieval manuscript miscellanies differed from sixteenth-century miscellanies but laid the foundations for the production of later collections of works. Sixteenth-century printed texts imitated the form of the earlier manuscript models and appealed to established audiences by presenting a variety of material in a recognised form.

The best-known sixteenth century miscellany is *Tottel’s Miscellany*, 1557–87, or *Songes and Sonettes*, written by the ryght honorable Lorde Henry Haward late Eearle of Surrey, and others. This work was published more than a century after the introduction of print, and was the first major collection of poems to appear after Skelton’s collected works appeared in 1568. It played on the idea of biography, author grouping and use of titles. It has remained an important work in literary history because of the forms and styles of verse it assembles. *Tottel’s Miscellany* was significant because it built on the traditions of lyric publication in manuscript and print, described above, and disseminated poetry associated with the private and courtly sphere to the

---

65 Jansen and Jordan, eds., *Welles Anthology*, pp. xvi-xvii, 40-52. The genre is fascinating and neglected but had huge contemporary appeal. The six prophecies in Rawlinson C. 813, ff. 72v-96r, include the ‘Prophisies of Rymour, Beid, and Marlyng’; ‘In principio erat Iohannis verbumb’; the ‘prophecia Iohannis merlyon’; ‘The prophesye of Methodius’; ‘A Prophese of Marleon’; and the ‘Sententia Sigismund’. The ‘Prophisies of Rymour, Beid, and Marlyng’ is one of only two versions surviving, the other in London, British Library, MS Lansdowne 762. It is an example of many fifteenth- and sixteenth-century prophecies that derive part of their authority from Thomas Rymour / Thomas of Erceldoune. The second prophetic piece echoes the opening of the Gospel of Saint John and purports to be a prediction for the year 6508 (counting from the year of creation). The third prophecy is attributed to Merlin, and the fourth is falsely attributed to Bishop Methodius, who died c.300, and is similar to the book of *Revelations*. The fifth bears no resemblance to the other prophecy of Merlin and the sixth is an untitled Latin piece about papal abuses based on a report given by Sigismund at the Council of Basle, 1431–1449. The prophecies include the characteristic references to known historical figures, prophetic disguises, animal symbolism, accidental designation, metaphor, use traditional material, and make reference to respected prophets.

66 Marotti, *Manuscript, Print*, p. 257. The 1568 publication of Skelton’s collected works by Marshe was also the first in a tradition of posthumous publications, including *The Whole Workes of G. Gascogne: Compiled into one Volume* (1587); Sidney’s in 1598; a collected edition of Spenser in 1611; Shakespeare’s first folio in 1623; Daniel’s 1623 *Whole Workes*; and the 1633 Donne and Herbert volumes.

67 Boffey, ‘Early Printers’, pp. 11-12.
public fashionable audience. Its publication started a trend for publishing collections of verse in print.\textsuperscript{68}

With changes in textual production, with the rise of a consciousness about textual preservation and the significance of the author figure, it became more common for sets of lyrics associated with single writers to survive in large coherently planned and executed collections. Initially printers were influenced in different ways. Caxton, for example, was providing models for the publication of later works, most often in the form of a single major text in the company of ephemeral or sub-literary short poems used as padding. His small quartos, emulating manuscript booklet production, were designed to be collected one by one, a cheap way of buying a book in instalments, and into these he incorporated lyrics, especially the minor poems of Chaucer and Lydgate.\textsuperscript{69} The reproduction of lyrics in new contexts, in this way, became common.\textsuperscript{70} De Worde continued Caxton’s activities of collecting items together with reprints of and additions to his material.\textsuperscript{71} However, many prejudices hampered the circulation of lyric verse in printed form. Often there was an absence of a strong manuscript tradition as a production and reception model; print held a stigma for some individuals due to its commercial and democratic nature; lyrics, especially love lyrics, were often regarded as immature and not intellectually serious or as morally suspect; lyrics were also associated with privacy and as ephemeral artefacts associated with specific social occasions.\textsuperscript{72} Despite these general perceptions, verse publications became increasingly popular with the rise of print and works by individual authors were more often collected together and preserved.\textsuperscript{73}

\textsuperscript{68} Marotti, \textit{Manuscript, Print}, pp. 212-14, 217.

\textsuperscript{69} Boffey, \textit{‘Early Printers’}, pp. 13-16.

\textsuperscript{70} \textit{Ibid.}, pp. 11-26. For example, religious lyrics appear in the English translation of Deguileville’s \textit{Pylgremage of the Sowle}, printed in 1483; there are other verses in Trevisa’s translation of the \textit{Polychronicon}, and in the Brut-based \textit{Cronicles of Englond}; and there are a whole series of verse epitaphs and other lyric snippets in Fabyan’s \textit{New cronicles of Englaunde and Fraunce} (Pynson 1516).

\textsuperscript{71} \textit{Ibid.}, p. 16.


Tottel's Miscellany demonstrates the conventional development of the miscellany form from manuscript to print. It builds upon fifteenth-century interest in bringing together works by single authors, and the delight in grouping together lyrics which perhaps exist only ephemerally elsewhere. It draws upon the early printing tradition of preserving lyrics alongside other items. Additionally Tottel recognised that the value of his collection could be enhanced if its contents were associated with a figure of rank and courtliness.\(^7\) As I discussed in Chapter Two, and further below, Skelton took pains to ensure that he was identified as the author of The Garland of Laurel through woodcuts, content and layout of the text, and he took a personal interest in the notion of a single-author collection and in the preservation of his lyrics in the text. The position of the poem in Marshe’s collection *Pithy pleasautnt and profitable workes*, and the existence of that collection, also responds to the demand for collections of single authors’ works, locates the author within a literary tradition, and appeals to audiences aware of his reputation. Marshe’s collection is unlike that of Tottel, focusing on the works of Skelton alone, but both men seem to have been driven by similar concerns, to please an audience and appeal to them through advertising a name of repute, to sell texts and to respond to popular traditions of publication.

To illustrate the development and diversity of miscellany in print in the sixteenth century, however, it is more interesting to consider the works of George Gascoigne. Gascoigne had a reputation as the foremost poet of his generation and was a precursor of the great Elizabethan poets. He was quickly eclipsed by Sidney and Spenser but is still praised for the variety of his works and the many different genres he adopted.\(^7\) He wrote what is considered by some to be the first critical treatise on English poetry, *Certayne Notes of Instruction concerning the Making of Verse* and was the only poet to make significant use of the sonnet between Surrey and Spenser.\(^7\)

Gascoigne (c.1534–76) was the eldest of three children born to John Gascoigne (1510–68) of Cardington, Bedforshire. His father held several distinguished positions in the

\(^7\) Marotti, *Manuscript, Print*, p. 216.


counties and at court and his grandfather had been connected with the households of Henry VIII, Anne Boleyn and Wolsey. Unlike his predecessors he squandered his fortune, quarrelled with his relatives, married bigamously, was imprisoned for debt and for most of his life was involved in personal legal disputes of various kinds. It is believed that he spent his childhood in Yorkshire with his mother’s relatives. He claims to have attended Cambridge, although there is no supporting evidence, and was admitted to Gray’s Inn in 1555. He represented Bedford in Parliament in 1558 and 1559 and served as an almoner in place of his father at the coronation of Elizabeth I.

After studying law he ruined himself financially while trying to make his way at the English and Valois courts. In 1561 he married a wealthy widow who had already remarried, and the matter led to involvement in many legal disputes. In the following year he leased a manor and experimented with farming, also being in the employment of the Countess of Bedford. Following this, after a period of imprisonment for debt, he escaped creditors and sought to repair his fortune by joining Sir Humphrey Gilbert’s expedition to the Netherlands. He was involved on a second expedition, was at some point made a captain and wrote several accounts of the expeditions.

Gascoigne sought royal patronage his whole life, especially in his last years, and died within a year of attaining it. In 1575, employed by the Earl of Leicester, he wrote entertainments for the Queen’s visit to Kenilworth and appeared to her dressed as a savage man, appealing directly for her patronage. He also received patronage from other nobles such as Lord Grey of Wilton and Viscount Montague. He used print as a primary means in his assiduous quest for preferment, publishing most of his works between 1573 and his death in 1576, although some of his writings date from the early 1560s. Failure on a grand scale followed his attempts to publish collections of his

79 Ibid., p. xxv.
80 Ibid., p. xxvi.
81 Ibid., pp. xxvii-xxxviii.
82 Ibid., p. xxiv.
works. Just as Skelton's scurrilous reputation seems to have affected the willingness of printers to print his works, so Gascoigne's bad reputation led to the unfavourable reception of his first collection, *STC 11635, A Hundreth sundrie Flowres bounde vp in one small Poesie. (Gathered partly by translation) in the fyne outlandish Gardins of Euripides, Ouid, Petrarke, Ariosto, and others: and partly by invention, out of our owne fruitefull Orchardes in Englannde: Yelding sundrie sweete sauours of Tragical, Comical and Morall Discourses, bothe pleaasaut and profitable to the well smellyng noses of learned Readers. Meritum petere, graue. AT LONDON, Imprinted for Richarde Smith.*

Composed much later than Tottel's *Miscellany*, Gascoigne's collection clearly demonstrates interesting developments in the form of miscellany and in authors' attitudes towards miscellany. The collection appears to be of the same order as Tottel's *Songes and Sonettes*, presented as works by diverse gentlemen, gathered together without patent moral intent. In fact it is really the work of one author, a pseudo-miscellany, and when it was reprinted in 1575, as a different work, the pretence of multiple authors was dropped. While the first resembles a miscellany, the second appears as a critical collection. The 1573 version briefly defends potentially immoral literature as providing examples of behaviour one ought to avoid, but it does not take this as the organising principle, which it becomes in the 1575 edition. Despite the assertions made in the prefatory material of the 1573 text the collection was branded as lascivious, offensive and was thought to have been 'written to the scandalizing of some worthie personages'.

*A Hundreth Sundrie Flowres* includes a title page and an address from the printer to the reader written by Gascoigne; two plays, a piece of fiction, several works in verse, and one long poem. Excluding the plays, the works number one hundred, as the title

---

85 Pigman, ed., *'Hundreth Sundrie Flowres*', pp. xxviii-xxxviii, xlvi-lx. Gascoigne adopted the stance of a 'reformed prodigal' when he reissued the collection as the *Poesies*, in 1575.
86 Prouty, ed., *Gascoigne's *A Hundreth*'*, p. 9. Prouty claims that this has 'led to the unwarrantable assumption that *A Hundreth Sundrie Flowres* is an anthology'.
88 Pigman, ed., *'Hundreth Sundrie Flowres'*, p. xxxviii
89 Prouty, ed., *Gascoigne's *A Hundreth*'*, pp. 11, 17-19. Prouty argues, on the basis of text order and pagination, that Gascoigne never meant these two plays to be published in this volume. He suggests that the printer was responsible for their last minute inclusion, hoping for more profit, and that the volume is divided into two parts, marked by the letters from the printer to the reader.
suggests. The first play, *Supposes: A Comedie written in the Italian tongue by Ariosto, and Englished by George Gascoigne of Grayes Inne Esquire, and there presented 1566*, is the first Italian style comedy in English and a free translation of Ariosto's *I Suppositi*. The second play is *Jocasta: A Tragedie written in Greke by Euripides, translated and digested into Acte by George Gascoigne, and Francis Kinwelmershe of Grayes Inne, and there by them presented. 1566*, the earliest version of a Greek tragedy in English. These are followed by *A Discourse of the Adventures passed by Master F.J.*, misleadingly called the first English novel, but for many the finest example of early Elizabethan fiction, a prose work including letters and verses. Seventy-seven miscellaneous verses follow this, under the title of *The Devises of Sundrie Gentlemen*, and finally there is a long poem about the history and adventures of *Dan Bartholmew of Bathe*.

The miscellaneous verses include translations; occasional poems; poems to friends, ladies and mistresses; elegies; appeals; characterisations and observations; sonnets; complaints; riddles; poems written in praise, scorn and fear. Following these are poem's entitled as being by Gascoigne: ‘Gascoigne’s Anatomy’, his ‘araignement’, his praises of ladies, his ‘passion’, his ‘libell of Divorce’, ‘praise of his mystres’, ‘Lullabie’, and ‘Recantation’. The collection also includes responses to themes provided by others; ‘on a good morow’, ‘on a good nyghte’; ‘De profundis’; a translation of Psalm 130; ‘councell to Douglass Dive’; ‘counsell given to [...] Bartholmew Withipoll’; ‘Epitaph uppon capitane Bourcher’; ‘devise of a maske’ (for the Montagu/Dormer double marriage, one of the earliest extant masques, includes an account of the siege of Famagusta and the battle of Lepanto); on hunting; on gardening; and an account of his voyage into Holland written to the ‘rygte honourable the Lorde Grey of Wilton’. The variety of metrical and rhyme patterns in *A Hundreth Sundrie Flowres* demonstrates

---


91 Pigman, ed., *‘A Hundreth Sundrie Flowres’*, pp. xxiii, xxiv. The two plays are the only works by Gascoigne to appear in manuscript and it is doubted that his works circulated extensively in this form. The manuscript is London, British Library, MS Add. 34063, dated 1568.

92 Marotti, *Manuscript, Print*, pp. 220-2. The *Adventures of Master F. J.* alone contains fourteen poems and the narrator carefully defines their circumstances of composition and transmission. Taken together these poems constitute an anthology of genres in various plain and aureate styles. They include pieces composed to music, sonnets, ballads, complaints and blazons, translations, imitations and adaptations. These are contained within a narrative, a fictional frame, ‘through which Gascoigne has replicated the circumstances of the production, transmission and preservation or collection of social verse, calling attention to the social and biographical circumstances in which lyrics were typically written.’ See my discussions below and in Chapter Six.
Gascoigne’s delight in the technical possibilities of English verse. Their sequential nature (some in chronological order, charting his affairs or the progress of his works) and the use of pseudonyms, or ‘posies’, has received much critical attention.

In 1575 Gascoigne attempted to re-launch the collection and re-titled it, adding new prefatory letters. Despite his adoption of a reformed stance and the inclusion of woodcuts of Elizabeth I, this anthology was also confiscated, and Gascoigne’s clear attempts and desire to attract a courtly audience, both through content and presentation, went ignored. This retitled work is STC 11636, The Poesies of George Gascoigne Esquire. Corrected, perfected, and augmented by the Authour. 1575. Tam Marti, quam Mercurio. IMPRINTED AT London by H. Bynneman for Richard Smith. These Bookes are to be solde at the Northwest dore of Paules Church.

In addition to the new overall title Gascoigne also changed some of the titles to works within the collection, altering the way they might be read. He also reorganised the contents of the collection under a guiding principle of moral instruction.

The 1575 text is almost a quarter longer than the earlier text and includes additional material, three prefatory letters, twenty commendations with Gascoigne’s two responses to them, ‘The fruite of Fetters’, a sequence of six poems amounting to 538 lines, ‘The fruities of Warre, 1481 lines long and the longest poem Gascoigne ever wrote, a third ‘triumph’, and the conclusion of ‘Dan Bartholmew of Bathe’, and ‘Certayne notes of Instruction concerning the making of verse or ryme in English. It omits three poems from the 1573 edition as well as the original prefatory matter. Otherwise the text appears substantially the same, barely revised or improved.

Despite appearances, the texts of 1573 and 1575 are significantly different and not just two editions of the same book. Gascoigne’s earlier work demonstrates an author collecting together his own works in a way which emulates a miscellany. He produces a sham miscellany which hangs on the miscellany form, a collection of his own works under the cover of being works by multiple authors. The organising principle at work

---

96 Ibid., p. xlvii.
97 Ibid., pp. i-liv.
behind the later text, and Gascoigne’s reformed stance, addresses the audience in an entirely different mode and dispels the notion of there being more than one author.

The motivation behind the production of the 1573 text indicates a variety of interesting authorial ideas about the significance and popularity of miscellany in the sixteenth century. Gascoigne’s emulation of the miscellany form in his early text is perhaps similar to the way in which Skelton produces *The Garland of Laurel*, a long poem which emulates the form of miscellany in its structure and content. Both poets seem to respond to the popularity of the form, seeking a particular kind of audience for their works. Indeed, Prouty suggests that Gascoigne played upon the fashion for particular kinds of text. With regard to the sonnet, he suggests that Gascoigne recognised its potential ‘to mollify a stony heart’ or ‘bring the reversion of an office,’ and that ‘a poem written for a powerful friend might also bring a reward’. He concludes by saying that ‘it is as a record of such a view of literature that we should regard *A Hundreth Sundrie Flowres*’ and that it is ‘the best of that genre’.

While Prouty sees Gascoigne’s collection as continuing and developing Tottel’s traditions of collecting and presentation, he fails to identify important differences between Gascoigne and his predecessors. Skelton, as I consider further below, for example, seeks to emphasise himself as a single author. He is proud and self-aggrandizing. He flaunts his technical virtuosity in creating a work which emulates a miscellany, something elsewhere produced by many authors. Tottel too is visibly proud of his achievement. Unlike them, Gascoigne wishes to conceal his sole responsibility for the works contained within his miscellany. He produces works which he attributes to other men. He deliberately seeks anonymity through the complex structure of miscellany. The self-deluding, self-aggrandizing pride, which is recognised by critics as characterising Gascoigne’s work, and bringing about his downfall, appears to be quite different from that poetical self-representation which characterises Skelton’s works.

Gascoigne has been compared to Skelton in other respects. For example, Samuel A. Tannenbaum considered that ‘as a satirist of the vices and corruptions of the clergy and

---

99 Wallace, ed., *Gascoigne’s ‘The Steele’*, p. 32. Wallace considers Skelton to be the only satirist between Langland and Gascoigne to focus on these characteristics.
the ruling class he brought upon himself the wrath and abuse of those who benefited from the vicious exploitation of the masses',
and Wallace considered that, while Gascoigne was not drawn to Skeltonian invective, Skelton's development in Colin Clout of Langland's technique of accumulation, repetition and parallel structuring of verse lines anticipated Gascoigne's satire in The Steele Glas.
While self-representation and reception of the poets has differed, the work of both Skelton and Gascoigne has evidently been influenced by the compilation practices and interests of early fifteenth-century compilers and collectors, especially with regard to lyrics. Additionally both poets seem to have been fully aware of poetic and generic variety and were keen to experiment with it in their work.

Like Skelton and Gascoigne, other sixteenth-century writers revealed a concern for self-representation. Erasmus, Lily and More, for example, produced single-author collections and were active in their quest for patronage and preferment, experimenting with genre and publication media. For example, Erasmus wrote and published his Prosopopoeia Britanniae for Prince Henry (1499). A presentation copy exists which looks exactly like a contemporary collection of poetry, illustrating how he built a reputation and attracted patronage. Similarly, William Lily's poetry was published in a collected edition, and Thomas More's collection, Epigrammata (1518), was printed in Basle and quickly became a collection within a collection when a single volume edition was published, including Utopia and Epigrammata Des Erasmi Roterdami. Bernard Andre, 1509-17, also published his work as collections, selections and compilations. These practices emulated earlier practices of collation and publication and illustrate the continuing acceptability and popularity of miscellany. They also illustrate the use of manuscript compilation, preservation and circulation as a model for the production of later texts. Skelton was not alone in his emulation of the form of miscellany and pre-empted some of the activities of these authors, collectors and compilers.

103 Ibid., pp. 87-9.
104 Ibid., pp. 137-8.
105 Ibid., pp. 60-81.
106 Ibid., pp. 95, 138, 142-63.
iv. The Popularity of Miscellany

Manuscript miscellany was both distinctive and varied. The texts described above illustrate some of its diversity and its development in print. For example, in manuscript the personal miscellany differed from the professional collection, and was in turn different from metropolitan collections. Miscellanies were kept by a variety of people, by those connected with the universities, the Inns of Court, the court, city traders and the household or family. Medieval collections were commonly associated with religious establishments and the households of provincial gentry.

Both Fairfax 16 and Rawlinson C.813, described above, have clear associations with particular families and the court. Their material form and known history reveal a clear narrative of their production and reception and the traditions of textual preservation and circulation. While distinct from each other in content and layout, both make evident the widespread popularity of miscellany through the later middle ages, and reveal some defining characteristics of the form. The evidence for textual production and reception which survives in them emphasises how different they are from Cotton Vitellius E.x. There is no evidence in Cotton Vitellius E.x. to prove that the items contained within it came from earlier medieval collections. This has been destroyed by the Ashburnham House fire and by the activities of Cotton and later librarians. Cotton Vitellius E.x. lacks the hand of a single compiler and comparison with Fairfax 16 and Rawlinson C.813 emphasises its uniqueness.

In this chapter, particular attention has been given to the grouping together of lyrics in the collections described above. Printers particularly exploited such works for economic profit. Lyrics were often used as fillers in miscellanies due to their ephemeral nature and the flexibility of the form. However, single lyrics or sets of lyrics, frequently occasional pieces, can form collections within a miscellany, ‘best viewed first within the social context which shaped them and the system through which they were originally produced, circulated, altered, collected and preserved’. Printed collections,

108 Ibid., pp. 2, 13. Marotti argues that Renaissance manuscripts should be thought of as collections of smaller groupings of poems or other materials, rather than treated as textual units.
as well as manuscript miscellany, may have been important precedents, contexts and models for the production and reception of Skelton's poems and may have had a lasting impact on his perceptions of miscellany.

Lyrics are indicators of specific social practices and provide an insight into the contexts of miscellany production and the shared interests and activities of their readers and compilers. In this respect, the lyrics in The Garland of Laurel become a focus for Chapter Six of this thesis which explores the significance of their presence in the poem in terms of patronage. However, a consideration of the lyrics is also of interest in this chapter and contributes to the argument that Skelton was influenced by the popularity and form of miscellany. A consideration of the lyrics becomes part of the discussion below about the ways in which Skelton's poem is miscellaneous.

B. The Garland of Laurel's Miscellaneity and Narrative Unity

The Garland of Laurel's compositional structure is not unlike the exuberant and polyglot nature of manuscript miscellany. This is perhaps one reason why Skelton's works were attractive to compilers and readers of miscellanies. Its varied stages of composition illustrate an amalgamation of different kinds of material, written in different periods and slowly collected together, something which is characteristic of miscellany. The author was, either consciously or unconsciously, influenced by the techniques of miscellany and freely added to, altered and omitted sections from his poem over a long period of time while it was in different states of publication.

Skelton's innovation and adaptation of the form of miscellany becomes clear to us in a consideration of The Garland of Laurel. Its miscellaneity can not be accounted for by different moments of composition alone. For example, a consideration of its narrative

---

109 Marotti, Manuscript, Print. pp. 2, 7, 9, 30, 42.

110 I refer the reader to the discussion in Chapter One, C. ii. An interesting comparison may be drawn with Piers Plowman which also continued to grow in different states of publication over a long period of time, although it has much less variation of register, and was the product of a single author, as was The Garland of Laurel.
and metric diversity shows that several sections incorporated into the poem are, on the surface level, not unified by virtue of their subject matter, form, metre, language and genre. Skelton responds to and explores the physical form of manuscript miscellany by emulating the approach to the varied structure, content and layout of items found in a traditional manuscript miscellany.

*The Garland of Laurel*’s narrative content also demonstrates unanticipated connections and relationships which influence our readings and understanding of the poem. Sections have a knock-on-effect, drawing attention to poetic intention and authorship, and they enhance the antithesis of the real and imagined worlds of the poem. These cumulative sections and ideas have interesting implications for our perceptions of this poem and display the same kind of spontaneous relationships which can be found between items in manuscript miscellanies.

While Skelton’s poem seems to have close affiliations with the techniques and practices of manuscript miscellany, it is unlike manuscript miscellany in that narrative and thematic unity are sustained throughout the poem, beneath its disturbing surface. This suggests that Skelton was adapting the form for his own purpose. Firstly, in this section, I consider those sections of the poem which appear to be miscellaneous or separable from the narrative whole, according to the criteria outlined above. Secondly I consider how interpretations of these miscellaneous elements of the poem work together to generate the meaning of the poem. I consider both the diversity of the poem’s subject matter and its overarching unity as a poetic work. I reflect upon how and why Skelton was influenced by miscellany.

### i. Miscellaneity

The eleven lyrics grouped together within the narrative of *The Garland of Laurel* (ll. 836-1085), form a section of separable material which has received particular attention because of its independence from the narrative whole. The lyrics are a clear example of the poem’s miscellaneity and an example of how manuscript miscellany may have

---

111 This is a feature of Skelton’s work more generally and in my conclusion I make larger claims for the influence of miscellany.

influenced the text.\textsuperscript{113} The lyrics are a special case, illustrating the idea of miscellany at work on different levels in this text; they are not only distinguishable from one another by their individual metres and presentation in the texts, but are also separable from the dream narrative of the poem as a group and directly address the ladies of the Howard household.\textsuperscript{114}

In the manuscript the lyrics are at the end of the version of the poem, whereas in the printed texts they are followed by further stanzas of the poem. In the manuscript each has its own folio, recto or verso, and is centred on the page. In the printed texts the lyrics still retain their independence and prestige, although they become less elaborate. It is significant that Skelton’s lyrics survive in both the manuscript and printed forms of the poem and it is possible that Skelton himself ‘authorised’ them in a special way, instigating their print and manuscript transmission during his lifetime.\textsuperscript{115} Such a view has implications for understanding both the audiences and authorship of these poems and suggests that Skelton understood the shifting literary relationships of the late fifteenth century and recognised the possibilities print provided and the differences to preservation and dissemination that it made.\textsuperscript{116}

\textsuperscript{113} J. Boffey, “‘Withdrawe your hande’: The Lyrics of “The Garland of Laurel” from Manuscript to Print’, \textit{Trivium}, 31 (1999), 73-85, pp. 80-3. Boffey firmly locates the recording and composition of the lyrics in manuscript culture. She suggests that a household or family book, where items of particular significance for a group of related readers are collected together, is a likely kind of manuscript for these lyrics to have been in. She draws analogies with several other manuscript collections. See also D. R. Carlson, ‘Appendix 1: The Stages of the Composition of the “Garland of Laurel”’, \textit{Studies in Philology}, 88 (1991), 102-9, (pp. 103-4).

\textsuperscript{114} This small group of lyrics is significant because in English miscellanies lyrics were not often preserved together, whereas long works survive relatively well. I refer the reader to the discussion above in this chapter. This was different from the attitude in France, where printers frequently gathered together large numbers of short poems for collection in miscellanies or collected together works which belonged solely to one author, perhaps drawing on precedents like Machaut’s work in manuscript. Significantly, in French manuscripts, lyrics were incorporated into long narrative structures, which were often dream poems. These lyrics either pre-existed or were later incorporated into the narrative. See Chapter Five below and M. B. McC. Boulton, \textit{The Song in the Story: Lyric Insertions in French Narrative Fiction 1200–1400} (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1993), Introduction and Chapter Six and L. Earp, \textit{Guillaume Machaut: A Guide to Research} (New York and London: Garland, 1995), pp. 77-97, 237-241.

\textsuperscript{115} Carlson, ‘Skelton and Barclay’, pp. 1-17. Most critics assume that because there is evidence for only a small portion of Skelton’s works printed during his lifetime that Skelton was uninterested in using print. Carlson claims that there is no evidence that Skelton co-operated with printers, in the case of most of his works, and that they came by his literary property indirectly and exploited the writer’s name without his knowledge. However Carlson claims that \textit{The Garland of Laurel} is an exception and that it was printed ‘at least with Skelton’s co-operation, if not at his behest’. Carlson notes that this kind of co-operation between printer and living writer was exceptional in Skelton’s case but was the rule for relations between Pynson and Barclay.

\textsuperscript{116} Boffey, “‘Withdrawe your hande’”, pp. 83-5.
Each lyric retains its individual status through its use of a heading and large initial which addresses the lady in question. Each one is also separated spatially and they are of varied metre, style, and tone, those to the most important ladies in rhyme royal, others in skeltonics. Each one represents the lady in miniature, for example:

To my Lady Anne Dakers of the Sowth

Zeuxes, that enpicturid fare Elene the queene,
You to devyse his crafte were to seke;
And if Apelles your coutenaunce had sene,
Of porturature which was the famous Greke,
He coude not devyse the lest poyn of your cheke;
Princes of yowth, and flowre of goodly porte,
Vertu, connyng, solace, pleasure, conforte.

Paregall in honour unto Penolope,
That for her trowth is in remembraunce had;
Fayre Dianira surmowntyng in bewte;
Demure Diana womanly and sad,
Whos lusty lokis make hevy hartis glad;
Princes of youth, and flowre of goodly porte,
Vertu, connyng, solace, pleasure, conforte.

To mastres Margery Wentworthe

With margerain jentyll,
The flowre of goodlyhede,
Enbrowdered the mantill
Is of your maydenhede.

Plainly, I can not glose,
Ye be, as I devyne,
The praty primrose,
The goodly columbyne.

With margerain jantill,
The flowre of goodlyhede,
Enbrawderid the mantill
Is of yowre maydenhede.

Benynge, corteise, and meke,
With wordes well devysid;
In you, who list to seke,
Be vertus well comprysid.

With margerain jantill,
The flowre of goodlyhede,
Enbrawlerid the mantill
Is of yowr maydenhede.
Grouped together, and inserted seamlessly into the narrative structure, the lyrics emulate a miscellany which contains groups of lyrics. Additionally, manuscripts often indicate the imagined or real circumstances of the production of such lyrics through their use of titles, also seen above. When lyrics were committed to print, titles or introductory material of some kind were necessary if readers were to perceive a connection to an actual social world, or to a traditional fictional or invented context or world. The use of titles to distinguish lyrics inserted into texts is a technique later used by Tottel and signals the recoding of social verse as literary texts in the print medium. Titles, in manuscript and print anthologies, provide ‘biographical and explanatory/interpretative comments framing individual lyrics cut off from their enabling social conditions’. Narrative prose also performs ‘a similar contextualising function’. 117

Skelton clearly chose to preserve these lyrics as a set, despite their differences in both metre and tone, and his narrative provides an occasion for their performance. It is interesting that when he reflects later in the poem upon the whole of his life’s work, and

creates a list as a record, that he does not mention these lyrics as individual works. Neither does he mention his collections of lyrics, *Agaynst a Comely Coystrowne* and *Diverse Balletys & Dytties Solacyous*, despite the fact that both collections are recognisably distinct with different themes.\(^{118}\) While wishing to preserve his lyrics it appears that Skelton attributed little importance to them as separable units, despite recognising their inherent adaptability to different contexts and perhaps the importance attached to lyrics elsewhere in the late fifteenth-century manuscript and print context. The fact that *The Garland of Laurel* itself appears in no collections before Marshe’s mid-sixteenth-century *Pithy pleasantaunt and profitable workes* could suggest that it was viewed as sufficiently miscellaneous, or hybrid, that it was not necessary to include it in a collection in order to sell it, or perhaps that it was not easy to assimilate into a collection because of its length and variety.

The list of Skelton’s works is another section of verse which appears to have been incorporated into the main narrative structure of the poem. It could also have been composed separately from the narrative at an earlier or later date. It is generically distinct from the lyrics above and easily separable from the poem’s narrative core. The list, 333 lines long (ll. 1169-1502), is read out from what is described as a decorative manuscript book, by the figure of Occupacyoun, and is an important focus for the meaning of the poem. When the book is banged shut the noise awakens the poet/dreamer, a traditional dream poem device.

With that, of the boke losende were the claspis,
The margent was illumynid all wit golden railles
And byse, enpicturid with gressoppes and waspis,
With butterflyis and fresshe pecoke taylis,
Enflorid with flowris ad slymy snaylis,
Envyvid picturis well towchid and quikly
 [...] 

*Occupacyoun redith and expoundyth sum parte o f Skeltons bokes and baladis with ditis o f plesure, in as moche as it were to longe a proces to reherse all by name that he hath compylyd, &c.*

*Of your oratour and poete laureate
Of Englande, his workis here they begynne:
In primis the Boke of Honorous Astate;*

Item the Boke how Men shulde Fle Synne;
Item Royall Demenaunce Worshyp to Wynne;
Item the Boke to Speke Well or be Styll;
Item to Lerne You to Dye When ye Wyll;

Of Vertu also the soverayne enterlude;
The Boke of the Rosiar; Prince Arturis Creacyoun;
The False Fayth that Now Goth, which dayly is renude;
Item his Diologgis of Ymagynacyoun;
Item Automedon of Loves Meditacyoun;
Item New Gramer in Englysshe compylyd;
Item Bowche of Courte, where Drede is begyled;  (ll. 1156-1183)

The passage is distinctly autobiographical and records Skelton's works in order that he might be found worthy as a poet. It forms the outline of a miniature miscellany of genre and form in Skelton's works, which is cleverly contained within the larger miscellaneous whole of *The Garland of Laurel*. Lists appear in other medieval poems, such as *The Legend of Good Women*, and Chaucer's *Retraction*, but Skelton's list plays upon the idea of a single-author collection as well as upon the idea of miscellany, in which disparate works are collected together. Skelton uses the list and manipulates a tradition in order to focus attention upon himself as an author, a figure unifying many disparate works.

The theme of Skelton's fame and reputation is also enhanced by a long passage which occurs earlier in the narrative scheme. Again, this is distinguishable by its layout and metre from the narrative whole, taking the form of a catalogue with a recognisable refrain after eight of the stanzas, which turns the description into a drinking song to Bacchus, and characterises the activities of these poets.

But blessyd Bachus, that bote is of all bale,
Of clusters engrosyd with his ruddy flotis
Theis orators and poetis refresshid there throtis.

Plutarke and Petrarke, two famous clarkis;
Lucilius and Valerius Maximus by name;
With Vincencius in Speculo, that wrote noble warkis;
Propercius and Pisandros, poeti of noble fame;
But blissed Bachus, that mastris oft doth frame,
Of clusters engrosed with his ruddy flotis
Theis notable poetis refresshid there throtis.

---

119 In turn this list of collected works is contained within a miscellaneous manuscript, within Faques's *Tratyse* and as the first item in Marshē's *Pithy pleasaut and profytable workes*, which also represents the text of *The Garland of Laurel* as part of the corpus of Skelton's own works.
And as I thus sadly amonge them avysid,
I saw Gower, that first garnishshed our Englysshe rude,
And maister Chaucer, that nobly enterprysyd
How that our Englysshe myght fresshely be ennewed;
The monk of Bury then after them ensuyd,
Dane Johnn Lydgate. Theis Englysshe poetis thre,
As I ymagenyd, repayrid unto me, (II. 376-392)

The catalogue is followed by conversations between Skelton and Gower, Chaucer and Lydgate. Poets who have worn the laurel are called upon to help judge Skelton's poetic capacities and guide him. Like the lyrics, these sections are also defined by headings in the text and by their grouping and alternation of stanzas.

The sections described above illustrate the miscellaneity of the text’s subject matter, metres and layout, but Skelton’s poem is also miscellaneous in its use of multiple languages, multiple voices or personas, diverse genres, and thematic matter. Skelton uses French, English and Latin in his poem but also shows an awareness of language at a local level. At the end of his poem, for example, Skelton exhibits his multilingual talents most clearly. Skelton's awakening from the dream is followed by two lines of Latin, ‘Mens tibi sit consulta, petis? Sic consule menti; / Emula sit Jani, retro speculetur et ante’ (ll. 1519-20), which can be translated as ‘Do you wish your mind to be skilful? In that case pay attention to your mind; / let it be like that of Janus which looks back and forward’. Then Skelton addresses his book, the poem The Garland of Laurel, as if focused once again on its importance by the vision of Janus, first in twelve lines of Latin, then in English and then in French, finally ending again in English (ll. 1521-32; 1533-86; 1587-93; 1594-1602). Switching between Latin and English, these passages celebrate Skelton as another Adonis and Homer, and exalt the English language.

Skeltonis alloquitur librum suum

Ite, Britamorum lux O radiosa, Britannum
Carmina nostra pium vestrum celebrate Catullum!
Dicite, Skeltonis vester Adonis erat;
Dicite, Skeltonis vester Homerus erat.
Barbara cum Latio pariter jam currite versu.121 (ll. 1521-1525)

121 Ibid., Scattergood’s translation is: ‘Skelton speaks to his book. Go, shining light of the Britons, and celebrate, our songs, your worthy British Catullus! Say, Skelton was your Adonis; say Skelton was your Homer. Though barbarous, you now compete in an equal race with Latin verse.’
These parallel but separable passages are not direct translations of each other but their sense and tone are the same. The epic status of poetry is commended and it is acknowledged that, despite continuing criticism, the status of English verse is now as great as that of Latin.

Go, litill quaire,  
Demene you faire.  
Take no dispare,  
Though I you writre  
After this rate  
In Englysshe letter.  
 So moche the better  
Welcome shall ye  
To sum men be;  
For Latin warkis  
Be good for clerkis  

(II. 1533-1543)

Skelton reveals that he hopes that his work will be respected by learned men, that his reputation will grow and that the poem will be preserved. Then, in Latin and a little English, he commands his book to bow down, worship and praise king Henry VIII and his cardinal, Wolsey, begging them to remember a prebend that he, the writer, has been promised, and, following on from this, an Admonet is issued which warns every tree, and many different types are listed, that it must give place to the Laurel (II. 1-14).

Finally, three versions of the conventional ‘abuses of the age’ are attached, in French, Latin and English. These lines bear little relation to the rest of the poem but are followed by the final conclusion of the poem, ‘Here endeth a ryght delectable tratyse upon a goodly Garlonde or Chapelet of Laurell, dyvysed by Mayster Skelton, Poete Laureaf. The endings mentioned above are short sections tagged onto each other, strongly miscellaneous in their language, subject matter, form and application. Their use varies from version to version of the poem. Only Marshe’s version of the poem, for example, contains the address to Wolsey and the king which according to Scattergood marks a sudden shift in Skelton’s attitude towards the cardinal. This may have been added by the printer, at a later date, or may have been Skelton’s own addition to the poem towards the end of his career. It is possible that some additions may not be Skelton’s own. In Scattergood’s most recent edition of the poem they are all included together but in other versions of the poem they are separated. The passages are thematically, if not linguistically related, and they form separate and easily extractable portions of verse.
Elizabeth Archibald calls Skelton’s use of multiple languages ‘a purposeful corruption of language’ and sees it as arising from the linguistic conflict at the end of the fifteenth century. The late fifteenth-century audience was eager for texts in multiple languages and in Skelton’s writing the variety of registers and appeals of language are important. Skelton often uses Latin to address his audience, to talk about his own authorship and authorial status, and to discuss textual reception. Linguistic registers, notably the informal, the formal, and the courtly, create a range of poetic effects which reveal Skelton’s attitudes towards, and relationships with, his audience, printers, patrons, king and contemporary writers. Clearly he expected some of his readers to be able to understand Latin and French, as well as English. These attitudes are complemented by the diversity of his metrics.

Skeltonics perhaps appealed most to a large and common audience while rhyme royal would have been intended to appeal to a more élite and courtly audience. This awareness of distinctions in his audience may have led Skelton to incorporate into his text the titles and headings which highlight important people and events in the poem, and basic information such as the name of the printer and writer of the text. The mixture of varied forms, metres and languages which Skelton uses in his poem is similar to the variety of material and subject matter found in miscellanies and may have appealed to the type of audience which enjoyed reading miscellany. This perhaps suggests that those critics who have attributed such oddities of versification to Skelton’s innovative flair, and to his being on the cusp between manuscript and print mediums, credit him with a little too much dynamic energy and brilliance. Quite possibly this was all acceptable and conventional to readers of miscellanies and an integral part of Skelton’s poetic productivity.

Another example of the miscellaneity in The Garland of Laurel, and another point of comparison with Piers Plowman, is Skelton’s use of multiple voices. Within the poem Skelton’s own voice can be heard in different forms. He expresses himself in a voice which we are meant to believe is that of the real Skelton, in the first person, which narrates the events of the dream and his state before and after the dream (ll. 1-49). Also present is the voice of the dreamer, Skelton’s second persona, which experiences first hand, speaking

to other figures within the dream (ll. 246-413). At the end of the poem Skelton addresses his book and sends it out to make its own reputation among the people of England and to celebrate himself as another Adonis (ll. 1587-93).

Equally importantly, within the poem, the voices of Fame and Pallas can be heard arguing about whether or not Skelton is worthy of a place in Fame’s palace (ll. 50-231); Skelton’s conversations with Gower, Chaucer and Lydgate contribute to our perceptions of Skelton as a poet of worth (ll. 400-41); Occupacyoun’s conversations with Skelton, her advice and guidance (ll. 533-60, 707-65, 808-21), and her final reading out of the list of Skelton’s works (ll. 1170-1511), illustrate the extent of Skelton’s poetic activity and justify his quest for fame and good reputation. In addition to the emphasis such voices lend to Skelton’s reputation, during his search for fame Skelton also makes use of reported speech to illustrate the way in which Fame is assailed by people from all regions of England and from other countries (ll. 489-520), a technique which is much more typical of representations of Fame’s court, for example in Chaucer’s *House of Fame*:

> Frome Napuls, from Navern, and from Rouncevall,
> Some from Flaunders, sum from the se coste,
> Some from the mayne lande, some fro the Frensche hoste;
>
> With, ‘How doth the north?’ ‘What tydingis in the sowth?’
> ‘The west is wyndy.’ ‘The est is metely wele.’
> It is harde to tell of every mannes mouthe:
> ‘A slipper hole the taile is of an ele’
> And ‘He haltith often that hath a kyby hele.’

(ll. 495-502)

The shouts of poets applauding Skelton’s admission into Fame’s palace, ‘triumpha, triumpha!’ (l. 1506) are also reported. The only other voice to be heard within the poem is the voice of the Countess of Surrey who addresses her ladies and urges them to come forward to work on the embroidered circlet she is devising for Skelton, her ‘clerke’, who is worthy of their help (ll. 772-86). The text is dialogic and dialectic, involving an interaction through judgement, debate and argument. It appears to the reader as a performance which grows out of the characters and experiences created by the writer, who is always present in the text. Skelton meets and speaks with Gower, Chaucer and Lydgate; Occupacyoun converses with Skelton but also reads and expounds from her book of record; Fame and Pallas debate whether or not Skelton should be allowed to enter into the rolls of Fame and in doing so they invoke the poets of the past whose final cries applaud Skelton’s poetic

---

123 For further references, see D. Lawton, ‘Skelton’s Use of Persona’, *Essays in Criticism* 30 (1980), 9-30.
career. Past literary tradition is invoked and brought alive through the discussions these characters have, as if they are presented on a stage before us in another time.124

ii. Thematic Unity?
The examples given above clearly illustrate ways in which Skelton’s text is miscellaneous. However, despite their differences, the miscellaneous passages have a knock-on effect on each other, interlacing themes and ideas. They appear to be carefully planned and subtly interwoven and their diverse narrative and thematic threads work together to create a unified performance. The effect of miscellaneity in Skelton’s text is a sophisticated illusion.

Part of the experience for readers reading a ‘real’ miscellany is their discovery of such fortuitous relationships between items, such as those identified in Cotton Vitellius E.x. 125 In writing The Garland of Laurel, Skelton responds to the idea that there can be unplanned relationships between items in miscellanies which can be identified by a reader, and reading Skelton’s poem is not unlike the process of discovering thematic unity between different items in a manuscript miscellany. Skelton anticipates this response of the reader to the text and sets up relationships between the miscellaneous elements of his poem. On one level these deliberate, oblique relationships, diminish the apparent miscellaneous character of the poem but, on another, they respond to the way in which a miscellany might be received by a reader. These relationships are not fortuitous, even though they look as if they have come about by chance. Together the disparate elements create thematic progression in the poem, and a poem which seems to be full of miscellaneous elements becomes a unified and cohesive performance. They generate and confirm the meaning of the poem.

Detailed examination of his poem’s miscellaneous content, for example, brings to prominence the issue of authorship – the single, emphatic, controlling, dominant, authorial presence – which distinguishes this poem from dream poetry and miscellany

124 Skelton’s use of multiple voices is perhaps typical of long verse forms such as dream vision, dits amoureux or epic, which need and use theatricality in order to sustain interest. The next chapters discuss Skelton’s adaptation of genres in The Garland of Laurel.
proper. Awareness of the author himself is manifest. Skelton is a dramatic director and unites the miscellaneous elements on a single stage and creates a single performance. The idea of a performance is appropriate because *The Garland of Laurel*’s theatricality extends to the poem as a whole. *Magnyfycence* and *The Bowge of Courte* also display this kind of theatricality. Clever interweaving of diverse episodes is a characteristic of Skelton’s longer poems. He animates the different elements as if they were actors and co-ordinates the action from a vantage point. Through his theatricality Skelton reveals to us the spaces and distances between writer and audience. He reveals that there is a difference between the author figure and the dreamer of the poem in emphasising his real and imagined role as a poet. He shows that the author has to play multiple and highly significant roles in the production and dissemination of his text. Chapter Seven of this thesis focuses further upon the author.

The audience or reader is also manipulated by Skelton’s mastery of events. The poem’s miscellaneity is excused as the overall scheme becomes thematically evident, and it can be seen as a deliberate exercise of technical skill. The audience is further worked upon, asked to respond favourably to the subtle representation of the author, and sympathetically to his depiction of his own relationships with the public or patrons. The lyrics, for example, work alongside the list of Skelton’s works to create a picture of the types of works Skelton was producing and the audiences at which they were aimed. They provide a microcosm of poetic productivity and patronage in the context of a wider narrative about how fame may be, or has been, acquired and they mirror wider attitudes about books and the preservation of lyrics.

The biographical list is a substantial transitional passage between the dream narrative and Skelton’s sudden awakening to reality. In this respect it is important because it

---

126 In *Magnyfycence*, Skelton co-ordinates four groups of figures around the King, Felycye, Lyberte and Measure; Fansy and Counterfet Countenaunce, Crafty Conveyaunce and Cloked Colusyon, and Courtly Abusyon; Foly, Adversyte, Poverte, Dyspare, and Myschefe; Good Hope, Redresse, Cyrcumspeceyon and Perseveraunce. Each character enacts a particular role in this exploration of the proper use of wealth and power struggles at court. In a similar way, *The Bouge of Court* describes the figure of the poet, Drede, and stages the appearances of Favell the flatterer, Suspyceyon, Hervy Hafter the pickpocket, Disdayne, Ryote, Dyssymulation, and Discyte.

127 See my interpretation of the poem in Chapter Six; Boffey, “‘Withdrawe your hande’”, pp. 77-8. Boffey agrees that the lyrics are miniatures of Skelton’s entire oeuvre and that *The Garland* offers a subtle evocation of the circumstances and social relationships within which lyrics of this kind were produced or presented. She pinpoints the weaving of the laurel garment as part of a feminine discourse of reward and encouragement reciprocated through the lyrics by Skelton.
immediately highlights the ‘real’ significance of the events which have taken place in the dream, including the construction of *The Garland of Laurel* itself. It makes the connection between the dreamer Skelton and his search for Fame and the real Skelton whose reputation is confirmed by Occupacyoun’s list of books. It also highlights the nature of Skelton’s intended audience. For example, Occupacyoun’s record of Skelton’s works is read from a manuscript book, described above, a traditional and valuable repository of texts, and a means by which reputations were made and sustained. As shown above, manuscript miscellanies circulated among noble or courtly readers, as well as a London-based audience. The illuminated manuscript is an image which conveys Skelton’s dependence on these types of readers and methods of circulation, despite the availability of print.

Many of the works read out from Occupacyoun’s list, however, also reveal Skelton’s connections with a less wealthy audience, such as *Manerly Margery Maystres Mylke and Ale* (l. 1198); *The Tunnynge of Elinour Rummyng* (l. 1233); *The Balade of the Mustarde Tarte* (l. 1245); *The Gruntyng and the Groyninge of the Gronnyng Swyne*; and *The Murnyng of the Mapely Rote* (ll. 1376-77). Some of these entries are playful, but some are perhaps also tinged with an irony which reveals an awareness of the limitations of manuscript compilation and miscellany, especially with regard to more ephemeral items. Skelton was aware that extensive textual production and circulation increased and enhanced his poetic reputation, and the potential for the survival of his works, but despite this works were ‘lost’ from circulation, perhaps even during his lifetime. The image of the manuscript book highlights not only the methods but the difficulties of sustaining poetic reputation and activity. It shows the fragility of works and a concern for their survival and illustrates that the survival of poetry or prose works was uncertain and that their survival was closely linked to sustaining a reputation as a poet. The list and the lyrics together, therefore, provide the reader with an extensive picture of the contexts in which Skelton’s works were read or heard. The relationship between the list and lyrics produces a sense of the actual context in which the poem may have been produced and circulated. They provide different examples of poetic activity and publication, and both are reflexive about contexts for production.

---

128 Boffey, “‘Withdrawe your hande’”, pp. 84-5. Boffey recognises that differences if the format and layout of the lyrics relates to the differences between manuscript and print and that this has implications for the generation, recording and further circulation of texts. She points out that Skelton recognises and uses the possibilities print provides and the differences it makes to preservation and dissemination.
Implicitly, the list and lyrics also highlight the themes of fame, reputation, poetic worth and ability. This theme unites the two separately staged narrative episodes described above, the catalogue of poets (ll. 285-399) and Skelton’s conversations with Gower, Chaucer and Lydgate (ll. 400-41), with the conversations of the Queen of Fame and Dame Pallas (ll. 50-245). It reveals that the poem is carefully ordered from the beginning:

But, how it is, Skelton is wonder slake,
And, as we dare, we fynde in hym grete lake:

For, ne were onely he hath your promocyon,
Out of my bokis full sone I shulde hym rase;
But sith he hath tastid of the sugred pocioun
Of Elyconis well, refresshid with your grace,
And wyll not endeavour hymselfe to purchase
The favour of ladys with wordis electe,
It is sittyngye that ye must hym correct. (ll. 69-77)

The Queen of Fame has grave concerns about Skelton’s worthiness to be registered in the rolls of Fame and she focuses upon Skelton’s arrogant laziness. Unlike the ancient poets he fails him ‘selfe to embesy with [...] holl corage’, he doesn’t promote his works or attempt to justify his right to wear the laurel (ll. 65-8) and he passes his time in ‘slowthfull ydelnes’ (l. 120). Pallas defends Skelton, suggesting that he recognises that he must be careful what he writes. She remarks that if faults are looked for they will be found: ‘Beware, for wrytyng remayneth of recorde!’ and ‘Who wryteth wysely hath a grete treasure.’ Finally, in an effort to end the argument, they agree that good record of Skelton be found and made public.

The catalogue, beginning with Greek philosophers of the past, ending with the most recent famous poets, also illustrates a similar response to Skelton and his right to fame. Catalogues were a form common to epic poetry and were often used to illustrate genealogical information and status. It lists those poets who come to the tent of Dame Pallas when summoned by Aeolus’s trumpet and gives primary position to Phebus, wearing a crown of laurel leaves upon his head, lamenting Daphnes with a song (ll. 287-94). This initial reference to Phebus recalls Skelton’s own references to himself in the text as Apollo, and the woodcut discussed in Chapter Two. Skelton suggests that his poetic work is of value and that it has a self-renewing and self-regenerating force.
At the end of the catalogue, Gower, Chaucer and Lydgate appear and speak to Skelton. Gower claims that Skelton has worked so meritoriously that he has earned a place with them in the starry sky for his services to English poetry; Chaucer acknowledges Skelton’s hard work and says that because of it they have been personally sent to ensure his fame is reported in Fame’s court. Lydgate gives Skelton his thanks and appoints him as the chief clerk of Fame’s court because of his laurel achievements. The two dramatic episodes draw out the distinctions between good poets and bad, and focus upon Skelton’s role in the making of his own reputation. The catalogue connects Skelton genealogically with the great poets of the past. The beginning of the poem therefore provides a context for the reception of Skelton’s works. It illustrates the distinctions between good and bad poets and the role of the audience in the making of reputation. Fame and Pallas are personifications of particular responses to Skelton’s poetry.

The list and the lyrics, the catalogue and arguments are episodes which work together to prompt consideration of production and reception contexts, which identify objections to Skelton as a great poet, and which justify his position as a poet of good reputation. They are complemented further by the miscellaneous endings of the poem, also described above. The ending passages contribute a sense of future literary tradition which is anticipated by Skelton’s works. At the end of his poem Skelton emphasises the value of English and poetry and show that his pleas for patronage have been heeded and that powerful benefactors have been influential in making his career successful. He recognises the potential for opposition to his works but has a confidence in his own ability to produce works of lasting reputation. This after-dream ending of the poem fulfils, in reality, the purpose of the dream journey and the challenges Skelton has had to undertake to prove his worth as a poet, validating his writing of the poem.

C. Conclusions

The popularity of miscellany and the regular association of it with Skelton’s works provides evidence that miscellany was a viable context for the reception of *The Garland of Laurel*. By the end of the fifteenth century, the manuscript trade’s chief concern was to
satisfy the pre-existing market’s demands for particular texts or kinds of texts.\textsuperscript{129} With the coming of print, and the industrialisation of bookmaking, it seems that authors recognised a need to market their books and appeal to reading tastes more widely.\textsuperscript{130} Printers, like compilers of manuscripts, wanted to produce books of long established appeal and on the basis of sound guesswork about public preferences.\textsuperscript{131} It seems likely that printers would have been keen to publish any works by Skelton which were based around popular methods of production.

Skelton was influenced by the trends he perceived in the book publishing industry and by the tastes of potential readers, those forms or genres of literature which were already popular. Additionally, those changes in the nature of collection, preservation and circulation brought about by the advent of print, particularly focused attention on the author figure and his reputation, and collections of single-author works. It is likely that Skelton was aware of the importance of establishing and maintaining a reputation in a period of textual instability and that he was aware of the methods by which this might be done successfully.

Manuscript miscellany provides a context for interpreting and exploring the production and reception of Skelton’s poem. Its popularity may have unavoidably conditioned the way in which Skelton composed, structured, produced and circulated his poem. Certainly, as discussed above, the production and presentation of this poem points us towards particular types of audiences, reading practices and modes of textual transmission. London-based audiences particularly were pleased with manuscripts which contained a mixture of literature, letters and records, items concerned with matters related to the court and to London. Skelton’s works, his mixed poetic forms and modes, appealed both to those in the city and to those in provincial areas.\textsuperscript{132}

The flexibility of the miscellany form made it an ideal vehicle for Skelton’s use of a range of other influencing poetic forms and modes, for a mixture of styles and content. It also allowed him to continue to add to the poem later in his career, at various stages of

\textsuperscript{129} Edwards and Meale, ‘Marketing’, p. 95.
\textsuperscript{130} O’Donnell, ‘Retractions’, p. 169.
publication, and to make revisions, as if he were a compiler working on a manuscript collection. Personal miscellanies, like Rawlinson C.813, were more likely to have influenced Skelton's seemingly haphazard marrying of material in his poem, than those more ordered miscellanies based around booklet exemplars. The internal workings of *The Garland of Laurel* provide an insight into its intellectual conditions of production, the traditions it was influenced by and the context in which it was produced. Skelton reveals much about his concern with changing methods of production and reception in his exploration of poetic forms and self-representation.

The poem reveals a high degree of thematic intention in the process of composition. Its miscellaneity is conscious and Skelton anticipates and responds to the readers' response to a miscellany. He represents himself to the reader as a highly skilled author, creating a pseudo-miscellany text both in size and content, something which would normally have been associated with the activities of many compilers or authors. He presents the extent of his poetic prowess in a single work and plays upon the interest in single author collections. In this poem, Skelton ceases to rely on manuscript precedents and depends on internal themes or relationships to give his text shape and meaning. In other words, Skelton adapts early traditions in innovative ways and in doing so anticipates the popularity of anthology by more than a hundred years.
Chapter Four

Dream Vision

*The Garland of Laurel* is a dream poem and the conventions of the genre of dream vision are most often used as an explanatory framework for its narrative progression, content and structure. Dream vision provides an additional context to miscellany for considering the production and reception of the poem.

This chapter considers further Skelton’s adaptation and use of tradition, genres, and forms of writing in unconventional and innovative ways. It looks closely at Skelton’s use of dream vision and considers the extent to which the genre influences Skelton’s composition. In the late fifteenth century, the dream vision genre undergoes interesting changes. These developments are evident in Skelton’s *The Garland of Laurel* and distinguish it from the earlier and more conventional tradition of dream vision writing, exemplified by Chaucer, Lydgate and their followers.

Firstly, this chapter considers the production and reception of dream poetry, what is known about its audience, the surviving works and the popularity and wide appeal of the genre. Secondly, in part B i., it considers those elements of Chaucer’s *Prologue to The Legend of Good Women* and *The Assembly of Ladies* (author unknown), two dream vision poems of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, which are structurally or thematically interesting in the context of Skelton’s poem. In part B ii. it compares these two poems with Skelton’s poem and considers how Skelton develops and diverges from the genre of dream vision. Finally I conclude by weighing up the relative impact and influence of miscellany and dream poetry upon Skelton’s composition of *The Garland of Laurel*.

A. Production and Reception of
Dream Poetry

Dream poems, such as those in Fairfax 16 and other courtly collections, are commonly preserved grouped together within manuscripts. Boffey suggests that early readers recognised the shared debts and similarities of these poems and saw them as a connected body of writing. They are the only generically connected works to survive collected together in this way.

Compilation of dream poetry manuscript collections was informed by familiarity with both French and English texts. The market for dream poetry was broad and the genre flourished in both England and France. Boffey’s work provides evidence that traffic in manuscripts between England and France was common during the course of the Hundred Years’ War and throughout the fifteenth century, and that in this way dream poems were widely distributed, often copied into miscellanies.

Miscellany is one context in which dream poems were popularly read and circulated over a long period of time. Dream poems therefore appealed to the same audience as miscellanies, particularly to the London-based, courtly audience that was interested in Skelton’s works. For example, many prestigious readers enjoyed and owned copies of Le Roman de la Rose, the earliest medieval dream poem, which circulated well into the sixteenth century in manuscript and printed editions. This poem set the fashion for poems about love presented within a dream framework and also fixed the assumption that sexual love was a serious literary topic. Sylvia Huot suggests that this text was especially suited to readers of miscellanies because, in addition to its being a romance and a dream

---

2 See my discussion of this manuscript in Chapter Three.
4 Ibid., pp. 115-17.
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poem, qualities in themselves popular, it was lengthy and encyclopaedic in nature. The episodic structure of dream poems, similar to the progressive and additive structure of a miscellany, was perhaps part of their lasting appeal. Dream poetry encouraged the mingling of concepts and styles from different disciplines as seemingly unconnected episodes became woven together to create a continuous narrative framework and formulaic structure.² Huot also sees the courtly popularity of miscellany as a contributory factor to the wide appeal, reception and circulation of *Le Roman de la Rose* in the centuries following its publication and claims that the text developed alongside the growing popularity of miscellany.³ Dream poems may have been adapted alongside miscellany to meet new market trends in the fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries. Texts of dream poems were desirable commodities because they appealed to a wide range of readers. Like miscellanies, collections of dream poems often circulated among different groups of friends, family or neighbours. Signatures left on manuscripts indicate such relationships and provide evidence of the long-term popularity of dream poetry.⁹

B. The Prologue to *The Legend of Good Women*, *The Assembly of Ladies* and *The Garland of Laurel*.

Dream poems existed in the Anglo-Saxon period, for example the Old English devotional text *The Dream of the Rood*, (late tenth or early eleventh century), and continued to be popular through the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, and throughout the fourteenth, fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. Related to the writings of Macrobius and the Bible, dream poetry was often regarded as an essential medium for what the poet had

---

² Interesting comparisons might be made between the structure of a dream vision and the structure of a romance. E. Vinaver's *The Rise of Romance* (London: Oxford University Press, 1971), describes the structure of romance as 'interlaced'. Interlace in romance works in a way which is similar to the structural workings of miscellany, where the reader may move between clearly separable texts or to collections where works are unified by a common factor or principle. While miscellany and the dream vision genre are distinct from each other they share this common structural characteristic. In romance, however, the narrative thread is disrupted and different unifying themes are returned to at unexpected intervals during the course of the whole work.


to say. Some of the best known Middle English dream poems include Chaucer’s *The Book of the Duchess, The Legend of Good Women, The Parliament of Fowls* and *The House of Fame*, which draw strongly on the tradition in French and Italian literature. Other important dream poems from a similar period include Lydgate’s *Complaint of the Black Knight* and *The Temple of Glas*, Langland’s *Piers Plowman*, and the Gawain poet’s *Pearl*. There are many less well known poems influenced by dream vision such as *The Flower and the Leaf* and *The Assembly of Ladies*. The genre of the story collection, as exemplified by Chaucer’s *The Canterbury Tales* and Gower’s *Confessio Amantis*, is closely connected with dream vision.

This section outlines the themes of two dream vision poems, Chaucer’s *Prologue* to *The Legend of Good Women* and the anonymous *Assembly of Ladies*. These two poems, like all dream visions, pay particular attention to the narrator, emphasise the framing devices of the narrative and the settings for the dream. They have been chosen particularly because, while being representative dream poems, both combine themes associated with literature of the court and its idealism with the subject of fame. Both poems make powerful female figures, allegorical or mythical, central to their narrative. In each case the narrator undertakes a task for preference or advice from them or is guided by them to behave in certain ways. Also, their power is shown in relation to other figures in the dream and often men are at their mercy and must prove their worth or lose their good reputation. Additionally, the written record of these women, and female authority, are important themes of both poems. This is established through their courtly, judicial or household influence, through laudatory lyrics and through the writing down of the dream at the end of the poem. Record is associated with the role of the poet and dreamer. This combination of themes is particularly pertinent to Skelton’s *The Garland of Laurel*. In the second subsection, on Skelton’s poem, I make evident how these

---


themes are developed by Skelton in order to assess how typical *The Garland of Laurel* is as an example of the dream vision genre.\(^{12}\)

i. Chaucer's *Prologue and The Assembly of Ladies*

*The Legend of Good Women* exists in two similar manuscript versions, both of which begin with a prologue in which the dream motif is introduced.\(^{13}\) The framework of the dream became increasingly popular in prologues during the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries.\(^{14}\) Chaucer's prologue is followed by nine legends or tales about famous women beginning with the story of Cleopatra, and like many dream poems *The Legend of Good Women* is unfinished. However, it is the prologue which is of interest as far as dream vision is concerned and which provides a focus for this chapter, along with *The Assembly of Ladies*.

*The Assembly of Ladies* also makes women central and its narrator is a woman. This in itself is unusual, and unlike the figure of the narrator in *The Legend of Good Women*, but the status of the dreamer is always unusual and highly privileged in dream poetry. The narrative voice continually draws attention to the ability of the dreamer to transgress boundaries. Some boundaries are mental or spiritual, and some physical, but the transitions the dreamer makes are always multiple and fluid. Often these transitions involve recognizable boundaries such as rivers and walls. Sometimes the boundaries crossed are less tangible, for example those between wakefulness, sleep and the liminal states

---

\(^{12}\) Skelton wrote two dream poems, very different from each other. His first dream poem, *The Bouge of Court*, written early in his career in 1498, uses dream poetry as a model for its narrative structure only in the loosest sense. It describes the court of Henry VII overthrown by seven court vices who in turn assail the newcomer, Drede (representing modesty, and 'once a poet', perhaps Skelton himself). The vices are Favell the flatterer, pale Suspyeyon, Hervey Hafter the pickpocket, Disdayne, the threadbare gallant Ryote, Dyssymulation and fawning Discye. *The Bouge* is primarily allegorical and owes much to the medieval morality plays which had earlier entertained the court. It does not focus upon the nature of the dream as a subjective fantasy or heavenly vision, or upon the character of Drede, the dreamer, but instead asserts that the reality of life at court is a nightmare. Spearing, *Medieval Dream-Poetry*, pp. 197-202; H. L. R. Edwards, *Skelton: The Life and Times of an Early Tudor Poet* (London: Camelot Press, 1949), pp. 61-2.

\(^{13}\) Both versions are provided in Benson, ed., *Riverside Chaucer*. The F text, dated c. 1386, is taken from Fairfax 16. The G Text is found only in Cambridge, Cambridge University Library, MS Gg.4.27 and is dated after 1394. F is considered more reverential and erotic in style but there are few major differences in content and narrative.

\(^{14}\) Phillips and Havely, eds.,*Chaucer's Dream Poetry*, p. 9.
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between. The device of the dream involves the reader in the interpretation of what is essentially a common experience. The dreamer is mentally involved while not active and participating in events in the dream physically, but the crossing of the imaginary thresholds in the dream mirrors the reality of moving through states of sleep. Most often this awareness of the narrator’s psychological state is implicit to understanding the action, but sometimes the physical state of the narrator is made explicit, as for example in *The Legend of Good Women*, when Queen Alceste explains to the God of Love that the dreamer-narrator, Chaucer himself, has:

```
[...]  
made the book that hight the Hous of Fame,  
And eke the Deeth of Blaunche the Duchesse,  
And the Parlement of Foules, as I gesse,  
And al the love of Palamon and Arcite  
Of Thebes, thogh the storeye ys knowen lyte;  
And many an ympne for your halidayes,  
That highten balades, roundels, virelayes;  
And, for to speke of other holynesse,  
He hath in prose translated Boece,  
And maad the lyf also of Seynt Cecile.  
He made also, goon ys a gret while,  
Origenes upon the Maudeleyne. (ll. 417-28)
```

Attention is frequently drawn to the narrator and his acts of narration, his role within and outside of the dream drama.

*The Assembly of Ladies* presents a group of ladies, the fifth and youngest of whom is the narrator, walking together in a garden with four gentlewomen, by a maze with a central fountain. Separated from her companions by a gentleman, the youngest lady is asked to recount a long story which explains why she is so pale. The unidentifiable narrator relates that one afternoon she and her courtly companions all ventured into the maze and

---

15 Brown, ‘On the Borders’, pp. 36, 40, 45-50. Like dream poetry, ideas of pilgrimage involve trial and discovery, quest, hopefully fulfillment, and psychological growth. Pilgrimage was closely associated with visionary experience, and dream poetry, which had biblical precedent, was particularly appropriate for exploring spiritual ideas. Rites of passage and the progress of dream narrative recognise liminality and seem to be a step towards reintegration with society and a return to reality. The impulse to pilgrimage, like the impulse behind the writing of much dream poetry, can be rooted in a response to a crisis in self or in social structure, and both turn the instigator to self-appraisal, learning and transformation. It is debatable whether dream poetry leads the dreamer to the same kind of transcendent moment and self-regeneration as pilgrimage does but it is interesting to place dream poetry within this wider social and historical context. See also Phillips and Havel, eds., *Chaucer’s Dream Poetry*, p. 16.


17 A melancholy disposition and isolation or solitude is a common pre-requisite for an interesting dream. The words recall Chaucer’s Black Knight in *The Book of the Duchess*. 

---
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became lost, while she alone found her way to the centre, fell asleep and dreamed. The central fountain is an important feature of the maze or garden, central to courtly romance. Similarly, the meadow and bower are recognisable framing devices through which the narrative moves. These also structure Chaucer’s poem. Dream poems readily accept both allegorical and realistic landscapes and most often they have a spring setting. It is common for the setting to be identified through a description of the zodiac, as well as by month. While the dream that takes place in Chaucer’s poem happens in May, the recollection of the dream in The Assembly of Ladies takes place on an afternoon in September. In The Legend of Good Women, only when May arrives is the narrator willingly distracted from his books. He describes a character trait, a ‘condicioun’, which makes him partial to daisies, and every morning from May

18 P. R. Doob, The Idea of the Labyrinth from Classical Antiquity through the Middle Ages (London: Cornell University Press, 1990), pp. 107-27, 134-44. Labyrinths and pilgrimage are both closely associated with dream poetry and were common features of medieval art and literature. Church pavements often had labyrinths, symbolically enabling pilgrims to reach important and distant shrines, liturgically used and associated with Easter ritual. Garland-like dances took place, mirroring the twisted paths and interlacings of the labyrinth. It was a symbol of the harrowing of hell, redemption and resurrection; implicitly, the medieval creator, a poet, builder or architect, associated himself with the master builder Daedalus.

19 N. Miller, ‘Paradise Regained: Medieval Garden Fountains’, in Medieval Gardens, ed. E. B. MacDougall, Dumbarton Oaks Colloquium on the History of Landscape Architecture (Washington: Dumbarton Oaks Research Library and Collection, Trustees for Harvard University, 1986), p. 137. Many Old Testament allusions to Eden and the Book of Revelations mention ‘the river of the water of life, bright as crystal’. These rivers which flow from Paradise serve as sources for the garden fountains of the Middle Ages. Fountains are the main element in the allegorical framework of the garden of love and the courtly literature of the Middle Ages. In Le Roman de la Rose the fountain is a mirror for God, as well as for light, nature, beauty, the rose and love.

20 Gardens or meadows are the central locus for a dream, a fashion also set by Le Roman de la Rose. Commonly, a dreamer-narrator falls asleep beside a stream, outdoors, or in isolation somewhere, as, for example, in Pearl. Enclosed gardens resembled the hortus conclusus in the Biblical Song of Songs, a metaphor for the courtly lyric. The central garden known as the hortus conclusus from Provence, and other Mediterranean countries, from the twelfth century, emphasised the beauty of woman and the garden as the place where that beauty is to be enjoyed. Illuminations from religious manuscripts of the period illustrate these boundaries and associations visually for the reader. For example, an image of the English Gethsemane, c. 1400, from the book of Hours, Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Aubrey 31, f. 38v, shows a round wooden fence with sharp pointed tops enclosing a mountain. There is a bridge over a river, the only access to the entrance. Illustrations from manuscripts of Le Roman de la Rose, dating from late fourteenth century and the early fifteenth century, demonstrate how Illustrators divided their pictures by placing a wall or boundary in the centre of the picture. Both sides of the picture are open to view and show different landscapes. Often in romance and dream literature central trees stood next to an overflowing well, signifying either sanctifying grace or false worldly pleasure. When romance gardens were planted in real life, as it seems some were, then it was likely the central tree was a laurel or pine. The laurel tree was popular in England during the middle ages; it was the ancient symbol of victory and of constancy. In addition, evergreens had an ambivalent fascination because they defied the seasons, as men and other plants and trees were unable to. D. Pearsall, ‘Gardens as Symbol and Setting in Late Medieval Poetry’, in Medieval Gardens, ed. MacDougall, pp. 237-51; B. E. Daley, ‘“The Closed Garden” and the “Sealed Fountain”: “Song of Songs” 4:12 in the Late Medieval Iconography of Mary’, in Medieval Gardens, ed. MacDougall, pp. 255-78; A. C. Spearing, Medieval Dream-Poetry, pp. 16-18; K. Brownlee and S. Huot, eds., Rethinking the Romance of the Rose: Text, Image, Reception (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1992), pp. 161, 177-9. Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Liturg. 58, f. 116v; Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS E. Mus 65, ff. 1v, 13v.; T. McLean, Medieval English Gardens (London: Collins, 1981), p. 245.
onwards he awakens early and goes down to the meadows to see the flowers open in the sun and ease his sorrows. At nightfall he runs home to sleep so that he can rise again early. His bed has been made for him on new turf in a small garden, strewn with flowers, and he falls asleep and dreams that he is back in the meadow lying down with the flowers when the god of love and his queen walk by.

The dream therefore works through easily recognisable framing devices, such as the garden or chamber, and the experience of falling asleep outdoors and the way in which the dreamer awakens are also identifiable traits of dream poems. In *The Assembly of Ladies*, for example, the dreamer-narrator is awakened when spray from the fountain falls against her face. Similarly, in *The Kingis Quair*, a dream poem of James I of Scotland, the dreamer awakens when his ear is roughly pulled by Fortune. Typically, dream poems also rely upon the framing device of the book. On awakening the dreamer must write down what he has learned from the dream, or complete a given task. This is the case in *The Assembly of Ladies*, where the narrator writes a book she calls *La Semble de Dames*, in *The Kingis Quair*, and in *The Legend of Good Women*. The writing down of the dream commonly begins with an examination of its causes, whether from an imbalance of the humours, from disturbed sleep or self-inflicted excess.

Both the *Prologue* to *The Legend of Good Women* and *The Assembly of Ladies* are clearly connected with the literature of the court and respond to its idealism, the myths of chivalric love and honour, and the self-interest and fear at its political heart. Love is a central theme of both poems, as it is in *Le Roman de la Rose*, and both seem to address a female audience. Unlike *Le Roman de la Rose*, *The Legend of Good Women* first presents love in the context of the record which books can make of human experience. The *Prologue* begins with an exposition on the value of seeing and believing, which is meant to enhance the credibility of the dream which follows. It asserts that books can make available to us records and knowledge of truths which would otherwise be unknown to us, such as the realities of heaven and hell and experiences of our ancestors. It sets out to provide records of faithful women and considers the importance of faithful representation. Books are described as the key to remembrance and the narrator delights

in books, puts his faith in them and reveres them with his heart. The bookish narrator is common in dream poems, as is the representation of record, commonly a temple or chamber engraved with images of famous lovers, for example the chamber in *The Assembly of Ladies*:

> On eche a corner and upon every wal,  
> The which is made of berel and cristal;  
> Wheron was graven of storyes many oon:  
> First how Phillis of wommanly pite  
> Deyd pitously for the love of Demephon;  
> Next after was the story of Thesbe,  
> How she slowe hir self under a tre;  
> Yit sawe I more how in pitous case  
> For Antony was slayne Cleopatrace;  

(ll. 454-62)

Other such examples can be found in Lydgate’s *Temple of Glas*, and in Chaucer’s *The House of Fame*. The temple or chamber is also a frame through which the dreamer can progress on his journey.

The focus upon the record of love to be found in books, described in the *Prologue*, foregrounds the typically Chaucerian debate between experience and ‘auctorite’, but also claims that his book defends and preserves the reputation of women who are true in love, rather than dramatising anti-feminist material. Despite these initial assertions, the narrator is accused of acting improperly and causing offence to the God of Love with the records of love that he has already made.

> “Thou maist yt natdeny,  
> For in pleyn text, withouten nede of glose,  
> Thou hast translated the Romaunce of the Rose,  
> That is an heresyse ayeins my lawe,  
> And makest wise folk fro me withdrawe;  
> And of Creseyde thou hast seyd as the lyste,  
> That maketh men to wommen lasse triste,  
> That ben as trewe as ever was any steel.  
> Of thyn answere avise the ryght weel;  
> For thogh thou reneyed hast my lay,  
> As other wreche han doon many a day,  
> By Seynt Venus that my moder ys,

22 The idea that writers lock up deeds in their books with the ‘keye of remembraunce’ is also found in the prologue to Lydgate’s *Troy Book*. Lydgate stresses the moral function of poets and their role in preserving the reputation of great men. He promotes the idea that everyone should live virtuously because after death poets will not fear to write the truth. Mostly this work survives in deluxe manuscripts for politically powerful patrons. J. Wogan-Browne, and others, eds., *The Idea of the Vernacular: An Anthology of Middle English Literary Theory 1280–1520* (Exeter: Exeter University Press, 1999), p. 46.
If that thou lyve, thou shalt repente! this
So cruelly that it shal wel be sene!" (ll. 327-40)

His translations of *Troilus* and of *Le Roman de la Rose* have done an injustice to both lovers and women, by representing them as foolish and untrustworthy. His penance, demanded by Queen Alceste, is to write a glorious legend, consisting of tributes to women who were faithful and records of the men who betrayed them:

‘The moste partye of they tyme spende
In makynge of a glorious legende
Of goode wymmen, maydenes and wyves,
That weren trewe in lovyng al hire lyves;
And telle of false men that hem bytraien,
That al hir lyf ne don nat but assayen
How many women they may doon a shame; (ll. 482-88)

By writing, the narrator will prove his worth and extend the praise of women that he began earlier in the balade. The events of a dream and the dream framework are often used as devices by which the narrator experiences and understands what he must write, or proves his worth, and the setting of such a task is common.

In the *Prologue* the relationships between the narrator, the queen and the God of Love are similar to those often presented in conventional romance, and fulfil the ideals of courtly love. These relationships reveal female power and the subservient male who must serve the lady. The narrator, for example, assumes the role of the courtly lover and is mesmerised by the daisy. The reader is told that he worshipped her (ll. 50-9), was powerless, and that his words and deeds were controlled by her, as a harp obeys the hands of a musician (ll. 86-93). The narrator describes his thirsting spirit, his heart full of awe and his happy devotion, and he likens waiting on the flower’s opening to attending the Resurrection. He falls on his knees to greet the flower (ll. 97-124). The narrator also mourns his lack of skill with English rhyme and prose to praise her correctly and enough, and he appeals to other lovers for help (ll. 60-83). When he finally sees the queen he sings a spontaneous balade in her praise.23

The queen is represented both as a beautiful lady, his heart’s desire, and as a flower. Poems praising the daisy, or marguerite, were fashionable in French contemporary courtly poetry, and had been written by Machaut, Froissart and Deschamps. The image

23 The insertion of such balades is a feature of *dits amoreux* and will be considered further in the next chapter.
was also used by other contemporary English writers, such as Usk, Clanvowe and the Gawain poet. *The Floure and the Leafe* is the only extant English poem which focuses upon the allegiances French courtiers seem to have made to the parties of the Flower and the Leaf, the first symbolising love’s mutable pleasure, the second the more enduring virtuous and chaste love. Chaucer claims not to be drawing upon this tradition in his poem, although nineteen faithful ladies dance in honour of the daisy.

The daisy retains some associations with the image of the rose in *Le Roman de la Rose*, a symbol of love, religious and amatory, and of national sentiment. Rather than being a symbol of sensuality in the *Legend*, however, it symbolises Queen Alceste’s fidelity and goodness. The queen (like a daisy) is described as wearing green and white, a crown of flowers, and a gold hair net. The white and gold colours (symbolizing purity and royalty), and the phrase ‘of alle flouris flour’ (l. 55), reflect the liturgy that honours Mary, queen of Heaven. Alceste intercedes for the narrator, mirroring Mary’s pleas for justice and mercy for humanity, and commanding he writes a ‘legend’, a word most often associated with the record of saints’ lives. Medieval queens were frequently associated with intercession for mercy, mediation and wise counsel, and often modelled their own lives on those of female saints.

In *The Assembly of Ladies* the narrator similarly dreams that she is met by a gentlewoman, the lady Perseverance, dressed in blue, with words and flowers embroidered on her gown. Perseverance, the chamber usher of the lady Loialyte, commands the ladies to come before her mistress, wearing blue, and identifying themselves by sewing words or mottoes onto their clothes, so that they may present petitions about their sorrows or complaints of love:

```
Remembre it wele and bere it in your mynde;
Al youre felawes and ye must com in blewe,
Everiche yowre matier for to sewe,
With more, which I pray yow thynk upon,
Yowre wordes on yowre slevis everichon. (ll. 115-19)
```

Such an image might be associated with the representation of Mary mother of God in medieval stained glass windows, as well as with courtly or religious processions.

---

However, the quest for a ruling from a higher authority about a personal matter is also a common feature of dream poems such as Chaucer’s *The House of Fame*.

In the *Prologue* the God of Love, with wings like an angel, wearing silk embroidered with green sprays and red rose leaves, is crowned with the sun and holds two arrows red as embers in his hand. Despite his renowned blindness he spots the narrator immediately and reviles him. However, he allows Alceste to pass judgement on the narrator and to remind him of his duties as a king and of the corruption of the court which might cloud his judgement. Subtly, Chaucer presents a code of conduct for a king, from the mouth of Alceste, while flattering him by comparing him with the omnipotent God of Love. The parallels between the imaginary Alceste and God of Love, and the real king, Richard II, and the queen ‘at Eltham or at Sheene’ (1.497), to whom the text must be presented, are made both implicitly and explicitly in the text.26

The dialogues between the poet, the God of Love and Queen Alceste in the *Prologue* owe much to literary convention, for example, to Machaut’s *Jugement dou Roy de Navarre*.27 Typically the dream poem provides not only a record of the emotional pain experienced by its narrator, but also gives advice to other lovers (sometimes kings) about their behaviour. Chaucer’s *The Book of the Duchess* even more fully exemplifies such techniques.

Meetings with a king or queen, with guides and judges, are typical features of dream poems which figure in the two poems described above. Gower, Chaucer and Lydgate are often encountered by poets seeking fame or advice, for example, Dunbar’s *The Goldyn Targe* and Douglas’s *The Palice of Honour*. The allegorisation of figures and places which the protagonist encounters on his journey is also common. Fame and Fortune are both commonly represented as ladies of authority and it is a common quest for a dreamer to be in search of fame, fortune or good reputation. The dreamer and his vocation or career – poets, poetry, fame and honour – are the particular subject matter of Chaucer’s *The House of Fame* and Douglas’s *The Palice of Honour*. The use of dream poetry to discuss the poet’s own role and standing is derived specifically from Chaucer.28

---

Often the narrator-dreamer demands information about where they are going from a guide provided for him, or seeks answers to questions relating to him personally. In *The House of Fame* Geoffrey’s guide is an eagle while in *The Assembly of Ladies* the narrator asks many questions about the way, the destination (Pleasaunt Regard), and the names of those she will meet. Diligence guides her, they meet Discrecioun, the provisioner, who tells them about the lodgings officer Acqueyntaunce; Contenaunce the porter meets them at the gate, welcomes them and takes them to rest in their rooms. The name of the steward of the house is revealed to be Largesse (generosity) and under her is the marshal of the hall called Bealchiere (good welcome). Contenaunce advises the narrator to show her petition to the chamberlain, Remembraunce, and describes her motto so that they can recognise her, but she also advises them not to forget the secretary who sees every petition, Avisenesse (circumspection). Arguments frequently arise between personalities in the dream poem, for example, in *The Kingis Quair* and *The Palice of Honour*, and a task is often given or judgement awaited from an enthroned figure, so that the dispute may be resolved. Dream poems are able to move fluidly between narrative and lyric, debate and didactic speech, and this is exemplified by passages which stage an argument or debate between characters.

*The Assembly of Ladies*, like *The House of Fame*, reveals crowds of people suing to the higher authority for favour and judgement. In *The Assembly of Ladies* the crowd is seen from a wall:

> And when she departed and was agone  
> We saw folkes comyng without the wal,  
> So grete people that nombre couthe we none.  
> Ladyes they were and gentil wymmen al  
> Clothed in bliew everiche, her wordes withal;  
> But for to knowe theyr wordis or devise  
> They com so thycke we myght in no wise. (ll. 393-9)

Then, led to the chamberlain by Perseveraunce the ladies enter a huge crowd which parts to let them through. They are welcomed and the narrator enters a chamber which has stories engraved on its walls and contains a throne on a stage with a canopy embroidered with a motto over it (ll. 414-90). A lady bearing a mace emerges and Perseveraunce holds aside a curtain so that a great lady with wonderful clothes and jewels, and her company, can emerge. The bills are rehearsed and answers are awaited, and it is common for the answer not to be revealed by the narrator, or for it to be inconclusive.
ii. The Garland of Laurel

In some ways Skelton’s *The Garland of Laurel* is typical of the dream poems described above, building upon their conventions and thematic concerns. However, many of its features can not be attributed to the tradition of dream poetry alone. Some can be more strongly attributed to the influence of miscellany, despite their origins in dream poetry and their connections with the genre; others find their origins elsewhere. This section explores the relative importance and impact of dream poetry upon Skelton by considering his use and adaptation of the themes and conventions described above. It also considers the relative importance of miscellany and begins to identify other significant contexts for the poem’s composition.

A. C. Spearing begins only tentatively to consider ways in which Skelton’s poem differs from the dream poetry tradition, but he recognises that, while dream poetry is still a vigorous and traditional form for Skelton, he is capable of setting the tradition in a new light. Spearing focuses closely upon the significance of the figure of the dreamer in his interpretation of the poem as a dream poem, but he is also highly aware that Skelton takes advantage of the audience’s knowledge of dream poetry in order to modify earlier dream vision for his own ends. In adapting the genre of dream vision Spearing describes Skelton as overcoming the ‘anxiety’ of Chaucerian influence.

Other critics have also considered the ways in which *The Garland of Laurel* newly emphasises some of the subject matter found in dream visions. Vincent Gillespie, John Scattergood, Seth Lerer and Julia Boffey, for example, all consider ways in which Skelton’s poetry resembles, draws upon and reworks the material of his predecessors. Like Spearing they acknowledge Skelton’s debt to dream poetry and they place an emphasis on Skelton’s adaptation of the genre rather than upon his emulation of it.

Skelton’s *The Garland of Laurel* presents a traditional melancholy, isolated dreamer-poet, leaning against an old and withered oak tree. When he begins to dream he is already marginalised from society in a half-worldly and damp outdoor setting. Skelton is is unable

to explain the cause or reason of his dream, uncertain whether his humours are out of balance, or whether he has drunk too much. The positions of the zodiac are given to place the dream cosmologically and images of desolation are emphasised.

When Mars retrogradant reversed his bak,
Lorde of the yere in his orbicular,
Put up his sword, for he cowde make no warre,
And when Lucina plenarly did shine,
Scorpione ascendyng degrees twyse nyne;
[...]
Where hartis belluyng, embosyd with distres,
Ran on the raunge so longe, that I suppose
Few men can tell where the hynde calfe gose
[...]
Whylis I stode musynge in this medytatyon
In slumbryng I fell and halfe in a slepe;
And whether it were of ymagynacyon,
Or of humors superflye, that often wyll crepe
Into the brayne by drynkyng over depe,
Or it procedyd of fatal persuacyon,
I can not tell you what was the occasyon. (ll. 3-7, 24-6, 29-35)

This extravagant astronomical opening, and the meditating narrator, are features of traditional medieval decorative dream allegory, and the poem’s opening is typically Chaucerian and formulaic. It is also clear from the start of the poem that the dreamer-poet muses about fortune and the ever-changing world. He is ‘depely drownyd’, in a ‘dumpe’, ‘Ensowkid with sylt of the myry wose’ and ‘encreumpysshed’, a word which itself seems squashed up in the line (ll. 15, 23, 16). While in these respects the opening appears conventional, the poem has an unusual autumnal setting and the exact location of Skelton’s dream is described on the title page. It is ‘Studyously dyvysed at Sheryfhotten Castell, in the foreste of Galtres’; on line 22, he falls asleep in the ‘frythy

---

32 The causes of dreams are always much puzzled and reasoned over in dream poems. Causes traditionally cited for disturbed dreams are melancholy, grief, insomnia and over-deep drinking, but it was also thought that dream visions could be caused by divine inspiration or by physical or mental disorder. Brown, ‘On the Borders’, pp. 28-32; Kruger, *Dreaming*, pp. 69-73, 73-82, 83-99. For example in *The House of Fame*, after a lengthy introduction, Chaucer relates how he slept and dreamed on a particular night at a particular time of year. He is uncertain exactly why dreams occur but he is able to draw distinctions between different types of dream, giving examples from long established literary tradition. Chaucer, *House of Fame* in Benson, ed., *Riverside Chaucer*, ll. 1-65. Similarly, the poet of *The Temple of Glas* goes to bed feeling troubled and melancholy. His vision occurs during a restless and anguished sleep, and Dunbar’s *Visions and Nightmares* occur at certain times of the night when the moon shines fully. J. Schick, ed., *Lydgate’s ‘Temple of Glas’*, EETS Extra Series, 60 (1891), ll. 1-14; Dunbar, ‘Visions and Nightmares’, in J. Kinsley, ed., *William Dunbar: Poems* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1958): *How Dunbar was desyrd to be ane Frier*, ll. 1-2; *The Fenyeit Freir of Tungland*, ll. 1-4; *Lucia Schynnyng in Silence of the nicht*, ll. 1-5; *The Dance of the Sevin Deidly Synnes*, ll. 1-9; *Betuix twell hours and ellevin*, 1-2. All Dunbar’s dream settings are described with particular atmospheric detail.
forest of Galtres’, an area which would have been subject to the law and boundaries of the Howard land owners. In its specificity it contrasts with the dream vision which Skelton experiences, ‘As one in a trans or in an extasy’ (1.37). It is rare for a dream location to be identified so specifically, and the introduction of the real world is one way in which Skelton adapts the genre for his own ends.

Skelton’s dream poem also ends in a conventional way, with the dreamer awakened by a noise. In The Garland of Laurel a list is read aloud from a manuscript book which when shut awakens the dreamer from his dream, a twist of the device by which physical sensation awakens the dreamer.

A thowsande, thowsande, I trow, to my dome,
‘Triumpha, triumpha!’ they cryd all aboute.
Of trumpettis and clarious the noyse went to Rome;
The starry hevyn, me thought, shoke with the showte;
The grownde gronid and tremblid, the noyse was so stowte.
The Quene of Fame commaundid shett fast the boke,
And therwith, sodenly, out of my dreme I woke.

[...]

Skeltonis alloquitur librum suum (ill. 1505-11, 1521)

Traditionally, dreamers awaken from their dream with the knowledge or urge to write down the events which have befallen them, as a record. However, when Skelton awakens we perceive that his dream has already been written down and is in fact the very poem which we have been reading. The poem ends by praising and exalting the book and Skelton’s place in literary tradition.

Skelton makes use of the formulaic and interlaced episodic structure of dream poetry, moving smoothly from the forest location into his dream and out again. He is provided with a conventional guide figure, Occupacyoun, who carries a book beneath her arm and

33 Norton-Smith, ed., The Kingis Quair, ll. 1-3, 192-7; The House of Fame, in Benson ed., Riverside Chaucer, ll. 59-65; Lydgate’s Temple of Glas, ll. 1362-1403.
34 The Garland of Laurel follows the formulaic pattern of dream poems. Commonly they begin with the dreamer, who is the poet himself, falling asleep. Usually they state the time and the place where the dream takes place. In The Kingis Quair the zodiac is used to date the occasion of the dream recalled in the poem. Most often the setting within the dream is a natural one and the season spring, summer or autumn. Spearing, Medieval Dream-Poetry, p. 26, suggests that dreams conventionally occur in places that are remote and isolated, often in meadows, forests or next to water, often in spaces removed from human company and near to things associated with other-worldliness. Forests, streams and rivers formed natural boundaries from society. In ‘Pearl’, for example, the dreamer sits down by the side of a stream and falls asleep. These common characteristics of dream poetry highlight the exclusion and isolation of the dreamer, A. C. Cawley and J. J. Anderson, eds., Pearl, Cleanness, Patience, Sir Gawain and the Green Knight (London: Dent, 1976). Kruger, Dreaming, pp. 140-1 suggests that they create part of the necessary structure of a dream poem, in which the dreamer must struggle to progress through tests and trials in order to reach a final goal.
who leads him on his journey between different locations, and rooms and gardens are used as typical framing devices for the narrative progression. The name ‘Occupacyoun’, and her role, however, specifically draw attention to Skelton’s poetic motivation for the journey and his concern with reputation, which I discuss further below. Skelton also makes use of a sudden mist as a framing device (1.647), an unusual means which cleverly bridges two different narrative episodes.

Firstly, on his journey, he enters a pavilion set with pearls and precious stones, a ground of burnished gold, where Dame Pallas and the Queen of Fame are arguing. The temple and allegorical figures follow the conventions of dream vision. Later Skelton enters a palace which is built from and decorated with precious stone and metal, when he is brought again before the Queen of Fame on her throne (ll. 459-88). This moment is similar to that described above in *The Assembly of Ladies*. In the argument, the Queen claims that Skelton is quite unsuitable to come before Pallas, despite the fact that he has drunk from Helicon’s Well, and an argument ensues in which Pallas defends the poet. The purpose of the argument and of Skelton’s dream and journey are made clear. He must prove his worth if he is to become a poet of lasting reputation. The argument which takes place between the two allegorical goddesses, about Skelton’s poetic prowess, is in the style of medieval judicial arguments. The conflict between them creates narrative progression and draws attention to poetic fame. Like the narrator-dreamer of *The Legend of Good Women*, Skelton’s quest is related to his failings as an author. He has failed to please the goddesses because he ‘wyll not endeour hymselfe to purchase / The favour of ladys with wordis electe,’ (ll. 75-6).

Conventionally in dream poems about fame the poet undertakes a quest in an effort to establish that he is worthy of renown. Several critics have illustrated Skelton’s dependence upon Chaucer and show that, while there is no specific verbal correspondence, the same general ideas and literary strategies occur. Occasionally Skelton remembers and responds to Chaucerian passages without quoting them directly. He retains traditional images and makes use of lines, but he never makes any extensive use of Chaucer as a literary source. Skelton’s poem is much less philosophical and much narrower in its conception of Fame than any of Chaucer’s poems. Skelton is concerned primarily with literary fame and engages with Chaucerian ideas in order to

---

define his own position. For example, in emulation of Chaucer’s *The House of Fame* and the scene described above in *The Assembly of Ladies*, when Skelton arrives at Fame’s court he sees and describes, from his viewpoint on a wall, thousands suing to Fame for good reputation outside the gates of Anglia.

Then I me lent, and loked over the wall:
Innumerable people presed to every gate.
Shet were the gatis; thei might wel knock and cal,
And turne home ageyn, for they cam al to late.
[...]
Hither they come crowdyng to get them a name,
But hailid they be homwarde with sorow and shame.
(ll. 602-5, 621-2)

In *The Garland of Laurel* there is nothing humble or modest about Skelton’s assertions of his claim to fame, unlike earlier models of the dreamer-poet. As shown by the mutability of the opening scenes, and the unpredictable figure of Janus, who predominates over the end of the poem, fame is not to be easily acquired by Skelton, nor is it of a stable nature. While the Queen of Fame and Dame Pallas agree that Skelton must prove his worth as a poet if he is to be admitted into the Rolls of Fame, Skelton himself begins by asserting his rights to fame and actively claims a position amongst those poets who are already famous, those called forward by the two goddesses (ll. 232-392). These great poets are celebrated in a hymn to Bacchus, the supplier of wine to poets and orators, with the recurring lines, ‘But blessed Bacches, the pleasant god of wyne, / Of closters engrosyd with his ruddy flotis / These orators and poetes refresshed there throtis.’(ll. 333-85).

The redefinition of authorial self in relation to other writers of the classical and medieval past is derived from Chaucer, for example, the end of *Troilus and Criseyde*, but Skelton’s admirers, as well as Skelton himself, take over the tradition. Like his medieval predecessors, Skelton believed that fame was derived from belonging to a

---


38 McLean, *Medieval English Gardens*, pp. 249-72. See also my earlier comments on the importance of medieval gardens. The grafting of vines was an important part of medieval horticulture and the lines perhaps imply that Skelton’s poetry is grafted from that of earlier literary tradition, that of the listed poets who have worn the laurel before him, sustained in their work by Bacchus.

tradition of notable writers and from setting oneself in the context of illustrious predecessors. In borrowing their themes and ideas, and in naming those who have been influential, he sets himself in a comprehensive tradition of poetry incorporating Greek and Latin authors and poets from the Middle Ages. He models himself as the latest and most glorious representative of the poetic tradition.40

In addition to the catalogued poets, Skelton meets Gower, Chaucer and Lydgate, speaks with them and honours them, remarking that ‘thai wantid nothynge but the laurell’ (1.397). The three poets support Skelton’s claim to literary fame and enhance the idea that the tradition of great poetry reaches its culmination in Skelton. Skelton makes the point that he already possesses the laurel, and, unlike his predecessors, has claimed this new distinction.

*Master Lydgate to Skelton*

‘So am I preventid of my brethern tweyne
In rendrynge to you thankkis meritory,
That weyny nothynge there doth remayne
Wherwith to geve you my regraciatory,
But that I poynt you to be prothonatory
Of Fame’s court, by all our holl assent
Avauenced by Pallas to laurell preferment.’ (ll. 428-34)

Skelton draws attention to his own laureations not because he considers himself to be a better poet than these illustrious predecessors but because he considers that English poetry and its representatives deserve more honour, and in more formal terms, than they have been previously accorded.41 The imagined voices of the dialogue of Chaucer, Gower and Lydgate present the world of past books as a living oratorical performance, utterly different from other dream poems’ representations of past literary tradition.42 Skelton recognised the important link between fame and the status of English poets. Such episodes illustrate how seamlessly narrative episodes and different forms of writing are combined in the poem.

Skelton also represents himself in the company of the muses and links himself with rhetorical eloquence. These muses appear in the garden which contains a fountain and a phoenix-bearing central laurel tree. Conventionally they were associated with the *hortus*

40 Scattergood, ‘Skelton’s “Garlande of Laurell” and Chaucerian Tradition’, p. 128.
conclusus, with Le Roman de la Rose, Song of Songs and with medieval gardens more generally. They dance with dryads around the tree, accompanied by Apollo and the Carthaginian poet Iopas. Such images recall the Aeneid and Palace of Honour, proclaiming a high destiny for poetry, reflecting on the origin of things and the nature of cosmic order: the evergreen laurel is a symbol of poetic fame and activity, and the phoenix symbolises rebirth and rejuvenation of the poetic spirit. Spearing suggests that Skelton’s use of such imagery is an indication of his exploration of the primitive roots of dream poetry but such an exploration also indicates that Skelton is exploring his own views about the changing role and place of the poet, specifically his own place in society.

Skelton endows the muses with new and highly personal significance, appealing to them in a highly conventional and formulaic manner. Vincent Gillespie suggests that, while they relate to Chaucerian tradition, Skelton places new emphasis upon them and he describes them as incarnating ‘a purely intellectual principle and a personification or incarnation of the traditions of Classical literature’. Gillespie suggests that the combination of rhetorical pragmatism and classical tropes recalls the historical respectability of poetry in the service of the state, and points to Skelton’s own pre-eminence in that art. Gillespie suggests that Skelton had an advanced conception of poetry being used in the rhetorical service of the state, and for the promotion of the poet, concerns unique in the context of dream poetry.

A commitment to the use of poetry for public rhetorical purposes was also a defining feature of the Burgundian concept of courtly and public poetry – a fashion which dominated the court of Henry VII – and has been associated particularly with Skelton’s works Colyn Clout and Why Come ye nat to Courte. In The Garland of Laurel Skelton’s predominant concern is with England and the English poetic tradition. The Garland of Laurel is infused with a sense of literary nationalism which can be identified in the description of Anglea and the heraldic beasts of Fame’s palace. Skelton not only makes claims for his own importance as an English poet, but draws attention to the overall status of writing in English, to his relationship with literary tradition, both

44 Spearing, Medieval Dream-Poetry, p. 215.
45 V. Gillespie, ‘Justification by Good Works: Skelton’s “Garland of Laurel”’, Reading Medieval Studies, 7 (1981), 19-31 (pp. 27-8). Skelton also appeals to the muses in Upon the Dolorus Dethe and Muche Lamentable Chaunce of the Mooste Honorable Erle of Northumberland and in Calliope.
46 I consider the Burgundian influence further in the next chapter.
continental and English, and to his role as a perpetuator of noble subjects. In doing this he makes claims to fame which are more substantial than Chaucer was ever able to make, both for himself and for his country. Scattergood describes the developments to be found in Skelton’s poetry as a reflection of the substantially different way of thinking about literature which had emerged in England in the hundred and fifty years separating the two poets and which suggests that English poets were beginning to feel new confidence.

Skelton’s perception of poetry as a method by which personal fame could be procured and perpetuated is central to an understanding of The Garland of Laurel and is strongly associated with Skelton’s adaptations of the theme of fame and the role of the dreamer-narrator. Unlike most dream poems concerned with fame, Skelton’s poem closely associates the making of an individual’s name or poetic fame integrally with textual production and circulation, both past and present. It was in the context of miscellany that much dream poetry circulated and the work of critics, such as Lerer and Boffey, has associated Skelton’s development of dream poetry with the late fifteenth-century literary context for the production and reception of texts. Their work relates most closely to my work on miscellany.

Lerer’s comparative argument about Hawes’s and Skelton’s self-representation takes into account the importance of the manuscript and print context for the production and reception of their works. As I discuss in Chapter Two, the different versions of Skelton’s The Garland of Laurel, and his continual rewritings, illustrate that he is interested in both the manuscript and print implications for the perpetuation of authorial name, and that he understands the ways in which works can evolve in circulation. Julia Boffey also recognises the numerous ‘intertextual and reflexive possibilities’ that existed for post-Chaucerian English writers, their ‘anxieties about the poet’s own position in what was newly perceived as an English literary tradition’ and the ‘status of that tradition in the wider field of classical and more recent continental writing’. While she identifies pressing similarities between Skelton’s The Garland of Laurel and Chaucer’s The House

---

48 Ibid., p. 125.
49 Ibid., pp. 125-8. Chaucer never claimed the laurel, or expressed any pretensions to fame through laureation, but he did associate the laurel with the everlasting fame of poets and sensed the poetic vocation.
of Fame, mainly in terms of their investigation of the nature of poetic discourse and the poet's role, she too focuses upon the immediate context for Skelton's oeuvre and the circumstances related to book production.51

In The Garland of Laurel these ideas are explored when a list of Skelton's works is read aloud from a decorative Burgundian-styled manuscript book.52

The margent was illumynid all with golden railles
And byse, enpicturid with gressoppes and waspis,
with butterflyis and fresshe pecoke taylis,
[...]
Encoverede over with golde of tissew fyne;
The claspis and bullyons were worth a thousande pounde;
With balassis and charbuncles the borders did shyne;
with aurum musicum every other lyne
Was wrytin, (ll. 1157-9, 1164-8).

Unlike the list in Chaucer's Prologue to the Legend of Good Women, Skelton makes it clear that his works can not be contained within the list and that his reputation as a poet in the world goes beyond its confines.53 As well as surviving works by Skelton it also lists works that are imaginative examples of his poetic prowess, or which have been lost, potentially within the poet's lifetime.

In primis the Boke of Honorous Astate;
Item the Boke how Men shulde Fie Synne;
Item Roayall Demenaunce Worshyp to Wynne;
Item the Boke to Speke Well or be Styll;
Item to Lerne You to Dye When ye Wyll;

Of Vertu also the soverayne enterlude;
The Book of the Rosiar; Prince Arturis Creacyoun;
The False Fayth that Now Goth
[...]
The Balade also of the Mustarde Tarte. (ll. 1172-9, 1245)

The list (ll. 1170-1476), which closely associates these books with Skelton, makes a point of emphasising that his reputation is sustained through his works, and that books are a means of record. This is especially the case in manuscript culture, and the list is similar to Chaucer's exploration of the significance of books and record at the beginning of The

51 Boffey, "Withdrawe Your Hande", pp. 73-7.
53 Lerer, 'Impressions of Identity', pp. 194-5.
Legend of Good Women. Skelton’s list also emphasises how limited that system of transmission can be. It is not a record of love which concerns the poet, but a record of his own poetic prowess and skill. Skelton’s list forms part of a retrospective review of a lengthy career in poetry and an attempt to justify that career, an intention which is very different from that associated with Chaucer’s list in The Legend of Good Women.54 The list contains works of an overtly propagandist nature, works about private morality, eloquence, classical learning and translation, interludes and courtly works.55 Skelton treats his own ambitions with amusing irony. He recognises that the triumphant shouts which accompany Occupacyoun’s exposition could only form part of a dream (ll. 1505-8). Spearing suggests that Skelton’s dream vanity, because of his self-mockery and the strong self-advertisement of the list, is a device similar to that of Chaucer’s and Hoccleve’s modesty.

Skelton’s attitude also reveals a deep concern for the stability of works and their durability. In The Garland of Laurel he accepts disparagement as part of a predictable reaction against him and seeks to broaden the notion of what is acceptable in order to justify and defend his works and the privilege of the poet to speak about everything. The dream vision facilitates an opportunity for the poet to speak in a particular way, perhaps saying things he could not otherwise say, connecting him to current culture while rooted in the traditional expression of the past. The nature of poetry, which validated the individual, and the role of the poet, both marginal issues in Chaucer’s work, became the central sphere for Skelton.56

A concern with textual preservation and poetic reputation leads Skelton to examine and adapt the representation of the relationship between the poet and the lady, traditionally exemplified in terms of courtly love, as the earlier examination of Chaucer’s work demonstrates. Skelton encounters the Countess of Surrey and her ladies, working at some embroidery, as well as describing Master Newton, an artist in residence at the Howard household, who is recording the scene.57 Just as specific locations are unusual it is not conventional for the poet-dreamer to address a group of such directly identifiable characters. They give the poem a ‘real’ dream location, and possible date.58 Such a technique is more common in the longer dream narratives of French tradition; for example

54 Scattergood, ‘Skelton’s “Garlande of Laurell” and Chaucerian Tradition’, p. 122.
57 Chapter Six focuses further upon these ladies.
Machaut introduces such a portrait of his patron the Duc de Berry in La Fonteimne Amoureuse. 59

The Howard ladies are making Skelton a laureate garland to symbolise his poetic fame, and Skelton is provided with an opportunity to write something in praise of women, the area in which he has been found lacking by the Queen of Fame. He writes each lady a lyric in return for their industry. As in Chaucer’s House of Fame, two aspects of poetic fame are treated by Skelton in this episode. The poet gains fame through his writing but he also confers fame, good or bad, on those he writes about. 60 Skelton’s writing establishes some kind of relationship between himself and these ladies who are modelled as possible patrons.

While Skelton’s poem, like Chaucer’s Prologue to The Legend of Good Women, and Machaut’s La Fonteimne Amoreuse, locates the composition within a context of courtly patronage, it develops its themes outside of courtly (or religious) love, giving un-idealised ladies a more active role in establishing Skelton as a poet of good reputation. Skelton’s tributes to the ladies draw upon conventional imagery, such as flowers and goddesses, but are ironised and made flippant.

To my Lady Anne Dakers of the Sowth

Zeuxes, that enpicturid fare Elene the quene,
You to devyse his crafte were to seke;
And if Apelles your countenaunce had sene,
Of porturature which was the famous Greke,
He coude not devyse the lest poynt of your cheke;
Princes of yowth, and flowre of goodly porte,
Vertu, conyng, solace, pleasure, conforte. (ll. 892-8)

To maystres Isabell Pennell
[...] The columbyne, the nepte, The jeloffer well set, The propre vyolet; Enuwyd your colowre Is lyke the dasy flowre


60 Spearing, Medieval Dream-Poetry, pp. 216-17.
After the Aprill showre;
Sterre of the morow gray,
The blossom on the spray,
The freshest flowre of May;

Maydenly demure,
Of womanhode the lure; (ll. 982-92)

To mastres Geretrude Statham

[...]
I wyll that ye shall be
In all benyngnyte
Lyke to Dame Pasiphe;
For nowe dowtles ye geve me cause
To wryte of yow this goodly clause,
Maistres Geretrude,
With womanhode endude,
With vertu well renude. (ll. 1046-53)

While women were a conventional audience for a dream poem, as readers or patrons, their representation is unusual in that here they appear alongside the personifications and allegorised female figures of the poem, and assume equally active roles. Their allegorical counterparts, the Queen of Fame, Dame Pallas and Occupacyoun, juxtapose the real world and dream world of the poem. Occupacyoun promises to broadcast Skelton’s name and leads Skelton towards the palace of the Quene of Fame. Spearing focuses upon Skelton’s meeting with his guide Occupacyoun in his reading of the poem as a dream poem. She fills the role of the conventional guide in dream poetry and leads the poet through a bejewelled palace and its praetorium, under a glorious ‘cloth of astate’ (1.484), and draws him by the hand through a walled field and across a wall. From this wall Skelton sees messengers rushing in from all over the world, hears snatches of conversation in different dialects and languages, and clearly sees the double-dealing and suspicious world of the court. Skelton sees a thousand gates for every nation besieged by the seekers of fame, and it is clear that amongst these he is at some advantage. This

61 Often, in gardens the dreamer meets allegorical figures, gods or goddesses, who can advise or guide him on his way, for example, Lydgate’s The Temple of Glas, ll. 370-453; Chaucer’s, The House of Fame. ll. 1365-1406, 2158, 495-566, 1521-1566; James I of Scotland’s The Kingis Quair, stanzas 171-2. Many illustrations from manuscripts show how the God of love and the dreamer appear together in a forest or garden, how virtues and vices appear beside trees, how the Lover and Reason meet in an unenclosed garden filled with trees. See Huot, The Romance of the Rose and its Medieval Readers, pp. 32-3, 288; and Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS e. Mus. 65, ff. 95, 27v, 81; 3v; and Spearing, Medieval Dream-Poetry, p. 122.
episode is similar to that of the labyrinthine house of twigs in Chaucer's *The House of Fame* and to the episode with the wall in *The Assembly of Ladies*. Skelton gives unusual emphasis to the role of women as patrons, intercessors, recipients and inspirations of courtly verse and implicitly parallels them with the muses.62

In his representation of the Howards, therefore, Skelton provides his reader with an insight into the conditions of production which prevailed in the late fifteenth century. He provides a snapshot of his relationship with his patrons or court acquaintances and provides a suggestive example of what this relationship entailed for both parties. I explore the relationship further in Chapter Six. Skelton shows that his intended audience was a courtly one but emphasises that this context for the production and reception of texts is different from that for which Chaucer wrote. Skelton adapts and modifies material which originates in the genre of dream poetry in ways which strongly reflect his interest in the production and reception context.

C. Conclusion

Skelton develops the formula and framework of a dream poem in interesting and innovative ways. *The Garland of Laurel* is no pale imitation of an earlier dream poem but uses that old and popular tradition for a new purpose. Furthermore, certain key features of the poem do not belong to dream poetry at all and must be attributed to other influences. Dream poetry is not a sufficient context in itself for understanding Skelton's poem and miscellany plays a distinctive role.

Skelton's poem derives many characteristics directly from the dream vision genre. It is told in instalments, its divisions subtly marked by gaps, repetitions or metrical differences in the text. The poem's framework, episodic and additive, is derived directly from the dream poetry tradition. Each episode is independent of, though tangibly connected to, every other episode within the dream. In the Cotton manuscript (folios 209r and 217r), these sections of the narrative are clearly differentiated and the dream is marked out from the rest of the poem by capitula, visually separating the levels of consciousness it describes. Strong frameworks, similarly episodic, with clear divisions of metre and content, can be seen in *The Kingis Quair* and in *The House of Fame*, also

62 Boffey, "'Withdrawe your hande'", pp. 78-9.
in Lydgate’s *Fifteen Joys and Sorrows of Mary*, where the poem grows out of a meditation on a picture.63

The subject matter of *The Garland of Laurel* is also formulaic, typical of the genre of dream vision. It incorporates standard representations of the dreamer, dream locations, his journey and his encounters on the way. It utilises the standard formula for a dream, presenting an outdoor setting, a melancholic dreamer-poet, zodiac coordinates, and eventual awakening by physical sensation; it makes use of temples, chambers and gardens; female allegorical guides, muses, and figures of authority such as Fame, Pallas, Gower, Chaucer and Lydgate pass judgement on the poet; it focuses upon the role of the narrator-poet and emphasises his authority. The poem seems to be thematically typical of dream vision; it touches upon courtly love but is more concerned with poetic fame and with locating the poet firmly within the tradition of English dream poetry.

Skelton’s poem is notable because it adapts and modifies the subject matter of dream vision for new purposes. The views about fame and poetic tradition which are developed in Skelton’s *The Garland of Laurel* diverge widely from their conventional exposition in dream poetry. Skelton develops an exclusive concern for his own literary fame and asserts his own poetical status in relation to that of his poetic predecessors.

Linked to Skelton’s notion of poetry and fame is his concern with their durability and his awareness of the changing contexts for literary production. The extremely long list of his own works gives emphasis to his self-representation in the poem and seems almost to exaggerate his poetic prowess. He celebrates *The Garland of Laurel* itself, even before he has properly completed composing it. Skelton develops traditional themes and ideas revealing an exclusive concern with literary fame. He locates himself for the reader as part of a past literary tradition, meditates on the origins of language and poetry, but he also recognises that English poetry now has a new status. He asserts his name and reputation, redefines himself as a poet in the light of these developments, and announces his right to fame.

---

Skelton’s *The Garland of Laurel* develops the association found in dream poems between sustained good literary reputation and textual production and circulation. Skelton is concerned with textual durability and reveals his awareness of the changing contexts for literary production in the poem. It is this recognition of Skelton’s which most closely relates his work to the context of miscellany, in which the work was produced and read. By emulating miscellany, Skelton doubled the appeal of his dream poem, making it attractive to his extant audience. The episodic, additive and interlaced framework is similar to the appearance of a miscellany, which gathers together seemingly unrelated items. The form of miscellany allowed Skelton to mix together languages and metres, and to incorporate into his dream poem unconventional elements, such as the group of lyrics. It remains a primary model for Skelton’s poem despite those features of the poem which find their roots in dream vision.

The varied stages of composition, for example, which have been identified by Tucker, and the variant endings of the poem, can only be attributed to the influence of the model provided by manuscript miscellany, not to that given by dream poetry. This is also true of the poem’s disparate metrical forms and languages with which Skelton responds to the still uncertain reception of his work in English and his readers’ lack of appreciation for their native tongue.

The lyrics are a most important feature of the poem, unrelated to the tradition of English dream vision. The composition and recording of the group of lyrics locates Skelton’s text firmly in manuscript culture and leads the reader to focus not upon courtly love, (despite use of conventional imagery), but upon patronage relationships and the changing status of the poet and his work. The introduction of the real world and identifiable personalities to the dream poem is one means by which Skelton adapts the genre of dream vision.

Additionally, the insertion of the lyrics in the longer narrative highlights the difficulties of preserving such works and the changing literary context to which they belong. While the lyrics enhance the strength of the argument that miscellany was an important influence and context for the production and reception of Skelton’s poem, they also

64 Chapters One, Two and Three discuss dates of composition, variant endings and the influence of miscellany.
suggest another important context for Skelton’s work, that of the French *dits amoreux*,
which I consider in more detail in the next chapter.
Chapter Five

*Dit Amoreux*

This chapter examines Skelton’s adaptation of the French *dit amoreux*, a genre which is characterised by insertions of lyric material within a long narrative framework. In this thesis the presence of the lyrics in *The Garland of Laurel* has been primarily attributed to the influence and popularity of the form of miscellany. Likewise, the lyrics have been shown to be an indicator of Skelton’s adaptation of the genre of dream vision, his rejection of its conventional imagery and language in favour of a personal agenda. In this chapter Skelton’s lyrics again provide a focus for the argument. I consider how Skelton adapts the technique of lyric insertion, why he does so, and what in particular his lyrics have to say.1 I examine his adaptation of the *dit amoreux* genre and the extent to which he was influenced by the French tradition.

Firstly this chapter focuses upon the Burgundian court, the popularity of French literature and the nature of its audience in England in the late fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries. It outlines the characteristics of the *dit amoreux* genre which are significant in the context of late fifteenth and early sixteenth-century textual production and, in its second part, examines the structure and processes of Machaut’s *Fonteinne Amoreuse*, (1360–62).2 It draws a comparison between Machaut’s poem and *The Garland of Laurel* in order to highlight Skelton’s literary technique. It considers what Skelton may have had in common with his French contemporaries and why he was influenced by French literary tradition.

---

1 M. B. McC. Boulton, *The Song in the Story: Lyric Insertions in French Narrative Fiction 1200–1400* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1993), p. xiv. Boulton prefaces her work with the questions, ‘Why were songs inserted into stories in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries? Why were these particular songs or lyrics inserted into this story?’ These questions have provided a helpful focus for my consideration of Skelton’s adaptation of *dit amoreux*.

2 All line references to this text are taken from R. B. Palmer, ed. and trans., *Guillaume de Machaut: ‘The Fountain of Love’ (‘La Fonteinne Amoreuse’) and two other Love Vision Poems* (London: Garland, 1993).
A. England and France

i. Burgundy

During the late fifteenth century the dukedom of Burgundy was the dominant European power, culturally, politically and economically.England’s links with Burgundy were complex. Intermittently she was allied with Burgundy against France. She also shared a mutually dependent and advantageous economic system with the Netherlands, and marriages were made to seal the bonds. The Burgundian dukes set standards of chivalry, art and literature for other powers to emulate, and ‘succeeded in rivalling the stature of kings’. They embodied the princely virtues of magnificence, chivalry and power, and displayed their wealth, good taste and status through luxury arts. Grand clothing, surroundings, ceremonies and pageants characterised their reign; ideological objectives were pursued through a complex aesthetic language.

When Henry VII rebuilt his palace at Richmond he imitated the latest and most fashionable architectural and landscape styles from Lowlands Burgundy. Richmond palace was used to celebrate the wedding of Prince Arthur and Katharine of Aragon and

---

3 G. Kipling, The Triumph of Honour: Burgundian Origins of the Elizabethan Renaissance (Leiden: Leiden University Press, 1977), pp. 1-3. The province of Burgundy spread from the far south of France to the North, including Burgundy and the Franche Comté in the South. It spread ‘through Luxembourg, Hainaut, Picardy, Artois, the Somme towns, Boulogne, and encompassed almost the whole of modern Belgium and the Netherlands’. The duke was ‘an independent Flemish prince and a bitter rival of the French king. He visited his ancestral French domains only infrequently, preferring to keep court at Bruges, Ghent, Lille, Brussels, the Hague or Hesdin’. Unlike Huizinga, Kipling has written extensively on the impact and influence of the Burgundian Empire on Tudor England and has sought to establish it as an equally important cultural influence to the Italian Renaissance on Tudor culture. Kipling sees ‘the reign of Henry VII as a transitional period, during which forms of poetry, drama, chivalry, architecture, painting and scholarship were imitated directly from Burgundian models and then transmitted to the Elizabethan era’; M. Belozerskaya, Rethinking the Renaissance: Burgundian Arts Across Europe (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), also questions whether the Renaissance was an Italian-based phenomena and establishes the importance of the Burgundian court as a cultural and artistic trend setter.

4 Belozerskaya, Burgundian Arts, pp. 58-9. Burgundian dukes were politically subject to the king of France for most of their reign but the Burgundian court eclipsed that of the French king and sought parity with the highest monarchs.

5 Ibid., pp. 146-7. Anne, sister of Philip the Good (reigned 1419–1467), married John, Duke of Bedford in 1423; Charles the Bold (reigned 1467–77), married Margaret of York in 1468; also Edward IV spent a period of exile in the Netherlands, 1470–71.

6 Ibid., p. 4.

7 Ibid, Printer’s preface, pp. 1, 48-58.

8 Ibid., pp. 2, 135-45.

9 Kipling, Triumph of Honour, p. 5. Fire destroyed the palace at Sheen in 1497. Henry aptly called the new palace Richmond; the structure alone cost £15,000, p. 3.
to impress the Spaniards with its sumptuous Burgundian furnishings, tapestries, stained glass, French jewels, gold plate and rich paintings. Forty-two immigrant painters were brought to the palace to decorate its walls and to paint miniatures and portraits in the Burgundian style.\textsuperscript{10}

These immigrant painters also illuminated manuscripts. Richmond contained the first palace library and Henry established a Flemish manuscript workshop there, staffed with Flemish scribes and a librarian, Quentin Poulet, who collected Burgundian books and manuscripts, and patronised European printers like Antoine Vérard.\textsuperscript{11} When Poulet left royal service in 1507, Franco-Flemish successors who shared Poulet’s tastes, interests and methods, continued to be appointed. The first of these was William Faques, printer, bookseller and native of Normandy, who was promoted to the library from the newly created office of King’s printer.\textsuperscript{12}

Admiration for Burgundian literature had been encouraged under Edward IV and his sister Margaret of York, Duchess of Burgundy. Also, during the course of the Hundred Years War, the Duke of Bedford had made a massive acquisition of the French Royal Library, and had distributed French texts widely among friends and family.\textsuperscript{13} The collection of books in the royal library reflected Bernard André’s tuition of Prince Arthur; many Classical works, translated into French, were read by Burgundian knights at court.\textsuperscript{14} André himself composed French poetry, for example, \textit{Les Douze Triomphes de Henry VII} (1497), and was also a court chronicler, in the style of Georges

\begin{footnotes}
\item Kipling, \textit{Triumph of Honour}, pp. 4, 6, 41-71, 52-9, 61-2, 66; Belozerskaya, \textit{Burgundian Arts}, pp 152-5.
\item Kipling, ‘Henry VII and the Origins of Tudor Patronage’, pp. 122-6. William Faques (d. 1509), was the father of Richard Faques, the printer of \textit{The Garland of Laurel}.
\item Belozerskaya, \textit{Burgundian Arts}, pp. 67-9. The education of Burgundian dukes included chivalry, classical history, and literature, mostly in French. Texts for the court drew on the works of antiquity and not from medieval writers, didactic treatises or romances. Many translations of important classical works into French were commissioned and works in Latin and French were continuously acquired by Philip the Good and Charles the Bold.
\end{footnotes}
Chastellain, Jean Molinet and Jean Lemaire de Belges.\textsuperscript{15} Henry VII imitated Philip the Good’s practice of appointing an official poet-chronicler and employed a number of other writers to translate popular Lowland court works and compose original poetry emulating fashionable Burgundian styles.\textsuperscript{16} For the first time patronage was widely offered to men of letters, and Kipling suggests that, ‘in the original if eccentric genius of John Skelton, the first creative synthesis of the English and Burgundian traditions appeared’.\textsuperscript{17}

Skelton was laureated at Louvain, a high Burgundian honour.\textsuperscript{18} His translations \textit{Diodorus Siculus, To Lerne you to Die When Ye Will, and the Enseignement de la vraie noblesse} were characteristically Burgundian.\textsuperscript{19} \textit{The Garland of Laurel} demonstrates a mastery of Burgundian motifs; for example, many Burgundian poems send a prince on a journey to the Palace of Honour where they achieve glory as a reward for their virtuous lives of accomplishment, themes strongly motivating Skelton’s dreamer.\textsuperscript{20} Similarly, \textit{Speke Parrot} was influenced by Jean Lemaire de Belges’s two \textit{Épistres de l’Amant Vert}, and Skelton’s \textit{Magnifycence} spoke out against the policies of Henry VIII and

\textsuperscript{15} Kipling, \textit{Triumph of Honour}, pp. 11, 17-19. Kipling notes that he was not emulating Petrarch and was more influenced by Burgundian styles than Humanism. See below for further references to these poets.


\textsuperscript{17} \textit{Ibid.}, pp. 11, 22-4. Kipling compares Skelton’s work with the ‘ uninspired imitation’ of ‘mediocre poets like Hawes and Barclay’, for example, Hawes’s \textit{The Example of Virtue} (1504) and \textit{The Pastime of Pleasure} (1509). William Cornish was another writer to receive patronage from Henry. He wrote disguisings and pageants for the Tudor court, transforming the imagery of Lydgate and \textit{Le Roman de la Rose}, and drawing upon Jean Molinet’s works, see note 20 below. \textit{Ibid.}, pp. 102-8, 111-12.

\textsuperscript{18} Belozerskaya, \textit{Burgundian Arts}, p. 68. From the 1440s, the university was attended by dukes, nobles and sons of aristocrats, including Cornelius, bastard of Burgundy, the eldest son of Philip the Good.

\textsuperscript{19} Kipling, \textit{Triumph of Honour}, pp. 23-4.

\textsuperscript{20} \textit{Ibid.}, p. 24, for example, Jean Molinet’s \textit{Trosne d’Honneur}, Octavien de Saint-Gelais’s \textit{Sejour d’Honneur}; Jean Lemaire de Belges’ \textit{Temple d’Honneur et de Vertus}. Molinet’s work was popular with Henry VII. His famous \textit{Le Trosne d’Honneur}, a dream allegory, provided a London pageant master with a model to devise Triumphs staged by the guilds to welcome Katherine of Aragon for her wedding to Prince Arthur. In it the workings of the cosmos reflect future glory for the king. Molinet’s throne and crown could only be approached by ascending through nine cosmic spheres, in order to reach Honour, seated there in a purple robe, pp. 22, 72-8, 85-8, 93. Katherine’s Triumph ‘stands as the first major statement in England for the Renaissance concern for Honour’, a motif pursued by Skelton, Barclay, Wyatt and Surrey, pp. 94-5.
called for a return to those of true magnificence, as exemplified by the court of Charles the Bold.21

The inventory from the royal library, as well as those works by Skelton, Hawes, Cornish and others, demonstrates a fashion and favour for non-English works and new influence at court which changed textual demand, production and reception.22 Exchange and circulation of texts between England and France, largely Burgundian lands, had been popular for centuries but by the late fifteenth century there was a new following for European fashions amongst those connected with the courts of Henry VII and VIII.

ii. Characteristics of the French dit amoreux Genre

*Dits amoreux* were medium length narrative poems, fashionable in pre-Burgundian France from the thirteenth century and in England from the fourteenth century. They flourished for a long period of time, through the fifteenth century and until the late sixteenth century.23 They often circulated with dream poems, finding popularity with the same audiences, and were based upon both lengthy dream visions and shorter lyrics.24 *Dits amoreux* use a variety of fictional frames, including the dream itself, and often have a specific seasonal or landscape setting. Sustained allegorical action is rare.

French *dits amoreux* combined lyric and narrative material and so helped to establish the importance of the narrative voice for the first time.25 Lyric insertions helped to

---

21 Kipling, *Triumph of Honour*, pp. 24-6, 30; W. H. Kemp, ‘The Burgundian Chanson in the Fifteenth Century, with Special Reference to the Anonymous Chansons in the MS Escorial V.III.24 and Related Sources’, 2 vols (Unpublished doctoral thesis, Oxford University, June 1971), pp. 2-6. Skelton uses the title of the seventh rondeau of El Escorial, Biblioteca del Monasterio MS V.III.24, ff. 6v-7r, [EscA 7], *Vostre tres doulx regart plaisant*, by Binchois, to convey a satiric joke in *Magnificence*. The manuscript is a comprehensive collection of the period containing Burgundian Chansons of the first half of the fifteenth century, words and settings.


25 J. H. M. Taylor, ‘The Lyric Insertion: Towards a Functional Model’ in *Courtly Literature, Culture and Context: Selected Papers from the Fifth Triennial Congress of the International Courtly Literature Society, Dalfsen: The Netherlands, 9th-16th August 1986*, ed. K. Busby and E. Kooper (Philadelphia: Benjamins, 1990), pp. 539-48 (pp. 542, 546). This has become the focus of much critical attention. Taylor, for example, distinguishes the concern with story and diachronic sequence held by a narrator, from the writer’s concern for form. She creates a coherent model for lyric insertion in which the lyric operates, while set between the poles of audience, writer, narrator, author.
highlight the narrator-author-audience, and patron-protagonist, interplay. Dits are always told in the first-person and provide an autobiographical point of departure. They present the author’s own story in combination with that of the dream. First-person narratives from this period, claiming to be the poet’s own lyric compositions, in which the poet-lover becomes the hero as he narrates, have been called pseudo-autobiography.

Insertion of material into the narrative – usually, but not always, lyric in nature – was an inter-generic literary technique, present in a substantial corpus of medieval French texts written between the thirteenth and fifteenth centuries. Daniel Poirion claims that ‘lyricism [derived from the thirteenth century Chansons de Geste and verse romances] constituted the hard kernel of literary production’. Insertions could be borrowed from contemporary or earlier repertoire, quoted in their entirety or only fragmentary; some authors used their own compositions as insertions in the text, but frequently inserted texts pre-date narratives.

Lyrics had different functions in the dit amoreux narrative. Some were used for descriptive purposes, to establish a background against which events took place, usually a castle or court; sometimes they were used to delineate the portrait of a particular character or object. Some retell classical stories which provide parallels to the situations...

---


27 For example many of Machaut’s dits are treated as examples of dream vision. See C. B. Hieatt, ‘Un Autre Fourme: Guillaume De Machaut and The Dream Vision Form’, The Chaucer Review, 14 (1979), 97-115.


29 Boulton, Song in the Story, pp. xiii; J. Fox, The Poetry of Fifteenth Century France, 1: Authors and Themes, 2 vols (London: Grant and Cutler, 1994), i, pp. 67, 81. Popular lyric forms inserted included the ballade, chanson d’amour, complainte, rondeau, virelai and lai, which presented familiar subject matter from medieval lyrics in a new and dynamic way.


31 Taylor, ‘Lyric Insertion’, pp. 539-40. For example, the writers of the Roman de Tristan and Roman de Perceforest composed their own lyrics and devised poems to suit circumstances; Girard d’Amiens, in his Meliacin, and the author of Flamenca both selected lyrics from a common pool; Froissart’s poems were distinct because unlike previous poems they included whole bodies of works in the text written separately.
of the protagonists and offer hope to them in their distress. Some lyrics were used to ornament the text.

While some lyrics integrated harmoniously with the narrative, others introduced a form of disruption into the work, a-temporal and static moments in a linear progression. Consequently, French literature of the late thirteenth and fourteenth centuries reveals the shifting configurations of lyric and narrative elements. Maureen Barry McCann Boulton and Paul Zumthor have perceived the emergence of a distinctive poetic language, ‘a poetics of contrast’, in the unpredictable and unsettling effect of lyric insertions and their disruption of narrative context. Several theoretical models have been created and used to investigate and attempt to categorise the relationship between lyric and narrative, including those of Jane Taylor, Jacqueline Cerquigline, Zumthor, and


33 Boulton, Song in the Story, pp. 9-13. The ideal of ornament was widely appreciated in the middle ages and was expounded by Geoffroi de Vinsauf and Mathieu de Vendôme in terms of poetry and rhetoric. Renart described his own inserted songs as the dye in the fabric of his text, ‘for just as one puts red dye into cloth to give it honour and worth, so has he put songs and music in this Romance of the Rose, which is a new thing’. Boulton describes them as the ‘ornaments of his narrative, standing out like embroidery on cloth.’ She suggests that ‘they suit their environments so well that the whole is a seamless web’, pp. 9-13; P. Terry and N. V. Durling, eds., Jean Renart: ‘The Romance of the Rose’ or ‘Guillaume de Dole’ (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1993), pp. 21, 25, 28, 43, 45, 53, 76-7, 79, 87. Renart’s Rose is a poem which is full of gifts of clothing and descriptions of fine materials. One example from Renart’s Rose, describing a lady called Marguerite, is particularly interesting in the context of Skelton’s lyrics: ‘She’s from Oissery / And never forgets / to go to a party. / So charming is she, / such games never yet / were played under trees. / She wears a fine chaplet / of roses still dewy; / her young face glows prettily, / gray eyes speak sincerely, / she wears her fine jewelry / to cause other girls regret’; Ibid., pp. 64-5.

34 Boulton, Song in the Story, pp. 3-5. For example, in the thirteenth century Renart’s Rose, Gerbert de Montreuil’s Roman de la Violette, Beroul’s Roman de Tristan en Prose, Ysaye le Triste, the Roman du Castelain de Coupé, and Le Chastelaine de Veri, and in the fourteenth century Froissart’s Méladur, and Mellacien, are all narrative poems which attempt to create a setting for the lyric insertion and to provide a transition between the linear and the static. These lyrics are often only comprehensible in the context of the plot and are interspersed with narrative which provides the text with its movement and purpose.

35 Ibid., p. 5. This ‘poetics of contrast’ is also defined by Zumthor, in P. Bennett, ed. and trans., Zumthor: Toward a Medieval Poetics (Minneapolis and Oxford: University of Minnesota Press, 1992), pp. 182-92.
Where lyrics disrupt the narrative the effect can be one of layered voices in polyphonic song.\(^{37}\)

The formal structure of the *dit* was suitable for technical innovation which led to combining narrative and lyric verse, embellishing prose and new forms of versification.\(^{38}\) Virtuosity, cleverness and skill were valued by their creators; poetic games and challenges were undertaken; and poets competed to combine languages, discourses and genres and experimented with form and genre.\(^{39}\) It has been suggested that literary experimentation emerged alongside changing attitudes towards literature in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, and that the act of writing starts to emerge, during this period, as a major theme in writers’ works.\(^{40}\)

In *dits amoureux* focus often falls upon a discussion of poetry and language and this usually becomes a discussion of art and aspects of the book-making process. Poetry and writing are centralised as important pursuits. The *dits amoureux* were perhaps the first poems to openly explore and subvert the relationship between the poet and his patron and have consequently been associated with new representations of the realities of literary production. Originally *dits amoureux* were concerned with love, frequently containing lovers’ debates, complaints or correspondence as insertions. They retained this association, and the expression of feelings and the depiction of the self are central to

---

36 Taylor, ‘Lyric Insertion’, p. 540-2. Taylor bases her model on that of Jacqueline Cerquigline. Taylor claims that discussion about narrative technique and manoeuvre is vital, accounting for the variety of ways in which lyric text is inserted, and offering a wider analytical range; Boulton, *Song in the Story*, pp. 17-18.

37 Ibid., pp. 26-42, 51, 61-6. In fact many insertions in French *dits* were meant to be sung and music is sometimes incorporated for this purpose, for example Machaut’s *Le Livre du Voir Dit* incorporates a musical score alongside letters, chansons baladées, balades, and rondels, and at the end of *La Fonteine Amoureuse* Machaut’s patron sings a rondel (2825-48). The *Roman du Castelain de Couci* is a romance constructed to account for surviving songs about its eponymous hero; the songs are central to the story and are quoted in their entirety at the expense of the narrative. Meliacin’s songs are emblems of fidelity to love. In the *Roman de la Violette*, the songs are provoked by specific memories. Songs in Renart’s *Rose* explore the inner emotional life of the hero.

38 Ibid., pp. 182-3; Calin, *French Tradition*, p. 227.

39 Taylor, ‘Lyric Insertion’, pp. 539-48. Froissart’s *Roman de Méliador*, for example, was a self-imposed challenge and a virtuoso narratological game. It incorporated into a frame-narrative a fixed corpus of lyric poems, with no possibility for selection or rejection of a lyric on grounds of narrative relevance or artistic merit. Its sheer scale makes it interesting. Machaut’s *Voir Dit*, similarly, combines letters and songs in an experimental and virtuosic manner.

them.41 However, while initially the song or lyric insertion had been associated with the love affair of the poet-hero, and amplified his reputation by making explicit his story and commemorating him, the knightly singer of old romance was gradually replaced by a clerkly writer-narrator whose concerns were much more commercial.42

The dits amoreux also frequently show an interest in creating single-author collections of works as a means of preserving poetic reputation for posterity in verse.43 Unlike English printers, French printers frequently gathered together large numbers of short poems for collections.44 A consideration of this process of recueil is particularly interesting in the context of poems which increasingly focus on the act of composition and the history of textual production by manipulating traditional materials.45 The incorporation of lyrics into narrative poems, and changes in technique – when the author needed to make the lyrics accountable in some way or plausible in a new context – reflect a need to mix new material with old material, in order to preserve it and in order to appeal to a changing and broadening audience. Not only did this give new appeal to literary texts and created inter-textual contexts for works of literature, but it also sanctioned what Zumthor calls the mouvance of texts.46

The French dit amoreux genre developed significantly during the period from 1475 to 1525, perhaps because of its thematic concerns, and provided an influential model for

---

41 Wimsatt, Chaucer and the French Love Poets, pp. 50-3. The Roman de la Poire is the earliest episodic poem, c.1230–72; Boulton, Song in the Story, pp. 143-80. Dits containing lyrics which communicate essential information, manifesting themselves in the forms of declarations, correspondence (letters) or celebrations, include Le Roman du Castelain de Couci, Guiron le courtois, L’Espinette Amoureuse, Roman de Fauvel, Voir Dit, Roman de la Poire (the earliest episodic poem), Roman de la Dame à La Licorne; Michel Zink, Medieval French Literature: An Introduction, Université de Paris IV – Sorbonne, Medieval and Renaissance Texts and Studies, 110 (New York: Binghamton, 1995), p. 103.

42 Boulton, Song in the Story, p. 182.


46 See Chapter Two, A. iv.
English writers in the early years of print. Machaut was perhaps the most prolific of the early writers, producing ten long narrative *dits*, four shorter narrative *dits*, a prologue and an immense corpus of lyrics. His *dits amoreux* include the *Remède de Fortune*, *Fonteinne Amoreuse*, *Voir Dit* and *Le Prologue*. In these, Machaut thematised his professional activities as a writer of narrative poetry. Froissart, Charles d’Orléans, Oton de Graunson and others also developed the genre and provided models for English activity.

4 On the insertion of lyrics within narrative structures in French poetry, and the relation of these poems to important English works, see Wimsatt, *Chaucer and the French Love Poets*; Wimsatt, *Chaucer and his French Contemporaries*; Poiron, *Le Poète et le Prince*; Calin, *French Tradition*; Fox, *Poetry of Fifteenth Century France*, i, pp. 67, 81. Today, as in studies of English poetry, French writing of this period attracts little attention from medieval or Renaissance scholars, although recent work by critics suggests that its period of neglect may be over.

48 Calin, *Poet at the Fountain*, p. 17.

49 Wimsatt, *Chaucer and his French Contemporaries*, pp. 30-1; J. I. Wimastt, W. W. Kibler, and R. A. Baltzer, eds., *Guillaume De Machaut: ‘Le Jugement du Roy de Behaigne’ and ‘Remède de Fortune’* (London: University of Georgia Press, 1988). The *Remède de Fortune* incorporates seven songs, each belonging to a different literary kind, composed independently from the narrative but completely integrated with it. Machaut’s poem presents a tableau of each of the most important lyric genres of his day arranged in a pattern of decreasing difficulty and complexity; Calin, *Poet at the Fountain*, pp. 70-1, has suggested that they formed the nucleus of an *ars poetica* which Machaut elaborated for the use of his students.

50 Calin, *Poet at the Fountain*, pp. 168-72. Letters and poems are inserted into the pseudo-autobiographical love narrative of the *Voir Dit*. These serve to guarantee the authenticity of the ‘true story’ of the title and perpetuate the illusion of historical truth. The poem presents a collected correspondence between the poet and his lady and makes central the theme of communication and the written word.


52 L. Earp, *Guillaume Machaut: A Guide to Research* (New York and London: Garland, 1995), p. 199. Machaut’s concern for manuscript collections of his own complete works influenced a generation of poets. Not only did he supervise the production of several of these manuscripts by establishing the order in which the works were copied, he also supervised the programme of illustrations for the narrative poems.

53 Froissart’s works include the *Espinette Amoureuse*, *Paradis d’Amours*, *Joli Mois de Mai*, *Prison Amoureuse*, *Le Livre du tresor amoureux*, *Melidor* and *Joli Buisson de Jonece*. Froissart’s *Melidor* is a revision of a work he had composed earlier but into which he later incorporated the poems of his patron Wenceslas of Brabant. Evidently theirs was a patron-client collaboration in which the lyrics were framed and placed to draw attention to both the patron and the poet. R. Morris, ‘Machaut, Froissart and the Fictionalisation of Self’, *Modern Language Review*, 83 (1988), 545-55; Wimsatt, *Chaucer and the French Love Poets*, pp. 126-9; K. M. Figg, *The Short Lyric Poems*, pp. 1-11, 14-15, 41. Charles d’Orléans’ *Fortune’s Stabilines*, London, British Library, MS Harley 682 (H), also unites mixed forms. M.-J. Arn, ed., *‘Fortune’s Stabilines’*, p. 2. Wimsatt, *Chaucer and his French Contemporaries*, pp. 278-9. *Dit amoreux* writing and lyric insertion was brought to its peak in c. 1390 when Jean le Seneschal and three other noblemen wrote the *Cent Ballades*. Oton de Graunson’s *Livre Messire Ode*, late fourteenth century and contemporary with the *Cent Ballades*, dissolves at the end into lyric, in a series of poems.
In the context of late fifteenth-century French literary productivity, the increasing popularity of the *dits amoreux* in England, and their common use of a dream framework, the lyric insertions in the long narrative of *The Garland of Laurel* appear highly significant. The *dits amoreux* were intertextual, hybrid literary forms, and critics have explored how lyric insertions combine discourses and styles as well as genres.54 Skelton’s interest in this kind of activity, as demonstrated in *The Garland of Laurel*, makes *dits amoreux* an interesting focus for considering his adaptation of the processes and structures of other genres. Here the focus for comparison is Machaut’s *Fonteinne Amoreuse*.

B. Machaut’s *Fonteinne Amoreuse* and Skelton’s *The Garland of Laurel*

i. Machaut’s *Fonteinne Amoreuse*

The *Fonteinne Amoreuse*, by Guillaume Machaut, is a courtly love poem which reflects upon love, and on the role of clerkly poets. It typifies the *dits amoreux*, making use of framing devices such as the dream, inserting lyric material, and retelling classical stories. It is also pseudo-autobiographical and focuses upon the skill of the poet and the production and reception of texts.

Machaut’s poem begins with an explanation of how events came to pass. The frames by which the narrative progresses are those of traditional dream vision, the dream itself, the chamber, the garden with a central fountain and the court.

Il n’a pas lone temps que j’estoie  
En un lit ou pas ne dormoie,  
Einsois faisoie la dorveille,  
Com cils qui dort et encor veille,  
Car j’aloie de dor en dor,  

(Not long ago I was  
In bed and not sleeping,  
But, rather, wakeful,  
Like a man who sleeps yet is awake,

For I was tossing and turning.) (ll. 61-5)

He identifies himself as the clerkly narrator of this poem. He also indicates that he is writing the poem for a particular pretty lady (l. 8), for courtly ladies in general (l. 19), and for a particular man, whose identity is revealed through an acrostic and through clues in the text (ll. 45-51). Machaut’s initially unidentified patron is Jean de Berry, cast in the role of a distressed courtly lover, and Machaut himself, by addressing his text not only to Jean but also to all ladies, takes on the conventional role of a subservient courtly and clerkly poet-lover.

Restless in his sleep, the poet overhears a complaint of love coming from inside a nearby chamber. Presented as coming from the lips of Jean himself (the patron), it is recorded without his awareness by the clerk/poet (Machaut).

[...]

il avoit une fenestre
Par ou sa parole escoutoie,
Car pres de la fenestre estoie.
Si que je pris mon escriptoire,
Qui est entaillié d’ivoire,
Et tous mes outils pour escrire
La complainte qu’il voloit dire.
Si commença piteusement,
Et je l’escri joieusement.

La Complainte de l’Amant.

Douce Dame, vueilliez oïr la vois
De ma clamour, qu’en souspirant m’en vois,
Tristes, dolens, dolereus, et destrois,

(there was a window

55 Calin, Poet at the Fountain, pp. 172-6, 240-1. Calin suggests that Machaut believed that *dits amoreux* no longer provided him with sufficient scope to recreate reality in the way he wished, thus contributing to the creation of a new literary type with a pseudo-autobiographical character, a poet-narrator-lover and a more sophisticated narrative technique.

56 Phillips and Havely, eds., Chaucer’s Dream Poetry, p. 40. Machaut’s patrons figure in many of his poems, including his two judgement poems, *Le Jugement du Roy de Navarre* and *Le Jugement du Roy de Behaigne* (The Judgment of the King of Navarre and The Judgment of the King of Bohemia). Palmer, Machaut: The Fountain of Love, pp. xviii-xx, l-li, lvi. The patron of the latter was Charles the Bad, the newly crowned king of Navarre, whose coronation took place in Pamplona on June 27th, 1350. Comfort for a Friend was also written for Charles the Bad, imprisoned when he plotted the overthrow of the king of France. Although he had many royal and noble patrons it was through his connection with Charles that Machaut became associated with his brother-in-law and cousin, Jean, Duc de Berry. In all his poems Machaut details precise autobiographical references, so that he and his patrons may be identified, but the *Fonteinne Amoreuse* is a special example of his work.
Through which I listened to his words,  
For I was close to the window.  
And so I took up my writing desk,  
Which is worked with ivory,  
And all my writing instruments in order to record  
The complaint that he intended to utter.  
Then he began piteously  
While I wrote with pleasure:

*The Lover’s Complaint*

Sweet lady, please hear the sounds  
Of my lamenting as sighing I depart,  
Sad, grieving, pained, and distraught.) (ll. 226-37)

Jean’s lament for his wretched state as a lover and his self-imposed exile from his lady, fifty stanzas in total, is the first of two lyrical monologues (ll. 235-1034). It includes within it the classical exemplum of Ceyx and Alcyone, which leads Jean to appeal to Morpheus, the god of sleep, to inform his lady of his love for her (ll. 542-698, 708-14).57

After walking together in the garden with Jean, both men fall asleep by the fountain of love and Machaut dreams of the story of the Judgement of Paris, and the wedding of Peleus and Thetis (further inserted classical exempla, ll. 1569-2144).58 Then, in the dream, he sees Jean’s lady coming towards them. She answers Jean’s complaint with a confort of eighteen stanzas, the consolation of the lover and the lady (ll. 2208-2494).59

“Amis, je te vieng conforter
Et joie et solas aporter
Et de ces tenebres oster
Ou je te voy;
Et aussi te vien je enorter
Que tu te vueilles deporter
De faire dueil et toy getter
De cest anoy.
Et je te promés, par ma foy,
Que m’amour et le cuer de moy

57 Skelton’s reception of the *Fonteine Amoreuse* may have been mediated by Chaucer’s *Book of the Duchess* which borrows heavily from Machaut. It is possible that this was a secondary line of transmission. L. D. Benson, ed., *Riverside Chaucer* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1987), pp. 329-30, 330-46.


Aras toudis aveques toy,

Et sans fausser
Seray tienne, faire le doy;
Et se tu ne prens cest ottroy,
Justque a mort me verras, ce croy,
Desconforter.

("Lover, I come to console you
And to bring joy and comfort
And to lift you from these shadows
Where I find you;
And also I come to implore
That you please stop
Grieving, and give up
This misery.
And I promise you, by my faith,
That you will always have with you
My love and heart,
For, without betrayal
I will be, must be yours;
If you do not accept this gift,
I believe that you will see misery bring me
To the point of death itself.") (ll. 2207-22)

The lady exchanges rings with her lover and leaves under the guidance of Venus before the two sleeping men awaken. The poem ends with Jean's departure from his court and with Machaut rewarded.

The poem’s structure combines narrative with lyric, varying the pace and rhythm of the whole work. In particular the complaint and its reply slow down the narrative and provide détente. The insertions predate the narrative and they give impulse to the unfolding of the plot while containing elements of that plot. Such a poem, as Calin says, uses ‘intertextual practice as its very reason for existence [...] the narrative tells how the lyrics came into being; the lyrics amplify and exemplify the story told by the narrative."\(^{60}\)

The lyrics become a means for the poet to pause and demonstrate his poetic skill and they exemplify the literary interdependence of clerk and patron. They are fully integrated into the poem. For example, the complaint is used as a means by which the narrator can give back to the lover a complaint which came from his own lips.\(^{61}\) When

\(^{60}\) Calin, French Tradition, p. 200.

\(^{61}\) Calin, Poet at the Fountain, pp. 147-9, 164-5.
Jean asks Machaut to compose him a complaint or lay to express his despair to his lady, Machaut takes out the earlier transcription from his pocket and returns it to his patron, without any pretense that the work is his own.

"Pour ce amis, je vous vueil prier
Que tant vueillez estudier
Que de m’amour et de ma plainte
Me faciés ou lay ou complainte.
Car je say bien que la pratique
Savez toute, et la theorique
D’amour loial et de ses tours,
Et ses assaus et ses estours
Vous ont donné mainte frisson
Plus poingnant que pel d’yresson."

Trop durement me rejoý
Quant ensement parler l’oÿ,
Car je sceus bien que c’estoit cil
Qui avoit l’engin si soutil
Et que j’avoie oÿ compleindre
En son lit, dolouser et pleindre.
Ma main mis a ma gibessiere,
S’ataingni sa complainte entière,
Et dis: “Sire, vostre requeste
Tenez; vesla ci toute preste.”

(“And so, friend, I would ask
That you please consider composing
A lay or complaint for me
About my love and sorrow.
For I am well aware that you know
All about the practice and theory
Of faithful love, its twists and turns,
For its assaults and struggles
Have given you many a pang
Sharper than could a hedgehog’s hide.”

I very greatly rejoiced
When I heard him speak this way,
Since I knew well that this was the man
With the very subtle genius
Whom I had heard complaining
In his bed, sorrowing and weeping.
I put my hand to my wallet,
Took out all of his complaint,
And said: “Lord, take
What you’ve requested; here it is, ready at once.”)

(ll. 1501-20)
Machaut cleverly shows a type of collaboration between the patron and his client which is peculiar to the manuscript context of textual production. The poet performs a service, which is in fact the patron’s own work, and is rewarded in a conventional way. The patron is shown to be great and noble and the story emphasises the value of service and hierarchy. It tells a history of the relationship between Machaut and Jean.62

The complaint is without repetition and contains more than one hundred different rhymes, drawing attention to Jean’s eloquence, and, by implication, to Machaut’s poetic skill and interest in the development of the poetic arts.

Ne vous anuit, dame, se plus ne rime,
Qu’on porroit bien espuisier un abisme.
Cent rimes ay mis dedens ceste rime,
 Qui bien les conte.
Prises le ay en vostre biauté, qui me
Tient sans dormir dou soir jusques a prime.
Mais en mil ans n’en dirioie la disme.
Toute seurmonte.

(Don’t be offended, lady, if I rhyme no more,
For a bottomless source can be well exhausted.
I have put a hundred rhymes into this verse,
Whoever numbers them right.
These I found in your beauty, which prevents
Me from sleeping all night till dawn.
But in a thousand years I couldn’t recount a tenth of it.
It surpasses everything.) (ll. 1019-26).

The passage demonstrates not only Machaut’s poetic skill and ingenuity, and his status as a lover, but also associates the lover and patron figure of Jean, Duc de Berry, with the role of the artist. From the outset, Machaut is reflexive about his act of writing and his relationship with Jean, and these relationships are explored through the complexity of the lyric insertions and their play with narrative voice. Rather than openly honouring the patron, the insertions draw attention to the dynamics of the patronage relationship. The disruption and shifts in authorship, which are characteristic of the insertions in dits concerned with writing, reflect the reversals of the relationship between the two lovers-narrators-poets of the action. Laurence de Looze describes the Fonteinne Amoureuse as

62 C. Nouvet, ‘Pour Une Économie de la Dé-limitation: “La Prison Amoureuse” de Jean Froissart’, Neophilologus, 70 (1986), 341-56 (p. 341). Nouvet suggest that, during the fourteenth century, the notion of a ‘work’ first emerged in the works of Machaut and Froissart. It became recognised that the relationships between writers and patrons generated texts and breached the gap between history and fiction for the first time. Such texts, according to Nouvet, led to the emergence of the ‘I’ of narrator-protagonist-lover-poet figure.
a narcissistic literary work, thematising the poetic process mimetically. It provokes not only a fictional ideal of a world but succeeds in advertising its own literariness and textuality. Machaut reveals that his work depends on his patron for its matter and form and in doing so he blurs the boundaries between his work and the reality which provides its context for reception.

The shared creativity of poet and patron is made explicit in the complaint but it is also highlighted later in the poem through the theme of love. Both Machaut and his patron are lovers, each has a lady whom he wishes to please, and in this way their fortunes seem tied together. When they reach the fountain of love Machaut will not drink because he already loves too much and his patron will drink no more because he considers himself already undone by the fountain (ll. 1425-38). In addition, Machaut expresses his deep love and admiration for Jean of Berry in personal terms, but also remarks upon his nobility and the generosity of his patron to many other people (ll. 1119-1204). The two men arrive at the fountain walking hand in hand and, having revealed their sadness, they fall asleep upon each other instantly and dream. Poet and patron are represented as being bound together by love, as sharing each other’s burdens and emotions, and as being mutually supportive and sympathetic about the difficulties of love and self-expression.

The second lyric insertion further supports this idea of their mutual dependence, suggesting that it is through the poet’s belief in the power of Venus that the patron is granted her mercy and finds consolation in love. Poet and patron dream the same dream about Venus and Jean’s lady, awaken at the same moment, share their experiences, and after this the patron requests the poet’s company on a journey, at the end of which the poet is rewarded for his services with lands and splendid jewels (ll. 2833-48).

Machaut’s poem represents a conventional poet-patronage relationship, in which the poet is dependent upon the generosity of his patron, but it also explores the depth and

---

Poet and patron are closely bound to each other emotionally, are mutually supportive and their fates are shown to be in parallel. The poet's subservience to his patron is emphasised through his humility and his pleasure in serving and writing. The patron's nobility is emphasised through the descriptions of his acts of generosity, his courtly entourage, the richness of his land and property and finally through his gift-giving. The distinction between them is always maintained despite the similarities in the fiction which highlight the changing place of the poet in the real world.

**ii. Skelton's *The Garland of Laurel*.**

Many elements of French *dits amoureux* appealed to Skelton. Their influence can be seen in the content and structure of *The Garland of Laurel*, most obviously through the integration and purpose of the lyrics, but also through the poem's experimentation with language and form, its pseudo-autobiographical emphasis and its concerns with book production and reputation. Again, Skelton can be seen to be adapting rather than merely imitating the processes and structures of the *dit amoureux* genre in a number of different ways.

**ii.i Integration and Function of Lyric Insertions**

Like the insertions in Machaut's *Fonteinne Amoreuse*, those in Skelton's poem function in a variety of ways. At a basic level the lyrics ornament the text and provide relief from its linear narrative movement. The narrative showcases and offsets the lyrics. Unlike the insertions in Machaut's poem, and those of other conventional *dits amoureux*, however, the multiple lyrics inserted by Skelton are grouped together in the text. They occur at only one point within his narrative and they retain their separate metres and appearance. This has the effect of focusing particular attention upon them, both causing the reader to pause in his progress and to consider them aside from the narrative. On the surface they appear to be nowhere near as integrated as Machaut's insertions.

The inserted lyrics also retain their basic descriptive function. They focus attention upon the ladies, describing and directing attention towards the particular attributes of each
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66 Wimsatt, *Chaucer and the French Love Poets*, pp. 115-17. In the *Fonteinne Amoreuse* the nature of the relationship between Machaut and a real patron, and the processes of exchange involved in their patron-writer relationship, are explored by the poet in a way which is similar to the explorations Chaucer undertakes in his *Book of the Duchess*. 

179
one in turn, like painted miniatures within the text. However, as demonstrated in the preceding chapter, Skelton diverges from the model of the courtly poet-lover expressing in monologue intimate and private feelings of love, sorrow or duty to his lady. His lyrics are not provoked by emotion or memory but appear to be spontaneous and public embellishments, which parody or distort courtly convention. Skelton hints at a courtly context, but he gives his insertions more significance and status in his poem than they have in the *dits*; he is not restrained by the conventions of the mode of courtly lyric writing or the *complainte-confort* structure found in Machaut’s *Fonteinne Amoreuse*. Unlike Machaut’s insertions, Skelton’s lyrics do not function as emblems of fidelity in love, but they do play upon the love convention and point to the significance of the poet’s relationships with his patrons.

Skelton’s lyric insertions, therefore, while primarily descriptive and ornamental, diverge from their conventional function. Skelton plays upon the special integral relationship between lyrics and the narrative found in the *dit amoureux* genre and adapts the lyrics to convey information and to be a substitute for action. His lyrics are essential to the plot and its action, and to its thematic message. As shown in the following two sections, Skelton uses the inserted lyrics in two ways, firstly to focus the readers’ attention upon the act of writing – literary experimentation with languages, genres and forms, demonstration of poetic skill, self-representation and the creation of poetic reputation – and secondly to focus the readers’ attention upon his relationship to patrons and audience. These themes are derived from the genre of *dit amoureux*, but Skelton adapts the structures and processes through which they are conveyed.

**ii.ii Writing**

Skelton’s interest in literary experimentation and his demonstration of poetic skill is presented in a more subtle way than that exemplified by the *dits amoureux*. Whereas French writers like Machaut demonstrated their skill and virtuoso techniques by inserting a variety of forms into long narrative poems, even compiling works in particular forms specifically for this reason, Skelton treats linguistic and generic virtuosity as secondary elements of *The Garland of Laurel* and relies primarily upon the meaning and narrative function of his lyrics, and the poem’s innate miscellaneity, to focus in a more general way upon textual production and reception.
While the lyrics appear in a variety of metrical forms, rhythms and registers, are unsettling and unpredictable, and disrupt the narrative, they are integrated into the plot and are not complex in composition or unusual in their structure. They are written at the command of the Queen of Fame, to remedy Skelton’s failure to write courtly verse for ladies, and are thus a test to prove his worth. In this way they focus attention upon Skelton’s ability to produce ‘courtly’ poetic tributes, his intentions as a writer and the ways in which the lyrics could be interpreted by their recipients. The reader must focus not only upon skill and diversity but also upon the act of writing and the intentions of the author. It is likely that Skelton was excited by the possibilities for generic and rhythmic experimentation, and the opportunities for displaying technical skill and virtuosity, which lyric insertion in the *dits amoreux* provided. He responded to these models but particularly drew upon the *dits*’ theme of authorial independence and self-assertion, their centralisation and exploration of the role of the poet figure.

Central to Skelton’s exploration of the role of the poet was the poet’s motivation. In *dits amoreux* poets were motivated by a desire to explore their own status and to make permanent their place in literary tradition.67 These concerns, revived more widely in the Burgundian attitude towards dynasty, described above, were recognised by Skelton and translated into a personal agenda. Skelton was closely influenced by his own awareness of changing modes of textual production and the difficulties of preserving texts.68 The grouping together of the lyric insertions of *The Garland of Laurel*, within a narrative framework, derives further significance when they are dated to a period when Skelton was collecting together short verse pieces in collections for print (see Chapter Two above), perhaps to ensure that they were preserved.69 His bibliographic list, described above, also demonstrates his concern with sustaining his poetic reputation and self-representation.

Influenced by the French models, and by the genre of dream poetry, Skelton also writes a pseudo-autobiographical text. Authorship becomes the focus of Chapter Seven of this
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67 Nouvet, ‘Pour Une Économie’, pp. 341-56 and de Looze, ‘Machaut and the Writerly Process’, pp. 145-61. Nouvet and de Looze see the *dits amoreux* revealing an awareness of changing circumstances of production, the central role of the author and his relationships with patrons and the market place. This is also demonstrated by the French interest in *recueil*.

68 See my earlier discussion in Chapters Two and Three.

69 For example, *Agaynst a comely cozstrowne* and *Dyverse balletys and dyties solacyons*. 181
thesis and I do not wish to dwell on it here, but it is important to note that, as in Machaut’s poem, Skelton identifies himself as the poet and dreamer of the poem, and places himself in an identifiable setting. He weaves a fiction which contains elements of reality and by doing so locates himself within particular literary and social contexts.

Unlike Machaut, Skelton does not announce the name of a patron as an intended recipient of the poem; he does not explain why the insertions have been included, nor does he openly comment on his skill as a poet and the overall complexity of his poem. Rather, he adopts the guise of dullness and feigns modesty before his reader. The effect of this is to emphasise his independence as a writer and the centrality of the author-narrator figure to the work in progress. Skelton, more subtly than Machaut, draws the readers’ attention to his own role and reputation, and to the work in progress.

An understanding of the context for Skelton’s dream and work involves a consideration of the relationship between the poet and the world of his patron, spheres which are first integrated, subverted and explored in *dits amoureux* such as Machaut’s *Fonteinne Amoreuse*. The courtly love scenario, rejected by the tone and content of Skelton’s lyrics, is easily transferable to the patronage scenario, as demonstrated by Machaut’s poem. While I look more closely at the patronage relationship in the next chapter, here it is necessary to consider how Skelton adapts the workings of those love relationships in the *dits amoureux*.

ii.iii Patrons and Audience

In works by Chaucer, such as *The Book of the Duchess*, and in Machaut’s *Fonteinne Amoreuse*, the text is geared towards patronal preferences and written for the patron or with the patron in mind. Such texts reflect and explore the nature of conventional patronage relationships, showing the patron as primary to both the production of the text and its reception. The author’s autonomy is shown to be limited; his role is well-defined and subservient to that of the patron.

In *The Garland of Laurel*, Skelton represents himself in relation to different kinds of female patron figures, real, potential and ideal patrons. Some of the ladies, alive at the time of composition, may have been real patrons as Skelton suggests, but some may have been potential patrons whose patronage was being solicited, while others – who
may have been past patrons – were already dead. The poem is representative, rather than merely a historical act. The ladies play no part in composing the lyrics, and have not commissioned or requested them. The lyrics both anticipate the progression of the dream narrative in which Skelton is glorified through their writing, and tell a macro-story, that of the real poet in the real world and his relationship with his patrons. They show the parallel situation of writer and patron and their interdependence. These real, potential, and ideal patrons, and their roles, are discussed further in the next chapter.

In addition, and more conventionally, Skelton includes a dream scenario offering the reader a fictionalised ideal of patronage relationships. Skelton undertakes to write the lyrics at the request of Dame Pallas who helps him to prove his worthiness as a poet to the Queen of Fame. He is guided on a journey by Occupacyoun and these three female figures offer an allegorical parallel to the patronage relationships represented by the lyrics.

In his consideration of his relationship to patrons, therefore, Skelton employs a number of strategies which are not to be found in earlier French models. Potential and ideal patrons, as well as actual patrons, become important to the way that he presents himself and his work to the real world. The appearance of such figures in the text is a device for self-promotion, just as the idea of a patron (real or make-believe) becomes an important selling point to a wider audience or a printer. Skelton name-drops to enhance his perceived status. Fictional presentation of ideal or potential patronage relationships permits an increased reflexivity or self-consciousness about the relations between patrons, authors and audiences on Skelton’s part. Like Machaut’s less troubled and uncertain depiction of his real patronage relationship with the Due de Berry, Skelton reveals these complex relationships through lyric insertions in the narrative framework.

Skelton chooses to place an emphasis on the equality of the relationship which exists between himself and his patrons, in this case female patrons. The flippant, careless, informal praise, and the familiar tone of the lyrics, assert a balance between the parties. This is in contrast to Machaut who works hard to promote the nobility of his patron, although he also develops a sense that poet and patron are on familiar terms. Skelton also chooses to depict himself and his patrons engaging in reciprocal acts; he writes

70 In the next chapter I discuss further the work of John Scattergood, M. J. Tucker and H. L. R. Edwards, concerning the identities, birth and death dates, and the familial relationships of these ladies.
lyrics for them, they weave a laureate garland for him. Unlike Machaut’s patron, the ladies do not request the lyrics and take no direct part in their composition. Skelton makes little effort to focus upon or celebrate their nobility, leaving us uncertain about the exact nature of his role and relationship with them. The lyrics are suggestive of growing authorial autonomy and seem to look sidelong at social hierarchies and the status of the individual poet. They allow for an exploration of the interplay between narrator, author, audience, patron and protagonist, and for an examination of poetic self. To a large extent, the lyrics’ exploration of patronage relationships is overshadowed by Skelton’s own self-celebration and reputation-enhancement.

The poem provides a microcosm of patronage activity by which the reader can mark changing circumstances of production and reception. Both Skelton and Machaut explored poetic status and relationships with patrons, providing insight into the changing dynamics of textual production and reception. Machaut’s response to changing markets and more competitive production at the end of the fourteenth century in France provided an apt model for Skelton as he adapted to the changing production and reception contexts of the late fifteenth century in England. Skelton combines discourses, styles and genres with lyric forms in order to reconsider the position of the writer and patron of literary works. The differences in their attitudes towards patrons and self-advancement are perhaps the result of a century of change.

iii. Skelton and his French Contemporaries

Dits amoureux provided Skelton with a model for The Garland of Laurel which was appropriate not only structurally but thematically. Skelton’s poem reflects increasing awareness of the problems of textual production, reception and circulation in the manuscript / print period, themes which were also important in the works of his French contemporaries. The group of poets known as the Grands Rhétoriqueurs, poet-historians connected with the French royal courts of Charles VIII and Louis XII between 1460 and 1530, wrote with an awareness and love of past tradition, but in

71 L. de Looze, ‘Machaut and the Writerly Process’, p. 147. De Looze recognised the pressures of a marketplace, the realisation that creativity was no longer a leisure pursuit and that the relationship between the poet and his world was changing. Nouvet, ‘Pour Une Économie’, p. 341, has also suggested that the end of the fourteenth century saw the emergence of the two figures, the professional poet and patron, and that their texts begin to mirror the circumstances of production.
particular produced works which were politically active and polemical, and which involved the remaking of French history in the vernacular as it grew in popularity and power. Frequent references to French current affairs in their works mean that precise dating is relevant to their interpretation. Like Skelton, they wrote historicized texts.

The Rhétoriqueurs focused upon the status of the writer and upon changing literary relationships in their works. They placed the author in relation to patronage, politics and new artistic needs. They addressed new audiences, undermined established literary codes and redirected poetic conventions and methods. They excelled at poetic experimentation, and were renowned for their manipulation of rhetorical and poetic devices, for hybrid literary creations and for innovations with literary form. Jean Bouchet, for example, exerted considerable influence in the development and production of mystery plays in the Poitiers region, adapting a taste formed before 1500 in reaction to the aesthetics of a new age.

Their works exemplify the tensions surrounding the emergence of the autonomous author figure in the print era in France. Increasingly explicit artistic self-awareness diminished the importance of patrons and seems to have been a product of a better understanding of the potential of print and changing perceptions of patrons and their glorification. Formal praise of patrons, ‘an essential feature of the Rhétoriqueur tradition’, was far more developed as a literary form in France than in England. As in
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77 Brown, _Shaping of History and Poetry_, pp. 152-3; Belozerskaya, _Burgundian Arts_, pp. 7, 10-11. Belozerskaya takes the Italian Giorgio Vasari as an example. In his _Le Vite de’ più eccellenti pitori scultori ed architettori_ (1568), Vasari sought fame for artists of the past, and their works, and those of his own age. He strove to elevate the place of the artist in society and emphasised artist above patron, revising extant social hierarchies.

Skelton’s case, while initially dependent upon their patrons, their position changed from one of subordination to independence. These French poets repositioned themselves in the political and poetic spheres, consciously fashioned and manipulated their own representation, and challenged established literary codes and authority.79

Pierre Gringore and André de la Vigne, for example, provide useful models for such authorial activity in this period of transition from manuscript to print.80 The replacement of woodcut illustrations of patrons with self-portraits, and the use of identifying acrostics in their works, reveals their growing consciousness, as well as that of printers and booksellers, of the importance of advertisement and self-identification.81 This led to much competition and conflict between poets and printers.82 Legal cases were fought over rights of publication but outcomes were often still influenced by patronage.83

The work of the Rhétoriqueurs, and their recorded disputes, gives much insight into their relations with their audience, with their printers and with each other. It is likely that the polemic and politics which dominated their writing at the end of the fifteenth century altered the balance of power within the literary community between the authority of the patron, the poet and the public.84 The developments in France—growing consciousness on the part of authors, printers and booksellers about the importance of self-advertisement, reputation, and the demands of their widening audiences—are themes reflected in Skelton’s The Garland of Laurel. The repositioning

79 Brown, ‘Rise of Literary Consciousness.’ p. 64.
80 Brown, ‘Text, Image and Authorial Self-Consciousness’, pp. 103, 118-19. The evolution of La Ressource illustrates the changing literary relationships of the period. Through its manuscript and print forms, illustration and symbolic ornamentation, title pages, and the acknowledgement of the author or printer, a key to the production and reception of this text is provided.
83 Brown, ‘Text, Image and Authorial Self-Consciousness’, pp. 124-31, 138. In 1504, André de la Vigne filed a law suit against Michel le Noir who was about to print Le Vergier d’honneur. The winning of this law suit reflected the royal protection of Anne of Brittany; see also Brown, ‘Confrontation between Printer and Author’, pp. 105-19.
84 Brown, Shaping of History and Poetry, pp. 147-8; Brown, ‘Confrontation between Printer and Author’, pp. 117-18.
of English authors in relation to their French counterparts, at the time manuscript and print co-exist, is an important extension of considering English book production and literary relationships in the late fifteenth and early sixteenth century.

Skelton’s poem illustrates not only continuity with the past but the development of literary consciousness on a wider scale. He looks back at attitudes of past writers towards literary relationships, but adapts and utilises them in response to the tensions of his own time, providing a modern reader with a snapshot of literary relationships in the late fifteenth century. While demonstrating continuity with medieval tradition he also displays an open and progressive attitude towards the depiction of relationships between authors and patrons in late fifteenth-century England, which finds counterparts in the work of his French predecessors and contemporaries.

C. Conclusion

Skelton was clearly influenced by dits amoreux, and the reflexivity that comes about through lyric insertion. This particular generic model had been used for writing about the tradition of courtly love but was easily transferable to affairs of more contemporary concern such as changes in, or explorations of, the structures of patronage and textual reception. Ongoing experimentation with the limits of poetry, a mixture of languages, genres and forms, demonstration of technical skill and a concern with writing itself, are characteristic of the dit amoreux genre and are found in Skelton’s work. Skelton also uses pseudo-autobiography, but was most significantly influenced by the technique of lyric insertion which focuses attention upon poetic identity and highlights the narrator-author-audience-patron-protagonist interplay. The lyrics become an essential focal point for the narrative and for an interpretation of the whole work.

The lyrics give a snapshot of production and reception conditions in the late fifteenth century. Through them Skelton investigates literary relationships between patrons, writers, and readers. He reflects upon the changing dynamics of textual production, reception and circulation in the late fifteenth and early sixteenth century. They reveal
much about Skelton’s attitudes towards textual production, the continuity of his writing with the medieval past and his willingness to embrace new developments. Unlike Chaucer or Machaut, Skelton does not write about his relationship with a single patron and explore how it has influenced the composition of his poem but, in his adaptation of the *dit amoreux* genre, he does provide his reader with real patrons, whether actual or potential, and with ideal patron figures, which become the focus of my next chapter. Skelton’s poem provides evidence that by the late fifteenth century patronage relationships, and literary generic relationships in general, were undergoing interesting changes.
Chapter Six

Patronage Processes

There are two key literary relationships necessarily involved in studies of production and reception, that between the commissioner of a text and its author, and that between the author of the text and the audience, which traditionally includes the patron. This chapter explores in more detail the argument proposed in the previous chapters that *The Garland of Laurel* gives patronage relationships a central role in Skelton’s scheme of self-representation. The notion, first considered in Chapter One, that the lyrics predate the narrative and are pivotal to the poem’s strategy, underlies a new argument which asserts that, through the lyrics, the poem explores the processes of patronage by which fame can be acquired. Traditionally criticism has assumed that the subject matter of *The Garland of Laurel* is Skelton’s pursuit of fame and self-aggrandisement. However, I suggest that the poem is more subtle; that it is carefully constructed around a consideration and re-definition of processes of patronage and the implications of this for Skelton’s reputation. This view is supported by David A. Loewenstein who debates how much critical consideration and praise *The Garland of Laurel* deserves. He suggests that, while the subject matter of the poem is indisputably concerned with Skelton’s personal achievements and fame (as my chapter on dream poetry illustrates), it deserves attention because of the way it evaluates Skelton's career and the meaning of literary fame.
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2 Much work done on the woodcuts of Faques’s 1523 edition has been used to uphold the view of the centrality of Skelton in the poem and his preoccupation with Fame. I discuss the subtlety of this representation in the final chapter; Erler, ‘Early Woodcuts’, pp. 17-28.

Firstly, this chapter looks closely at the traditional reception of the lyrics and the problems of Skelton’s relationship with the Howard ladies, the real, ideal and potential patrons described above. It explores who the ladies were, their familial and obligatory ties and the personal networks which existed between them. The inserted lyrics provide a unique representation of female patronage in the late medieval and early Tudor periods, and I argue that examples of late fifteenth-century women’s patronage illustrate changes to traditional patronage structures, changes which are central to our understanding of Skelton’s poem. In particular I consider the example of female patronage provided by Lady Margaret Beaufort, with whom Skelton had personal connections. I look for what is new or different about late fifteenth-century patronage relationships.

In the second part, I examine more fully the processes of patronage evident in the poem and consider how these structures aid Skelton in his self-representation. In the poem Skelton’s self-representation is enhanced by his depiction of the Howard ladies and their act of weaving the laurel wreath for him. This is a reciprocal act, made in return for the lyrics which he writes addressing and describing each of them in turn. In particular I focus upon the reciprocal actions of the Howard ladies, their weaving and embroidery, undertaken so that Skelton may appear as a laureate poet. This representation suggests that Skelton’s depiction and understanding of patronage, and his place in society as an author, are newly formed by the changing social conditions in which he works. The relationship between Skelton and these ladies draws attention to female patronage and the role of the poet in the late fifteenth century.

A. The Howard Ladies and Female Patronage

i. Traditional Approaches
The identity of the eleven ladies at the centre of Skelton’s *The Garland of Laurel* has provoked a great deal of critical debate. Scholarship has always assumed that the incorporation of the lyrics to the ladies in *The Garland of Laurel* means that there was a
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4 I explain exactly what is meant by these terms in Chapter Five, section B. ii. iii, Patrons and Audience.
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patronage connection between Skelton and the Howards. However, no recent in-depth studies of Skelton patronage have been made, despite the fact that the Howards have long been a source of interest to critics.

Recently Greg Walker questioned the assumptions that have been drawn about Skelton’s relationship with the Howards, made primarily in the biography by H. L. R. Edwards. Walker claims that these notions of Skelton writing at their behest are unfounded. While he admits that it is possible that Skelton knew the Howard family, even that he was present at Sheriff Hutton at the time *The Garland of Laurel* was written, he emphasizes the lack of proven patronage connections. The *Garland of Laurel* remains the only substantial piece of evidence for Howard patronage; there is evidence in the Household Books of 1481 to 1490 of a John Newton, the ‘maister Newton’ of *the Garland of Laurel*, being paid to make a copy of a pardon, which lends more credence to there being a biographical element to the poem. However, Walker claims that historians have been fundamentally misled in their interpretations of Skelton’s works, particularly the satires, by assumptions about patronage:

The unanswered questions and unquestioned answers which have, for most of this century, been the substance of historians’ perceptions of Skelton and his motivation need to be addressed if the poet’s testimony is to have any place in serious historical scholarship. If it is to be alleged in the future, contrary to the argument of this study, that Skelton was a client of the Howards, earls of Surrey and dukes of Norfolk, then more substantial evidence ought to be brought to the support of that assertion than the unconvincing mixture of coincidences, inspired inference and superficial readings of
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5 H. L. R. Edwards, M. J. Tucker, J. Scattergood, and D. R. Carlson have all assumed this to be the case.
8 Walker, *Skelton and the Politics of the 1520s*, pp. 5-34.
the poet’s texts which have hitherto been employed on the task.\(^\text{10}\)

Walker’s assertions are true – more reliable evidence is required if Howard patronage is to be considered seriously in relation to Skelton’s works in the historical sense – but he ignores the difficulties of uncovering medieval patronage relationships.\(^\text{11}\) Evidence for literary patronage has been described as the silence filled with an active world, which surrounds and isolates many writings of the Middle Ages.\(^\text{12}\)

Proven patronage evidence is one way in which the implications and significance of Skelton’s example might be made clear to the reader. Below, I provide a detailed account of what is known about these ladies. Some, alive at the time of composition, may have been real patrons as Skelton suggests, some may have been potential patrons whose patronage was being solicited, others who had possibly been past patrons were already dead. I consider the implications of the given patronage scenario, something which has as yet provoked no comment.

ii. Identifying the Ladies

M.J. Tucker’s article ‘The Ladies in Skelton’s “Garland of Laurel”’, which originally grew out of work on Howard literary patronage, engages with the research of Dyce and other Skelton critics to confirm or correct identifications of the individuals and connections between them.\(^\text{13}\) Tucker’s approach is somewhat literal and he argues that Skelton’s Howard connections have never satisfactorily been explained. Although he claims that the incident in which the Countess of Surrey and other ladies of her household weave the

\(^{10}\) Walker, *Skelton and the Politics of the 1520s*, p. 221. See also pp. 5-8, 17-19, 29, 33.


garland for Skelton is apparently biographical, he also claims that its narrative account must
be fabricated on the basis that there is no one recorded time at which all these women
appeared together at the castle.\textsuperscript{14} In another article Tucker re-examines the opinion that the
poem was written in 1523 and, by looking at the Howard itinerary and the ownership of the
castle, concludes that the only likely time that the poem could have been written would
have been during the 1490s, while Thomas Howard I, Earl of Surrey, was lieutenant of the
north.\textsuperscript{15} This also fits with the work done by Tucker, Brownlow and other recent critics on
the astrological dating of the poem to 1495.\textsuperscript{16} It also complements my argument that the
lyrics were composed early and formed the central core of the poem.

Tucker finds no evidence to support the ladies having been assembled together at Sheriff
Hutton during the period in which the Howards were resident.\textsuperscript{17} He considers the identity of
each of the eleven ladies in turn and concludes that the lyrics must be individually dated
and that the separate lyric fragments were incorporated into the poem at a later date. He
does not consider that the poem itself may have been fabricated around the lyrics.

The ladies mentioned are the Countess of Surrey, Elizabeth Howard, Muriel Howard, Lady
Anne Dacre of the South, Margery Wentworth, Margaret Tylney, Jane Blenner-Haiset, Isabel
Pennell, Margaret Hussey, Gertrude Statham, and Isabel Knyght. On the basis that the
Howards only used the castle during the period when Thomas Howard I was lieutenant of the
north, from 1488 to 1499, Tucker re-identifies the Countess of Surrey, mentioned in the
poem, as Elizabeth (née Tylney), Thomas Howard I’s first wife (d.1497).\textsuperscript{18} The accustomed
identification of the Countess was as Elizabeth Howard (née Stafford, d.1558), wayward wife

\textsuperscript{14} M. J. Tucker, ‘Ladies’, pp. 333-4, 342. Tucker bases his opinion upon household accounts for the possible
years the ladies could have been in residence. Scattergood, ed., Complete English Poems, pp. 15-19.
\textsuperscript{15} M. J. Tucker, ‘Skelton and Sheriff Hutton’, English Language Notes, 4 (1967), 254-9, (pp. 254-6).
\textsuperscript{16} F. W. Brownlow, ed., The Book of the Laurel: John Skelton (Newark: University of Delaware Press;
London: Associated University Presses, 1990), pp. 52-61, 214-16; Tucker, ‘Ladies’, p. 334; O. Gingerich and
\textsuperscript{17} Tucker, ‘Ladies’, pp. 333-45.
of the third Duke of Norfolk, also a Thomas Howard.\textsuperscript{19} Elizabeth Howard (née Stafford) was the daughter-in-law by second marriage to Elizabeth Tylney. Elizabeth Howard and Muriel Howard are not recorded in the \textit{Dictionary of National Bibliography} but Tucker identifies them as daughters of Thomas Howard I and Elizabeth Tylney. Similarly he identifies Lady Anne Dacre of the South as the Countess’s daughter by her first husband, Humphrey Bourchier. Dyce wrongly believed that Elizabeth was a child of Howard I’s second marriage to Agnes Tylney and that Muriel was the daughter of Thomas Howard II.\textsuperscript{20}

Elizabeth Howard, the daughter of Thomas Howard I and his first wife, eventually married Sir Thomas Boleyn circa 1500 and became mother to Mary Boleyn, Henry VIII’s mistress, and Anne Boleyn, his queen. Muriel Howard married John Grey, Viscount Lisle, circa 1500, and Lady Anne Dacre of the South married Thomas Feys, Lord Dacre of the South, circa 1492. After the death of Viscount Lisle, Muriel Howard married William Knyvett who had wardship of Dacre lands, and it is also known that Thomas Howard I had wardship of Dacre lands which may have accounted for the marriage of Anne into this family.

Margery Wentworth is represented as the niece of the first Countess of Surrey. She was the daughter of the Countess’s half-sister (also née Tylney). Margery’s father was an important figure in both Yorkshire and Suffolk politics, at one time sheriff of Yorkshire, and at the time of the Yorkshire uprising in 1489 they moved to Yorkshire. Margery married John Seymour and became the mother of Edward Seymour, Duke of Somerset and Lord Protector, and of Jane Seymour, Henry VIII’s third queen and mother of Edward IV. The Wentworth family had East Anglian connections and, by coincidence, on the same day that Margery married John Seymour, her father married Lady Jane Scrope, the Jane Scrope of Skelton’s poem \textit{Philip Sparrow}.

Margaret Tylney was the wife of Sir Philip Tylney, and was probably sister-in-law to Sir Thomas Howard I through his second wife Agnes. Tucker reveals that Philip Tylney was

\textsuperscript{19} H. L. R. Edwards, \textit{Skelton: The Life and Times of an Early Tudor Poet} (London: Camelot, 1949), p. 226. Dyce was the first to assume this was the case.

\textsuperscript{20} All following information concerning the Howard ladies, their identities and supporting evidence, is drawn from Tucker, ‘Ladies’, an article which draws upon and corrects the earlier work of H.L.R. Edwards, concerning the ladies, in \textit{Skelton: The Life and Times}. I have checked Tucker’s details against the relevant entries in the \textit{DNB} and supplemented Tucker where appropriate.
steward of Thomas I’s manor at Framlingham in 1495 and also his auditor, a member of the Howard household long before his sister married into it. He was later treasurer of war in the Flodden campaign (1513), for Howard II, and his grandson Edmund wrote prose tracts.21

Jane Blenner-Haiset may have been daughter of Sir Thomas Blennerhasset, one of the executors of Thomas Howard I’s will. She was probably wife of Ralph Blennerhasset and died in 1501 at the age of ninety-seven. Her grandson was connected with Philip Tylney, received Howard patronage and had literary connections. His publications include translations of the works of Ovid, the Continuation of The Mirrour for Magistrates, a panegyric on Elizabeth I, and a dedication to Prince Henry.22

Isabell Pennell has never been identified. Possibly her name was Pennel, Pinnel, Penel, Pannel or Paynell, and there was an Isabel Paynell, alive in 1492, daughter of John Paynell who was married to Margaret Tylney, a sister of Philip Tylney. Paynells and Tylneys therefore have both family ties and political and economic ties. Tucker also explains that the Paynells had Howard connections. Both families held property in Lincolnshire and Thomas Howard I’s father bought cloth from a Paynall. Another Paynell served as one of the commissioners of sewers for Lincolnshire alongside John Hussey, Margaret Hussey’s husband, and Philip Tylney, Margaret Tylney’s husband. Sir John Hussey was sheriff of Lincolnshire in 1493 and 1494, and later controller of Henry VII’s household and chief butler of England. Tucker suggests that Margaret Hussey, wife of John Hussey (son of William Hussey, Chief Justice of the King’s Bench), was the daughter of Simon Blount of Mangotsfield. There was an inquisition into Margaret’s death in 1492 so the lyric must have been written before that date.

The other ladies of the poem are even less easily identified. It has been suggested that the lyric to Gertrude Statham, née Anstey, may have been included by the poet because she had a special place in his heart. She had rejected Skelton for a groom, Roger Stathum, whose name appears in acrostic as Skelton’s enemy in The Garland of Laurel. They married in 1482, suggesting again that the lyric for her was perhaps written earlier than this. Tucker believes that there was a definite connection between the Howards, Stathams and Ansteys.

---

21 DNB, lvi, p. 399.
22 DNB, v, pp. 211-12.
He elaborates on the possible relationship and records the non-payment of a debt by an Anstey to the Duchess of Norfolk, to whose property the Howards were co-heirs.

Tucker identifies Isabel Knyght as the wife of Leonard Knyght of South Duffield, Yorkshire. He was one of the justices for the assize of York city and the northern counties in 1492 and also one of the commissioners of gaol delivery for York city in 1489. There could well have been a personal as well as a political relationship between him and Thomas Howard I. Leonard's sons were recipients of Howard's patronage. Isabel was the daughter of John Langholme of Coningsholme, Lincoln, another area with which the Howards had connections.

Without precise information about when the lyrics were actually written, Tucker suggests that they should at least be roughly individually dated as follows: the lyric to Elizabeth Howard, Countess of Surrey, before her death in 1497; Jane Blenner-Haiset's before her death in 1501; Margaret Hussey's before her death in 1492; those to Elizabeth Howard and Muriel Howard, before their marriages in 1500; Margery Wentworth's before her marriage on October 22, 1494; Margaret Tylney's and Isabel Pennell's before their marriages for which there is no date; Lady Anne Dacre's after her 1492 marriage; Gertrude Statham's after her marriage in 1482 and probably circa 1490; and finally Isabel Knyght's after her marriage for which there is no date.

To conclude: according to Tucker, there are affinities of family, property and patronage amongst the ladies. Three of the ladies are daughters of the Countess, another a niece, one a second cousin, another a cousin by marriage, one a retainer, another associated with the Earl in law enforcement. Occasional evidence of common property interests and treasury patronage indicate continued association with the Howard family. There are several associations with the royal household, with York and with East Anglia. Only the Statham relationship with the Howards remains unproven.

An interesting coincidence Tucker highlights in his later article concerns the dating of The Garland of Laurel and the ladies. He suggests that the date of May 8th 1495, deduced from the first stanza, could allude to the Scottish match between James IV and Margaret Tudor, Henry VII's daughter. He sees the astrological and astronomical portents as significant in
terms of Mars being England’s planet, and the Howard family protecting the area against the Scots. By a curious coincidence, Thomas Howard I was one of the principals in constructing the alliance which had begun with a commission in 1495, and was also Henry VII’s chief representative at the royal wedding in August 1503. He had to conduct Margaret through the Northern shires until he delivered her safely to James. In his train were his daughter Muriel, then Lady Lisle, and his second wife Agnes. Tucker also points out that Dunbar celebrated this marriage with his poem *The Thistle and The Rose* and that he awakens in the dream sequence on May 9th, the day after Skelton’s ‘awakening’.

In the late fifteenth century the Howards were an important family with widespread influence at court, in Norfolk and in the north of England.23 They, and the other families they are associated with in Skelton’s poem, had particularly prominent roles in official and civic life, in the law as justices and sheriffs, as landholders, traders, treasurers and courtiers. There are accounts of the Howard bounty being used to finance the education of Skelton and others.24 There is also a Howard connection for Skelton through John Howard, who owned Power Key (circa1481), a Howard manor in Harwich mentioned in *The Bowge of Court*.25 All of these associations are interesting in the context of Cotton Vitellius E.x., which includes *The Garland* extracts, with many official letters and records relating to religious and civic affairs in Yorkshire. The importance of the Howards is a possible reason for Skelton’s naming these ladies as patrons.

---

23 This is confirmed by existing records for the Howard household held at the National Records Archive. However, the only records of the Sheffield estates date from 1598 and the nineteenth century. Other accounts date from the mid-eighteenth-century period and Howard settlements largely begin in the seventeenth century, so there does not appear to be a great deal of material relating to the fifteenth century. Compotus rolls, consisting of estate accounts of royal and seigniorial officials, exist and a collection of them is held at Kew P.R.O.; similarly estate papers and family and household papers exist mainly at Arundel Castle, some at Castle Howard, http://www.hmc.gov.uk/NRA/nra2.htm. I have acquired and considered descriptions of these papers but none seems to contain any material relating to household members. A copy of *The Catalogue of the Arundel Castle Manuscripts (the Muniments of the Duke of Norfolk) relating to Yorkshire, Nottinghamshire and Derbyshire Estates* (Sheffield: Libraries and Arts Committee, 1965), reveals that the Dukes of Norfolk held a large amount of land in the Sheffield area but that the bulk of their estate papers were at Arundel because of the Fitzalan-Howard connection. *DNB*, x, pp. 62-7.


It is unlikely that these ladies could have been together at Sheriff Hutton at any one time. It is necessary to acknowledge that the seeming real-life episode during which Skelton writes and presents the lyrics is fabricated. Skelton presents himself to the reader in relation to female patrons, some of whom may have provided him with actual patronage at the time the poem was written, some of whom may have given him patronage at an earlier date, and some of whom may have appeared to him as likely future or potential patrons.

iii. Evidence for Patronage

In reality, there is no strong or direct evidence of patronage activity of any kind amongst the ladies of Skelton’s poem, despite their connections and associations. However, the inserted lyrics provide a unique representation of possible female patronage in the late medieval and early Tudor periods. Skelton creates a believable fiction which illustrates for the reader figuratively the likely network of readers and recipients available for a work, and their response to it.

Women who were patrons usually had independent means and the resources or prestige to commission or command works of art. Frequently they were noble and wealthy or widows. Patronage took various forms; active roles included the commissioning and directing of texts, the provision of translations, prescription of subjects and their interpretation. Passive roles included paying the artist when the work was completed, or receiving the work from someone else who had paid for it. Female patronage was characterised in particular by its pious, devotional and educational emphasis, but in other respects it differed little from male patronage. It is known that the variety of literature women possessed during this period parallels qualitatively, though certainly not quantitatively, the patterns of book ownership of men, and that female patrons were as competitive as their male counterparts.

26 Edwards, Skelton: The Life and Times, pp. 29-38, 85-6, 237-8; DNB, x, p. 64.
27 DNB, x, p. 67. There is some evidence of male Howard patronage. Records show that John Howard, first Duke of Norfolk (1430–85?), known for his dispute with the Paston family, had fine paintings, a portrait in coloured glass, and two portraits of himself and his first wife. Thomas Howard II, Earl of Surrey and third Duke of Norfolk, Wolsey’s implacable enemy, also possessed three portraits of himself by Holbein.
While Skelton’s relationship with the Howard women remains ill-defined, it is known that he enjoyed patronage from another powerful woman. His connections with the royal household and Lady Margaret Beaufort are a focus here for a consideration of his relation to possible female patrons. Lady Margaret was descended directly from the illegitimate line of John of Gaunt, a great-great-granddaughter of Edward III, and was the mother of Henry VII.29 Her book patronage equaled that of Margaret of York, Duchess of Burgundy. She is known to have been influential in Skelton’s acquisition of the living in the parish of Diss and his position as tutor to the young Henry VIII.30

Margaret’s marriages brought her position, political power, direct influence in the royal household and at court.31 Her enfeoffed properties remained in her own hands, a major source of income and a bastion of Beaufort power. A leading landholder in her own right, she was entrusted with important wardships and the power to arbitrate disputes. She was solely responsible for her family estates and household management, providing jobs, welfare and education for her wards, servants and kindred.32 Her residences were filled with tapestries, pious works of art and self-portraits, and there are records of her opulent clothing, state accoutrements and generous gift-giving. In her capacity as a landholder, the mother of the king and a woman of independent means, Margaret forms an unusual and outstanding example of female patronage in the fifteenth century.

29 Unless otherwise stated, all information below concerning Lady Margaret Beaufort is drawn from M. K. Jones and M. G. Underwood, eds., The King’s Mother: Lady Margaret Beaufort Countess of Richmond and Derby (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992). The Beauforts were a powerful family with a strong sense of identity with the Lancastrian House. She was related to the St John family through her mother’s first marriage to Oliver St John. She achieved prominence through her marriages, especially in her marriage to Thomas Stanley, her final husband, and through her marriage into the Stafford family, particularly interesting in the context of the relationship between the Howards and the Staffords. Margaret’s lineage is illustrated in the genealogical tables, Jones and Underwood, eds., King’s Mother, p. xvii.

30 Walker, Skelton and the Politics of the 1520s, p. 15.


32 Jones and Underwood, eds., King’s Mother, pp. 93, 98-100. In 1485 Margaret Beaufort became a femme sole. For the rest of her life she could sue in any manner of legal actions and remain independent of any husband, having her property and title for her own use, as well as other advantages. This was unprecedented for an aristocratic woman.
Margaret’s patronage activities included extensive pious giving. Her will mentions a valuable primer and psalter, and she set up a chantry for her mother and father. She bequeathed devotional books to members of her household and made many concessions and allowances to abbeys, priories and educational establishments, on her estates and elsewhere. During her lifetime she intervened in their disputes and economic affairs, but her devotion to God and to the shrines of saints was always her chief concern. She appears as the dedicatee of a manuscript of the office and proper of the mass attached to the Feast of the Holy Name of Jesus, given to her by John de Gigli, the bishop of Worcester (1497–98) and Papal collector in England (1485–90). She commissioned the printing of Hilton’s *The Scale of Perfection* by Wynken de Worde in 1494 and bought a second copy in 1507 when Julian the notary printed an edition also containing Hilton’s *Treatise on Mixed Life*. She also acquired a copy of *The Shepherd’s Calendar* towards the end of her life, which set works of mercy in the wider context of social and moral obligations.

Margaret lent London printers her name to grace devotional works from their presses. She and other royal ladies were a market for books of devotion and meditation which became increasingly common products of the presses of Caxton and Wynkyn de Worde. However, it was politics which first drew Margaret and Caxton together. The first book she commissioned to be printed was a romance, *Blanchardin and Eglantine*, which mirrored political events of the time. Caxton soon became connected with the royal household and Margaret encouraged book purchase and production, buying many copies of printed books herself. Richard Pynson was paid for a hundred books in 1505 and in 1506 for another fifty books. She provided Ingelbert de la Haghe, a Rouen printer, with money to purchase books for her in Paris and he printed at her expense an edition of the Hereford Breviary. She also had her own bookbinders and illuminators.

Margaret was also given books as gifts. An English translation of the *Legenda Sanctorum*, a book of saints’ lives, a lectionary in French and a primer bound in red velvet and clasped in

33 J. K. Tarvers, "’Thys ys my mystrys boke’: English Women as Readers and Writers in Late Medieval England’, in *The Uses of Manuscripts in Literary Studies: Essays in Memory of Judson Boyce Allen*, ed. C. C. Morse, P. R. Doob and M. C. Woods (Kalamazoo: Western Michigan University, 1992), pp. 305-25. Tarvers looks at the manuscript evidence for women’s literary activity – their reading, writing and owning of manuscripts – in the late fourteenth and early fifteenth century and suggests that there is strong proof that women participated in learned communities, particularly, though not exclusively, religious communities.
silver-gilt were bequeathed to her by her mother-in-law, Anne Neville, Duchess of Buckingham. Margaret inherited a French version of the works of the silver-age poet Lucan and a book of hours illustrated by the painter William Abell, which incorporated an earlier psalter commissioned by John, Earl of Somerset, her mother’s father-in-law. It is known that Margaret also possessed mass books, classical epics and a copy of *The Canterbury Tales*. She associated with Elizabeth of York’s sister, Cecily, who was the widow of Margaret’s half-brother John, viscount Welles, Lady Powis and Lady Scrope whose second husband was Sir Henry Wentworth, of interest because of family ties with the Howards. Elizabeth Talbot, the dowager-Duchess of Norfolk, was a great patron of Cambridge colleges and the Masters there, and was also a close friend of Margaret.\(^{34}\)

It has been claimed that Lady Margaret Beaufort was no great bibliophile but there is much evidence to suggest that she, and a group of other royal women, were interested in devotional and secular texts, commissioning and buying them, as well as in patronage in the wider sense. While the patronage of Lady Margaret Beaufort is unique because of her particular relationships with the court and king there is much evidence to suggest that other women had earlier acted in similar ways as patrons and influenced the production and reception of literature.\(^{35}\) Lady Elizabeth de Burgh, of Clare, for example, was a connoisseur and patron of fourteenth-century arts.\(^{36}\) She purchased vast numbers of artistic works and gave many of them away to friends and family. The processes of giving were as important as those of acquisition. She hired scribes to copy books, bought vellum, vermilion, silver and decorated book covers, borrowed books on surgery and romances from the royal collection and sent seven horses to transport her book purchases home in 1350/51. Her will leaves four antiphoners and two service books, two missals, a book of legends, a Bible, two pairs of books of decretals, a legend of saints, a book of questions and Archbishop Bradwardine’s *De causa Dei contra Pelagianos*. Mostly the books are serious in their theological content and

---

\(^{34}\) Jones and Underwood, *King’s Mother*, pp. 161-3.


suggest that Elizabeth could read Latin; they are also often lavishly illuminated in the East Anglian style by her own illuminators.  

Family, household ties, and friendships, social and geographic contexts, were very important to literary production and reception. Not only did works circulate in such contexts, but patterns of patronage were thus exemplified and propagated. Jambeck, for example, highlights matrilineal lines of female patronage in case studies of Elizabeth Berkeley, Countess of Warwick (d.1422); Blanche, Duchess of Lancaster, (d.1369) whose daughter was Philippa of Hainault (d.1415); and Joan Beaufort, Countess of Westmoreland (d.1440). Matrilineal paradigms of patronage were important: where a mother patronised writers and artists it seems that there was a strong incentive for the daughters to do the same. In her consideration of these women Jambeck particularly emphasises the continuities between grandmothers, mothers and daughters.

Of particular interest, illustrating further the familial relationships between the Howards, Fitzalans and Staffords, is the example of Joan Fitzalan, Countess of Hereford (d.1419). Joan Fitzalan was the daughter of Richard Fitzalan, Earl of Arundel (d.1375/6) and his second wife Eleanor (d.1372). She married Humphrey de Bohun, Earl of Hereford, Essex and Northampton (d.1372/3), a noted bibliophile, and she was the cousin of Blanche of Lancaster. For almost half a century after his death Joan held, in addition to her dower, a substantial amount of the property enfeoffed by her husband to trustees, there being no Bohun heir. During this period it is known that Thomas Hoccleve wrote and translated poems for her and it is possible that she was the owner of the Simeon manuscript, London, British Library, MS Add. 22283. This manuscript contains religious and moral works in verse and prose.

Joan Fitzalan had two daughters, Mary de Bohun and Eleanor de Bohun, and her granddaughter was Anne Stafford. All have been recognised as literary patrons who

---

38 Jambeck, 'Patterns of Women's Literary Patronage', pp. 233-42.
39 The Fitzalan family is of particular interest in the context of the Howards. Although its members are not among those in *The Garland* the two families were united in marriage to become the Fitzalan-Howard family in 1556, when Thomas Howard III, fourth Duke of Norfolk married Lady Mary Fitzalan, heiress to all the Fitzalan fortune through her father the twelfth heir of Arundel.
40 Jambeck, 'Patterns of Women's Literary Patronage', p. 236.
commissioned high-quality manuscripts. Mary was married to Henry Bolingbroke but died in childbirth in 1394 before his coronation as Henry IV. It is known that she owned a French *Lancelot*, London, British Library, MSS Royal 20.D.iii and iv, and some psalters. Eleanor was coheir to the Bohun fortune and a wife to Thomas Woodstock, Duke of Gloucester. She commissioned at least one of the Bohun manuscripts, Edinburgh, National Library of Scotland, MS Advocates 18.6.5. Additionally she bequeathed a remarkable number of books in her will to her three daughters, Isabella (a nun), Joanna and Anne.

Eleanor’s daughter Anne (d.1432), the eldest, married three times in all, twice into the Stafford family, having inherited the estates of Thomas Woodstock, her mother Eleanor’s lands and fortune, and her grandmother Fitzalan’s vast estates. Her third marriage was to William Bourchier with whom she had five children. A son from this marriage eventually became the husband of Isabel, patron of Osbem Bokenham. Surviving her last husband, Anne was perhaps the wealthiest woman in England, controlling over half of the Stafford inheritance and her mother’s half of the Bohun inheritance. Anne is known to have commissioned Lydgate’s *Invocation to Saint Anne*. Continuing into the fourth generation of Joan Fitzalan’s family, Anne’s daughter by her second Stafford marriage, another Anne, appears to have been a patron of Lydgate too. He dedicates *The Legend of St Margaret* to her after her marriage in 1415 to Edmund Mortimer, Earl of March.

Jambeck shows that patronage can be frequently traced from mother to daughter and that there are often connections between sisters, nieces and aunts, and cousins, as in the fabricated case of the ladies in *The Garland*. Most of those she looks at belonged to a class of women whose role in building the economic and political strength of the medieval nobility was well established. They had responsibility for family and household, and many lived as widows for a considerable period of time, having control of estates and inheritances. We know that Elizabeth Tylney had been married once before she married

---

43 Lady Anne Dacre, daughter of Elizabeth Tylney by her first marriage, eventually married a Humphrey Bourchier.
44 Jambeck, ‘Patterns of Women’s Literary Patronage’, pp. 237-8
46 Ibid., pp. 244-5.
into the Howard family, which suggests that she may have had interests in other estates as well as Howard ones, and as such she would have been a very choice patron for Skelton. Evidence for later female Howard patronage exists in the form of the Devonshire Manuscript, London, British Library, MS Add. 17492, which dates from the 1530s. This manuscript, passed between family members, contains 167 lyrics and is an author-centered collection containing many poems by Wyatt. It illustrates how, from the mid to late sixteenth century, women were involved with compiling miscellanies, contributing to and owning poetry collections, in courtly, familial or other restricted environments.

Female patronage was used as a means of self-representation and self-definition, reflecting women’s concern with their status and reputation and their place in the after-life. Some women used patronage as an expressive mode for clear and well-defined political agendas or in seeking out power, but patronage was more generally used to preserve the values and ideals that women believed were important. Works they commissioned were infused with an edifying purpose and exemplified both Christian and womanly ideals. These values resonated in their lives and linked generations of patrons along matrilineal lines.

Acts of patronage from the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries also reveal a gendered awareness. The fourteenth century saw a significant increase in literary works about women sponsored by women, for example, Boccaccio’s *De mulieribus claris*. Similarly, Christine de Pizan used the iconography of the mirror, its meaning explained by the figure of Reason, in both text and image in her *Livre de La Cité des Dames*, a manuscript which was purchased by many women and was extremely popular. The manuscript was also illuminated by her female artist, Anastaise.

The late medieval period is characterised by women’s self-

---

48 Meale, ‘Laywomen and their Books’, pp. 128-9, 145. For example, Margaret, Lady Hungerford and Botreaux used the iconography of virginal female piety to represent herself on a seal between 1462 and 1478, an image which revealed not only her religious devotion but also her public assertiveness of a political role.
51 Ibid., pp. 30-2.
fashioning and increasing self-awareness and support for other women, as writers, translators and artists.

Most significantly, in the context of The Garland, and on the threshold of the Renaissance, women were patrons to some of the earliest printers. Female patrons and printers responded to print's potential for individual representation. It has been suggested that, with the shift from scribal to print culture, the textual activities of women and the meanings that adhered to them were subtly and sometimes conflictingly redefined. For example, Margaret Beaufort’s possession and use of devotional books, as well as her personal involvement with printers and the production of texts, was censured and admired from different quarters. Women like Margaret, engaged in literary practices and patronage, struggled for self-definition at the end of the fifteenth century.52

Evidence of this tension, and of the relationship between male printer and female patron, exists in Caxton’s prologues and epilogues. Commercial interests remained at the heart of the relationship, but signs of patronage provided a legitimising mark of the printed book’s social location, despite the dislocation of standard social relations in which book production took place. Caxton used Lady Margaret’s patronage to mask his commercial exchanges, and to distinguish and publicise his books; but simultaneously he reflects an image of her as a great patron, modelling himself on a courtly lover.53 Beyond the dyad of printer and patron it is possible to consider how the representation of patronage operates within the complicated and sometimes conflicting networks that make up English print culture.

iv. Implications of Female Patronage

Patronage was a form of self-representation, one which conferred power or status in multiple ways. While it reflected and perpetuated historical conditions, as we see in Jambeck’s account of matrilineal lines of patronage, it also enhanced the power and stability of the monarchy and became a means of self-representation for individuals, such as the women and men described above.

53 Ibid., pp. 152-4, 160-1.
Fifteenth-century female patronage reveals a negotiation of social and cultural meanings between patron and artist, suggesting that investigating structures of patronage has implications for not only thinking about networks and relationships between those individuals, but also for thinking about how they impact on the wider culture at a national or even international level. Work like Summit's suggests that women were highly aware of their power and role as patrons, and that they were negotiating a place for themselves in the changing, more commercial artistic structures of the late fifteenth century. Skelton received patronage from Lady Margaret Beaufort and in *The Garland of Laurel* he represents himself in relation to a noble household, represents ladies of that household as patrons, and displays the processes of female patronage activity which shape his identity as a poet.

**B. Processes of Patronage in *The Garland of Laurel***

While the processes of patronage in *The Garland of Laurel* are made most immediate through the lyrics, the narrative content also provides indications of the importance of the patronage theme. Both the types of lyrics that Skelton writes to the Howard ladies and the presence of these ladies and other female characters in the text lend weight to the view that the poem is about the processes or ways in which fame is acquired by Skelton, rather than being directly about his fame.

**i. Presenting the Ladies**

As discussed briefly in Chapter Four, many of the lyrics are developed outside of mainstream tradition of courtly and idealised love. With their jaunty metrics and lack of reverent or pleading tone, many of them mock the traditional idea of love lyrics. They make use of conventional imagery, but are curious, sometimes flippant, deeply intimate and unconventional, written from a personal and individual authorial point of view. They are not the kinds of works normally commissioned by patrons, nor are they the works that a paid artist would produce to delight, flatter and win favour from an acting or potential patron. Skelton does not take care to treat each lady with equal respect.
Of those lyrics, the first four, written to the Countess and her closest family members, are written in rhyme royal. These are the most conventional of Skelton’s lyrics, in the Chaucerian pattern, making use particularly of courtly language suggesting a sense of obligation and respect. First, praising and acknowledging the Countess of Surrey in all suitable ways, Skelton promises that while his life endures he will exalt her in every way he can. He compares her to Argyva the noble wife of King Polimites and Rebecca of the Bible whose prudence and chaste living is balanced by the Countess’s noble demeanour. He also compares her to Pamphila the Greek queen, renowned for her royal attire, Thamar who had skilful hands, Thamarys, and courageous and virtuous Dame Agrippina who accompanied her husband on military campaigns. Like these women, Skelton promises, the Countess will be forever remembered (ll. 836-63). He uses only acceptable traditional similes to describe and praise her.

Similarly Lady Elizabeth Howard is compared to Aryna, maidenly, virtuous and knowledgeable, to Cressida and Polixene (ll. 864-77); she is beautiful, young and ‘lusty to loke on’. Lady Mirriell Howard, Skelton’s ‘litell lady’, is described as benign, courteous, gentle of heart and mind, and favoured by Fate and Fortune. Her beauty is compared to budding red roses and white lilies; she is said to be as beautiful as Cidippes (ll. 878-91). Skelton tells us that Lady Anne Dacre resembles Helen of Troy, that she is beautiful enough to challenge even the painter Zeuxis. She is described as youthful, a flower, virtuous and knowledgeable, as solace, pleasure and comfort. She is as honourable and faithful as Penelope, more beautiful than Deianeira, and as demure and womanly as Diana (ll. 892-905).

Typically the lyrics follow the format of other medieval lyrics. Though not blazons, they draw upon the courtly context, make mythological comparisons and focus upon the virtues and abilities of the ladies, as well as upon their beauties. In this respect the lyrics not only imitate the courtly love conventions but provide a model of each lady’s moral and social

standing. Skelton creates a sense of the worth of each woman, constructing her identity in terms of moral value as much as beauty, respecting their qualities both in the tone and style of the lyrics.

Those lyrics to the less important ladies, the following seven, assume a variety of verse patterns and an increasingly casual tone. They are less courtly and serious, though equally striking, similar in content to the first four but more light-hearted and humorous. Skelton claims he cannot gloss, ‘glose’, flatter or talk smoothly with plain language. He relies upon flower and embroidery imagery to convey the delights of mastres Margery Wentworth. She is virginal like the flower Marjoram, a pun on Margery and the plant hyssop, traditionally associated with the crucifixion of Christ. Her virtues are suggested through the religious allusion and through the properties of the herb, its prettiness and usefulness. She is also compared to the pretty primrose (a rare flower circa 1450), and the goodly columbine, and is praised for her qualities of meekness, kindness and courtesy. This lyric consists of five stanzas of four lines, rhyming abab, also a common form for a courtly love lyric (ll. 906-25). All but six of the lyrics are written in a stanza form without seven lines, although not all those with seven lines conform to the iambic pentameter pattern of rhyme royal.

Similarly Skelton diligently and humbly recommends himself to Margaret Tylney. The seven-line stanzas of this lyric, in stately Skeltonics, consist of lines with four syllables and two stresses. Skelton promises her that he will ensure her name will be remembered. She is heedful and diligent, always busy, virtuous above all others. Skelton puns on ‘Marguerite’, a pearl or daisy, and also calls her a guiding star, brightly shining, recalling the imagery of the prologue to The Legend of Good Women (ll. 926-53). These two lyrics draw loosely upon religious imagery, and emphasise virtues, but depart from the conventions surrounding traditional courtly tributes to female beauty in their verse patterns.

Likewise, Skelton promises Jane Blenner-Haiset that nothing will prevent him from openly praising her reputation and immortalising her fame. In his nine-line lyric, only vaguely

\[55\] J. S. Berrall, The Garden: An Illustrated History (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1966). Flowers and plants had a traditional symbolism originally evolved by monks and associated with the Virgin Mary and Christ. Fruits and birds also accumulated religious connotations.
resembling rhyme royal, he promises to 'stelyfy' her and work unstintingly because she has helped to set flowers in his laurel garland. She is compared to Laodamia who is the example of truth in The Legend of Good Women (ll. 954-72). The 'public' nature of this poetry is truly striking. The lyrics avoid the more subjective, private and meditative aspects of much lyric poetry. Skelton meant them to be circulated amongst an audience wider than just the ladies at Sheriff Hutton. He meant to create and sustain reputations and, in doing so, to promote his own reputation by association with the Howard family.

Isabell Pennell's beauty is said to be like that of several flowers, including the odorous beautiful rose and fragrant camomile, like the daisy, rosemary and the strawberry; she is like the morning star, like blossom on a bough and like the freshest may flower. Little of the imagery used here has religious or courtly overtones. She is maidenly, demure, the epitome of womanhood, a sweetly warbling nightingale bringing heavenly health and endless wealth. This lyric is perhaps the most unusual in that it departs most seriously from the conventions which seem to loosely govern the others and makes use of many invented words. The three line stanzas and flippant tone of the lyric, combined with invented words and the bird imitations at the end, 'Jug, jug' and 'chuk, chuk, chuk, chuk', suggest that the poet's relationship with Isabell Pennell is less formal and respectful than his relationship with other ladies. He compares her to a nightingale with a very unromantic song. It seems to be a lyric which focuses less on the lady's actual qualities and more on the delight words provide for an ingenious wordsmith (ll. 973-1003).

Margaret Hussey's lyric is similar in style to Isabell Pennell's lyric. It makes use of Skeltonics with even more recklessness; there is a merry unrestrained lilt to its meter which runs down the page. Skelton demonstrates his versatility as a poet, and with his many verse forms differentiates the ladies from each other. Again, Skelton describes his lady with flower imagery and compares her with classical heroines who were brave, steadfast and wise, (ll. 1004-37). He comments that she has no madness in her, due to the associations with the phrase 'midsummer madness'. She is also compared to a bird, this time a falcon or hawk which is kept for hunting. The repetition of these ideas at the end of each stanza, and their rhyme, emphasise the inappropriate nature of the comparisons.
The final two lyrics, ‘to mastres Gertrude Statham’ and ‘to maystres Isabell Knyght’, are less interesting but both deal specifically with the making of the garland. Carlson, who first identified the stages of the poem’s composition, makes a point of distinguishing those lyrics which are concerned with narrative structure, which focus upon the making of the laurel garland, from those which do not. Carlson suggests that these lyrics, *To maystress Jane Blenner-Haiset* (ll. 954-72), *To maystress Gertrude Statham* (ll. 1038-61) and *To maystres Isabell Knyght* (ll. 1062-85), are the earliest of the lyrics.\(^5\)\(^6\)\(^7\) This may be the case but they do not seem to be different in other ways from the rest of the lyrics. Skelton’s lyric to Gertrude Statham may draw on his disappointment at being rejected as a suitor.\(^5\)\(^7\) He compares her to Dame Pasiphae, allowing us an insight into his wicked humour (l. 1048). However, despite his disappointment in love, she is still an example of virtuous womanhood and his skeltonics take on a sorrowful tone. Finally, Isabell Knyght is repaid for her kindness with a lyric of four stanzas from Skelton. She is described as womanly and wise and Skelton recalls her pleasure in helping to produce his laurel garland, working in the silk and gold threads. He claims that she is more beautiful than Galatea the sea nymph (ll. 1062-85).

**ii. Reciprocity**

Skelton’s representation of female patronage in the poem extends beyond books. Initially he presents an image of all the women working on a laurel tribute which is to be given to him in return for his lyrics. This act of reciprocity is at the heart of the poem’s narrative. The similarity of the processes which Skelton and the ladies together undertake – one writing the lyrics, the others simultaneously weaving and embroidering a laurel wreath – are important and measured accounts of the relationships established within the poem which are mutually admiring. Master Newton’s additional presence, painting a record of the ladies’ embroidery, and Skelton’s progress, enhances this idea that processes of self-fashioning – of both patron and artist – are being explored and recorded. Julia Boffey has put forward a complementary and persuasive case, suggesting that Skelton’s poem itself offers ‘a very subtle evocation of

---

the circumstances and social relationships within which lyrics of this kind might be produced and/or presented'. She pinpoints the weaving of the laurel by the ladies as part of a feminine discourse of reward and encouragement, reciprocated through the commemorative lyrics by Skelton.58

In the poem Skelton is led into an upstairs chamber. Greg Walker has commented that, in The Bowge of Courte, Speke Parott, and The Garland of Laurel, it is always 'from the female chamber that he meditates upon the male court world'.59 The seated Countess commands her ladies to sit down and to begin work upon a 'crown of Laurel', a reward which she herself has designed for her clerk, Skelton. She claims that Skelton is responsible for the reputation of all ladies and that he censures those who deserve shame, while reporting well of good women.

‘Come forth, jentylwomen, I pray you,’ she sayd,
‘I have contryyvd for you a goodly warke,
And who can worke beste now shall be assayde;
A cronell of lawrell with verduris light and darke
I have devysyd for Skelton, my clerke;
For to his servyce I have suche regarde,
That of our bownte we wyll hym rewarde:

For of all ladyes he hath the library,
Ther names recountyng in the court of Fame;
Of all gentylwomen he hath the scrutiny,
In Fames court reportyng the same;
For yet of women he never sayd shame,
But if they were counterfettes that women them call,
That list of there lewdnesse with hym for to brall.’  (ll. 773-86)

As Skelton is responsible for their reputations, the ladies undertake to be responsible for his. The ladies prepare themselves for the work in hand, and it is implied that many of them gather around the embroidery frame with weavers’ reeds, bobbins with thread wound around them, and with cords which sustain the warp of the loom. They are prepared for work as any industrious and professional weaver ought to be. Some of the ladies hurry to begin embroidery, guiding their embroidery needles to keep their silks straight, others twist gold to work into their stitches. Every minute of their labour is industriously filled with virtuous action. The laurel tribute is created ‘of theyr bownte’, with their co-operation and with the consideration or instruction of the Countess.

Their actions, described with particular and accurate detail, reflect female stereotypes of virtue, industry and beauty and focus attention upon the nature of patronage itself. Their production of the laurel wreath for Skelton highlights a process of reciprocal giving in a way which suggests a breaking down of divisions, or narrowing of boundaries, between patron and artist, and a new perception and representation of the role of the patron. One is not exalted above the other, status is not emphasised, both patron and artist work together to satisfy each other and to make their names eternal. Their roles interact and the processes of writing and weaving are processes which contribute to the fashioning of identity of artist and patron respectively.

Embroidery was a popular art form and a traditional leisure pursuit and accepted manual occupation for women in noble families and particularly queens. Henry VII and Margaret Beaufort bought tapestries and embroideries for their homes. Henry VII was particularly eager to acquire a fine tapestry collection and established a royal arras-maker as part of the King’s Wardrobe to assist in their accumulation. His tapestries are recorded as being among the finest in Europe and whole sets of tapestries were woven for the royal collection. Margaret Beaufort is recorded as presenting embroidery of her own making at the marriage of John St John, executed in gold thread and showing the various branches of the St John

---

family. The themes of such works were usually classical or Christian and are often identified with the tradition of the allegorical love narrative. Medieval tapestries are rich in flora and, even today, botanists can identify the plants embroidered there. Birds, forests, flowers, streams and a fountain, as well as the theme of the hunt, were frequently depicted in them. Just as medieval poets repeatedly express the coming of spring, tapestry makers wove into their hangings blossoms and leafy trees to express their delight in nature. The work of the Skelton’s ladies, therefore, is highly traditional in its theme and the imagery of the lyrics mirrors that of the embroidery. For example, Mistress Jane Blenner-Haiset has skillfully set the crown of laurel with small flowers, while Geretrude Stratham has garnished it with laurel. Lady Mirriell Howarde has ‘enbuddid blossoms of roses rede of hew’ which her ‘bewte doth renewe’ with ‘lillis whyte’ and Mistress Margery Wentworth describes her praise as ‘embrowdred’, as his chaplet will be. Just as Skelton ‘clothes’ his ladies in the lyrics with flower imagery, they will ‘clothe’ him with the laurel, skilfully embroidered with flowers. The weaving or embroidering of the clothing and the writing of the lyrics are simultaneous and draw attention to the similarities between the processes of production. Skelton emphasises the interdependence and equality of himself and his patrons.

Additionally, embroidered textiles were prized as vital symbols of wealth and distinction, particularly Burgundian fashions, which were significant in social, political and religious displays. Clothes and fabrics expressed wealth and social standing; the intrinsic value of clothing was high and only those of high status could afford embroidered cloth. Ornamentation often required silk, gold and pearls and presentation miniatures used clothing

62 Jones and Underwood, King’s Mother, pp. 31, 165; Underhill, ‘Connoisseur and Patron’, pp. 268-9, 271. Lady Elizabeth de Burgh of Clare also lavished money on embroidered ecclesiastical vestments. Opus Anglicanum embroidery was a great art at this time and was prized throughout Europe for extraordinary technique and design. There was a woman’s atelier at Clare Castle but Opus Anglicanum was often produced in embroidery workshops where the designs were planned and then executed by both women and men. Elizabeth’s purchases bear testament to her continuing patronage of the spectacular art form.

63 The Unicorn tapestries are one famous example of such themes in embroidery. For example, see J. Williamson, The Oak King, the Holly King and the Unicorn: The Myths and Symbolism of the Unicorn Tapestries (London: Harper Row, 1986), pp. 76-8, 162-3, 193.

64 M. B. Freeman, The Unicorn Tapestries (Lausanne: Imprimeries Réunies, 1976), pp. 91-7. More than a hundred different plants are represented in the unicorn tapestries and eighty-five of these have been so accurately depicted that they are identifiable. Desire for accuracy however, did not restrict the makers to a particular season. Each plant is represented in its prime and in an idealized ensemble. Plants are shown growing naturally, but are also strewn over the entire background. Many were undoubtedly chosen for their symbolic significance but almost all would have been meaningful and beautiful to the medieval observer.
to construct social identity. Skelton’s representation of the Howard ladies creating a rich crown to signify his laureate status is thus heavily symbolic of the way in which he hopes his audience will perceive him. Covered in the raised work of flowers and laurel leaves, he resembles a green-man figure and assumes all the connotations of eternal renewal and everlasting renown. This is upheld by the words beneath the woodcut illustration of Faques’s 1523 text. This interesting image, in the bejewelled, embroidered context of the dream, which begins in the forest of Galtres, licenses Skelton’s wild verse-patterns and embellishment of words, his comic and ribald sallies, and his own peculiarities of temperament.

The act of reciprocity, fore-grounded by the lyrics, suggests new ways of thinking about female subjectivity and patronage relationships in the late fifteenth century. Writer and ladies are represented with equality and as mutually dependent. The wording and structure of the lyrics and the modes of representation in the text also depart from traditional patronage discourse and set at work within the poem a number of new social, cultural and institutional voices.

iii. Women as Agents

The mainly female cast of the poem motivates and directs the action from beginning to end. In addition to the Howard ladies, significant roles are played by Fame, Pallas and Occupacyoun. The allegorical and reflexive modes of narrative in dream poetry are particularly suited to such symbolic representations. These female figures can certainly be seen as the agents of the dream poem, motivating the action.

65 Belozerskaya, Burgundian Arts, pp. 116-22.
66 Green Men are usually found on roofs and pillars, amid leaf patterns, or spewing leaves and foliage from the mouth, nose and ears. They are found all over England, in some parts of Wales, Scotland and Ireland. They appear in greatest concentration where there are stretches of old relict woodlands, for example, in Yorkshire. The image is linked with revival and regeneration, and the triumph of life over death. For examples, see Williamson, Oak King.
67 Scattergood, ed., Complete English Poems, pp. 312, 497: ‘Eterno manusura die dum sidera fulgent / Equora dumque tament hec laurea nostra virebit. / Hinc nostrum celebre et nomine referetur ad astra. / Undique Skeltonis memoribatur alter adonis’, translated as, ‘While the stars shine remaining in everlasting day, and while the seas swell, this our laurel shall be green: our famous name shall be echoed to the skies, and everywhere Skelton shall be remembered as another Adonis’.
When Skelton falls asleep in the forest of Galtres he is transported to a wondrous pavilion in which two immortal goddesses, Fame and Pallas, are arguing with each other, (ll. 36-49). One is represented as a ‘prynces excellente of porte’, her bearing, behaviour and reputation without fault, richly attired and surrounded by nobles. We are told that ‘A goddesse immortall she dyd represente’ and that her name is Dame Pallas. Fame is described as noble, transcending all others, wealthy, crowned as an empress of worldly fate, royal, rich and ornate. She is unmatched, pre-eminent, mighty, and renowned. As the queen of the seven liberal arts of the medieval curriculum – grammar, logic, rhetoric, arithmetic, music, geometry and astronomy – all the nobles must give way to her superior rank. Her palace, to which Skelton is led by Chaucer, Gower and Lydgate later in the poem, is described as ‘rich’, wondrously and skilfully built, with turrets and towers, galleries, halls and courtyards. The ground is paved with turquoises and chrysolites, the pillars sumptuously decorated with beryl, the gates are made of ivory, with plates of gold and many crystal stones. The stairway to the hall has jasper and whale bone steps and the walls are studded with diamonds. During the Middle Ages there was a strong movement towards the conceptualising of paradise and its imaginary terrain. In their descriptions of Paradise, poets from the twelfth to the fifteenth centuries commonly 'clothe' the earth with 'embroidered' fabric; Skelton follows this tradition using words such as ‘garnysshed’, ‘enhachyde’, ‘engrossyd’, ‘engolerid’, ‘enlosenged’, ‘entachid’, ‘pointed’, ‘envawtyd’, and ‘englasid’, to describe decoration of rooms. The carpets and tapestries are of fine rich cloth, possibly velvet, and the chambers are hung with Arras cloth. The vaults are arched over with rubies, the posts of the praetorium decorated with Indian blue sapphires, and there are clear stones, jacinths and emeralds. In many ways Fame’s palace resembles visions of the heavenly city.

---

68 Pallas (Athena/Minerva) was the daughter of Metis and Zeus and was the wisest and most powerful of goddesses.
The description of Fame concentrates on wealth and opulence, imitations of Paradise, and, on the other hand, the description of those hundreds suing for fame and recognition, bringing news from all over the world. In contrast the poet reveals nothing about Pallas or her court. The opposition between the two goddesses and their material situation, as described in the poem, seems to emphasise the conflict of wisdom and noble influence with material culture and worldly inclinations. It also fits into the context of late medieval representations of women, where figures such as Sapience and Prudence were used to set virtuous examples for a female audience. Skelton provides us with a text which is initially motivated by representations of female desire, proper behaviour and reasoning, but which also reflexively looks at exactly what patronage, and particularly female power, means in the career of a poet and in the mind of the patron.

Dame Pallas has commanded the Queen of Fame to give Skelton a place in her court because he has spent time studiously in her service, and is already registered in the rolls of the court. This is a source of discontent to the Queen of Fame. While other poets work diligently and busily to ensure their works become famous, Skelton is lazy and thought inadequate, because he writes no flattering words to ladies:

```
'Not unremembered it is unto your grace,
How you gave me a ryall commaundement
That in my courte Skelton shulde have a place,
Bycause that he his tyme studyously hath spent
In your servyce; and, to the accomplysshement
Of your request, registred in his name
With laureate tryumphe in the courte of Fame.

But, good madame, the accustome and usage
Of auncient poetis, ye wote full wele, hath bene
Them selfe to embesy with all there holl corage,
So that there workis myght famously be sene,
In figure wherof they were the laurell grene.
```

But, how it is, Skelton is wonder slake,
And, as we dare, we fynde in hym grete lake:

For, ne were onely he hath your promocyon,
Out of my bokis full sone I shulde hym rase;
But sith he hath tastid of the sugred pocioun
Of Elyconis well, refresshid with your grace,
And wyll not endeavour hymselfe to purchase
The favour of ladys with wordis electe,
It is sittynge that ye must hym correct.’ (ll. 57-77)

Pallas responds by turning Fame’s complaints into a comment on Skelton’s dullness, which is really a form of humility and cleverness. He is not yet at the peak of his artistic powers and his quietness hides his intelligence, astuteness and good business sense. Pallas claims that when he writes he does so with care and discretion and that others are too eager to find fault with him when he is being less productive. Criticisms of poetic dullness are similar to the attacks writers such as Ovid suffered and Juvenal made in his satires. Skelton recognises that as a memorial the poem is both precarious and desirable, that it could endanger him as well as bring him fame.

This initial passage of the text is particularly interesting. Dullness was a favourite guise in which poets of the fifteenth century presented themselves, and as such owed much to Chaucerian tradition. However, Lawton detects a non-Chaucerian moral undertow to the metaphor, especially as it is used in the writing of Barclay, Ashby and others, where it is connected closely with theologians and with the importance of truth-telling. In one sense dullness becomes the mark of the fifteenth-century poet; in another, denial of being a poet – and abrogation of special status – is equally a mark of respectable fifteenth-century poetic practice. 73

73 D. Lawton, ‘Dullness and the Fifteenth Century’, English Literary History, 54 (1987), 761-99, pp. 762-71. Hoccleve manipulated the extravagant guise of dullness in La Male Regle and The Regement of Princes, as did Lydgate in The Fall of Princes and the poet of The Court of Sapience. In the context of writing for women, Bokenham was another writer who exploited claims of poetic deficiency.
The debate between Pallas and Fame provokes serious questions about Skelton's merits as a poet. Accusations of dullness are made because he has abandoned the traditional style and its conventions, failing to attempt to win the favours of noble ladies with 'wordis electe', despite having tasted the waters of Helicon's Well. However, the intervention of Pallas upholds Skelton's claims to a place in Fame's court and emphasises his inherent respectability and truthfulness, despite contrary opinion. At the start of the poem Skelton's 'dullness' is recognised and authorised by Dame Pallas, an archetype benevolent patron, who denies that it is a fault in the pursuit of authorial recognition.

Pallas continues to defend Skelton despite being questioned by Fame about her motives, pointing out that it is easy for others to find fault and that there are plenty of poets whose fame is questionable for a variety of worse reasons. Fame continues to defend her own views with careful, respectful language, but Pallas insists that it is nothing more than personal dislike which blinds her to Skelton's qualities. It is because Fame refuses to accept Pallas's viewpoint that they agree to seek further evidence of his qualities (ll. 50-245). The poem is testing and an affirmation of his qualities as a poet.

The argument, which consists of about two hundred lines, highlights the processes by which poetic recognition is gained and by which the poet wins acceptance. Skelton only receives recognition because his patron Pallas is persistent in the face of her interrogation by Fame. The goddesses exert a powerful, rational and investigative presence over the whole poem and its portrayal of Skelton's past, present and future. The fact that they are both noble ladies, and that his fate rests in their hands, is significant in the context of my discussion about female patronage.

Occupacyoun, Fame's registrar, is another female character used to make a similar social point. The name 'Occupacyoun' is unique to The Garland of Laurel, whereas 'Fame' and 'Pallas' are common figures in dream poems. It may be suggestive of female diligence and good character. Occupacyoun is engaged in the process of producing the book or poem, which eventually leads to poetic fame, and she is also described as 'a goodly maystres' and

74 Other examples of Fame and Pallas are found in The House of Fame and in Douglas, The Palace of Honour.
‘gentilwoman’, sent to Skelton to be his ‘sufferayne accessary’ and to show him ‘singular pleasures’. She greets Skelton with aureate language and beneath her arm she carries a book. She is in charge of the records of Fame’s court.

This gentilwoman, that callyd was by name
Occupacyon, in right goodly array,
Came towarde me, and smylid halfe in game;
I sawe hir smyle, and I then did the same.
With that on me she kest her goodly loke.
Under her arme, me thought, she hade a boke. (ll. 527-32)

She has known the poet before in less fortunate circumstances and has rescued him when his worldly trust was broken. She promises that now, again, his trust in her will be repaid.

With Occupacyoun as his guide, Skelton passes across a field and the wall of gates, where Skelton can see crowds suing for Fame.

A mist descends and Skelton passes through an enclosed garden, with a central gushing fountain, and a laurel tree surmounted by a phoenix. Skelton sees Flora and her maids dancing in a circle and singing in the garden, like the dreamer in *The Flower and the Leaf*. Traditionally gardens had strong spiritual associations. Additionally, Sir Thomas More associated them with private patronage, collective effort and shared pleasure, the antithesis of traditional forms of patronage. More’s views are particularly interesting in relation to

---


76 Walker, ‘Skelton and the Royal Court’, p. 6. Walker suggests that this image of Albion’s gate reflects the dangers of court life and Skelton’s dread of conspiracy and betrayal, ‘he disrupted the dreamscape of *The Garlande of Laurel* with a hellish vision of the casualties of political and civil conflict’.


78 I refer the reader to my discussions about fountains and gardens in Chapter Four.

79 Lytle and Orgel, eds., *Patronage in the Renaissance*, pp. 7-8. In *Utopia*, 1516, More wrote about gardens as an image of Paradise and an earthly paradise, as a living mythology and as an instance illustrating man’s attempted dominance over nature. Such images abound in Renaissance literature and More’s focus fell upon pleasure gardens, open and publicly accessible to everyone, with doors onto the streets and into houses, very different from the ideal courtly or monastic garden of the Middle Ages.
Skelton’s poem because he eliminated the social as well as the material basis for patronage. *Utopia* saw a world without aristocrats, where physical labour was shared by all. In Skelton’s poem the actions of the writer and patron are reciprocal, their relationship one of mutual adulation and satisfaction. The ladies are weaving a laureate crown of laurel for Skelton, and Skelton mirrors these unusual representations with the individualistic quality and tone of his lyrics. Similarly, Occupacyoun takes on a traditionally male role as record keeper and the goddesses argue out Skelton’s worthiness with strong ‘masculine’ reason and logic. More’s appreciation of the changing forces in society, and of the increasing equality between people, seems to be a concern of Skelton’s work too.

In *The Garland of Laurel* Occupacyoun explains to Skelton the meaning of the garden. The laurel tree, fountain and flaming phoenix are symbols of triumph and poetic fame but they are also visions symbolic of paradise or immortality. Traditionally the phoenix cultivated fire among the olive trees and such an image suggests that one desiring fame and immortality must cultivate the arts of peace.80

> In the middis a coundight, that coryously was cast,  
> With pypes of golde engusshing out stremes;  
> Of cristall the clerenes theis waters far past,  
> Enswymmyng with rochis, barbellis and bremis,  
> Whose skales ensilvred again the son beames  
> Englistered, that joyous it was to beholde.  
> Then furthermore aboute me my syght I revolde,  
> Where I saw growyng a goodly laurell tre,  
> Enverdurid with levis contynually grene;  
> Above, in the top, a byrde of Araby,  
> Men call a phenix; her wynges bytwene  
> She set up a fyre with the sparkis full kene  
> With braunches and bowghis of the swete olyve,  
> Whos flagraunt flower was chefe preservatyve

80 Loewenstein, ‘Skelton’s Triumph’, p. 616.
Gardens were the special province of women in the Middle Ages and are associated with female power. It is by female agency that Skelton achieves his fame. Skelton enters into this garden on his journey away from the domain of the Queen of Fame, and the hellish gates of Albion, towards the Countess of Surrey. This episode is highly symbolic and takes place just before Skelton meets the Howard ladies and is required to write lyrics to prove his worth as a poet and acquire the laurel. It is a moment in the poem which focuses upon poetic fame and which draws attention to Skelton’s memorialising representation of himself, but it is facilitated and explained by the workings of the goddesses and Occupacyoun. Occupacyoun’s final task is to expound from her expensive and highly decorated manuscript book, all the records of Skelton’s works (ll. 1170-1511). She seems to appropriate and replace traditional male roles and her part in the action takes up a significant proportion of the poem.

Representations of Fame, Pallas and Occupacyoun develop the idea that female patronage is a significant feature of Skelton’s poetic productivity. These representations are conventional, highlighting the poet’s dependence on the good will of others, and they illustrate how closely Skelton adheres to medieval traditional representations of patronage activity. However, the lyrics to the ladies, and the role of Occupacyoun in presenting her record of Skelton’s works at the end of the poem, emphasise new aspects of the patronage process. While the representations of Fame, Pallas and Occupacyoun are directed towards thinking about exactly what patronage means to the patron and to the artist, the representations of the Howard ladies and Occupacyoun’s record keeping suggest that

81 MacDougall, ed., Medieval Gardens, p. 9. See also my discussion of the role of the daisy and queen in Chaucer’s Prologue to The Legend of Good Women, Chapter Four.
changes are taking place in the perception of patronage and the status of the different parties.

C. Conclusion

The narrative account of the writing of the lyrics is a complex representation of patronage relationships in which Skelton abandons generic convention and rejects biographic realism. Representation of female patronage is central to *The Garland of Laurel* and Skelton’s construction of female patrons, motivating and directing the action, holding his fate in their hands, attributes new significance to the patron-artist relationships in the late fifteenth century.

Skelton draws upon women’s own self-representation through patronage as a means of negotiating the changing social and literary conditions. Changing perceptions of patronage, and new representations of patrons and authorial self, were both necessitated and made possible by print, and by the changing sociopolitical and literary climate nationally. An examination of the processes of patronage in the poem illuminates not only the social context but Skelton’s perception of himself in relation to that context. *The Garland of Laurel* is not just about Skelton’s fame but is a poem which emphasises the processes involved in the acquisition of fame and the poet’s social status. Such thoughts about the processes behind writing and self-advancement are perhaps particularly fitting to a poem written early in the career of the poet while he was still acting as a tutor at court to Prince Henry.

While Skelton had real experience of female patronage, in *The Garland of Laurel* he chooses to make use of a fictionalised patronage scenario to emphasise his relationship with the Howard household, to name-drop, and to enhance his status as perceived by an audience wider than just the patrons he names. The lyrics emphasise Skelton’s personal investment in writing such public tributes to the ladies and the mutual dependence of their reputations. He draws attention to other means of self-fashioning – textile production and portraiture – and
through an examination of these processes of patronage he defines a position and status for himself.

Skelton’s text exhibits a consciousness of life within Britain and its relationships with Europe. The text is cosmopolitan, both inward and outward looking. It is concerned with the state of England, with literary production and with readership. In these terms Skelton could be defined as a second-generation English vernacular poet, exhibiting different concerns from those of his predecessors. The patronage patterns which I expose in this poem, the re-shaping of the identity of the patron figures and the mutual dependency of artist and patrons, make evident that a process and exploration of self-fashioning, of the writer and of the patron, is an important theme of Skelton’s work. In the final Chapter I consider further how his self-representation and self-definition become central to his writing of poetry.
Chapter Seven

The Author

As I have suggested, Skelton's poetic identity is partially defined by discourses generated through variant representations of female patronage in *The Garland of Laurel* as well as through his adaptation of the subject matter and structures of dream poetry and the French lyrico-narrative tradition. The adaptation of earlier literary traditions in *The Garland of Laurel* results in a newly dialogic and communicative poem which reflects the processes by which language and the construction of identity are being developed and re-appropriated for new purposes in the late fifteenth century. Skelton's perceptions of shifting identities, seen through patronage relationships, are focal points for the text both ideologically and structurally. He draws attention to the changing role of literature in society, to the changing roles of those who produced and read books and to the different intellectual, social and economic factors influencing book production.

This chapter focuses upon the figure of the author and Skelton's representation of himself. It examines how and why Skelton generates a representation of authorship in *The Garland of Laurel*. I consider the relationship between text and author and how the text points to the figure of the author, which can be reconstructed through an analysis of structure and form, as well as through the consideration of the text's internal relationships.¹

Firstly, I focus upon Skelton's use of personae and pseudo-autobiography in *The Garland of Laurel* and I place this in the context of the patronage relationships I have already examined. Secondly the chapter focuses upon the way in which Skelton fashions himself through images in his texts and relates this to his English audience and reception context. I consider the implications for defining Skelton's poetic status. Finally I draw some tentative comparisons between Skelton's self-representation and that of his English contemporaries, the Humanist scholars of Henry VIII's court.

A. Self-Presentation

i. Personae and Pseudo-autobiography

Skelton represents two worlds to his reader, the dream world and the real world. In the poem he appears as both the dreamer and the writer, central to both spheres of action. One way in which Skelton negotiates these different stances is through his manipulation of narrative voice. He makes use of a persona to explore the real and dream worlds of the poem.

A persona can be defined as 'the assumed identity or fictional ‘I’ [...] assumed by a writer in a literary work; thus the speaker in a lyric poem, or the narrator in a fictional narrative.'\(^2\) It has the function of focusing the attention of the reader on particular aspects of the text and issues it raises. It sets up distinctions between the poet, patron, and anonymous other as author figure.\(^3\) Often, as in Skelton’s poems, there can be more than one persona.\(^4\) In addition to *The Garland of Laurel* Skelton’s poems *Colin Clout*, *Speak Parrot*, and *Phillip Sparrow* make use of personae to negotiate difficulties of narration and presentation.

Such experimentation with the functions of voice and identity in literature was not new but Skelton’s use of it was innovative, subtle, confident and varied. Little has been written about his use of personae but he is an undisputed master of the technique. His sophisticated use of it is unmatched both by his Renaissance successors and by his English predecessors, with the possible exception of Chaucer.\(^5\) Critics tend to use a persona to distinguish between the voice of the poet in imaginative composition and his voice in autobiography. However, in *The Garland of Laurel* Skelton’s use of persona is unique. He creates an 'autobiographical' persona, representing the narrator and another character, which the audience are meant to equate – compare, contrast or regulate – with a real-life Skelton. De Looze calls this merging of fiction and reality pseudo-autobiography.\(^6\)

---


\(^4\) D. Lawton, ‘Skelton’s Use of Persona’, *Essays In Criticism, 30* (1980), 9-30, (pp. 9, 11-12).


According to De Looze conditions in the fourteenth century favoured the rise of pseudo-autobiographical narrative, a narrative mode in which both fiction and autobiography could be read, in which ‘both perceptions were possible and different readers metonymically mapped partial readings onto texts, declaring them autobiographical or fictional’. De Looze suggests that fourteenth-century readers were pleased with retrospective first person narratives purportedly about the author’s life which also undermined that claim.

Complementary to this are recent discussions around Hoccleve which highlight the conflict between autobiographical impulse and imaginative fiction evident in his works. Lee Paterson suggests that accounts of Hoccleve’s self have been read as strategic poses adopted by the poet depending upon the needs of the communicative situation. He suggests that Hoccleve wears the mask of the subordinate who wants his superiors to listen to his importunities and advice and he quotes Paul Strohm who sees Hoccleve’s representation of self as an ‘imaginative exemplification of broader issues’.

Zumthor has also provided some sceptical theoretical approaches to medieval autobiography of this kind suggesting that there is a paucity of truly first-person narratives in medieval writing and that these experiences are often so codified that individuality is washed away. However, where he does recognise autobiography he sees major shifts in modes of reading and argues that there is a growing identification of poetry with the person(ality) of the author and a need to recognise the author as extratextual as well as the authorial persona.

Such reactions to this centralising of self in poetry of the fourteenth century have resonance for a consideration of Skelton’s *The Garland of Laurel*. The traits by which De Looze identifies pseudo-autobiography in the fourteenth century are not features unique or original to the fourteenth century, but are seen to cluster around pseudo-autobiography of this period in a particular way. He recognises its particular concerns

---

7 De Looze, *Pseudo-autobiography*, pp. x-xi. *La Fonteine Amoreuse, Voir Dit, Remède de Fortune, Prison Amoreuse, Nicole de Margival’s Dit de la Panthère d’Amours* (1290–1328), and the *Roman de Poire* (1250), among many other poems, use pseudo-autobiography as a method for their telling.

8 L. Patterson, ““What is Me?”: Self and Society in the Poetry of Thomas Hoccleve”, *Studies in the Age of Chaucer*, 23 (2001), 437-70.

with truth-telling; a rhetoric of sincerity which justifies the self-reflexive book; self-consciousness about the writing process (often expressed as a concentration on the construction of a book of the self which will live on independently of the poet-narrator/author); the poet active poetically without any elision with erotic activity; and a thematicization of the reader and the reading process as integral to the construction of the text.\textsuperscript{10}

Skelton’s poem is pseudo-autobiographical and is characterised in the ways highlighted above. It also defies such real categorising and takes on different effects from those described by De Looze. Early chapters have discussed its deep rooted concern with the immortality and reputation of the poet, and Skelton’s place in current and past literary tradition. The poem contains much justification for its own reflexivity; for example, it focuses upon the construction of Occupacyoun’s manuscript book as a way of immortalising the writer figure and reflecting upon production and reception processes. While imitative of courtly courtesy, Skelton’s autobiographical persona, poetically active in the poem, also remains disassociated from the erotic activity of the traditional dreamer-lover and relies upon an evocation of relationships set within the paradigm of manuscript and print culture.

Helen Phillips suggests that multi-faceted narrator figures, popular with medieval audiences, highlight ‘the socio-historic situation of the court poet in the era before printing’. She claims that they highlight relationships between the fictional and real narrator, time and composition processes, reading, writing and scribing, and that they raise questions about narrative structure: ‘Medieval poets delight less in consistent narrative personae than in multifaceted narrative figures: the narrative voice becomes an intriguing point of interface, a protean fictional consciousness, representing at different times the experiences of a reader, poet, oral presenter, fictional protagonist, reporter, and the scribe and producer of the volume.’\textsuperscript{11} Like the multi-faceted narrative figures

\textsuperscript{10} De Looze, \textit{Pseudo-autobiography}, pp. 8-16, 39, 41. In his work on the fourteenth century, De Looze perceives a new and growing exploitation of the analogy between the author’s life or ‘body’ and the author’s book. He emphasises the new quasi-professional position for the poet (in relation to the patron) and recognises a ‘crisis of truth’. This crisis of truth is a response to the powerful medieval analogy which underpins Saint Augustine’s \textit{Confessions}, Alain of Lille’s \textit{De Incarnatione Christi} and Geoffrey of Vinsauf’s \textit{Poetria Nova}. The analogy risks suggesting that the poet is godlike in his powers of creation and that the author, in recreating himself, vies for immortality.

that Phillips describes, Skelton's persona in The Garland of Laurel creates a dynamic representation of the author figure. As a dreamer and as an identifiable author, Skelton explores and reflects upon the relationship between patrons and poet and generates discourses which bring forth an image of an author figure in the context of print culture, changing economics, changing audience, printers' self-interest, threats of plagiarism and questions about the ownership of intellectual property.

Skelton's choice of pseudo-autobiography, an autobiographical persona, places him indisputably at the centre of the poem's action. Lawton has made the point that, because The Garland of Laurel bears signs of being an occasional poem, the relationship between persona and audience is difficult to define. 'Unless we can recapture the occasion, we lack sufficient grounds for judging how as readers we are being invited to respond. In each case, we lose the full significance of the persona because we have lost the key to its external relationships'. However, if the imaginary and the real audience are not conceived as one and the same, if the lyrics indicate a potential audience, and the persona indicates an author figure, identifiable in some respects with Skelton himself, then these reflect in interesting and specific ways upon The Garland of Laurel – ways which have not before been considered. Skelton's technique places him at the centre of the action of the poem and in a text where fictions cloud reality and discourses and their significations flourish, the author becomes a 'principle of thrift in the proliferation of meaning', a means by which the text can be limited and interpreted.

ii. The Patronage Context

From the beginning of the poem Skelton's special status, or independence, is emphasised by a specific description of his dream location. Galtres forest in Yorkshire is the locus for the opening of the poem and is the setting in which the poet falls asleep against the trunk of a tree. Forests were central to the archetypal romance landscape of medieval literature. Imaginary functions of the forest were linked to the geographic, economic and legal realities of forests in the Middle Ages as well as to their historical, biblical and philosophical origins. They were defined by borders and boundaries, had their own laws, and were separate from public and communal areas. They were traditionally places of exile and often symbolise the human need for regeneration. They

---

13 Foucault, 'What is an Author?', p. 221.
were also associated with evil, chaos, adventure, mystery, spiritual vision, and with love. Anthropological approaches to forests include the concept of *limen* — the transition period within ritual movement from one state to another — a rite of passage or a period of initiation or testing.\(^{14}\) Skelton appears marginally positioned in relation to his patrons, outside of their house, emphasising that the patronage relationship has little influence over his production of the poem.\(^{15}\) It is also clear that he is about to transgress the boundary between wakefulness and sleep, that his state is privileged, and that this may have significant consequences for our perceptions of the poet. In the dream Skelton's work is unconstrained by the desires of his patrons and he displays autonomy in his productivity, unlike the clerkly writers in the poems of Machaut and Froissart.

However, the relationships between Skelton and his patrons, real, potential and ideal, becomes a focal point for re-interpreting poetic identity in *The Garland of Laurel*. The lyrics which appear to be written to honour the ladies in fact redefine Skelton's position as a writer in a potential patronage scenario and construct afresh female patron identity, pointing to changing literary relationships and textual modes of production. The autobiography which Skelton seems to be writing for the ladies is ultimately his biography. The lyrics raise questions about exactly what patronage means to the artist and how an artist can fashion himself. Skelton illustrates the instability starting to emerge in these traditional literary relationships and connects it to authorial identity through the notions of reciprocity and work.

Reciprocity is the key to considering Skelton's self-representation. In return for the lyrics the Howard women weave a laurel garland for Skelton's laureation, an embroidered item of clothing he is to wear and which will symbolise his poetic powers. The ladies' industry is part of a discourse of reward which places Skelton amongst the greatest poets. Their weaving and embroidering of the laurel sets up a parallel with Skelton's textual production, both within the dream and in reality, and with wider

---


\(^{15}\) This was Julia Boffey's apt suggestion in an e-mail sent on Thursday 22\(^{nd}\) February 2001 concerning an earlier version of this chapter written as a paper for the conference *Changing Identities: 1000–1600* given at the University of Kent, 9\(^{th}\)--11\(^{th}\) February, 2001.
processes of textual production. It draws attention to the similarities of textual and textile production. It shows that Skelton's literary productivity does not depend ultimately upon the favour of the patron figure. The reciprocity equalises literary relationships and confers status or emphasis on the figure of the poet. It emphasises the author as an independent figure, free to construct or manipulate his own identity within the constraints imposed by patronage and modes of literary production. The ladies repay Skelton for his lyrics in a way which conjures up the image of the gift-giving Jean, Duc de Berry, and which recalls grand and traditional concepts of patronage. However, in the context of the late fifteenth and early sixteenth century, and the growing literary economy, their actions and the status of the poet assume new meaning.

Occupacyoun also provides an example of one aspect of patronage which directly enhances Skelton's own self-representation in the text. The list of works she reads aloud from her book of record is important because, while traditionally lists of works confirmed the authority of the poet, such as that in the prologue to The Legend of Good Women, Skelton's list includes a near complete bibliography of his literary production including some works of dubious veracity, such as the Ballad of the Mustard Tart, lost to us today. Such a work may never have existed; Skelton is a playful enough poet to invent and attribute works to himself that he did not write. However, in this case Skelton perhaps pokes fun at notions of poetic authority while simultaneously extolling and memorialising his own, in a way which dominates the ending of the poem. His reflexive consideration of his own works and their production in The Garland of Laurel has much in common with author-based manuscript collections which emphasise the poet's role in structuring his own work, a preoccupation with text and the physical make up of the book. The list also responds to the popularity of miscellany and a new interest in the preservation of shorter works in collections.

16 Text is etymologically derived from the Latin word textus, meaning a web, texture or structure, and in the context of speech or writing a 'connection'. Barthes distinguished between the notion of 'oeuvre, a work considered as a closed, finished, reliable representational object, and the modern notion of 'text' considered as an open, infinite process that is both meaning-generating and meaning-subverting, S. Heath, ed. and trans., Barthes: Image Music Text. Essays (London: Fontana, 1977), pp. 155-164. He also describes text as 'tissue' and as 'perpetual interweaving', R. Miller, ed., Roland Barthes: The Pleasure of the Text (Oxford: Blackwells, 1975), p. 64. Skelton's The Garland of Laurel is reflexive about both oeuvre and text and creative processes.

17 R. B. Palmer, ed. and trans., Guillaume de Machaut: 'The Fountain of Love '(La Fontenine Amoureouse') and two other Love Vision Poems (London: Garland, 1993), pp. 89-239. In this work by Machaut's the poem which the narrator offers originally came from the mouth of the patron. At the end of the tale the poet is lavished with jewels illustrating his dependence on his patron. These exchanges confer identity on the poet/writer, playing around the questions who's writing? Who's originating? Who's controlling? Who's authoring?
Occupyoun promotes Skelton's literary glorification, but the list denotes his authority and suggests that he has already achieved a certain amount of status without her help. The incompleteness of the list, indicated by its ending *et cetera*, extends his works ostentatiously beyond the boundaries of the 'manuscript' book in which they are contained. The book and its list, which when shut awakens Skelton from his dream, form the link between dream and reality which is essential to the realisation of Skelton as an historical figure, and to the recognition of the poem as a memorial for his poetic activity.

This picture of Skelton subtly upholds the commentary already established by Fame and Pallas about Skelton's right to a place in literary tradition and his lasting reputation. His dullness is recognised and authorised by Pallas as a sign of worthiness which places him firmly in the traditions of other great writers before him. Chaucer, Gower and Lydgate grant Skelton their approval and guide him through the poem, also helping him to establish his status as a poet of the English language and his place in literary tradition. Skelton defines himself in relation to these earlier writers in an oratorical extravaganza which establishes his living reputation and claims to authority in the context of tradition.

B. Visual Image and English Audience

i. Woodcuts

One further way in which poetic identity is generated in *The Garland of Laurel* is in the woodcuts of Faques's 1523 edition of the poem. Some of the woodcuts reveal that new attention is being given to the role of the author at the end of the fifteenth and beginning of the sixteenth century; that the author is refashioning himself for an audience with changing needs and demands, or is being refashioned by publishers.


20 See Appendix 8 and my earlier observations in Chapter Two.

21 R. S. Renchler, "'Goe Forth my Booke': Authorial Self-Assertion and Self-Representation in Printings of Renaissance Poetry" (Unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Oregon, 1987). This thesis suggests that this is also the case in the works of Caxton, John Heywood, Thomas Churchyard and John Taylor the Water Poet.
This kind of representation has been much considered by critics of French texts and similar examples can be seen particularly in the works of Pierre Gringore, Skelton’s French contemporary.22

While the woodcuts are not intended as portraits of the writer they emphasise his laureation and ‘fit reference to his personal honour into a pre-existing pictorial convention’. They combine ‘traditional authorial iconography, poetic self-promotion, and publisher’s advertisement’.23 Pearsall and other critics have commented that an exploration of the relationship of late medieval manuscript illustration to the text can provide a glimpse of an ‘authentic primary response’ to that text and this seems to be the case with the woodcuts in Faques’s text where we have indications of how the poet wished to represent himself and, or, what kind of representation his publisher thought would be most successful.24

In all there are five woodcuts in Faques’s text, described by Hodnett as ‘neither new nor interesting’.25 However, the interest in visual representation may reflect Skelton’s interests, or his publisher’s interests, in a broadening and non-courtly audience for his work. The printing of pictures and diagrams pre-dated the invention of printing the written word with moveable types by fifty years, and repeatable pictorial statements had an incalculable effect upon knowledge and thought, although recognition of their social, economic and scientific importance did not come until long after they were in common use.26 Original single sheet woodcuts seem to have been made for simple people and are usually images of figures which are no more than class or religious symbols.27 Their identity is represented by use of a sign or symbol especially connected with them and all


27 Irvin, *Prints and Visual Communication*, pp. 31-9. It was not until 1467, in Cardinal Torquemada’s *Meditations on the Passion of Our Lord*, that woodcuts, which have sentences referring to them, were printed that purported to be pictures of precisely identifiable and locatable objects.
are printed from an identical block with adaptations, sometimes gaudily and badly painted over.28 The interests that they traditionally represented were distinctly bourgeois and it is doubted that they were of interest to the great or wealthy until towards the end of the fifteenth century. They continued to flourish during the sixteenth century but by 1600 had been driven from the pages of all but the smallest number of serious and elegant books.29 Skelton’s use of woodcuts seems to play into this early tradition and in the woodcut in which he represents himself with the symbolic laurel branch held in his hand, he advertises his own self-importance. He associates his name and image with the text in a popular form. However, the image also appears in Faques’s small, elegant and possibly bespoke book, here advertising the literary qualities of the volume and the renown of the author. The inclusion of such woodcuts points to the author’s and printer’s realisation of the power of print and their manipulation of it for purposes of sales and self-promotion.

The woodcuts, possibly the result of the printer’s or writer’s intervention, contribute to the generation of poetic identity in this text. Two woodcuts have provoked much interest. Firstly, a full page image of the writer/teacher/reader at his desk with a book appears in the volume; secondly, the woodcut which has produced most interest, a full page illustration of a figure holding a laurel branch.30 It is in fact an adaptation of one used by Marchant in his Shepherd’s Calendar and Vberrimon Sphere Mundi, a representation of the month April and an orator-magister.31 Clearly the woodcut is reused by Faques and adapted, with the elimination of zodiac signs and other elements, and the addition of the laurel, to represent Skelton.32 This image locates Skelton

29 Ibid., pp. 29-30, 40-50.
30 E. Hodnett, English Woodcuts, pp. 404, 434. The cut of the author crowned with Laurel at his desk is a common image and is often copied in other works by Skelton. It appears in Dyvers baletys and dyttes solacyjous devised by Master Skelton Laureat (1525–30), repeated, or first occurring, in Skelton’s Agaynst a comely coystrowne, undated but certainly printed by Rastell. The figure holding the laurel branch is not used elsewhere. See also Appendices 5, 6, and 8.
32 Ibid., p. 20; Hodnett, English Woodcuts, pp. 50-3. In 1506 Pynson acquired Verard’s Kalendar of Shepherds blocks, which he had used in 1503, for his own edition. In 1497 the series of cuts for Caxton’s Aesop’s Fables appeared in Pynson’s edition (the only instance known of in which a whole series of blocks goes from Caxton / Wynken de Worde to Pynson, perhaps illustrating an early business transaction). Wynken de Worde reused woodblocks from Caxton’s press, varying their arrangement, when they came into his possession after de Worde’s death. Julian Notary working in partnership with John Barbier and I.H. (Jean Huvin of Rouen) produced in 1518 one of the most elaborate Kalendar of Shepards of the period. It contained over 125 cuts, in main based upon the Verard and Pynson set, although no block belongs to it; Skelton’s Ballade of the Scottyshe King (1513), a crudely decorated broadside, made use of earlier cuts.
biographically, alluding to details of his personal history, and iconographically, situating him within two well-established traditions, the representation of the months and representation of the orator-magister. As I discuss in Chapter Two, this image is unique amongst those found in texts by printers associated with Skelton.

Woodcut images of months, seasons and readers are associated with ‘processes of work’ and with learning or teaching. The woodcut upholds the notion of the authority of teachers, writers and scholars in its subject matter and position in the text. Furthermore, the woodcut has Latin words printed beneath it: ‘Eterno manusura die dum sidera fulgent / Equora dumque tament hec laurea nostra virebit. / Hinc nostrum celebre et nomen referetur ad astra. / Undique Skeltonis memoribatur alter adonis’, translated as, ‘While the stars shine remaining in everlasting day, and while the seas swell, this our laurel shall be green: our famous name shall be echoed to the skies, and everywhere Skelton shall be remembered as another Adonis’. The words conflate the non-dreamer Skelton with Adonis. While establishing familiar visual-verbal links, the illustration also goes further, connecting the author-poet with a god and with the notion of Adonis’s resurrecting and rejuvenating power. Skelton assumes a stature equal to that of his patrons in the text (goddesses and near-goddesses) and, more than that, assumes a position in the textual illustration which might equally well have been occupied by a dedication to or image of a patron. The link between god and poet destabilises the traditional status of the patron in the context of this poem and gives significance to the figure of the poet and the memorialisation of his name in verse.

More direct references to patrons in the poem also indicate instability in the traditional relationships between printers, authors and patrons as depicted in Skelton’s works. It may have been at the printer’s instigation that endings were attached to The Garland of Laurel, addressing the king and Wolsey, making the book more saleable and exalting the reputation of the writer. It is equally possible that these sections were added with Skelton’s approval, or by Skelton himself, suggesting a changing relationship between Skelton and the court towards the end of his career, and his later dependence upon the

---

33 Erler, ‘Early Woodcuts’, p. 17.
34 Ibid., pp. 20, 23-8.
goodwill of the king and cardinal. They may reflect Skelton’s increasing awareness that his reputation was enhanced through its association with the royal court. These additional passages addressed to the king and Wolsey, like the woodcuts, potentially give us insight into Skelton’s relationship with his printer and information about the possible reception of his work. Skelton performs both to and for his patrons and printers but he appears to leave the world of manuscript book making and coterie circulation in favour of the more commercial world of print.\(^{37}\)

ii. Englishness

Skelton’s concern for his reputation and his place in society is also revealed in *The Garland of Laurel* through his perceptions of being English and using the English language. The poem seems to evoke a sense of national pride and interest, just as the poems of the French *Rhétoriqueurs* depicted France, French current affairs and noble history. Skelton emphasises that he is writing in English and gives some indication of how he expects such a work to be perceived and received. His choice of language contributes to his self-definition. He understands it as partially defining what it means to be an author in the late fifteenth century and the nature of that authority, particularly in relation to the court or state.

*Mens tibi sit consulta, petis? Sic consule menti;*  
*Emula sit Jani, retro speculetur et ante.*

**Skeltonis alloquitur librum suum**

*Ite, Britannorum lux O radiosa, Britannum*  
*Carmina nostra pium vestrum celebrate Catullum!*  
*Dicit, Skeltonis vester Adonis erat;*  
*Dicit, Skeltonis vester Homerus erat.*  
*Barbara cum Latio pariter jam currite versu;*  
*Et licet est verbo pars maxima textia Britanno,*  
*Non magis incompta nostra Thalya patet,*  
*Est magis inculta nec mea Caliope.*  
*Nec vos peniteat livoris tela subire,*  
*Nec vos peniteat rabiem tolerare caninam,*  
*Nam Maro dissimiles non tuit ille minas,*
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Skelton identifies skilfulness, or literary skill, with memory and intellect, and with the ability to look back on past tradition and to anticipate future achievements. The idea of emulating Janus, who can look in opposite directions at once, is suggestive of an authorial omniscience and is made immediately before Skelton addresses his book. He calls it the ‘shining light of the Britons’ and celebrates himself as ‘the worthy British Catullus’. He claims to be writing ‘our songs’, suggesting that he sees himself as producing something of national importance and, as a poet, has a claim to recognition.

The Garland of Laurel, his ‘book’, is launched with the Latin imperative *ite* and is described as a ‘shining light’ for the British people. Skelton posits himself as a ‘British Catullus’, an ‘Adonis’ and a ‘new Homer’, assuming the status of a god, an epic writer and an efficient statesman. The figure of Adonis again suggests a continual renewing life force and an ever-springing well of poetry and the notion that all success must be attributed to Skelton is clearly evident. The phrase ‘Though barbarous, you now compete in an equal race with Latin verse’ identifies Skelton’s work, and his use of English, as carrying some authority, in a manner similar to the perception of the status of Latin and Greek, while the admission that the language is barbarous is especially interesting and can perhaps be equated with the dullness trope commonly found in medieval verse.

Skelton claims that the epic and comic muses can still work effectively even with British words and that the language is not deficient, rude or uncultured so as to fail him entirely in his desire to express himself. Skelton makes it clear that the English language is worthy enough and effective enough to withstand any criticisms and abuse, just as Classical authors suffered antagonism and exile for what they wrote. This section of Skelton’s poem, distinctly positioned after the dream ends, reveals new confidence and

---

38 Scattergood, ed., *Complete English Poems*, pp. 354-5, and note p. 512. Scattergood translates this, ‘Do you wish your mind to be skilful? In that case, pay attention to your mind; let it be like that of Janus which looks back and forward. Skelton *speaks to his book*. Go, shining light of the Britons, and celebrate, our songs, your worthy British Catullus! Say, Skelton was your Adonis; say, Skelton was your Homer. Though barbarous, you now compete in an equal race with Latin verse. And though for the most part it is made up of British words our Thalia appears not too rude, nor is my Calliope too uncultured. Nor should you be sorry to suffer the intrigues of malice, nor to endure the attacks of a mad dog; for Virgil himself bore similar threats; nor was Ovid’s muse spared them.’

39 Skelton’s stance is perhaps comparable to that of the Humanists who fashioned their patrons as *maecenas meus*. The Humanists also located their work in relation to the classics and a revival of learning, see, D. R. Carlson, *English Humanist Books: Writers, Patrons, Manuscript and Print, 1475–1525* (London: University of Toronto Press, 1993), pp. 5-7 and later work in this chapter.
excitement about what words and writing can do for the reputation of a poet. It suggests that Skelton is exploring and revelling in the new power he perceives in the use of the English vernacular. However, in addition, this section highlights insecurity about exactly how this language will be received and used. It is interesting, and ironic, that although he writes about and extols his own use of English, Skelton chooses to write this section of his poem in Latin, the traditional language for official documents and expressions of authority.

iii. Poetic Status

Another following section of Skelton’s poem, ‘L’Envoy’ (ll. 1533-86), written in English, seems to sum up Skelton’s discussion and more clearly reveals the concerns that he has about The Garland of Laurel and his own poetic status. He ushers his book out into the world telling it not to despair, ‘Though I you wrate / After this rate / In Englysshe letter’, (ll. 1536-38). In fact, Skelton claims that this is a very good thing because ‘Welcome shall ye / To sum men be; / For Latin warkis / Be good for clerkis’, (ll. 1540-43). Skelton attributes full confidence to the fact that he has written the poem in English. He claims it will be welcome to all men, even to some clerks who can read Latin, and that because of this its reputation, which is closely connected to his, will grow. Skelton warns, however, that there will be a need for the poem to counter accusations or criticisms made through envy and ill-affection, even as it is celebrated for its beauty, and that this defence should be done not through cowardice but through courtesy and delight in his words. Ultimately, it is less the language and more his own status and place in literary history which Skelton fears will be problematic. Skelton had encountered hostility from his contemporaries many times before the publication of The Garland of Laurel.40

40 D. R. Carlson, ‘Skelton and Barclay: Medieval and Modern’, Early Modern Literary Studies, 1 (1995), 1-17, (pp. 1-10). Carlson’s work focuses upon the differences and animosity between Skelton and Barclay. Barclay castigated Skelton and the poem Phyllip Sparrowe, which Skelton responded to in an addition to the text. John Bale also attributed a poem to Barclay, Contra Skeltonum and his poem The Ship of Fools charged Skelton with ‘viciousnes’ and ‘wantones’. Carlson sees these hostilities as indicative of more substantive antipathy between them. Fundamentally different as writers, their affiliations with traditions and institutions, literary and social, were also different. These characterise the shift taking place between what had flourished in the middle ages and new practices and institutions, such as print or humanism. They have led to the opposition of a medieval Barclay and a modern Skelton, distinctions Carlson does not uphold in his article.
Skelton’s perception of his place in society is also illustrated earlier in the poem when Occupacyoun leads him to a wide and large field, or perhaps an inner courtyard, walled by an expensive and glistening sharp, flint wall. Skelton is persuaded to walk on the wall, but is warned to venture carefully because it is slippery. Below he sees a thousand gates, both new and old, which are pressed against by innumerable people. The profusion of people, often used to symbolise barbarism and anarchy, is evident in other poems by Skelton, such as *Upon the Dolorous Dethe*, *Speke Parrot* and *The Bowge of Court*. The imagery also echoes that of Book Three of Chaucer’s *House of Fame*. Often Skelton is caught up among the throng and the crowds in *The Garland of Laurel* have this sense of immediacy. Skelton is first told to ‘put hymselfe in prease / Amonge the thickeste of all the hole rowte’ and to compete in noisemaking with the rest, by Dame Pallas, (ll. 239-41). In response to his questioning, Occupacyoun explains the meaning of the gates to Skelton.

she answeryd, and brely me tolde
How from the est unto the occident,
And from the sowth unto the north so colde,
‘Theis yatis,’ she sayd, ‘which that ye beholde,
Be issuis and portis from all maner of nacyons’; (ll. 576-80)

Each gate has writing next to it, including Greek, Hebrew, Latin and French, both old and new inscriptions and one gate is inscribed with an A which stands for Anglea, (ll. 586-8). The gate is surmounted by a leopard, the heraldic beast of the English royal coat of arms, crowned with gold and stones.

Terrible of countenaunce and passynge formydable,
As quikly towchyd as it were fleshe and bones,
As gastyly that glaris, as grimly that gronis,
As fersly frownyng as he had ben fyghtyng,
And with his forme foote he shoke for the this wrytyng:

*Formidanda nimis Jovis ultima fulmina tollis:*
*Unguibus ire parat loca singula livida curvis*
*Quam modo per Phubes nummos raptura Celeno;*
*Arma, lues, luctus, fel, vis, fraus, barbarac tellus;*
*Mille modis erras odium tibi querere Martis;*
*Spreto spineto cedat salunca roseto.* (ll. 591-601)

---

41 J. A. Richardson, *Falling Towers: The Trojan Imagination in ‘The Waste Land’, ‘The Dunciad’ and ‘Speke Parrot’* (London: University of Delaware Press, 1992), pp. 15-29, 89-98. Richardson’s work looks at the ‘infancy of nations’, or thresholds of cultural epochs or cultural traditions. He considers how the imaginations of authors are shaped by traditions’ decay and how each of these poems, and others by these authors, engage with cultural crisis and delineate a disintegrating society.
It is terrible of countenance and has clawed out some Latin words with its foot, which speak of ‘Arms, plague, lamentation, gall, force, fraud, a barbarous world!’, the ‘thunderbolts of Jupiter’ and ‘the strife of Mars’. It has been suggested that Skelton’s own writing and use of language as a method of attack is the subject of these lines, that they are self-referential, but it is also possible that they allude to England, symbolised by the rose.\textsuperscript{42}

Skelton seems to identify with the throngs of people he can see trying to enter through the gates below him and he watches them milling around until they are blasted away by cannon, (ll. 602-43). The image is like that which Chaucer used it in his \textit{House of Fame}, especially that of his labyrinthine house of twigs, specifically referring to the writing and circulation of poetry and the acquisition of fame.\textsuperscript{43} The gates are a focus for what seems to be a centre of activity. Some of those below come from foreign lands, ‘Some were of Poyle, and sum were of Trace, / Of Lymerik, of Loreine, of Spayne, of Portyngale, / Frome Napuls, from Navern, and from Rouncevall, / Some from Flauders, sum from the se coste, / Some from the mayne lande, some from the Frensche hoste’. There are also men from Dartmouth, Plymouth, Portsmouth and burghers and bailiffs from the Cinque ports of Dover, Sandwich, Romney, Hastings and Hythe. Their commerce and communications are characterised by Skelton in a jumble of phrases and reported fragments of their speech: “How doth the north?”; “What tydinis in the sowth?”; “The west is wyndy”; “The est is metely wele.”, (ll. 491-516). Skelton describes the facts as being as slippery to get a grip on as the tail of an eel, a reference to the end of Chaucer’s \textit{House of Fame}.\textsuperscript{44} There are those amongst them who are false and deceitful, some polite, some full of bad news, some exaggerating diverse tales, others honest and practical. Some are full of flattery and others have come to spy; some bear charters and others letters.

\textsuperscript{42} Scattergood, ed., \textit{Complete English Poems}, pp. 501-2. Scattergood calls these lines ‘the despair of editors’ but translates them, ‘You bear things to be feared beyond measure, the very thunderbolts of Jupiter. With curved talons he is as ready to go to various dangerous places as was Celaeno the harpy to get treasure from Phoebus. Arms, plague, lamentation, gall, force, fraud, a barbarous world! You wander a thousand ways to seek yourself the strife of Mars. Let the wild nard give place to the scorned and thorny rose-tree.’

\textsuperscript{43} L. D. Benson ed., \textit{The Riverside Chaucer} (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1987), pp. 347-73. All of Book Three of the \textit{House of Fame} is relevant, but particularly: the house of twigs, ll. 1907-1985; Skelton’s arrival in the court, ll. 1341-1367; those seeking fame, ll. 1520-1566; attendance on the queen, ll. 1320-1340.

\textsuperscript{44} \textit{Ibid.}, p. 373, l. 2154.
In this description Skelton exhibits a consciousness of communities and the place of language within them, perhaps even an awareness of the crisis of these communities, traditions and language. The poem is intimately concerned with the English poetic tradition and the place therein of authors and their reputations, and it is complemented by an awareness of literary practice on an everyday level. Skelton shows how the English vernacular has established itself as a means of everyday communication, dealing with the political and social commonplace. There seems to be new and celebratory awareness of language and its uses, or new anxiety about it, perhaps precipitated by a new tide of anxiety concerning England’s relationship with its foreign neighbours. Skelton’s England is a meeting point for languages and cultures, slightly on the fringe of Europe geographically, linguistically and politically, but nevertheless influenced by Europe in its activities.

As a whole Skelton’s poem shows a consciousness of the wider continental, political and social context for literary activity and survival. Skelton makes a point of highlighting the importance of Anglia and its language in The Garland of Laurel and it seems as though his representation of himself and his authorial role is located within this more widely perceived locus of activity. Skelton’s poem reveals that his identity is closely related to language and literary practice and the notion that there is something new and progressive about the end of the fifteenth century. Such a culture valorises Skelton’s interchangeable use of Latin and English and his experimental and changeable verse structures.

In fact, critics have suggested that the end of the fifteenth century saw linguistic conflict which directly contributed to widespread use of macaronics, a purposeful corruption of language which was usually a mixture of languages (such as Latin and Greek), words, phrasings and syntaxes, for comic or burlesque effect. Skelton’s writing seems to directly reflect such diverse influences, drawing attention to the place of language in the world and the influence of other literary cultures. His use of the mixed languages and verse structures at the end of The Garland of Laurel is incongruous rather than comic

45 Richardson, *Falling Towers*, pp. 152-3. Richardson writes about the failure of order in society and its association with poetic structure. He sees the failure of poetic authority as the reason for confused or poor poetic structure.

and it has a serious undertow. Skelton recognises that language influences the future of his work and that his choices are part of a more widespread debate about learning and its display.⁴⁷

The late fifteenth-century audience may have been eager for bilingual, trilingual and even quadrilingual texts but it still perceived a fundamental difference in the status of languages, despite probably knowing several. Latin was traditionally thought of as the language of source, status and authority and it was thought of as a language of purity as opposed to vernacular vulgarisation. Skelton’s use of Latin forms shows not only linguistic virtuosity and intellectual self-consciousness but an ability to address particular types of readers, to speak of his own authorial status, and to model the reception of his own work. In The Garland of Laurel Skelton is highly perceptive about the power of language and its implications for shaping his own self-representation, literary reputation, and audience. He is both traditional and innovative in the way he uses language and his experimental structures illustrate his understanding of the traditions of literary form and genre and their connection to the idea of reputation.

iv. English Humanists

In her work on Skelton Gutierrez recognises different rhetorical stances in Skelton’s poetry which reveal new responses to perceptions of the poet at the beginning of the sixteenth century. She claims that Skelton can be identified both as a king’s poet, speaking to the king’s court, and as a popular spokesman, addressing the people of England as their teacher, and expressing their views in his own voice. Gutierrez has considered Skelton’s attitudes and representations alongside those of the Humanists and recognises in his work new responses to audiences, new functions of poetry and a changing role for the poet in this period which is similar to the social factors which influenced the development of the Rhétoriqueurs in France.⁴⁸

Skelton’s concern with his status, with establishing himself within poetic tradition, and with his patrons, does find counterparts in the work and lives of the Humanists,

⁴⁷ Carlson, ‘Skelton and Barclay’, p. 9: ‘Skelton’s best writings have also evaded categorisation. In metrical, stylistic, generic and topical terms, Skelton’s most characteristic work is wholly unlike anything else being done at the time, before or since, and such idiosyncrasy is unmedieval all by itself.’

although little critical work has been carried out in this respect. It has been argued that Skelton’s position amongst the Humanists at court, whose views had formed intellectually to some extent before 1480, was isolated, but it is notable that he shared many of their concerns and attitudes.\(^4\) Skelton has been described as a notable xenophobic and it has been suggested that he felt ‘animosity from this closed shop of continental literati, especially at a time when Burgundian and Italian letters were the vogue of Europe, and England was considered a cultural backwater’.\(^5\) The Humanists wrote in Latin, in part because many of them were Italian and in part because writing in English was less important to them. Skelton’s concerns about the use of English may be seen as a response to their activities.

The development of Humanist print culture in England was linked to traditions of English patronage and court life. Before 1485, in its earliest phases, the numbers involved were small, patrons were few and institutional support was rare.\(^5\) Like the Rhétoriqueurs the early Humanists were propagandists. They made cases for their patrons’ points of view on particular issues, broadcast and apologised for specific positions on contemporary affairs, and supported the king. They also advertised the general qualities of their patrons, sometimes with political consequences, and they prioritised making a living by writing, for which a good reputation was essential.\(^5\)

D. R. Carlson’s work, based in the main upon Latin sources, is of direct relevance to my consideration of Skelton’s attitudes and approaches to his work.\(^5\) There is much potential here for future scholarship regarding Skelton’s associations with the Humanists. In particular Carlson focuses upon the figure of Bernard André as an example of Humanist activity, who like Skelton produced texts which reveal a concern with authorial representation and self-awareness, the importance of relationships with

\(^4\) Carlson, ‘Skelton and Barclay’, pp. 1-17. Carlson defines Skelton, Barclay and Hawes as a group of ‘vernacular makers, professional or nearly professional English writers’ (p. 1). In his mind this circle is distinct from, but overlaps a little, with the Humanist circle, which included More and Erasmus, and, in the later decades of the reign of Henry VIII, the ‘new company’ of courtier poets which included Wyatt. See also Greg Walker, *John Skelton and the Politics of the 1520s* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988), p. 38.


\(^6\) Carlson, *English Humanist Books*, p. 14


\(^8\) I have been unable to follow up this research because Carlson’s sources are not published in translation.
patrons and a desire for prosperity, and a concern with new literary activity. André recognised that print was a valuable means by which reputation could be aggrandised and wider audiences reached. His works were diverse including propaganda, presentations and collections, annales, topical orations, devotions, saints’ lives, liturgical pieces, political writing and occasional pieces. His use of different kinds of publications and styles of writing demonstrated an ability to adapt his writings and publishing activities to changing circumstances and profitable situations.

André’s works reveal his awareness that print could help a writer to build and sustain a reputation and it shows the developments of court writing, from 1485 to 1522, which were partly shaped by varied methods of publication. Printed books show-cased his ability to write in a variety of verse forms and on a range of subjects; he made use of the increasing popularity of collections as a means for republication as well as for new works. He saw them as a more efficient tool for reputation building and for public self-fashioning than single item publications. Like Skelton he exploited the possibilities for reputation-making that print offered and the diversity of the late fifteenth-century audience.

C. Conclusion

Skelton’s modes of self-representation were similar to those of the *Rhétoriqueurs* in France and the Italian Humanists in England. Political crisis developed their independence from patrons and brought about an explicit awareness of the role of the

---

55 Ibid., p. 61.
56 Ibid., pp. 60, 79-81, 132-8. Carlson states that except for perhaps half a dozen books out of about seven hundred produced in England in the first decade of the sixteenth century, no Humanist interest books by English or English-based Humanists were printed by de Worde, Pynson, Julian Notary, William and Richard Faques, Rastell or Henry Pepwell and that a shift did not become discernible until after 1518 to 1522 when production suddenly exceeded their total production in the past forty years of printing.
57 Ibid., pp. 65-8.
58 Ibid., pp. 13, 18, 74.
The shift from manuscript to print, the struggle to gain patrons, and competition between writers, seems only to have facilitated these movements away from dependence and to have provided a vehicle for Skelton's authorial self-assertion. Humanists and Rhétoriqueurs recognised the importance of reputation for their own advancement and set about re-fashioning the relationship of patrons to writers through which the writer could instigate or emulate a patronage relationship.

Skelton's practices and concerns find counterparts amongst those of his European contemporaries and there is much scope for a future fruitful study of this material in relation to Skelton. Skelton shows a reliance on the self-conscious first person narrator closely related to the protagonist. He redefines his relationship to the past by re-articulating his identity through a persona linked to imaginary, institutional and biographical identity. His use of persona defines him in relation to patrons, printers and audiences, and his pseudo-autobiographical poem centralises the author figure and makes him the 'principle of thrift in the proliferation of meaning'. Skelton’s poem is a highly reflexive and intertextual, taking into account the inter-relatedness these figures in manuscript and print production. Skelton himself becomes an interface for understanding the literary relations of the text, a text which interweaves dream world and real world, autobiography and biography.

Those literary relations are explored through Skelton’s involvement in reciprocal patronage relationships. His reflexivity about creativity; the accurate and imaginary biographical record of his own works; the realisation that The Garland of Laurel is a part of this poetic achievement; and the recognition that Skelton’s reputation, fame, and place in tradition are part of the changing context for textual production and reception, are all means by which Skelton defines himself and establishes himself as the primary figure in the text. Woodcuts are also an important means by which Skelton addresses an audience directly, involving them in the recognition of himself as a great literary figure.


61 Ibid., pp. 5-7, 63.


63 Foucault, ‘What is an Author?’, p. 221.
poet. Skelton recognises the potential of print in making his concerns about authorial self and their articulations manifest.\textsuperscript{64} Authorial self-promotion is taken to new extremes by Skelton and justifies some of the assumptions critics have made about Skelton's interest in fame.

Skelton's poems reflect an identity which is foremost and such self-referentiality has led to accusations of egomania. However, Skelton's work is more concerned with the way in which such an identity can be produced, with manuscript circulation and with attendant habits of reading and rewriting for audiences.\textsuperscript{65} Skelton, as I have previously considered, is a poet who continuously rewrites and re-presents his work and himself. Reading itself becomes a form of rewriting and Skelton perceives this as he adds to his poems over a number of years. There is certainly evidence for such activity in \textit{The Garland of Laurel}. Skelton's presentation, and reflective reading, of his own work are a thematic concern of his work and his authority is found in these processes of production which include the developments which came with the introduction of print technology.\textsuperscript{66} He recognises the instability of literary texts and the power that audiences have to shape their reception and his reputation.

Skelton's concern with English is closely connected to these strategies of self-promotion and is a response to some of the tensions he recognises. Skelton understands that language determines reception, and emphasises English in a way which suggests that it was being newly perceived in relation to other languages and literary traditions. He sees the author as a figure located within a wide intertextual field of cultural influence and tradition, within continental and well as domestic spheres of literary activity, and highlights the necessity of good lasting reputation. \textit{The Garland of Laurel} highlights 'anxieties about the poet's own position in what was newly perceived as an English literary tradition, and about the status of that tradition in the wider literary field

\textsuperscript{64} Carlson, 'Skelton and Barclay', pp.12-13. Carlson disagrees and claims that, although a small portion of Skelton's works were printed during his lifetime, Skelton avoided printers. By comparison, he suggests that 'Barclay had important ties with printers and derived income from the relationship. Barclay's writing circulated in the new medium with a consistency unparalleled among living writers at the time, including Hawes'; Lerer, ed., \textit{Chaucer and his Readers}, pp. 178-9.

\textsuperscript{65} Lerer, ed., \textit{Chaucer and his Readers}, pp. 196-201. \textit{Phyllyp Sparowe} and \textit{Speke Parrot} are other texts of this kind by Skelton. \textit{Phyllyp Sparowe} includes a list which is a critical response to anthologicist tendencies and which aggrandises the power of the writer. It is also a text which makes use of a persona and which presents Skelton as both a poet laureate and Britain as a nation with living poets as opposed to a nation with only dead great poets. Similarly, \textit{Speke Parrot} distinguishes the author from the reader and recognises that it is through the reader that the author achieves recognition.

\textsuperscript{66} Ibid., pp. 194-5.
of classical and more recent continental writing'.\textsuperscript{67} Skelton models himself, his audience, and the reception of his text, through his discussions about English and his linguistic awareness. Such awareness precipitates his experimentation with literary genres and forms and provides a means for the locating of authorial reputation and its creation.

\textsuperscript{67} J. Boffey, ""Withdrawe your hande": The Lyrics of "The Garland of Laurel" from Manuscript to Print", \textit{Trivium}, 31 (1999), 73-85 (p. 73); D. R. Carlson, 'Skelton and Barclay', p. 16. Carlson writes that, in comparison with Skelton, 'Barclay was much better informed about recent continental literature and he did more to put the products of Italianate literary fashions before English audiences'.
Chapter Eight

Conclusion and Directions for Future Research

*The Garland of Laurel* is an interesting case study for the production and reception of Skelton’s works and for the dynamics of literary production more generally in the late fifteenth and early sixteenth century. This period, in which the manuscript and print media overlapped, brought about increased market competitiveness and innovation in textual production which are reflected in the subject matter and style of Skelton’s writing. While the focus here upon *The Garland of Laurel* has been limited, and the discussion of the manuscript context for the poem especially difficult due to the nature of that material source, it has highlighted new and interesting issues and contexts for a wider discussion of Skelton’s works.

The consideration of Skelton’s poem in manuscript and print made in this thesis suggests that Skelton’s audience was wide-ranging. He seems to have appealed to the ordinary people in and around London, but his works have also been connected with the court, with ecclesiastical and aristocratic circles, with bourgeois men coming to the capital on commercial or personal errands and with areas as diverse as York, Lincoln and London. It would be instructive to research further some of the networks of readers and book and manuscript owners that *The Garland of Laurel* suggests are an integral part of the circulation of Skelton’s works. Here, perhaps as suggested in the volume by Griffiths and Pearsall, the accounts of the Stationer’s Company or of book-sellers in the city of London could be of interest, and a further investigation of the practices of printers in relation to the court and its literature might be fruitful. It would also be valuable to consider further other manuscripts containing works by Skelton, their relation to the court or to less noble groups of readers. The circulation of manuscripts containing Skelton’s works might fruitfully be compared with that of other manuscripts which are known to have circulated among specific groups of readers, for example London, British library MSS Royal 18 D. ii, Harley 367, Harley 2252 and Add. Ms

---

The multiple performances of *The Garland of Laurel* in manuscript and print illustrate that the processes of its production are as complex as our responses to the poem today. Its hybrid character—varied endings, additions and omissions, use of many languages—suggests that it is a living text, created over an extended period of time, and that it is illustrative of the changing relations between the writer and his audience and their influence over textual production. While much has been said about the production and forms of the manuscript and early printed texts of *The Garland of Laurel*, it would be a revealing exercise to place these findings alongside those of other studies similarly concerned with works by Skelton, and extend the kind of study carried out by John Scattergood in his consideration of the London manuscripts of Skelton’s poetry.2 A comparison with theories derived from reception studies and cultural studies could enable us to consider how such theories fail to address adequately the complexity of late medieval textual production and reception, and might lead us to re-position ourselves in relation to Skelton who deserves considerably more critical attention than he has been given. Lerer’s work on Skelton has already begun to achieve this, relocating Skelton and Hawes as a new courtly dyad, replacing Wyatt and Surrey, and pointing to *The Garland of Laurel* as a seminal work for understanding the late fifteenth century.3

A consideration of Skelton’s *The Garland of Laurel* and of Skelton himself in terms of current trends in reception studies might provide a valuable foundation for producing a new edition of the poem. On the one hand, selected passages of *The Garland of Laurel* give the reader little sense of its variety and energy, while a combination of the three different versions of the poem is necessary if the reader is to perceive the meaning of its diverse subject matter and understand it as a whole. An edition of the whole poem, and/or of a group of Skelton’s most significant works, could be most fruitfully produced if it were placed alongside a series of discursive papers which made particular reference to the texts. The discursive papers could provide general contexts for considering Skelton’s poetry, including primary sources, manuscript and print context, tradition,

---


patronage and authorship. Select bibliographies could be provided with each paper locating material relevant to Skelton studies.

Skelton’s attitude towards form and genre, and literary tradition generally, is a prominent theme of this thesis. His adaptation of popular and traditional literary techniques, such as the compilation of a manuscript miscellany, was innovative and challenging. The consideration given to collections and compilation practices draws attention to Skelton’s new awareness about the growing importance of textual preservation and the need to market texts. Skelton’s adaptation of the form of miscellany can be read as a two-pronged response to the changing dynamics of textual production, firstly recognising the demands of an audience for certain types of text, secondly turning this to the ends of authorial self-promotion and the memorialisation of his own works. Skelton’s use of miscellany points us towards particular kinds of audiences, reading practices and modes of textual transmission and provides a wide context for considering the production and reception of Skelton’s works in the late fifteenth century. It suggests that he understands the demands of readers and responds to them by providing a work which seems to imitate the popular form of miscellany. Miscellany is shown to be an integral feature of this work and future research might include applying this theory about Skelton’s use of miscellany to his other works. In my consideration of miscellany I also suggest that Skelton’s adaptation of the form is like a theatrical performance. In *The Garland of Laurel* he brings together, on one stage, the different narrative and structural elements of the poem, and he unifies them as if he is the director of a play.

In the thesis I argue that miscellany provides the strongest context for considering the production and reception of *The Garland of Laurel* in the manuscript and print era. I recognise that objections may be raised to this, in terms of dream vision and the *dit amoureux* genres, but my exploration of these influences leads me to conclude that they are adapted and modified in order to place an emphasis upon processes of book production and the place of the author in this, and that, therefore, they too depend upon the over-arching context of miscellany.

The influence of French poetry on *The Garland of Laurel* illustrates how Skelton responds to the late fifteenth-century audiences’ demand for particular kinds of texts. He blends old and popular genres with new ones, demonstrating innovative attitudes
and techniques. As with his use of miscellany and dream poetry, Skelton adapts his subject matter and traditional forms and structures to accommodate the changing demands of his audience, new technological methods of publication and his own personal requirements. He is adept at stretching the conventional boundaries of genres in order to satisfy the new demands made on him by patrons, the public and his publishers. His work shows him responding to the political and social concerns and innovations of his French contemporaries, and places him in the context of European markets and audiences.

Skelton’s use of the form of miscellany and of these different generic traditions is highly suggestive of a writer who wishes to transgress and break through the constraints and boundaries that particular genres bring to writing. In this respect he seems to be very much a second generation English poet, differing in his concerns from his predecessors Chaucer, Gower and Lydgate. Skelton’s perception of himself is that of an author who must challenge and surpass the constraints of the old traditions of literary productivity and find a place for himself and his works in the new marketplace. England and the English language are depicted as being central to his poetic vision. He builds upon autobiographical frameworks to emphasise his desire for reputation and fame and adapts the genres for these ends. These literary acts are made more acceptable through the overarching structure or mode of miscellany in his poem.

Skelton’s dynamic approach to tradition is one which illustrates not only the development of an individual writer in the late fifteenth century, but also the rich pattern of literary generic development over time. A study of Skelton’s attitude towards tradition could be extended by looking at a variety of his other works in order to consider how he makes use of other genres and techniques. For example, it would be possible to consider his use of liturgy or sermon writing in Ware the hawke, in the boke of Phyllyp Sparowe and in A replycacioun; of satire in Collyn Clout, Speke parrot, Against Garnesche, Why come ye nat to court? and in many other poems; and it would be interesting to consider the influence of chronicle, in light of the London and court connections many of his poems have, for example, in upon the dolorous dethe [...] of the] Earl of Northumberland, A lawde and prayse, A ballad of the scottyshe kyng and in Magnyfycence.
Skelton’s adaptations of French the *dit amoreux* and dream vision genres emphasise literary relationships as central to the self-representation of the artist. The exploration of traditional relationships found in the *dits amoreux*, made a focal point by their writers through the use of lyric insertion, is a technique which Skelton adapts in order to re-examine patron-writer relationships in the late fifteenth-century literary context. In the absence of firm evidence for Howard patronage, and in order to consider how conventional Skelton’s representations of female patronage are, in this thesis I look at other examples of female patronage, for example that of Lady Margaret Beaufort, with whom Skelton is known to have had personal connections. My explorations show that patronage created communities of women and became a means by which they defined themselves and became actively influential, politically, educationally and socially. Skelton’s lyrics to the Howard ladies, most likely written early and inserted into *The Garland of Laurel* at a later stage of its composition, highlight the altered dynamics of patron-author relationships and lead the reader to an awareness of growing authorial autonomy. The Howard ladies may never have been Skelton’s patrons but Skelton’s representation of them provides a snapshot of the differences forming within the traditional modes of literary productivity.

Skelton’s promotion of his own identity in *The Garland of Laurel* becomes a focal point for the whole poem. Through his redefinition of patronage relationships and the focus upon his own works and his own authorial figure, Skelton establishes himself as a writer who is capable of being independent of his patrons, if not from his printers. His use of persona and pseudo-autobiography forge a new representation of an authorial self. Skelton’s awareness of the English language and his place in this wider literary tradition further consolidates his independence and locates him as a respected and memorialised writer.

Comparisons could be drawn between Skelton’s attitudes towards patronage exemplified in *The Garland of Laurel* and his response to other recognised patrons, such as the king or the Scrope family. Similarly, useful comparisons could be made with other writers’ self-fashioning in the period, such as that of Hawes and Churchyard. Tentative beginnings of such a comparison have been made by critics such as Scattergood and Lerer and there is much further scope for a comparison of these writers in terms of my work here. It would also be extremely interesting to consider the response of other European contemporary writers to their patrons in the late fifteenth
and early sixteenth century in light of some of the philosophical and political developments of the period. There is much work still to be done comparing Skelton’s work with that of the Rhétoriqueurs and Humanists.

Skelton’s attitudes towards the role of authorship and the function of reputation exist within a patronage system which is on the cusp between manuscript and print culture, and it seems clear that despite his sense of difference from other contemporary writers, his attitudes are markedly similar to some of those adopted by French and English authors of the same period. In his production of *The Garland of Laurel*, technical and artistic, Skelton was influenced by both groups of writers. His poem, which reflects closely upon the role of the author, reputation and methods of publication, is fashioned both by the need for patrons and the desire for independence from them. Most significant to a consideration of Skelton’s work and position is acknowledging his recognition and use of print. He saw and used its potential for establishing reputation, reaching wide audiences, focusing attention upon the author figure, and for textual preservation.

It seems probable that the concerns revealed by Skelton in *The Garland of Laurel*, his representation of himself, his appreciation of the relationship between language and politics, and his consideration of the position his work will hold in the future, were concerns which he shared with other contemporary groups of writers. These issues illustrate the complexity and sophistication of Skelton’s writing and demonstrate the wealth of opportunity for research in the late medieval and early Tudor period.
Appendices
Appendix 1

Contents List of Manuscript Cotton
Vitellius E.x.

f. 1r – 1v. Table of contents.

Latin fragments, c.16 x 12 cms. Incomplete lines of text. Omits some items.
The table of contents is in a late sixteenth- or early seventeenth-century hand, a later
hand than most of the items in the manuscript.
This table of contents is transcribed from the manuscript; translation and identification
of items is made below under individual folio descriptions, followed by the catalogue
entry from the British Library Manuscripts Catalogue Online (MOLCAT).

...Nonnihil de Burgundis...
...1424. Gallice / folio: 1. Vitel. E ...
...s Rues de Paris Gallicanis Rithmis fol: 63...
...de lege Salica et Masculo Francorum regno vel In...
elegiacum, Philippi Valerii quondam Francorum ...
Status Equestri appensum. Character; fol: 74...
Carmina aliquot Buchanani, et Latinè et Anglice...
Formula paucula Notariorum. (1)
Littera a Ruperto Romanorum Rege; et aliam Ludovici B...
ad Regem Henricum IV Angliae datae, de morte filiae suae Lud...
1409. / fol: 82 ...
Alexandri Papae. litterae ad Regem Angliae et de St....
Archiepiscopo ut ab aula expellatur quod i ...
Coram rege : Dat Ion Pontificatio timo / ...
Quamplurimae litterae a regebus Angliae, Edw ...
ad principes externus data, f.87., nonnullae ite ...
etiam Burgundia, et Caroli Regis Fran ...
Monitiones quas Ludovicus Francor...
Suo et manu propria scrispsit. f ...
Bulla revorationis fastina a domino pa ... 
Oxonien is in causa visitationis ...
... Alia item Academicorum...
...era quamplurimae R
...illud...

...non...
...tur Dialogi ...
...rcensis Episcopi confirmationis ...
...id eis Lewes in Sussex. Anno Domini 1121 ...
...f Englishe Pollicyke, exhortinge all England to ...
...Rithmis Anglicis / 206

Rithmi aliquot Anglic a Heroinas aliquot Anglice
... et Statuta Collegii de Rotherham, in agro Eboracu ...
...a Eboracensi Archiepiscopo (circa Henrici 4) Eundati. 242 ...

Sepulchram, monumentorum Priorum aliquot de Bridlin ...
Ripleye - / 251

...s literae ad Synodum Basilienses alia nonnullae id genus
252
...mae de Aseldon; Anglicanis rithmis, de rebus –
...d...255
... ia 259 ... teria hereticorum autor est Caughinus
...69

f. 2r.

Coat of Arms. Fragment measuring c.17 x 12 cms.
Likely to be late Sixteenth or early Seventeenth century.
The coat of arms is drawn in pen and ink, with some colour and traces of gold. Two supporters, or decorative appendages, in this case lions, are placed at the sides of the armorial shield. The supporters stand on an island of green earth. The background of the shield is black with three red cinquefoils, two at the top and one centrally beneath. Shields usually indicate an owner’s badge but this is unidentifiable. Above the shield is a black helmet (which indicates degree), topped with a crown (which denotes rank). A bearded and horned goat's head, with a dragon like body, emerges out of the crown and
is surrounded by blue mantling. Goats were frequent symbols in armoury, their different stances denoting different things. Here we have just the head.\footnote{A. C. Fox-Davies, *The Art of Heraldry: An Encyclopaedia of Armoury*, (London: Jack, 1904).}

\textbf{f. 2v.}

The word ‘Thomas’, heavily crossed out, and beneath the word 'Booke'. Underneath that the signature of John Stow.\footnote{C. M. Briquet, *Les Filigranes: Dictionnaire Historique des Marques du Papier des leur Apparition vers 1282 jusqu'en 1600*, (London: Paper Publications Society, 1968), nos. 8619, 8622, 8624, 8639. This is similar to examples given in Briquet of watermarks from Nancy, 1477; Brutzbach, 1481; Meurthe et Moselle, 1484; (Lunebourg Hanover), 1519.}

The watermark is clearly evident where the inks from the shield have seeped through the paper. It appears here as an upside-down and backwards ‘P’.\footnote{C. M. Briquet, *Les Filigranes: Dictionnaire Historique des Marques du Papier des leur Apparition vers 1282 jusqu'en 1600*, (London: Paper Publications Society, 1968), nos. 8619, 8622, 8624, 8639. This is similar to examples given in Briquet of watermarks from Nancy, 1477; Brutzbach, 1481; Meurthe et Moselle, 1484; (Lunebourg Hanover), 1519.}

\textbf{ff. 3r-61v.}


Part of a chronicle, the History of France, 1407-1424, concerning Loys, Duc d'Orleans, brother of Charles VI, (or annals of France and Burgandy 1407-1424).

Begins mid-page: ‘L’An 1411 li roy Charles et le duc Jehan de Bourgogne firent leur mandement pour aler vers bourges in berry ... assemblirent viii.c.mille hommes ...’
Ends in the year 1424 with a section rubricated, ‘Coment le duc de Bethefort frere du Roy Henry d’angleterre promis a mariage avec soeur au duc…’ Followed by another 17 lines ending ‘son pays de britaigne…duc de …’

The chronicle is possibly missing its last three years because in Bouchon it ends with the year 1427.

MOLCAT: ‘Histoire de Loys duc d’Orleans, frere de Charles VI: ou plutot annales de France et de Bourgogne depuis 1407 jusqu’a 1424; fragment tres mutile. 3.’

**ff. 62r-71r.**


Beginning: ‘Plurimes gens mont demand / pour quoy ie study siemprie / ne me vient pas de maladie / Ou me vient de merencolie.’

Ending: ‘Explicit Les rues de paris.’

**ff. 72r-76r**

*Salic Laws* Incomplete Latin song.

Late Sixteenth or early Seventeenth Century hand.

beginning: ‘Trinitas suus statuae equestri appensuum. Foemenissimo minguary deduit diademate flecti, / Exterim gallus nestius imperii / sed nec ab innecto solita, est duce et hospite franca / Gens virtute potens, at R ammosae Regi.’

Ending: ‘Pii fariant francos semper sub lege virili / Libera foeminico tollera rolla imago. FINIS’. There follow a further 6 lines as a colophon.

ff. 76v-77r.

**Two alphabetical poems by George Buchanan (1506-82), about the court.**

Late Sixteenth or Seventeenth century hand.

The first is in Latin, the second is a translation of the first into English.

Unidentified but most likely some of Buchanan’s short works of grammar. Most lines end with ‘Aula’, ‘the court’, or some form of the Latin word.

The first poem, in Latin, is damaged but begins in the ms: ‘A. Aula eadem est omnia… /B. Blanditur sed post inordet seu Scorpius Aula / C. Consiliis raro melioribus otitur Aula / D. Dissimulet regnare diu qui poscit in Aula / E. Exulat integritas probitas, et candor ab Aula …’

Ending: ‘V. Vitae difficilis methodus bene dicitur Aula / X. Xanthe retro ibis, erit quando constantia in Aula / Y. Ydra Aula est caput inultorum horetas veneris / Z. Zenoves fatui sunt atque Thrasones in Aula. / G. Buchanon.’

The second begins: ‘G.B. Donet A.B.C. in Englishe. / A. As winde whith constant vextering / Such faythe in courte is founde / B. Be wishing more but serpents bite / do still in court a bound… / C.’

It ends: ‘Yea court is nye and full of lies / ? poyson now to seke / Zeno the worse and Terence hymself / in court both fools a like.’

MOLCAT: ‘Buchanani quidam versus de Aula; cum versione Anglicana. 76. b.’

f. 77v.

*Alia Carmina Latina.* Another little Latin poem, unidentified, possibly an Eclogue.

It begins: ‘Bissina quod vestis multo tibi splendeat auro / Ambrosiae quae clapes, et pleno copia cornu…’

It ends: Abdidis in sylvas hæc …pace … / Erro finit, multis pax haec neglecta / Bissidet in somnis producens tedia / Haec animum contendere, Heros his / Delitys solida haec …
Unidentified English Poem. A fragment which appears to be some kind of riddle. It has three stanzas and is missing its first lines.

The first stanza in the ms begins: ‘Shine in silke and glitter all in goulde / to flower in wealth and feade on daynty faere’

The last stanza in the ms begins: ‘The want of this made Adam ende his goode / the want of this made Caine to wayle and worse / the want of this makes many go to bad’

ff. 79r-84v

Ecclesiastical and Royal Letters. Latin prose. Possibly included as formularies.

Incomplete. First line begins, ‘...Sancte matris ecclesia filiis ad quas praesentes scribere pervenerint.’

f.79v, ‘Honores continuos et utriusque hominiis saluti perserpos pariter et felices’

f. 83v. ‘Alexander Episcopus seruus seruorum dei Excellentissimo principi ...anissimo quae filio suo domino Regi Collegii Cantuarii et omnibus...’

Included are letters regarding Queen Isabella, Philip son of the King of France and King Charles of France. There are also letters to Pope Alexander, against a certain Thomas

---


4 Some of the material in these letters seems to relate directly to that contained in ff. 3-61, Fenin’s Mémoires.
chosen by faith at Canterbury by Simon, (Simon Sudbury Archbishop of Canterbury, d. 1381), written from Rome.\(^5\)

MOLCAT: ‘Formulae notariorum. 79.’


ff. 85r-110r.

**Notes and Letters in French and Latin. Fragmentary**

ff. 85-87. Letters issued under the privy seal of Queen Isabella, wife of Edward II.\(^6\)

Letters about King Rupert of Rome and Ludvig, Duke of Bavaria.

Letters about English affairs from English bishops dating from the time of Henry IV of England (d.1413).\(^7\)

---


f. 92. refers to the death of Blanche daughter of Henry and wife of Louis (f.92).\textsuperscript{8}

Also included is an elegy to King Philip.\textsuperscript{9}

f.87 refers to Canterbury and Robert Middleton.

f.89 refers to the convent at Wykeham.

MOLCAT: ‘Fragments of notes, &c. scarcely intelligible. 111 b.’

\textbf{ff. 111r-120v.}

\textbf{Letters relating to Ecclesiastical Law.}

Latin. Very fire and damp damaged folios. The writing is possibly in ink mixed with gold. Some marginal drawings are included. Decoration includes a three-faced Seraph, f. 116, as part of an illuminated initial ‘R’.

f.111v. First complete section begins, ‘Iudice et preclare principi Reverendissime Pater re domine humili commendacione permissa tot et tantis ...domini... margarete ...Regine...’

MOLCAT: ‘Quomodo reges et principes ecclesiam defensare debent: ex legibus Imperialibus, decretis Apstolicis, &c. 119.’

\textbf{121r-132v.}

\textbf{Letters of Gilbert Stone (Formularies / Letters relating to Oxford University and City).}

\textsuperscript{8} C. Tyerman, \textit{Who’s Who in Early Medieval England 1066-1272} (London: Shepheard-Walwyn, 1996), pp. 194-6, 225. Eleanor of Aquitane (c.1122-1204) married Henry of Anjou, in 1137, Henry II of England. After his death she assumed a prominent political role and secured the succession in England of Richard I (1189), and her son John’s succession in Anjou in 1199. In 1200 Eleanor arranged for her grandchild Blanche of Castille (daughter of the young Henry, son of Henry II, though not the heir to the English throne) to marry the heir to the king of France, the future Louis VIII (1223-26).

\textsuperscript{9} Kingsford, ed., \textit{Stow: A Survey of London}, i, p. 67. This might relate to the above item concerning Rupert and Ludvig. It could be Philip I of Castile. In the eighteenth year of the reign of Henry VII Henry met with the ambassadors from the King of the Romaines and they were sworn to each other.
[A description of these folios, including some of the letters, is printed in H.E. Salter ed. *Oxford Formularies* i.181-208 (Oxford Historical Society). Sometimes the examples are genuine, sometimes they are fabricated.]

These letters date from c. 1396-1412 but are in a hand from 1450. They are mainly concerned with the time of Henry IV. The letters were chosen as specimens of good style. They are carelessly written and often make no sense.


**ff. 133r-140r**

**Political Dialogue**

Latin prose with some underlined passages. References to Edward IV and the court.

Beginning: ‘Banfacto quondam femina cum leticia celebriet ñ in eius colendissimo die quo rosa delicata victoria serenissime princeps tam triumphalis qui heredita rie corone decus atque insigniat regum …’

Ending: ‘Per id ergo contencionem sopita feliciter optamine dirigi concessus tuos te quae semper quod optiam cupis valitudine habiturini. Sunt feliciter.’

MOLCAT: ‘Colloquium inter R. Caesaris-burgi (Cherbourg) praesulem, et cubicularium suum, de rebus aulicis sub initio regni Edw. IV. 134.’

**ff. 141r-144v.**

**Political Sermon.** In English with Latin quotations.

Fragmentary beginning: ‘multa membra habemus; omnia autem membra non eundem actum habent. / Seynt Paule whoos be these wordes ad Romanos taken out for thys tyme / of the dominical epistle of thys weke as wele yn othir hys wrytyngs…’
It ends: ‘I fere me that we can fynd agayn the / auncienne prosperyte whych semeth
now loste whyle we be sobyng for / the besaunt we shall be occupied for a tyme with a
physical dragme / A dragme in physik ys called the weyght of iii sequples.’

MOLCAT: ‘Sermon made at the beginning of Parliament about Ao 1483, on these
words: “In uno corpore multa membra habemus; omnia autem membra non eundem
actum habent.” 139.’

ff. 145r-146v
Speech given in Rochester about the election of a prior.

It begins: ‘Deo Venisti magister Johrmnis in Ecclesia militas hic in tuo quantum...’

It ends, ‘Ideo clerus et populus attento quod tanti regimine rectitudo nisi asumppina
insitia potitur originaliter durinari exultantibus omnis prelibatus thema tibi declamatur
vir... quod a deo venisti magister...'”

MOLCAT: ‘Oratio habita in capitolo Roffensi, in electione prioris. 143.’

ff. 147r-163v
Sermon given at Stekyswold in Lincoln diocese. Latin prose.

Consecutive pages bound in the wrong order, ff. 154r-157v, some in late Sixteenth or
early Seventeenth century transcription. They seems to follow on numerically in the
original page numbering from the previous folios, ie 143-151, 159-161 (ending Deo
Grasia), 152-158. f.145 is marked ‘A’ but no other marks are evident.

It begins: ‘...eti sunt omnes perpetua Spiritu Sancto. Actum in capitulo’.

It ends: ‘Venite benedicti prius mei percipite regnum quod nobis... ab origine mundi’.

263
MOLCAT: ‘Sermo habitus in visitatione monialium apud Stekyswold in diocesi Lincoln. in haec verba: “Erant mulieres aspicientes a longe, inter quas erat Maria Magdalena.” 152.’

ff. 164v-169v.

Sermon. Latin prose. Late Sixteenth or early Seventeenth century transcription. Incomplete.

Begins: ‘…omnibus placent altissimo ut ex … singulis ad installatuum requitur et cum vulgus hoc pub …’

Ends: ‘Bona mundi in excessu sumpta et spumatia expellunt.’

MOLCAT: ‘Sermo in installatione cuiusdam, “Ingressus angelus ad eam dixit, ave:” circa An. 1481. 157.b.’

ff. 170r-183r

Two Parliamentary Speeches / Sermons.

In English interspersed with Latin from Isaiah 49, i, or from the Sermon of St. John the Baptist. These folios, in English, do not follow on from the previous ones although their numbering is consecutive to the previous folios’.

The first speech begins: ‘Edwardi Quinti, …/in cristen Remes sheweth over alleyn tho dayes that we be yn how theyr public body ys compowned of iii notable partes of the prync the nobles and the peuple…’

Closing: ‘…that ys to sey to the avauncyng of the comonwele we be yn this place where that traytour schuld be tretyd thys tyme ys prefixed for the same entent.’
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ff. 184r-189v.
Sir John Fortescue's Dialogue between the Understanding and Faith. English prose headed from f. 185r onwards. Alternately in large script are the words 'Ondrestondyng' and 'Feyth'. Incomplete.

Begins: ‘...stabilisshed by the ... we shulde ... how be that he ... made them...’

Ends: ‘...here beauty ... al day erly or hire erf ...and go ... and exertioun ofayne uppon the sand for when ...’

MOLCAT: ‘Dialogue between the understanding and faith, by sir John Fortescue. 176.’

ff. 190r-191r.
Confirmation of privileges to the Monastery of Lewes, Sussex, by Radulphus. In Latin. Late Sixteenth or early Seventeenth century transcription at beginning. Fragment.

Begins: ‘fara Amestrem experno ... retorna in domino saltim ...’

Ends: ‘m.c.xxi Romano Jalinto, novo rege Anglorum Ly...’

MOLCAT: ‘Confirmatio privilegiorum monasterii Lewes in Com. Sussex, per Radulphum Episc. Cicestrensem, Ao 1121. 182.’

f. 191v.
The words Vitel. E.X.
ff. 192r-207 r

*The Libel of Englyshe Policye.*

(MS Darlington 271 contains another copy of this English poem.) *Prologue of the bible [sic] of the polyce exceuteinge all Englonde to kepe the See.* Later reprinted as Haklyyt, *Principal Navigations,* 1598; Selden, *Mare Clausum,* 1635. See the Supplement to *The Index of Middle English Verse.* 3491/9.

Exists in two versions the first of which was written sometime between the autumn of 1436 and the early part of 1438, as a response to the political crisis precipitated by the Franco-Burgundian alliance.10

Begins: ‘the prologue of the bible of [engli]she pelyce exceutinge all englond to kepe the see’

Ends with Envoy, incomplete: ‘Goo forth libelle and mekly shewe thy face / Apperyng ever with humble contentaunce ...etc’

This transcription was the work of the same scribe who copied the poem into British Library Additional Manuscript 40673 and the paper comes from the same stock. Both copies are dated to the last quarter of the fifteenth century.11

MOLCAT: ‘The Bible of English policy; exhorting all England to keep the narrow sea environ: in Old English verse. 184.

f. 207v

‘Unto my coussyn John Ryche man of London marchaunte taylor of London, this Byll be deliuerd’, followed by a name: Prinybee?

Evidence that the *Libel of Englyshe Policye* was in Ryche’s possession before Cotton’s. It was sent to him by his cousin.

---


ff. 208r-225v.


English verse. A unique text of the poem, shortened but seemingly complete in this version, ending with the lyrics. No title.

Beginning, ‘Arectynge my syght towad the zodiak…’

Ending, ‘For of my bokis thate ye shall se / Whyche in your recorddis I knowe wele be enrolde / And so Occupacion your Regesier me told.

MOLCAT: ‘A poem in the form of a dialogue between Pallas and the Queen of Fame, Skelton and Occupation, with stanzas to the Countess of Surrey, lady Elizabeth, Ly Myrryel, Ly Dakers, &c. If this be Skelton’s, it is not in the edition of his works: perhaps it is a part of his “Crown of Glory.”’ 200.

ff. 226r-234v

*Founding Statutes of Jesus College, Rotherham.*

In Latin prose.

Begins: ‘...Thomas permissio...et aplice sedis legabus salutem in amplexiibus ... perpendentes et considerantes quod in villa de Ro…’

Ends: ‘...in registis praedictorum deceni et capituli necnon prepositorum / sutressorum nostrorum Eboracum archiepiscorum quorum interesse in hoc negoti ...ad perpetuam rei memoriam integre feribatus’.

f. 235r.

Drawing of the tomb of Gregorius prior of Bridlinton

f. 235v.

Drawing of the tomb of George of Ripley.
Decorated with alchemical symbols.
Titled respectively, ‘hic iacet Gregorius prior de Bridlinton’ and ‘Sepultura Georgii Ripley.’

MOLCAT: ‘Figurae feretrorum Gregorii prioris de Bridlinton, et Gerogii Ripley. 227.’

ff. 236r-239v.

Letters of King Henry VI. In Latin.

Begins: ‘...assiduus Cirumductor / ...et emperor Bartoctor cuius tremande magestate /
...

Ends: ‘...unam venerenciam prosequeretur habere dignemini favor ... sum Magnificentiam vestram dux et feliciter conservet altissi ... / in honore. Scriptus roma.’

MOLCAT: ‘Epistola R. Henrici VI. Ad concilium Basileense; et alia ejusmodi. 228’

ff. 240r-243v

The Whole Prophesie of Scotland / The Prophecy of Thomas of Erceldoun
An English poem.

It is written in two columns divided mid-line with a red marker. On ff. 241-243 the two columns become one. The lines are in rhyming couplets, also highlighted with red brackets.

Begins: ‘Incipit Prophecia / Thome Arseldon. / In a lande as I was lent, / In the grykyng of the day, / Me a lone as I went, / In hunte bankys me for to play, / I sawe the throstyl
& the iay, / the mawes movyde of hyr songe / the wodwale sange notes gay, / that all
the wod a boute range.'

Ends: ‘...that lady gay I upon hyr wrayed for to ... / hor ... on hyr palfray I a lofte
thomas widor ... man wole I hele I shal con... nor of th... kyng is close and bryng us to
thi hel ...’

[References are: J. A. H. Murray, ed., The Romance and Prophecies of Thomas of
Erceldoune printed from five manuscripts; with illustrations from the prophetic
literature of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, Early English Text Society Original
Series, 61 (1875); I. Nixon, ed., Thomas of Erceldoune, 2 vols (Copenhagen:
Department of English University of Copenhagen, 1980). The entries to be found in C.
of the Writings in Middle English, (New Haven, 1975), vol 5, are erroneous.]

f. 243v ends with a round labyrinth or theatre plan image.

MOLCAT: ‘Prophetia Thomae de Asseldon; in old English verse. 232.’

**ff. 244r-251v.**

**Bartolus, De Tyrannia.**

[Ephraim Emerton, Humanism and Tyranny. Studies in the Italian Trecento
(Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1925)]

Treatise of Bartolus of Sassoferrato on Tyranny, in Latin.
The paragraphs are divided up according to twelve parts of the argument.

f. 244 begins: ‘...grece latine dicitur fortis seu angustia unde / ... accidit tyrannus ...
passivus et imperbas reges ...’

f. 251 in the twelfth section begins: ‘Explicit tractatus Bartholi de Tiranno’.

MOLCAT: ‘Bartholomaei tractatus de Tyranno. 235.’
ff. 252r-272v

In Latin until the end of the book, very fire-damaged and indecipherable.

Begins: ‘...celebraret dicebat quod hoc li / ...appositionem Sacrarum vestrem cessarent /

Ends: ‘Explicit tract …’
Appendix 2.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Introduction.</strong></td>
<td>Title; Latin text comparing Skelton to Adonis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-7</td>
<td>Zodiac setting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-21</td>
<td>Description of Melancholy; description of oak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22-35</td>
<td>Setting of scene; falling asleep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-49</td>
<td>Vision of Temple, Dame Pallas and the Quene of Fame.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-77</td>
<td>The Quene of Fame refuses to accept Skelton into the court of Fame.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78-112</td>
<td>Pallas accuses the Quene of being too demanding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113-133</td>
<td>The Quene demands Skelton prove himself worthy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>134-140</td>
<td>Pallas argues back that she let Eschines remain on her list.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141-168</td>
<td>The Quene defends many of the great philosophers on her list.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>169-210</td>
<td>Pallas argues the Quene favors those she pleases with or without good cause.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>211-231</td>
<td>The Quene says in order not to fall out Pallas should find evidence that Skelton is worthy of her favour.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>232-245</td>
<td>Pallas summons Skelton with Eolus’s trumpet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>246-322</td>
<td>Skelton narrates the throng suing to the Quene of Fame; he describes the great poets present beginning with Phoebus and his lament for the transformation of Daphnis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>246-323</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>324-399</td>
<td>Skelton lists a long catalogue of poets in the form of a drinking song with a repeated refrain heralding Bacchus. He sees Gower, Chaucer and</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Lydgate approaching him.

Gower and Skelton converse.

Chaucer and Skelton converse.

Lydgate and Skelton converse.

Skelton narrates how Gower, Chaucer and Lydgate are commanded to lead him to the palace of the Quene of Fame; how he is brought into a bejewelled palace; how he passes through the praetorium, under a glorious cloth of astate; how he sees people of many nations and regions with many tales suing to Fame’s court.

Gower, Chaucer and Lydgate leave Skelton with Fame’s registry Occupacyoun.

Skelton describes Occupacyoun’s approach.

Occupacyoun welcomes Skelton.

Skelton thanks her.

Occupacyoun tells Skelton to follow her.

Skelton narrates she takes him by the hand.

With reported speech Skelton narrates how he and Occupacyoun walk through a walled field, across a wall from which Skelton sees a thousand gates. He questions her about their meaning and she answers that they are the gates for every nation.

Skelton narrates a description of the gates; the gate of Anglea in particular; his view from the wall of those trying to enter through the gates; Occupacyoun’s explanation of the people below; their progress in the face of gun blasts raining down on them.

Skelton describes how a mist descends on them and blinds their view; how when it lifts he is in a garden with a fountain and laurel tree; the meaning of the laurel tree; the presence of Dryads, Muses and Flora, making garlands and dancing and singing.
Occupacyoun asks Skelton if it pleases him, Skelton answers that it does. He and Occupacyoun confer about who lives in the building they can see and Occupacyoun explains that Roger Stathum is there and that Skelton should beware of him.

Occupacyoun leads Skelton through a doorway and up a staircase into the chamber of the Countess of Surrey, who calls her gentlewomen around her and sets them to work on a laurel garment for Skelton.

Occupacyoun tells Skelton he must thank the women for their efforts with poetry.

Skelton prepares himself to write.

Lyrics to the Countess of Surrey; Elisabeth Howard, Muriel Howard, Anne Dakers, Margery Wentworth, Margaret Tylney, Jane Blenner-Haiset, Isabell Pennell, Margaret Hussey, Gertrude Statham and Isabell Knyght.

Occupacyoun hurries Skelton.

Skelton sees Maister Newton painting the activities.

Gower, Chaucer and Lydgate appear again and lead Skelton to the Quene of Fame.

The Quene demands to hear why Skelton deserves his place in her court. Calliope shows Skelton where to sit and Occupacyoun opens her book to read the record.

Skelton narrates a description of the book and Occupacyoun beginning to read.

Occupacyoun reads out the list, Skelton intercedes, the poets acclaim him loudly. Occupacyoun shuts the book and Skelton awakes from the dream.
Skelton sees Janus and draws meaning from this vision.

Skelton speaks to his book in Latin; an Envoy in English.

Lautre Envoy in Latin and English.

Admonet by Skelton to trees.

En Parlement A Paris in French

Out of Frenshe Into Latyn.

Owt of Latyne into Englysshe.

Words of Closure.
Appendix 3.


### A. Survival of Skelton Manuscripts:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TITLE</th>
<th>QUANTITY</th>
<th>DATE (If known)</th>
<th>LOCATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>A ballad of the scottyshe kyng / Skelton Laureate against the scottes / A treatise of the scottes</em></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1513?</td>
<td>London, British Library, MS C. 39. e.1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Against Garnescche</em></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1514?</td>
<td>London, British Library, MS Harley 367, ff. 101r-109v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>A lawde and prayse made for Our Sovereigne Lord the Kyng [Henry VIII, on his accession, 1509]</em> (The rose both white and rede. / The boke of the rosiar)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1509</td>
<td>London Public Record Office, Treas. Receipt of Excheq, B.2.8, ff. 67r – 69v / MS E 36/228, ff. 7r-8v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Here after foloweth a lytell boke called Collyn Clout</em></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1545</td>
<td>Oxford, Bodl. Library, MS 12653 (frag.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1524-1529</td>
<td>London, British Library, MS Lansdowne 762 ff. 71r (The Prophecy of Skelton, an extract vv. 462-80)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>An elegy on the death of Henry the Seventh</em></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1509</td>
<td>Durham, Durham Cathedral Prior's Kitchen, B.P. Hatfield's Survey, Registrum Parvum II, f. 174r.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Pages</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I liber et propera regem tu pronus adora.</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1512?</td>
<td>Dedication to a copy of the Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, Chronique de Rains, 432, ff. 1v-3v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lamentation for the soul of Ed. 4th</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>London, British Library, MS Harley 4011, f. 169v.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>?</td>
<td>London, British Library, MS Ad. 29729 f. 8r.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Private Collection. Miss Richardson Currer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Maner of the worlde nowadays / Satire on gallants</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>London, British Library, MS Sloane 747, f. 88v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mannerly Margery Mylk and Ale</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1501-1504</td>
<td>London, British Library, Additional MS 5465, ff. 96v-99, [With a musical Setting by William Cornish]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Poem on time</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1512?</td>
<td>London, British Library, MS Egerton 2642. f. 130r. (frag.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Edinburgh, National Library of Scotland, MS Advocates 1.6. f. 82r.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Dublin, Trinity Dublin MS 661, ff. 3r-5v. (frag.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Prayer to the Trinity</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>London, British Library, MS Ad. 20059. f. 100v.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Quantity</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speculum principis</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1501</td>
<td>London, British Library, MS Add. 26787. ff. 2r-30v.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speke parrott</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1517-1538</td>
<td>London, British Library, MS Harley 2252, ff. 134r-140r.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skelton laureate upon the dolorous deth and much lamentable chaunce of the most honorable [Henry Percy, 4th] Earl of Northumberland.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1489</td>
<td>London, British Library, MS Royal 18. D. ii, f. 165r-166v.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The bibliotheca historica of Diodorus Siculus.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, MS 357. ff. 2, 268.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The tunnyng of Elynour Rummyng</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1517?</td>
<td>London, British Library, MS Ad. 22504/28504.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verses to Henry 7th</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1488</td>
<td>London, British Library, MS Cotton Domit. Xvii, f. 248v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why come ye nat to court?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Oxford, Bodl. Library, MS 12653, f. 36r. (frag.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bodley Rawlinson C. 813, ff. 36-43v.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
B. Works surviving in Early Print which are also still in extant manuscript form.

1558 (x2) = two variations printed in 1558.
PPPW = *Pithy Pleasaunt and Profitable Workes of Maister Skelton.*
CB = *Here After Followeth Certayn Bokes Cöpyled by Mayster Skelton.*
*at Woburn Abbey.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WORK</th>
<th>NO. OF PRINTED VERSIONS</th>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>PRINTERS</th>
<th>COLLECTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>A ballad of the scottyshe kynge</em></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1513</td>
<td>R. Faques</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(Skelton Laureate against the scottes / A treatyse of the scottes)</em></td>
<td></td>
<td>1545</td>
<td>R. Lant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1554</td>
<td>J. Kynge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Here after foloweth a lytell boke called Collyn Clout</em></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1533*</td>
<td>T. Godfray</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1545</td>
<td>R. Kele</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1554</td>
<td>W. Copland</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1558</td>
<td>A. Kytson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1568</td>
<td>T. Marshe</td>
<td>BBB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1558 (x2)</td>
<td>J. Day</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>An elegy on the death of Henry the Seventh</em></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1509</td>
<td>W. De Worde</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1528</td>
<td>J. Rastell</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1568</td>
<td>Marshe</td>
<td>DBDS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>En parlament a Paris</em></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1523</td>
<td>Faques</td>
<td>PPPW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1568</td>
<td>Marshe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Lamentation of the soul</em></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1542</td>
<td>R. Lant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1560</td>
<td>Kynge &amp; Marche</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>/1554?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Skelton laureate upon the dolorous dethe and much lamentable chaunce of the most honorable [Henry Percy, 4th] Earl of Northumberland.</em></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1568</td>
<td>Marshe</td>
<td>PPPW</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Volume</th>
<th>First Edition</th>
<th>Printer 1</th>
<th>Printer 2</th>
<th>Printer 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Here after foloweth the boke of / a litel booke of Phyllyp Sparowe</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1545</td>
<td>R. Kele</td>
<td>J. Wyghte</td>
<td>R. Toy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1554</td>
<td>R. Kele</td>
<td>J. Day &amp; A. Kytson</td>
<td>J. Day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1554 (x1)</td>
<td>R. Kele</td>
<td>J. Day &amp; A. Kytson</td>
<td>J. Day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1558</td>
<td>R. Kele</td>
<td>J. Day &amp; A. Kytson</td>
<td>J. Day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1558 (x2)</td>
<td>R. Kele</td>
<td>J. Day &amp; A. Kytson</td>
<td>J. Day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1568</td>
<td>R. Kele</td>
<td>J. Day &amp; A. Kytson</td>
<td>J. Day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PPPWW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poem on time</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1545</td>
<td>R. Lant</td>
<td>CB</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1560 /</td>
<td>R. Lant</td>
<td>CB</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1554?</td>
<td>R. Lant</td>
<td>CB</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1563</td>
<td>R. Lant</td>
<td>CB</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1568</td>
<td>R. Lant</td>
<td>CB</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PPPWW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speke parrot</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1545</td>
<td>R. Lant</td>
<td>CB</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1560 /</td>
<td>R. Lant</td>
<td>CB</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1554?</td>
<td>R. Lant</td>
<td>CB</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1563</td>
<td>R. Lant</td>
<td>CB</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1568</td>
<td>R. Lant</td>
<td>CB</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PPPWW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Garland of Laurel – A right delectable tratyse upon a goodly garlande or chapelet of laurel / The crowne of lawrell</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1523</td>
<td>Faques</td>
<td>PPPWW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1568</td>
<td>Marshe</td>
<td>PPPWW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The tunnyng of Elinor Rumming / Elynour</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1521</td>
<td>W. De Worde Lant</td>
<td>CB</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rummin, the famous ale-wife of England</td>
<td></td>
<td>1545R.</td>
<td>W. De Worde Lant</td>
<td>CB</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1560 /</td>
<td>W. De Worde Lant</td>
<td>CB</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1554?</td>
<td>W. De Worde Lant</td>
<td>CB</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1563</td>
<td>W. De Worde Lant</td>
<td>CB</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1568</td>
<td>W. De Worde Lant</td>
<td>CB</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PPPWW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Here after foloweth a lytell boke, whiche hath to name, why come ye nat to court?</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1545</td>
<td>R. Copland</td>
<td>PPPWW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1545</td>
<td>R. Copland</td>
<td>PPPWW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1554 (x2)</td>
<td>R. Copland</td>
<td>PPPWW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1558 (x3)</td>
<td>R. Copland</td>
<td>PPPWW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1568</td>
<td>R. Copland</td>
<td>PPPWW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Appendix 4.

A. Works printed by Thomas Marshe.

\begin{itemize}
  \item a = London in Fletestrete at the sygne of the Prynces armes
  \item b = London, in Fletestrete neare to S. Dunstans Churche
  \item c = London, in Fletestrete, by Thomas Marshe for Michel Lobleyn dwelling in Poules church yarde at the signe of S.Michel
  \item d = London
  \item e = London, in Fletestrete neare to S. Dunstans Churche by Thomas Marshe [and John Kingston]
  \item f = London; Now Newly Imprinted by Richarde Tottill and Thomas Marshe
  \item g = London, in Fletestrete
  \item h = Imprinted by Marshe for Gerald Dewes, dwelling in Paules Churchyarde at the signe of the Swanne
\end{itemize}

\begin{table}
\begin{tabular}{|c|l|c|}
\hline
Date & Title & STC \\
\hline
1554 & Proper new book of cookery [with J. Kynge before 1555] & \\
1554 & Skelton's certain bokes & \\
1554 & Motulino's almanac for 1555 & \\
1554 & Treatise of astronomy & \\
1555 & Institutions, or, Principall groundes of the lawes and statutes of Englelde... & 9293a.3 \\
1555 & A treatise of prayer / This treatyse concernynge the fruyfull saynges of Davyd in the seven penytencyall psalmes. Deuided in vii. sermons, was made and compyled by the ryghte reverente father in god John Fysher douctour of divynity and byshop of Rochester, at the exortacion and steryng of the most excellente prynces Margaret countesse of Richemount and Derby, and mother to our soveraygne Lordde kynge Henry the seventh, by Saint John Fisher, 1469-1535. & 10908 \\
1555 & Spare your good & 23014 \\
1555 & Dares Phrygius's history & \\
1555 & Fisher's fruitful sayings & \\
1555 & Institutions of a gentleman & \\
1555 & Institutions and grounds & \\
1555 & Processionale Sarum & \\
1555 & Psalterium Sarum & \\
1555 & A Boke of presydentes by Thomas Phayer, 1510-1560 & 3332 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\end{table}
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Author/Editor</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1556</td>
<td>A Breuiat Chronicle</td>
<td></td>
<td>9972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1556</td>
<td><em>An Almanacke and prognosticatyon for the yeare of ourde god MDLV</em>I*</td>
<td>Anthony Askham</td>
<td>410.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1556</td>
<td>Lyttelton temes in Englysshe. Truelye translated</td>
<td>Sir Thomas Littleton, d. 1481</td>
<td>15768.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1556</td>
<td>Field's Ephemeridis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1556</td>
<td>Institutes and grounds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1556</td>
<td>Magna Carta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1556</td>
<td>Standish's Trial of Supremacy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1556</td>
<td><em>An Almanacke and prognostication for the yeare of oure Lorde God MDLvii</em> made by Anthony Askham priest, fl. 1553.</td>
<td></td>
<td>410.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1557</td>
<td>A prayer sayd by the lorde Sturton and also his confession</td>
<td>Charles Stourton, Baron, d. 1557</td>
<td>23318.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1557</td>
<td>The Golden Boke of Marcus Aurelius Emperoure and eloquent oratour.</td>
<td>Antonio de Guevara, d. 1545</td>
<td>12443</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1557</td>
<td>Constitutiones Angliae provinciales by Londini</td>
<td></td>
<td>17112.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1557</td>
<td>Beso las manos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1557</td>
<td>Elyot's The Governor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1557</td>
<td>Lyndewode's Constitutiones</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1557</td>
<td>Marcus Aurelius's Golden Book</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1557</td>
<td>Oratio dominica</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1557</td>
<td>Prayer of Lord Sturton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1558</td>
<td>The Rules and right ample documents touchinge the use of the common almanackes named ephemerides by Oronce Finé, 1494-1555.</td>
<td></td>
<td>10878.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1558</td>
<td>An Exposicyon upon the .li. psalme. Made by Hierom of Ferrarye</td>
<td>Girolamo Savonarola, 1452-1498.</td>
<td>21796</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1560</td>
<td>A Necessary Almanack ... for 1560 ... serving wel for these thre next yeares by Thomas Hill, b. c.1528.</td>
<td></td>
<td>458</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1561</td>
<td>A briefe cronicle contayngyn the accoumpte of the raygnes of all kynges in this realme, from the entring of Brutus to this presente yeare.</td>
<td></td>
<td>9976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1561</td>
<td>The historie of Italie ... [which] intreateth of the astate of many and duers common weales</td>
<td>William Thomas, clerk of the Council to Edward IVth</td>
<td>24019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1561</td>
<td>A Neve Almanacke and prognostication of the yeare of our Lord God MDLXI by Lewes Vaughan.</td>
<td></td>
<td>521.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1561</td>
<td>The Castel of Health. Corrected and in some place augmented by the fyrst author therof, Syr Thomas Elyot, Knyght, the yeare of ourde lord 1561.</td>
<td>Sir Thomas Elyot, 1490-1546.</td>
<td>7651</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1561</td>
<td>Those fve questions, which Marke Tullye Cicero, disputed in his manor of Tusculanum: written afterwardes by him, in as manye bokes to his frende and familiar Brutus in the Latine tounge. And now oute of the same translated and englishted by John Dolman, studente and felowe of the Inner Temple. 1561.</td>
<td>By Marcus Tullius Cicero.</td>
<td>5317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1561</td>
<td>The history of two the moste noble capitaines of the worlde, Anniball and Scipio, by Sir Anthony Cope, d. 1551.</td>
<td></td>
<td>5720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Author</td>
<td>Page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 1562 | The true reporte of the forme and shape of a monstrous childe, borne at Muche Horkesleye, the xxi of Apryll 1562 | 12207
| 1562 | In this boke is contayned ye offices of sheryffes, bailliffes of libertyes, escheatours, constables and coroners, and sheweth what every one of them may do by vertue of theyr offices by Sir Anthony Fitzherbert, 1470-1538. | 10990.7
| 1563 | A most briefe and pleasaunte treatise, teachynge howe to dresse, sowe, and set a garden: and what properties also these few herbes heare spoken of, have to our comodytie: With the remedies that may be used against such beasts, wormes, flies and such lyke, that commonly noy gardens, gathered out of the principallest authors in this act by Thomas Hyll Londyner, b. c.1528. | 13490
| 1563 | A myrroure for magistrates | 1248
| 1563 | The first and chief groundes of architecture by John Shute, d. 1563. | 22464
| 1563 | The nobles or of nobilitye by Laurence Humphrey, 1525/6-1589. | 13964
| 1563 | A briefe chronicle, where in are described the originall, and the successive estate of the Romaine Weale publique by Eutropius, 4th Cent. | 10579
| 1564 | Thabridgment of the histories of Trogus Pompeius, collected by Justine, and tr. by A. Goldyng by Marcus Junianus Justinus. | 24290
| 1564 | A prognostication for the yeare of oure Lorde God 1564 by Henry Low, fl. 1554-1574. | 482.7
| 1564 | A prognostication everlasting of right good effect by Leonard Digges, d. 1571. | 435.41
| 1565 | A copie of the last advertisement that came from Malta, of the miraculous deliuerie of the isle from the Turke. Tr. out of the Italian | 17214
| 1565 | A most excellent and learned woorke of chirurgerie, called chirurgia parua Lanfanci, ...A compendious work of anatomie. An historiall [sic] expostulation by Lanfranco of Milan, 13th c. | 15192
| 1566 | A New postil conteinyng most godly sermons upon the Sonday gospelles by Thomas Becon, 1512-1567. | 1736
| 1566 | A summarie of Englysh chronicles. Collected by J. Stow 1525-1605. | 23319.5
| 1567 | A New postil by Thomas Becon, 1512-1567. | 1737
| 1567 | Certain tragicall discourses written oute of Frenche and Latin, by Geffraie Fenton, no lesse profitable then pleasaunt, and of like necessitye to al degrees that take pleasure in antiquityes or forreine reapportes by Matteo Bandello, 1485-1561. | 1356.1
| 1567 | Horace his arte of poetrie, pistles and satyrs Englished, by Horace. | 13797
| 1567 | A Prognostication of right good effect, by Leonard Digges, d. 1571. | 435.43
| 1568 | Floures for Latine spekynge selected and gathered oute of Terence, and tr. by N. Udall | 23901.3
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Author/Editor</th>
<th>Page Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1568</td>
<td>The diall of princes, compiled by the reverend father in God, Don Anthony of Gueuara, Byshop of Guadix, preacher and chronicler to Charles the fift, late of that name Emperor. Englished out of the Frenche by T. North, sonne of Sir Edward North Knight. L. North of Kyrtheling by Antonio de Guevara, bishop, d. 1545?</td>
<td>12428</td>
<td>1568 f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1568</td>
<td>The institution of a gentleman</td>
<td>Humfrey Braham.</td>
<td>14104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1568</td>
<td>The profitable arte of gardening</td>
<td>Thomas Hill, b. c.1528.</td>
<td>13491</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1568</td>
<td>Epigrams and sentences spirituall in vers, of Gregori Nazanzen, an auncient and famous bishop in the Greke Churche by Saint Gregory of Nazianzus.</td>
<td>12345.5</td>
<td>1568 b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1568</td>
<td>A new almanacke and prognostication for the yere of our saviour Christ MDLXVIII</td>
<td>John Securis.</td>
<td>511</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1569</td>
<td>The booke of Marcus Tullius Cicero entitled paradoxa stoicorum</td>
<td></td>
<td>5314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1569</td>
<td>A new almanacke and prognostication for the yeare of our Lorde God 1569. Practised in Salesbury neare to the close gate by Maister Henry Low. By Henry Low, fl. 1554-1574.</td>
<td>482.9</td>
<td>1569 b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1569</td>
<td>A new almanacke and prognostication for the yere of our Lord MDLXIX, being the yeare since the creation of the worlde 1531: Made chiefly for Englande and applied sometimes to other countries.</td>
<td>511.3</td>
<td>1569 d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1569</td>
<td>The ofspring of the house of Ottomanno, and officers of the greate Turkes court</td>
<td>Bartholomeus Georgievits d. c.1566</td>
<td>11746</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1569</td>
<td>The palace of pleasure</td>
<td>William Painter clarke of the ordinaunce and armarie. 1569.</td>
<td>19122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1569</td>
<td>The pleaasaut and wittie playe of the cheasts renewed, with instructions to play it well</td>
<td>Damiano da Odemira.</td>
<td>6215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1569</td>
<td>The line of liberalitie by Lucius Annaeus Seneca, c. 4BC-65.</td>
<td></td>
<td>12939</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1569</td>
<td>The worthye boke of old age otherwise entituled the elder Cato, now Englished</td>
<td></td>
<td>5294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1570</td>
<td>A boke named Tectonicon by Leonard Digges, d. 1571.</td>
<td></td>
<td>6850.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1570</td>
<td>The rules and ryghte ample documentes, touchinge the use and practise of the common almanackes named ephemerides by Oronce Finé, 1494-1555.</td>
<td></td>
<td>10878.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1570</td>
<td>In this booke is contayned ye offices of sheryffes, bailliffes ... coroners, by Sir Anthony Fitzherbert, 1470-1538.</td>
<td></td>
<td>10991.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1570</td>
<td>A summarye of the chronicles of Englande, ... unto 1570. Nowe newly corrected and enlarged.</td>
<td></td>
<td>23322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Author/Translator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1570</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>Newlie conferred with the Latin copye: Thabridgment of the histories of Trogus Pompeius, collected by Justine, and tr. by A. Goldyng.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1570</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>A catholike and ecclesiastical exposition of S. Mathewe. Tr. T. Timme, by Augustine Marlorat, 1506-1562.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1571</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>A Chronicle of all the noble emperours of the Romaines by Richard Reynoldes, d. 1606.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1571</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>A myrroure for magistrates</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1571</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>A newe almanacke and prognostication, for the yeare of our Lord God MDLXXI by John Securis.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1571</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>Toxophilus, the schole of shootinge conteyned in two bookes by Roger Ascham, 1515-1568.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1572</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>A briefe collection and compendious extract of straunge and memorable thinges, gathered oute of the cosmographye of S. Munster by Sebastian Munster, 1489-1552.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1572</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>The castel of helth corrected, and in some places augmented, by the first author therof, Sir Thomas Elyot Knight</td>
<td>Sir Thomas Elyot, 1490-1546.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1572</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>The foure bookes of Flavius Vegetius Renatus, briefelye contayninge a plaine forme, of martiall policye by Flavius Vegetois Renatus.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1572</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>A most briefe and pleaasunte treatise, teachyng how to dresse, sowe, and set a garden: and remedies agaynst wromes, flies, ... gathered oute of the principallest authours. And now englished...Now the thirde time sette forth. Wherunto is newly added a treatise, of the arte of graffing and planting of trees by Thomas Hill, b. c.1528.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1573</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>Cardanus conforte translated into Englishe by Girolamo Cardano, 1501-1576. [Cum Privilegio 1573.]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1573</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>A letter sent by a gentleman of England, to his frende, contayning a confutacion of a French mans errors, in a report of the myraculous starre nowe shyninge.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1574</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>A briefe collection and compendious extract of the straunge and memorable thinges, gathered oute of the cosmographye of S. Munster.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1574</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>The first parte of the mirour for magistrates, containing the falles of princes from the coming of Brute to the incarnation by John Higgins, fl. 1570-1602.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1574</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>The last parte of the mirour for magistrates. Newly corrected and amended by John Higgins, fl. 1570-1602.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1574</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>The pageant of popes, contayninge the lyues of all the bishops of Rome. Nowe englished with sondrye additions... by John Bale, 1495-1563.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1575</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>The firste parte of Churchyardes chippes, contayninge twelve severall labours by Thomas Churchyard, 1520-1604.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1575</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>[Anr. Issue]The last parte of the mirour for magistrates by John Higgins, fl. 1570-1602.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1575</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>A catholike and ecclesiasticall exposition of S. John. Tr. T. Timme by Augustine Marlorat, 1506-1562.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Volume</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Author(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1575</td>
<td>b</td>
<td><em>The second volume, conteyninge those statutes, made in the tyme of Henry the eyght.</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1575</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>[Anr. ed.] Corrected and augmented. <em>The palace of pleasure</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1575</td>
<td>d</td>
<td><em>A needefull, new and necessarie treatise of chyrurgerie</em> by John Banister, 1540-1610.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1576</td>
<td>b</td>
<td><em>Certein letters wherin is set forth a discourse of the peace attempted by Holland and Zelande 1574.</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1576</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>[Anr. ed.] <em>The castell of helth.</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1576</td>
<td>b</td>
<td><em>The mirrour of madnes, or a paradoxe maintayning madness to be most excellent.</em> Tr. by J. Sanford, Gent.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1577</td>
<td>b</td>
<td><em>Fovvre severall treatises ... conteyninge discourses of frendshippe: old age: paradoxes: and Scipio his dreame. All turned out of Latine by T. Newton by M. Tullius Cicero.</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1578</td>
<td>d</td>
<td><em>A comfortable ayde for scholers, full of varietie of sentences, gathered out of an Italian authour by David Rowland.</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1578</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>[Anr. ed] <em>The firste parte o f Churchyardes chippes,</em> by Thomas Churchyard, 1520-1604.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1578</td>
<td>b</td>
<td><em>The French grammar: or an introduction by ready rules, teachinge the french tongue,</em> by Jacques Bellot.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1578</td>
<td>g</td>
<td><em>A fort againste the feare of death and losse of frends and all other commodities of this worlde</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1579</td>
<td>b</td>
<td><em>Bulleins bulwarke of defence againste all sickenes, sornes, and woundes</em> by William Bullein, d. 1576.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1579</td>
<td>d</td>
<td><em>In this booke is containeyd ye offices of sheryffes, bailiffes ... coroners</em> by Sir Anthony Fitzherbert, 1470-1538.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1579</td>
<td>b</td>
<td><em>Certaine tragicall discourses written oute</em> of [Belleforest’s] Fenche and Latin, by Geffraie Fenton, no lesse profitable then pleasant, and of like necessitye to al degrees that take pleasure in antiquities or forreine reapportes* by Matteo Bandello, 1485-1561.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1580</td>
<td>g</td>
<td>[Anr. ed.] <em>Agayn corrected and encreased. The second tome of the palace of pleasure</em> by William Painter, 1540-1594.*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1580</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>[Anr. ed.] <em>The castell of helth,</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1580</td>
<td>g</td>
<td><em>Approoved medicines and cordiall receiptes, with the natures, of simples.</em> by Thomas Newton, 1542-1607.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1581</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>[Anr. ed.] <em>Floures or eloquent phrases of the Latine speech gathered out of all the sixe comedies of Terence: those the first three by N. Udall. And those of the latter three, nowe annexed by J. Higgins</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1581</td>
<td>b</td>
<td><em>A compendious or briefe examination of certayne ordinary complaints</em> by William Stafford</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1581</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>[Anr. ed.] <em>A compendious or briefe examination of certayne ordinary complaints</em> by William Stafford</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1581</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>[Anr. ed.] <em>A compendious or briefe examination of certayne ordinary complaints</em> by William Stafford</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1581</td>
<td>g</td>
<td>[Anr. ed. w., title:] <em>A watchword for wilfull women. An excellent pithie dialogue betweene two sisters.</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>STC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1504</td>
<td><em>Anno xix henrici viij Statuta bonum publicum concernentia edita in parlamento tento apud westmonasterium xxv die Januarii anno regni illustriissimi Domini nostri regis Henrici septum</em></td>
<td>9357</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1504</td>
<td><em>Henricus dei gracia... The kynges our soverayne lorde [etc. Regarding the currency of silver coin, clipped or otherwise. 5th July 1504.]</em></td>
<td>7760.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1504</td>
<td><em>[Anr. ed.] Here begynmeth the Accedence diligently correcte and poynytyn by John Stanbridge, 1463-1510</em></td>
<td>23153.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Work</td>
<td>Author(s)</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1505</td>
<td><em>How many partes of reson ben there</em></td>
<td>John Stanbridge</td>
<td>1463-1510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1505</td>
<td><em>Omelia originis de beata maria magdalena</em></td>
<td>Origen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1505</td>
<td><em>Donatus minor per pueros cù remigio.</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1505</td>
<td><em>Vulgaria Therentii in anglicanam linguam traducta</em></td>
<td>Publius Terentius</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1507</td>
<td>Universis xpi fidelibus presentes litteras inspecturis, vel audituris</td>
<td>Richardus dei patientia Prior prioratus de Kyrkeby super wrethik, alias vocatur Kyrkeby Beler ...</td>
<td>[Letter of confraternity]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1509</td>
<td><em>These be the articles</em></td>
<td>Henry VIII’s accession pardon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1509</td>
<td>Gui de Saliceto, <em>In hoc libro hec continentur Salus corporis salus anime.</em></td>
<td>Publius Terentius</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1510</td>
<td><em>The Graces folowyng be graunted to al the bretherne and systers benefactours and good doers unto the hospytall of ye blessyd confessour Saynt Rocke founded and establyssyd within the of sic cyte Excester ye daye that they do say a pater noster an Ave, and a crede it si graunted them that they shal never be infecte not greved with the stroke of ye pestylence as more playnly it dothe appere in his legende how and when al myghty god graunted thys petycyon to the sayd blessyd confessour Saynt Rocke, and sentyt by his angell Raphael.</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1510</td>
<td><em>Anno Primo. Henrici Viij</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1511</td>
<td>Missale ad consuetudinem insignis ecclesie Sarum:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1512</td>
<td><em>Here begynneth the festyuall</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1513</td>
<td>A ballade of the scottysshe kyng by John Skelton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1513</td>
<td>Hereafter ensue the trewe encountre or ... batayle lately don betwene Englanede and Scotlanede. [Flodden]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1518</td>
<td><em>Be it knownen to all cristen people</em></td>
<td></td>
<td>[Indulgences: Hereford Cathedral, Porch and Chantry Chapel]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1519</td>
<td>Frater Philippus Mulart decretorum doctor sacri et apostolici hospitalis sancti spiritus, by the Hospital of the Holy Ghost, Rome, Italy. [Indulgences]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1520</td>
<td>[Anr. ed.] <em>The Table. Here begynneth a boke in Frenche called le pelerymage de Lhomme, ... &amp; in our tunge the pylgrymage of man kynd incompendiouce sic prose copouded by William hendred prioure of Leomynystre and now newly at the specyal commaundemente of the same compyled in metre</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1520</td>
<td>Frater Philippus Mulart ... hospitalis sancti spiritus in Saxia de urbe Romana. [Indulgences]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Page</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1521</td>
<td>[Anr. ed.] <em>Hore beate maria virginis ad usum Sarum.</em></td>
<td>15932</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1522</td>
<td>[Anr. ed.] <em>The parlyament of devylles</em></td>
<td>19305.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1522</td>
<td><em>The Graces folowyng be graunted to al the bretherne and systers benefitours and good doers unto the hospytall of ye blessyd confessour Saynt Rocke founded and establyssyd within the cyte Excester</em> [Letter of Confraternity]</td>
<td>14077c.4 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1523</td>
<td>A gloruous medytacyon of Ihesus crystes passyon</td>
<td>14550</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1523</td>
<td>A ryght delectable tratyse upon a goodly Garlande or Chapelet of Laurell by mayster Skelton Poete laureat studyously dyvysed at Sheryhotton Castell. In ye foreste of galtres, where in ar comprysyde [comprised] many &amp; dyvers solacyons &amp; ryght pregnant allectyves of syngular pleasure, as more at large it doth apere in ye pces folowyng.</td>
<td>22610</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1525</td>
<td><em>Almanacke for xv yeres. [1525-40]. Here begynneth the scycle of change of the mone with the coniuncyon and sheweth what daye houre mynute sygne and degré the mone shall change. Also ye maye knowe the eclipse of the sonne and mone from the date of our lord MCCCCC. And xxv. Unto the date of our lord MCCCCC and xl. And truly corrected by a true copye with great dylygence.</em></td>
<td>390</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1525</td>
<td><em>Here foloweth a lytell treatyse of the Beaute of women newly tr. out of Frenshe in to Englishe.</em></td>
<td>1696</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1525</td>
<td><em>Alexander. [Romance of King Alexander]</em></td>
<td>321</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1525</td>
<td><em>The arte and science of arismetique</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1526</td>
<td>Confraternity of St. John (Wakering, Essex), <em>Venerabilibus et in Christo carissime dilectis gardiano et magistris una cum fratribus et sororibus gylde seu confraternitatis sancti Johannis in ecclesia perochiali sancti Nicholai de wakering London ... Frater wilhelmus Aiter ...</em> [Letter of Confraternity]</td>
<td>14077c.8 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1528</td>
<td><em>De cursione lune</em> [Aristotle]</td>
<td>768</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1530</td>
<td><em>A devout intercescion and praier to our saviour Jesu Christ</em></td>
<td>14546.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1530</td>
<td><em>Here after folowith the boke callyd the Myrroure of oure lady</em></td>
<td>17542</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1531</td>
<td>[Anr. ed.] <em>Universis et singulis xpfidelibus ... Nos aldermannus et camerarii ...</em> [Indulgence]</td>
<td>14077c.3 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1537</td>
<td>[Anr. ed.] <em>Hore beate Marie virginis, ad usum insignis ecclesie Saruum</em></td>
<td>15996</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix 5

A. Printed Collections of Skelton's Works.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TITLE OF COLLECTION</th>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>PRINTER</th>
<th>STC NO.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Skelton laureate agaynst a comely coystrowne</td>
<td>1520?</td>
<td>Pynson?</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1527</td>
<td>J. Rastell</td>
<td>22611</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1568</td>
<td>T. Marshe</td>
<td>22608</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Here folowythe dyvers baletys and dyties solacyous</td>
<td>1528</td>
<td>J. Rastell</td>
<td>22604</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1568</td>
<td>Marshe</td>
<td>22608</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and other copies?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Here after foloweth certayn bokes copyled by mayster Skelton. Speke parrot, The deth of kyng Edward the fourth. A treatyse of the Scottes. Ware the hawke, The tummyng of Elynour Rummynge.</td>
<td>1545</td>
<td>R. Lant for H. Tab</td>
<td>22598</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1554?</td>
<td>I. Kynge &amp; T. Marche</td>
<td>22599</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1563</td>
<td>J. Day</td>
<td>22600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1568</td>
<td>T. Marshe</td>
<td>22608</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pithy pleausaunt and profitable workes of maister Skelton, Poete Laureate. Nowe collected and newly published.</td>
<td>1568</td>
<td>Marshe</td>
<td>22608</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Not all of the works in these tables appear in the bibliography of this thesis; however, their STC numbers are included, for further reference, in Appendix 6.
B. Remainder of Printed Texts by Skelton (pre-1600), listed alphabetically.

PPPW = *Pithy pleasaut and profitable workes of maister Skelton, Poete Laureate. Nowe collected and newly published.*

CB = *Here after foloweth certayn bokes copyled by mayster Skelton. Speke parrot The deth of kyng Edward the fourth. A treatyse of the Scottes. Ware the hawke The tunnyng of Elynour Rummynge.*

DBDS = *Here folowythe dyvers balettys and dyties solacyous*

CC = *Skelton laureate agaynst a comely coystrowne*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TEXT</th>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>PRINTER &amp; LOCATION</th>
<th>COLLECTION</th>
<th>STC NO.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>A ballade of the scottysshe kynge / Skelton laureate against the scottes / A treatyse of the scottes.</em></td>
<td>1513</td>
<td>R. Faques, London.</td>
<td>CB</td>
<td>22593</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1545?</td>
<td>R. Lant for H. Tab I. Kynge &amp; T. Marche</td>
<td></td>
<td>22598</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1554?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>22599</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>A parable by William Cornishe</em></td>
<td>1568</td>
<td>Marshe</td>
<td>PPPW</td>
<td>22608</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>A prayer to the Father of Heaven</em></td>
<td>1568</td>
<td>Marshe</td>
<td>PPPW</td>
<td>22608</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Honorificatissimo, amplissimo... A replycacioun agaynst certayne yong scoters.</em></td>
<td>1528</td>
<td>Pynson</td>
<td>DBDS</td>
<td>22609</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>A Reproof to an erring lady</em></td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Pynson</td>
<td>DBDS</td>
<td>22604</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>A ryght delectable tratyse upon a goodly garlande or chapelet of laurel.</em></td>
<td>1523</td>
<td>Faques</td>
<td>PPPW</td>
<td>22610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1568</td>
<td>Marshe</td>
<td>PPPW</td>
<td>22608</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Agaynst dundas</em></td>
<td>1568</td>
<td>Marshe</td>
<td>PPPW</td>
<td>22608</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Agaynst the prowde scottes</em></td>
<td>1560</td>
<td>Kynge &amp; Marche</td>
<td>CB</td>
<td>22599</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1568</td>
<td>Marshe</td>
<td>PPPW</td>
<td>22608</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2 The eleven lyrics to the ladies are listed separately by Ringler as 68, 280, 288, 816, 1166, 1469, 1977, 2012, 2139, 2304, 2345. There is no evidence that they were ever printed separately.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Year(s)</th>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Publisher</th>
<th>Shelf Mark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agaynst venemous tongues</td>
<td>1568</td>
<td>Marshe</td>
<td>PPPW</td>
<td>22608</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An attack on Mastres Anne</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Pynson</td>
<td>CC, PPPW</td>
<td>22611, 22608</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ballad by Skelton laurate [My darling dere my dasy flour.]</td>
<td>1528</td>
<td>J. Rastell</td>
<td>DBDS</td>
<td>22604</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bedal quondam Belial</td>
<td>1568</td>
<td>Marshe</td>
<td>PPPW</td>
<td>22608</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disconsolate love</td>
<td>1528</td>
<td>Rastell</td>
<td>DBDS</td>
<td>22604</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elegy on the Death of Henry 7th</td>
<td>1528</td>
<td>Rastell, W. de Worde</td>
<td>DBDS, Douce E.20, PPPW</td>
<td>22604</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epitaph for Adam Udersall...</td>
<td>1568</td>
<td>Marshe</td>
<td>PPPW</td>
<td>22608</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epitaphium Margarete Countisse</td>
<td>1568</td>
<td>Marshe</td>
<td>PPPW</td>
<td>22608</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eulogium pro fuorum temporum</td>
<td>1568</td>
<td>Marshe</td>
<td>PPPW</td>
<td>22608</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How the douty Duke of Albany...</td>
<td>1568</td>
<td>Marshe</td>
<td>PPPW</td>
<td>22608</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Praise of his beloved</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Pynson</td>
<td>DBDS</td>
<td>22604</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Author</td>
<td>Publisher</td>
<td>ISBN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lamentation for</strong> Norwiche</td>
<td>1568</td>
<td>Marshe</td>
<td>PPPW</td>
<td>22608</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lines beneath a Latin epitaph...</strong></td>
<td>1528</td>
<td>Lant &amp; Tab Marshe</td>
<td>CB PPPW</td>
<td>22598 22608</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Magnyfycence, a goodly interlude and a mery...</strong></td>
<td>1530</td>
<td>P. Treveris for J. Rastell</td>
<td>PPPW</td>
<td>22607</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Of fickle fortune</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pynson</td>
<td>DBDS</td>
<td>22604</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Of his service to Calliope</strong></td>
<td>1568</td>
<td>Marshe</td>
<td>PPPW</td>
<td>22608</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Of the deth of the noble prynce kyng Edward the Fourth</strong></td>
<td>1542</td>
<td>R. Lant &amp; Tab Marshe</td>
<td>CB PPPW</td>
<td>22598 22608</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Praise of the Palmtre</strong></td>
<td>1568</td>
<td>Marshe</td>
<td>PPPW</td>
<td>22608</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Prayer to the father of heaune...</strong></td>
<td>1542</td>
<td>R. Lant &amp; Tab Marshe</td>
<td>CB PPPW</td>
<td>22598 22608</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Skelton Laureate, a ballet [though ye suppose all Ieperdys ar paste.]</strong></td>
<td>1528</td>
<td>Rastell</td>
<td>DBDS</td>
<td>22604</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Skelton Laureate at the instance of a nobyll lady</strong></td>
<td>1528</td>
<td>Rastell</td>
<td>DBDS</td>
<td>22604</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Skelton Laureate [Knolege Aquayntance resort favour with grace]</strong></td>
<td>1528</td>
<td>Rastell</td>
<td>DBDS</td>
<td>22604</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Skelton Laureate, untitled ballet [The auncient acquaintance Madam between us twayn]</strong></td>
<td>1528</td>
<td>Rastell</td>
<td>DBDS</td>
<td>22604</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Skelton Laureate, [Ye may jeer now, in this ryme / How every thing, must have a tyme]</strong></td>
<td>1528</td>
<td>Rastell</td>
<td>DBDS</td>
<td>22604</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Speke parrot</strong></td>
<td>1545?</td>
<td>R. Lant for H. Tab Marshe</td>
<td>CB PP</td>
<td>22598 22599</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Printer</td>
<td>Publisher</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Here begynmeth a lytell treatys named the bowge of courte</td>
<td></td>
<td>PPPW</td>
<td>1499</td>
<td>22597</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1510</td>
<td>22597.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1568</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Lover deceived...</td>
<td>Pynson</td>
<td>DBDS</td>
<td>1528</td>
<td>22604</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Here after foloweth a lytell boke, which hath to name, why come ye nat to courte. (The relucen mirror)</td>
<td>R. Copland for Richard Kele.</td>
<td>CB</td>
<td>22615</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R. Copland for R. Toy</td>
<td>CB</td>
<td>22616</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>W. Copland for I. Wyghe</td>
<td>CB</td>
<td>22616.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>J. Day for A. Kytson.</td>
<td>CB</td>
<td>22617</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>J. Day for A. Veale</td>
<td>CB</td>
<td>22617a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>J. Day for J. Walley Marshe</td>
<td>CB</td>
<td>22617a.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PPPW</td>
<td>1545?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1554?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1554?1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1609</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1609</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1624</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The tunnyng of Elinour Rumming</td>
<td>W. de Worde</td>
<td>CB</td>
<td>22611.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R. Lant for H. Tab</td>
<td>CB</td>
<td>22598</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I. Kynge &amp; T. Marche</td>
<td>CB</td>
<td>22599</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B. Alsop for S. Rand</td>
<td>CB</td>
<td>22612</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CB</td>
<td>22613</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CB</td>
<td>22614</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To Mastress Anne</td>
<td>Rastell</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td>1527</td>
<td>22611</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To the Holy Ghost</td>
<td>R. Copland for Richard Kele.</td>
<td>CB</td>
<td>22598</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R. Copland for R. Toy</td>
<td>PPPW</td>
<td>22608</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Marshe</td>
<td>PPPW</td>
<td>1568</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To the Second Person</td>
<td>R. Copland for Richard Kele.</td>
<td>PPPW</td>
<td>22608</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R. Copland for R. Toy</td>
<td>PPPW</td>
<td>22608</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Marshe</td>
<td>PPPW</td>
<td>1568</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uppon a deedman's hede</td>
<td>Pynson</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td>1527</td>
<td>22611</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Marshe</td>
<td>PPPW</td>
<td>1568</td>
<td>22608</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ware the hawe</td>
<td>R. Lant for H. Tab</td>
<td>CB</td>
<td>22598</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I. Kynge &amp; T. Marche</td>
<td>CB</td>
<td>22599</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>W. Copland for R. Toy</td>
<td>CB</td>
<td>22600</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>J. Day for A. Veale</td>
<td>CB</td>
<td>22599</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>J. Day for J. Wallye</td>
<td>CB</td>
<td>22608</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kynge &amp; Marche Marshe</td>
<td>CB</td>
<td>22608</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Appendix 6.

List of STC numbers of Works Printed by Faques, Marshe, and Other Printers of Skelton's Works, consulted during the production of this thesis.

STC 2nd ed. /  
261; 321; 390; 410.11; 410.12; 435.41; 435.43; 458; 482.7; 482.9; 508.5; 511; 511.3; 511.7; 517.12; 520; 521.5; 768; 787; 838; 868.6; 1243; 1248; 1249; 1250; 1251; 1304; 1356.1; 1356.3; 1360; 1421; 1696; 1736; 1737; 1852; 2133a; 3184.8; 3332; 3358; 3365.5; 3810; 3978; 4034; 4607; 4940; 5109.5; 5232; 5233; 5274; 5294; 5314; 5317; 5720; 5729; 5730; 6035.5; 6086; 6215; 6277; 6850.5; 6931; 7016.3; 7543; 7565; 7571.5; 7651; 7652; 7652.5; 7653; 7760.4; 7762; 9293a.3; 9304; 9353; 9357; 9357.9; 9971; 9972; 9976; 1020.5; 10448; 10579; 10597; 10617.5; 10878.7; 10878.9; 10908; 10990.7; 10991; 10991.5; 10993.9; 11013.6; 11088.5; 11192.5; 11244; 11362; 11746; 11886; 12207; 12345.5; 12428; 12443; 12512; 12939; 12952; 13170; 13443; 13444; 13490; 13491; 13492; 13608; 13691; 13797; 13805; 13964; 14077c.34; 14077c.41; 14077c.42; 14077c.44; 14077c.79; 14077c.80; 14077c.92; 14077c.93; 14077c.94; 14105; 14106; 14112.5; 14282; 14508; 14546.7; 14550; 15059; 15192; 15224; 15477; 15525; 15525.3; 15527; 15768.5; 15932; 15996; 16189; 16933; 17011; 17022; 17112.5; 17214; 17295; 17404; 17406; 17542; 17980; 18067; 18222.5; 18242; 18243; 18510; 18846; 19122; 19123; 19125; 19187; 19213; 19305.5; 19918; 20394; 20570; 20700.3; 20722; 20881.3; 20897; 20926; 21070; 21287; 21299; 21357; 21742; 21796; 22160; 21796; 21826.8; 22222; 22249.5; 22322; 22464; 22593; 22594; 22595; 22596; 22596a; 22598; 22599; 22601; 22603; 22604; 22608; 22610; 22611; 22615; 22617; 22618; 22880.4; 23014; 23133; 23133a; 23134; 23153.6; 23154.7; 23163.7; 23187; 23263; 23318; 23318.7; 23319.5; 23322; 23663; 23901.3; 23903; 23907.3; 23908; 24019; 24199; 24216a; 24290; 24291; 24571.7; 24631; 25149.5; 25938; 315760
Appendix 7.

Publication History of *The Garland of Laurel*

c.1495
Proposed astrological dating for *The Garland of Laurel*
Ms Cotton Vitellius E.x. ff. 223r-240v. Late fifteenth century.

1523 - 3rd October.

c.1526
J. Rastell, *Here foloweth dyvers balettys and ditties solaccyous*. Includes a title page with a woodcut of Skelton and inset a line of Latin verse from the concluding poem of *The Garland of Laurel*.

? 1525-1550
MS Cotton Vitellius E.X. ff. 223a-240b (Incomplete).

1568
repr. 1736 J Bowle, *Workes*.
repr. 1810

1736.
A. Dyce, ed., *The Poetical Works of Skelton and Donne with a memoir of each*, 4 vols in 2. This is possibly a ghost copy. It was said to be based on Faques’s ed., 1523, collated with Marshe’s ed., 1568, and with fragments of Cotton Vitellius E.X. f.200.¹

1810

¹ Joseph Haslewood (1769-1833), London lawyer and antiquary, made a small manuscript collection, for his own use, of rare, difficult to access poems, attributed to John Skelton. He thereby anticipated the later efforts of Dyce, Brie, Kinsman and others to clarify the Skelton canon. Haslewood’s collection contained only poems and versions of poems by Skelton that had been printed neither in the original editions of Skelton’s writings published during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, nor in the 1736 reprint of John Stow’s *Pithy Pleasaunt and Profitable Workes of Maister Skelton*, 1568, 1736, 1810. See D.R. Carlson, ‘Joseph Haslewood’s Manuscript Collection of Unpublished Poems by John Skelton’, *Papers of the Bibliographical Society of America*, 81, (1987), 65-74.
1843

1856

1895

1924
R. Hughes, John Skelton: Poems (Heinemann: London, 1924), pp.149-206. Based mainly on Dyce’s text, includes the Latin start but ends after the book shuts – “Good luk this new yere! ...”

1927

1931

1969

1980

1983

1990
F.W. Brownlow, ed., The Book of the Laurel: John Skelton (Newark: University of Delaware Press; London: Associate University Presses, 1990), pp. 99-160. Brownlow makes use of the two early printed texts, the manuscript, and modern editions. He expands abbreviations according to the spelling and word-division of the MS, modernises spelling and capitalization. Punctuation is editorial but based on the manuscript. Spelling and format in the sections taken from the two early printed texts follows that of those taken from the MS. Editions of Dyce and Scattergood are fully collated. Readings from Hammond and Henderson are recorded selectively.
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Appendix 8

Illustrations from Faques’s 1523 text of Skelton’s
The Garland of Laurel.

A. Title Page.

Typo upon agoodly Gar
lande or Chapeter of Laurell by maister Skelton Poete
laureate seuoposly dryved at Sheypshorcon Lattell. In
a booke of gateres/where in ar copie of many a pruets
colepons & cyghte pegrnate allegories of yngular pleasure/as mory ar large te doch aper in spees folowynge.
In place alone then musing in my thought
How all thing past hath as doth the some flower
One streweth my rebukts for the I sought
How of my purpose varryeth in an bowre
Now close together fast with a fixt close bowre
All thinge compassed no perpeture
But now in welth/now in sowerthe
C So deeply downed I was in this dume
Esteampild to lose was my conceipt
That me to tell I lends me to a dume
Of an oke that someone heem full streighthe
I myghte creche and of a noble heyphe
Whole heyphe blyppe was with the bonestre wynde
His leue lorte/the dume was frome the critehe
C Thus atode I in the dreme forst of Garees
Easlyviki with hit of the mydmore
Where heres bly percept with disters
Ham on the rauenge so longe that I suppose
Few men can tell where the dume calle gote
Faire fall that faster that to well can bare his bownde
But of my purpose now strome we to the grounde
Cypheus I rode musing in this mephitasure
In slumberge I fell and halle in a stepe
And whether it were of imagination
Or of humane superstitie that ever was crepe
In to the diaphe by drynkeinge over daye
Or of procede of facall praisation
I can not tell you what was the occasion
But sodeynly at ones as I me aduised
As one in a trans of an excasy
Fawe a paupishion wonderfully displesed
Swerliethed the ale my fantasie
Stemmphys with perle and stones precious
The grounde engroved and her with bourse goode
That passage goodly it was to be holde
Wherethat a pythons excellence of poete
But to recounte her pyche abysmaly
And what elates to her did recolle
There is full insufficient
A goddesse inmozeall the dye represente
As that say Dame Pallas was her name
To whome supplieth the regale Queen of fame
The queene of Fame. To dame Pallas

Princes most puissante of high supremacy
Known in ladys about the sere heypa

All other transcending of very congruence
Madame regent of the science leapen
To whose altare all nobelnes most lene
By supplie aspon to you I areset
Whereof I deseche you to tender the efforce
For unremebered it is vnto your grace
How you gave me a call commaunderne
That in my course thelson thale have a place
Becausse cynec his syne hlepdyly spene
In your leisure and to the accomplismenter.
Of your rebuell: regesterd is his name
Wherethan (ypumpere) in the course of fame
For good madame the accoutame and blage
Of ancients poetes se were full whel bath bren
Then stike to empiecl wall there doll coasage
So that, there wokis mygtte famously be bren
In figure whereof the were they laurel greene
But how is helson is wonder flake
And as we darre we finde in hym greene take
If foere were onely be hath your promiscous
Out of my bokes full tone I shulde hym sake
But such he hath calyn of the sugerd porcoun
Of streams well refelctidy to your grace.
And will not endeour hymselfe to purchase
The louer of ladys to words elect
He is strange that ye must hym correct

Dame Pallas To the queene of Fame
The sum of your purpose as we are aduised
Is that our scheme is sam what to bult
Wherein this answer for hym we have erased
How purpose you not sppel the syping be full
Wit a dull mouth then a headlesse scull.
D. Faques's printer's device on the final folio
Appendix 9.

Printed Images from Faques’s Press

A.

STC 12512 (2nd edition)
Copy from British Library.

This text is written in the form of a dialogue between the poet and the ancients. It has an elaborate title page illustrated with a huge shield which is upheld by a dragon and greyhound rampant. There are two portcullises, a crown on top, a Tudor rose and two figures holding a scroll. The Title page verso has a flower border, a woodblock initial and a full sized shield in a bordered square. F.1r has a huge woodblock initial decorated with animals, some larger type and another woodblock initial with smaller type. The woodblock initial ‘A’ seems to be the same type as that in The Garland of Laurel. Faques’s device which appears on f.23 is small.
B.

*Here after folowith the boke calld the Myrroure of oure lady* by [London]: Printed by Richarde Fawkes, 1530.  
STC 17542 (2nd edition)  
Copy from Henry E. Huntington Library and Art Gallery.  

177 page volume with images of books and readers. In addition it contains several illustrations including an image of the annunciation, and one of the Eucharist, with pictures of the Virgin set in woodblock initials to mark the sections. Faques’s printer’s device appears at the end with the words ‘Soli deo honor et Gloria, Amen.’
A devout intercescion and prayer to our saviour Jesu Christ. Imprint in Durham
rentes: By Richard Fawkes, 1530
STC 14546.7 (2nd edition)
Copy from Trinity College (University of Cambridge) Library.

The title page of this four page volume of services for days of the week has an image of
Christ holding an orb with his other hand raised in peace, the signs of Evangelists, on the
recto.
De cursione lune. Here begynneth the course of the dayes of the moone by Aristotle.
STC 768 (2nd edition)
Copy from British Library.

A text about the movement of the moon, sun and star signs. There is one column of poetry per page, Faques’s printer’s device and an elaborate title page showing the moon and an astrologer.
E.

STC 15932 (2nd edition)
Copy from Bodleian Library

‘God be in my head…’, appears here under a woodblock. The woodblock in this case is Faques’s own device although slightly different from his usual device shown in Appendix 5. In its content and layout this text is very similar to the text of STC 15996 with several fine quality religious woodblock illustrations, including a set from the dance of death. There are not titles at the top of the pages, however, and the layout is generally different from that of STC 15996.

God be in my head
And in my understanding
God be in my eye
And in my lothynge
God be in my mouth
And in my speke
God be in my hart
And in my thoughtynge
God be at my ende
And my departynge.
Appendix 10.

Author Illustrations from other Works by Skelton.

X.

*Here after foloweth a litel boke called Colyn Cloute* [Imprinted at London: by R. Copland for me Rycharde Kele dwellyng in the powltry at the long shop under saynt Myldredes chyrche, 1545. STC 22601 (2nd edition) Copy from British Library*
Y.

Skelton laureate agaynste a comely coystrowne. [London: Printed by J. Rastell, 1527]
STC 22611 (2nd edition)
Copy from Henry E. Huntington Library and Art Gallery.
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