

Durham Research Online

Deposited in DRO:

04 December 2019

Version of attached file:

Published Version

Peer-review status of attached file:

Peer-reviewed

Citation for published item:

Atkinson, Laurie (2019) 'And to that ende, here is remembrance' : registers of petition in Thomas Hoccleve's devotional and begging poetry.', *Medium Ævum.*, 88 (2). pp. 301-328.

Further information on publisher's website:

<https://aevum.space/journal>

Publisher's copyright statement:

Additional information:

Use policy

The full-text may be used and/or reproduced, and given to third parties in any format or medium, without prior permission or charge, for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes provided that:

- a full bibliographic reference is made to the original source
- a [link](#) is made to the metadata record in DRO
- the full-text is not changed in any way

The full-text must not be sold in any format or medium without the formal permission of the copyright holders.

Please consult the [full DRO policy](#) for further details.

‘AND TO THAT ENDE, HERE IS REMEMBRANCE’:
REGISTERS OF PETITION IN THOMAS HOCCKLEVE’S
DEVOTIONAL AND BEGGING POETRY

Today, most celebrated among the literary outputs of the Privy Seal clerk Thomas Hoccleve are the three holograph manuscripts produced in the final four years before his death in 1426.¹ Durham University Library, MS Cosin V.iii.9 is a tantalizingly intimate witness of Hoccleve’s last, pseudo-autobiographical work, *The Series* (1419–21); San Marino, Huntington Library, MSS HM 744 and HM 111 have been influentially described as the ‘first “collected poems” in English’;² and between them, the three holographs contain almost complete texts of all of Hoccleve’s English verse excepting his Lancastrian *fürstenspiegel*, *The Regiment of Princes* (1410 × 1413).³ Despite an inauspicious critical reception in the first half of the twentieth century,⁴ in the last thirty years Hoccleve has been revived as a deliberate self-anthologizer in a shifting bureaucratic culture, as an innovator in literary reflexivity and self-fashioning, and as a canny operator within the politics and systems of patronage of early fifteenth-century England.⁵ Paradoxically, however, given the centrality of the holographs to Hoccleve’s Chaucerian, Lancastrian, and essentially *secular* critical reputation, remarkably little attention has been paid to the devotional and specifically Marian verse that makes up much of their contents.⁶ The first six of the ten Hoccleve items in HM 744 are in fact devotional; half of those concern the Virgin Mary, including the little studied hagiographical work ‘The story of the monk who clad the Virgin by singing *Ave Maria*’.⁷ Four more devotional items appear in HM 111, three addressing Mary, whilst ‘The compleynte of the Virgin before the Cross’ is a translation from Guillaume de Deguileville’s *Pèlerinage de l’âme* (1355). In what follows, I take as my focus the Huntington Holographs with the intention of reassessing the importance of Hoccleve’s previously underexamined religious verse. I draw attention to the shared registers of petition in Hoccleve’s devotional and begging poems, which are usually considered separately, and propose that his apparently dichotomous religious and secular verse can mutually inform our critical approach to Hoccleve’s poetic as a whole.

Seemingly lacking the self-reflexive and indigent voice of the *Series*, the *Regiment*, and the occasional and begging poems – the canon for what Robert

Meyer-Lee has described as a distinctively ‘Hocclevean’ poetic – it is perhaps the religious poetry’s perceived conventionality that has relegated it to the margins of Hoccleve scholarship.⁸ The religious verse, it seems, may tell us something of the piety and devotional practices of Hoccleve and his society, yet it evinces little of the virtuosity or individualized voice of the poet’s more recognizable, personalized writings.⁹ For the short, devotional poem, H. S. Bennett’s oft-quoted pronouncement in *Chaucer and the Fifteenth Century* rings true: ‘the larger part of the interest that Hoccleve has for us’ continues to be ‘social’ rather than ‘poetic’;¹⁰ and the religious verse remains neglected in the growing field of Hoccleve studies.

It is the contention of this article that Hoccleve’s religious poetry deserves critical reappraisal as exactly that, poetry. Quite apart from constituting so considerable a portion of Hoccleve’s works, the devotional verse offers valuable nuance to our conception of a ‘Hocclevean’ poetic that is not exclusively secular. Key to this analysis is the recognition of a shared register in Hoccleve’s religious and secular verse, one that speaks to the often analogous presentation of royal and divine patronage in his work. Whether a speaker’s desired benefactor is his lord, his God, or a mediator between them, Hoccleve’s petitioner–patron relationships are similarly beset by anxieties of deference, duty, and decorum. The solutions to these challenges are most obviously expedient to Hoccleve’s ‘begging’ poems; yet the distinctiveness of this petitionary register is in part derived from the features it shares with the devotional verse. Central to the supplicatory mode as manifested in Hoccleve’s secular and religious poetry is *remembrance*. It is the nexus for a group of strategies including indirect address, a disinterested or *conuenient* (‘appropriate’) rendering of service by a petitioner to his intercessor or patron, and the concomitant notion of the proper reciprocation of that favour. In what follows, my point of departure is perhaps the least overtly ‘Hocclevean’ item in HM 744, the prologue and the legend of the ‘Monk who clad the Virgin’. Following an examination of the Middle English term *remembrance* and its related terms in Hoccleve’s devotional verse, I interrogate the intersection of this petitionary register with that of Hoccleve’s begging poems in particular. The contract of reciprocal *remembrance* between the supplicant monk – meditating on the Passion and saying his *Ave Maria* – and the mediatory Virgin – who in return ‘hasst euere in mynde | Alle tho / þat vp on thee han memorie’ (HM 744, 5. 1f.) – offers striking similarities to the strategies of petition in Hoccleve’s perennial requests for financial remuneration.¹¹ The prologue to the legend presents the text itself as at once an object and an act of *remembrance*, an equivocality that offers compelling new directions for our understanding of making, reading, and voice in Hoccleve’s work. It is not my intention here to recast Hoccleve as a principally ‘religious’ or ‘Marian’ poet; I am hesitant even in asserting a consistent direction of influence between his begging poems and

devotional verse. I do believe that this notion of *remembrance* and its associated register can provide an instructive approach to instances of petition – for the purse or for the soul – in Hoccleve's work. In particular, I hope that this reintegration of his corpus will challenge the often artificially imposed dichotomy between the 'secular' and 'religious' in late medieval English poetry.

'The story of the monk who clad the Virgin by singing *Ave Maria*', or 'quomodo psalterium beate marie primo erat inuentum', is the sixth Hoccleve item in HM 744.¹² The text follows two lyrics that make supplication to Mary for her intercession on man's behalf.¹³ This piece, *Item de beata virgine*, begins on the recto of folio 36, where there is a sidenote in Hoccleve's hand stating that the work was commissioned by one 'T. Marleburgh'.¹⁴ Immediately preceding the legend proper is a three stanza prologue with the explicit 'Explicit prologus & incipit fabula'. The prologue lauds Mary's role in mankind's salvation as the 'mediatrice' (8) between man and God; and in a final stanza, the legend itself is introduced as an appropriate or *conuenient* devotion in Mary's honour:

Now syn þat lady noble and glorious
 To al man kynde hath so greet cheertee
 That in this slipir lyf and perillous
 Staf of confort and help to man is shee.
 Conuenient is / þat to þat lady free
 We do seruice / honore & plesance
 And to þat ende / heere is a remembrance

(HM 744, 6a. 16–21)

What follows is a relatively typical legend belonging to a group of miracles associated with the proper recital of Our Lady's Psalter, what in modern times is known as the rosary.¹⁵ A monk of the abbey of St Giles in France has been taught by his father to say fifty *Ave Marias* each day. One Saturday, after he had said his prayers in his father's Lady Chapel, the Virgin appears to him wearing a 'sleeueless' garment (line 52).¹⁶ 'Merveillynge', the monk enquires, 'What garnament is this / and hath no sleve' (lines 54–6). She informs him that, through his prayers, 'this clothyng / Thow hast me yoven' (lines 57f.). Now, however, he must increase his daily observance to 150 *Aves*, joining a *Pater Noster* to every tenth 'In the memorie' (line 65) of the Annunciation, the Nativity, and her Assumption. The monk complies 'aftir hir doctryne & enformyng' (line 88), and when the Virgin returns one week later she is 'fresshly arraied and wel' (line 90) with sleeves affixed to her garment. She thanks the monk and instructs him to return to the abbey where 'the Covent teche thow for to seye / My psalter / as byforn taght have I thee' (lines 101–3). The monk obeys, disseminates her Psalter, and is soon made abbot of the abbey. In a return to the didactic mode of the prologue, the legend's final lines extend Mary's and the monk's 'enformyng' to its devotional audience at large:

And now heer aftir / the bettre to speede
 And in hir grace / cheerly for to stonde
 Hir psalter for to seye / let vs fonde

(HM 744, 6b. 103–5)

The crux of the poem – both its subject and its ‘ende’ – is *remembrance*. It is a term which is central to the pervasive register of petition in Hoccleve’s work that I have set out to describe and it is worth pausing here to consider the full semantic range of *remembrance* in Middle English usage. First attested around 1330, the noun *remembrance* is partly a French borrowing, partly formed within English by derivation from Middle French *remembrer* and post-classical Latin *rememorari* (‘to remember’) and *rememorare* (‘to call to mind, to remember’).¹⁷ The term has obvious semantic overlap with the earlier *memory* (the *OED*’s first attestation is ?c.1225), *memorial* (a. 1382), and the later *commemoration* (1382, but only as a borrowing of the Vulgate’s *commemoration* in the Wyclif Bible; its next attestation is 1485).¹⁸ In phrases such as ‘callen to remembrance’ or ‘haven in remembrance’, the meaning of *remembrance* bears close affinity to the cognitive sense of the Middle English verb *remembren* (‘to bear in mind’ or ‘to refresh the memory [of somebody]’).¹⁹ In these formulations, *remembrance* is essentially synonymous with the medieval faculty of memory. Following late medieval theories of cognition adapted ultimately from Aristotle, the *cellula memorialis* in the back part of the brain was conceived of as a storehouse for the sensory impressions processed by the various inner senses. The material or forms stored in the memory could later be recombined into new cognitive representations that could be outwardly expressed as speech or as writing (for which, compare the *MED*’s third definition of *remembren*, denoting an externalized process, with the sense of giving an account or making a record or a denomination).²⁰ Hoccleve’s devotional poetry exhibits only a limited interest in the cognitive processes associated with memory. Whilst evocations of ‘thought’ and perception are a favourite motif of Hoccleve’s longer works – see, for instance, the Prologue to the *Regiment*, the framing narrative of the *Series*, and the ‘Address to Sir John Oldcastle’ – the engagement in his religious writings with the practices of meditative contemplation is relatively superficial. Instead, it is the rhetorical possibilities of *remembrance* and its related terms that are so readily applied by Hoccleve to his religious and also his secular supplications. In these works, *remembrance* may constitute not only a process/act but also the stimulus for remembering.

The *Middle English Dictionary* gives three broad definitions for *remembrance*: (1) ‘consideration, thought, reflection’, the seat of an individual’s or a collective faculty of memory but also ‘a particular memory; recollection’; (2) ‘a memento, keepsake; a memorial’ – often with a didactic or admonitory force – such as the confessor, Genius’ exempla in the *Confessio Amantis*, ‘Which I schal telle in

remembraunce / Upon the sort of loves chaunce' (IV.449f.); and (3) 'a record, list; an account, a narration' – for now, the sense closest to Hoccleve's usage in the prologue to the 'Monk who clad the Virgin' quoted above.²¹ Though there is ambiguity between and within these three broad groupings, definition (1) generally pertains to an internal, cognitive act or process, whilst definitions (2) and (3) refer to a (usually) external stimulus – an emblematic memorial or a textual record – that may be manifested as an object, or as a performance or event.

This potential slippage between *remembrance* understood as an internalized faculty or process of remembering, and *remembrance* as a tangible or emblematic memorial with the potential to stimulate that process, has perhaps its most celebrated instance in Chaucer's adage in the *Prologue to The Legend of Good Women*: 'And yf olde bokes were aweye, / Yloren were of remembraunce the key' (F.25f.). This rhetorical move from textual production presented as a private act, to the valorization of remembrative texts as objects with extrinsic value, held an obvious pragmatic appeal to late medieval makers and readers of such 'keys of *remembrance*'. We might chiefly associate these worldly concerns with secular works and the whims and weaknesses of their patrons; however, important analogues can also be seen in the devotional poetry that Chaucer, his contemporaries, and his fifteenth-century successors were no less active in producing – with human but also holy benefactors in mind.

In Middle English devotional verse, *remembrance* is often used to connote the honour due to the divine, or as frequently, man's dread of death and damnation. It has a cognitive, emblematic, but also a textual significance – indeed, one form usually predicates another. An illustrative example is John Lydgate's *Legend of Dan Joos*, a verse narrative, like the 'Monk who clad the Virgin', prescribing the proper veneration of Mary and also extant (twice) in Trinity R.3.21.²² Here, the *remembrance* from which the legend takes its impetus is five psalms—the Magnificat (Luke i.46–55), and Psalms cxix, cxviii.17, cxxv, and cxxii – the initial letters of which spell MARIA.²³ One day, walking by a garden, the monk Dan Joos overhears a bishop reciting the psalms 'in honour of that flower [Mary], | That bare Iesu Cryst' (lines 34f.).²⁴ Delighting in the performance of this 'remembraunce' (line 46), Dan Joos 'wrote hem [the psalms] in hys mynde' (line 50) and recites them every day after matins. After some years, Dan Joos passes away in the night. The monks of the convent examine his corpse and discover a rose springing from his mouth on which is written

... in lettres of bornyd golde,
 Marie full curiously as hit ys specyfyed
 In books oolde ...
 (lines 81f.)

Dan Joos's death has enacted a reification both of the originary text of the MARIA *remembrance* and also of the emblem of the flower that it evokes. In the first Trinity copy of the poem, the three occurrences of 'Marie' (lines 38, 81, and 126) are written in red; the word on the page has a *mise en abyme* effect, at once recording, representing, and when read, rehearsing the textual, memorial, and also the cognitive *remembrance* encoded in the legend.²⁵ Writer and scribe have recognized the closed system represented by the reading, recital, and subsequent recording and re-recital of a text. The effect is much the same as the instruction at the end of the 'Monk who clad the Virgin' that the reader go forth and *fonde* ('attempt' or 'undertake') the Psalter of which they have just read the origin;²⁶ each expresses a reciprocal system of *remembrance*, one that is made uniquely visible in the texts and layout of Hoccleve's holograph manuscripts surveyed below.

In his devotional verse, Hoccleve fully exploits the multivalent quality of *remembrance*. There are nine occurrences of the term in the religious poems of HM 744 and HM III, thirteen more of the related terms *remembren* and *memorie*. The subjects and objects of these acts or stimuli of remembering appear in three main configurations (though as will be seen, Hoccleve reserves a particular equivocality for *remembrance*): the recollection of Christ's Passion by God the Father, Mary, or Christ himself as the motivation for their intercession on man's behalf; the entreaty that God the Father, the Trinity, or in particular Mary remember the faithful and think not on their sins, with the implication that mankind has no other recourse against damnation; and in two striking instances, one of which is that in the prologue to the 'Monk who clad the Virgin', the duty of mankind to 'do *servuice / honore & plesance*' towards their mediator Mary *in exchange* for intercession. The occurrences of *remembrance*, *remembren*, and *memorie* in the religious poems of HM III and HM 744 are presented in Table I below:

Table 1. *Remembrance*, *remembren*, and *memorie* in the religious poems of HM III and HM 744²⁷**remembrance**
HM 744**remembren****memorie**

1. *Inuocacio ad patrem*
And in his torment /
[Christ] ful greet delyt hadde
| Remembrynge / how we
synful folkes bade | Redempt
sholde be / thurgh his
passioun (lines 88–90)

Forgete our giltes / &
remembre hem nocht: /
Mercyful lord / putte al out
of thy thought (lines 97f.)

1. *Inuocacio ad patrem*
... we thee byseeche, | That
thow haue of thy sone swich
memorie (lines 23f.)

3. *Ad spiritum sanctum*
O. Trinitee haue vs in
remembrance (line 70)

4. *Ad beatam virginem*
... it is an impossibl / þat
thow sholdest nat haue in
remembrance / Why thow
baar god ... (lines 15–17)

5. *Item de beata virgine*
Syn thow modir of grace
hasst euere in mynde / Alle
tho / þat vp on thee han
memorie | Thy remembrance
ay ought oure hertes bynde /
Thee for to honore / blisful
qweene of glorie (lines 1–4)

6a. *Item de beata virgine*
And to þat ende / heere is
a remembrance (line 21; see
above)

5. *Item de beata virgine*
Remembre on þat [Christ's
Passion] / and preye for vs
aye (line 140)

5. *Item de beata virgine*
See left.

6b. *Explicit prologus & incipit
fabula* [the 'Monk who clad
the Virgin']
The ferste .l.ⁱⁱ wole I þat
seid be | In the memorie of
the ioie and honour / That
I had / wan the Angel grette
me (lines 43–5)

[Thow shalt ekk seyn the
seconde .l.^v / In honur and

in mynde of the gladnesse /
That I had / whan I baar of
my body | God and man /
withouten wo or duress. (lines
50–3)]

... The .iii.^{de} l.^v / in thy
herte impresse / And seye it
eek with good deuocioun,
/ In the memorie of myn
Assumpcioun (lines 54–6)

11. *Hic incipit ars vtilissima
sciendi mori / Cum omnes
homines &c* ['Lerne to die']²⁸
Wordly swetnesse / sleeth
swich remembrance [of death]
(line 61)

Euery day haue of me
[the image of death] deep
remembrance (line 603)

11. *Hic incipit ars vtilissima
sciendi mori / Cum omnes
homines &c* ['Lerne to die']
Dat I greetly haue erred / & mis
went | Me wel remembrith this
tyme present (lines 438f.)

Remembre on my doom / for
swich shal thyn be (line 608)

[let man] the dirk hour and
dayes wikke / Remembre or
that he [man] come to the
prikke (lines 846f.)

Remembre therfore on thy
Creatour | In thy fresh youthe
& lusty iolitee (lines 848f.)

11. *Hic incipit ars vtilissima
sciendi mori / Cum omnes
homines &c* ['Lerne to die']
[For a memorie leve y this
sentence | To thee and heere
y die in thy presence (lines
739f.)]

*cp. 7. *Lepistre de Cupide*
Hir [Saint Margaret's] louyng
herte / and constant to hir lay
/ Dryue out of remembrance
we nat may (lines 433f.)

HM III

1. ['The Compleynte of the
Virgin before the Cross']
Whi hast thou [the Holy
Ghost] me not in thi
remembrance | Now at this
tyme, right as thu had tho [at
the Annunciation]?²⁹

1. ['The Compleynte of the
Virgin before the Cross']
[To the Sun:] Remembre
he [Christ] is thy lord and
Creatour (line 146)

7. *Ad beatam Virginem*
His [the Devil's] sotil snares
and cacchyng twyn | In my

memorie ficchid been ful
deepe (lines 71f.)

10. *Ad beatam Virginem*
Thow shapen art by goddes
ordenance / Mene for vs
flour of humilitee / Ficche
þat lady in thy remembrance
(lines 43–5)

10. *Ad beatam Virginem*
Tendrely remembre on the
wo & peyne / Þat thow
souffridist in his passioùn
(lines 57f.)

19. *Ceste balade ensuyante*
feust translatee au
commandement de mon
Meistre Robert Chichele
Let me nat slippe out of
thy [Mary’s] remembrance
(line 46)

19. *Ceste balade ensuyante*
feust translatee au
commandement de mon
Meistre Robert Chichele
Lat nat him [Christ] lesse
þat he by deeth boghte ...
Mynghe him ther on / for
thee [Mary] so to doon /
oghte (lines 142–4)³⁰

*cf. 2. *Ceste feust faïcte au*
temps que le Roy Henri le
v^e que dieu pardoint feust a
Hampton sur primer passage
vers harflete [‘Address to Sir
John Oldcastle’]
Haue of thy synnes heuy
remembrance (line 92)

*cf. 2. *Ceste feust faïcte au*
temps que le Roy Henri le
v^e que dieu pardoint feust a
Hampton sur primer passage
vers harflete [‘Address to Sir
John Oldcastle’]
Remembre [God] how
deer / þat thow hast him
[Oldcastle] boght (line 268)

Right as a spectacle helpith
feeble sight | Whan a man
on the book redith or writ
... The same may men of
ymages [in Churches] seye
/ Thogh the ymage nat the
seint be / yit | The sight vs
myngith to the seint to preye
(lines 417–24)

*cf. 6. *Ceste balades ensuyantes*
feurent faïtes au tresnoble Roy
H. le quint que dieu pardoint
 au reshonurable conpaignie
du Iarter (‘Yee lords eek
shynge in noble fame’)
Lord lige / & lords haue in
remembrance | Lord of al is
the blissid Trinitee (lines 61f.)

Most frequent here are those exhortations that Mary ‘Tendrely remembre on the wo & peyne / Pat thow souffridist in his [Christ’s] passio^{un}’ (HM III, 10. 57f.), a complex affective appeal that acknowledges both Christ’s and Mary’s suffering on earth, but which also has the discursive function of reminding the Virgin of the cause for which her son died and her motivation – indeed, her natural inclination – to act as *mediatrice* (‘intercessor’) between man and God. The devotee is necessarily anxious that this divinely authorized mode of Marian intercession be observed. In the ‘Balade to the Virgin and Christ’, the speaker begs Mary that he ‘nat slippe out of thy remembrance’ (HM III, 19. 46) or in *Ad spiritum sanctum*, that the Trinity ‘haue vs in remembrance’ (HM 744, 3. 70). In general, however, the petitions in Hoccleve’s devotional verse function through indirection. In most instances, the speaker’s addressee is not a member of the Trinity, the ultimate arbiter of grace, but rather man’s mediator, Mary, as ‘For whom thow preyest / god nat list denye / Thyn axynge’ (HM 744, 4. 48f.).³¹ The devotional verse rarely approaches anything like a personalized dread of damnation – a theme expounded at some length in ‘Lerne to die’, Hoccleve’s translation from Henry Suso’s *Horologium sapientiae* (c.1334). As a corpus, these poems are preoccupied rather by mankind’s sin, his redemption through the Incarnation and Christ’s death on the Cross, and the compulsion of the devotee and the Virgin alike to hold this divine contract – and by extension, each other – constantly in *remembrance*.³²

So in HM III, 10. *Ad beatam Virginem*, better known as Hoccleve’s ‘Mother of God’, each of the poem’s first five stanzas contains a speaker’s entreaty that the Virgin pray to Christ for him, ‘Syn for my gilt I fully me repente’ (line 14). This is the role for which ‘Thow shapen art by goddes ordenance’ and Mary is exhorted to ‘Ficche þat lady in thy remembrance’ (lines 43–5), i.e. that mediatory role which she has been ordained to perform. In stanzas 8 and 9, the speaker explicitly states Christ’s intention ‘Vp on a crois to die for our sake’ (line 53) and exhorts the Virgin to ‘Tendrely remembre on the wo & peyne / Pat thow souffridist in his passio^{un}’. Yet in stanzas 10–13, the poem’s midpoint, the emphasis shifts from Mary’s responsibility as mediator to the agency available to the devotee in this salvific exchange. Christ himself is never addressed directly; instead, ‘Wel oghten we thee [Mary] worsshipe & honure / Paleys of Cryst / flour of virginitee’ (lines 64f.). The second half of the poem comprises a catalogue of Mary’s attributes – her virginity, her womb, her role as peace-maker and the opener of Paradise – followed by the introduction of a second addressee, St John, in a concluding section that bears close affinity to the composite Latin prayer, *O intemerata et in aeternum benedicta, specialis et incomparabilis virgo*.³³ This intimation towards a popular and clerically authorized prayer, appearing in psalters, *horae*, and books of private devotion from the twelfth century onwards, has a similar function to the monk’s recital of Our Lady’s Psalter in the ‘Monk who clad the Virgin’. In

each poem, a legitimizing remembrative text authorizes a mode of devotion that is *conuenient* ('appropriate' and 'opportune') to the Virgin – at once deferent to her glory and efficacious in securing her intercession.³⁴ This is a favourite strategy in the devotional verse. Neither the Christian's reverence for the Virgin, nor her attention for the souls of mankind, is tainted by its implicit partiality; they are *conuenient* to one another regardless of self-interest. In the 'Monk who clad the Virgin', the monk's prayers exemplify the 'memorie' that is due to the Annunciation, the Nativity, and Mary's Assumption, which are themselves a model for the devotee's affective response to Christ's Passion. It is almost as an afterthought that the Virgin, now properly adorned, assures the monk that

... for thy trauaille
 Shalt thou be quit / heere in this lyf present,
 And in þat othir / whan thou hens art went
 (HM 744, 6b. 75–7)

Encoded here is a conception of divine 'cheertee' that is granted *in exchange* for 'seruice / honore & plesance', part of an eschatological scheme that transcends the individual, but is all the more worth rehearsing for the shared profit of the devotee!

This particular facility of *remembrance* to petition is aptly demonstrated by the opening lines of the second *Item de beata virgine*, the item that immediately precedes the prologue and the legend of the 'Monk who clad the Virgin' in HM 744:

Syn thou modir of grace hasst euere in mynde
 Alle tho / þat vp on thee han memorie
 Thy remembrance ay ought oure hertes bynde
 Thee for to honure / blisful qweene of glorie
 (HM 744, 5. 1–4)

The exact sense of 'remembrance' here seems to be deliberately ambiguous. The positioning of 'thou, modir of grace' as the subject of lines 1f. creates the expectation that 'Thy remembrance' will refer to Mary's intercession on behalf of 'Alle tho / þat vp-on thee han memorie'; 'oure hertes bynde', therefore, must refer to the security of the hearts or souls of all those Christians that she 'hasst euere in mynde'. In line 4, however, 'Thee for to honure' indicates that the *remembrance* in question is in fact mankind's veneration of Mary, the 'seruice / honore & plesance' prescribed in the prologue to the 'Monk who clad the Virgin'. It seems curious, then, that Hoccleve should postpone this reading by withholding the object of the devotee's honour until the apostrophe's fourth line; indeed, the contortion of syntax necessitates an uncharacteristic elision of the final *-e* in 'bynde' in order to satisfy the poet's fervent adherence to his decasyllabic line.³⁵ This duality of meaning may in fact be exactly the effect that

Hoccleve hoped to achieve. It overtly displays the connotative equivocality upon which the doctrine of Marian intercession relies: the devotee has *remembrance* of Mary as the necessary, but voluntary, corollary of the *remembrance* that she has for mankind. The lines above might be paraphrased as follows: 'since you, Mother of Grace, always have in mind all those that venerate you, your remembrance [Mary's intercession on behalf of mankind, but also mankind's meriting of that intercession] ought to compel us to honour you, blissful queen of glory.' Such is the reciprocal *remembrance* that is *conuenient* to the Virgin, performed simultaneously but apparently disinterestedly to the mediation which she offers in return.

Indirection, *conuenience*, and most vitally, reciprocity: these are Hoccleve's chief petitionary resources in his appeals to the divine, all revolving around a central imperative of *remembrance*. Here, the term is extended to its full semantic range – cognitive, emblematic, and textual. Hoccleve's usage exhibits not only the transmutation of one form of *remembrance* into another, but a deliberate equivocality between them. It allows a gratifying level of agency to the individual devotee who is otherwise at the mercy of an immutable cosmic scheme, a facility, as will be seen below, that is usefully redeployed in Hoccleve's secular begging poetry.

'Patrons and intercessors are close analogues', observes Ethan Knapp, and there is a striking overlap in the petitionary register of Hoccleve's devotional verse and that deployed in his begging poetry.³⁶ Whether the circumstances of Hoccleve's employment as a servant of the Lancastrian regime influenced the supplicatory mode adopted in his religious verse, or whether the petitions made by Hoccleve to his secular lords instead bear the vestiges of devotional practice, cannot adequately be determined – nor are these possibilities mutually exclusive. In what follows, I will proceed to draw attention to the common strategies of petition exhibited in Hoccleve's devotional and begging poetry, as well as their possible precedents. I turn first to the prerequisites for patronage that bear on the production and presentation of Hoccleve's secular but also his religious verse, and which are most overtly illustrated in the Prologue to the *Regiment of Princes* written for the future Henry V.

Hoccleve's career as a clerk of the Privy Seal (1387?–c.1426) coincides with an ongoing transition in the activities of the royal administration out of the king's household and into the more or less formally recognized offices of the Great Seal, the Privy Seal, and, in time, the Signet.³⁷ Knapp has described this 'story of the writing offices' in the late fourteenth and fifteenth centuries as 'a story of private government yielding to depersonalized administration.'³⁸ Hoccleve was dependent on a system of patronage caught between the traditional distribution of royal gratuities, and the institution of new, less dependable, annuities.³⁹ In an age 'seemingly chronically incapable of prompt payment', the petition became a

vital tool in the repertoire of the government servant.⁴⁰ Hoccleve's immersion in petitionary language and protocol, and the centrality of the office of the Privy Seal in handling such complaints, is demonstrated not only by the begging poems written on his own and his associates' behalf, but his vast *Formulary* (London, British Library, Additional MS 24062) compiled in the 1420s, an exemplary collection of warrants, writs, and letters that passed under the Privy Seal during his clerkship.

Hoccleve's case is made all the more remarkable by the extensive documentary evidence we have for his finances – grants, guarantees, and records of payment, some corroborating the requests in his begging poetry, others suggesting that his situation may not have been so desperate as he would have his patrons believe.⁴¹ The 'Hoccleve' who names himself as such to his interlocutor, the Old Man, in the well-known Prologue to the *Regiment* (line 1864) describes an annuity of twenty marks granted to him by the king, but laments that 'paiement is hard to gete adayes' (line 825). His long service as a clerk of the Privy Seal, a 'gretter labour than it seemeth' (line 993), has left him with an aggravated stomach, a sore back, and has ruined his eyesight (lines 1016–29). Marriage has disqualified him from a clerical benefice (lines 1450–6) and he and his fellow clerks are frequently cheated by strangers – claiming to be 'sum lords man' – who commission copying work but then withhold payment (lines 1499–540). The historical Hoccleve did indeed receive an increased annuity of twenty marks on 17 May 1409, though his 1410 Michaelmas instalment had still not been paid by Easter of the following year.⁴² It is 'Hoccleve's companion, the Old Man, who exhorts the plaintiff to 'Conpleyne unto his excellent noblesse [Prince Henry], / As I have herd thee unto me conpleyne' (lines 1849f.). He recommends that 'Hoccleve' 'Endite in Frenssh or Latyn thy greef cleer' (line 1854), perhaps a written petition of the type transcribed in the *Formulary*. The clerk's protest, 'Yit, fadir, of hem [French and Latin] ful small is my taast' (line 1859), is surely disingenuous; yet obliging, the Old Man instead suggests that he 'Wryte to him [the Prince] a goodly tale or two' (line 1902), the ensuing mirror for princes compiled from Aegidius Romanus' *De regimine principum* (1277 × 1281), the pseudo-Aristotelian *Secretum secretorum*, and Jacobus de Cessolis's *De ludo scaccorum* (late thirteenth century). Lines 2017–156, a prologue proper addressed 'Unto my lord the Prince' (line 2016), advocate the worthiness of Hoccleve's sources and the 'profyte' (line 2139) to be derived from his translation, but omit any mention of the outstanding annuity. Yet should we assume that the prince's presentation copy of the *Regiment* (not extant) also included the 2016 line Prologue that is so faithfully preserved in the extensive manuscript tradition, Hoccleve/'Hoccleve' could be relatively assured that his 'conpleynt' would not go unseen.⁴³

Whether the work produced the desired effect is a matter of speculation: Hoccleve eventually received his 1410 Michaelmas payment in July 1411, though

it is not certain that the *Regiment* was by that time complete.⁴⁴ Whatever our reservations regarding Hoccleve's claim of the 'unsikir of my smal flode' (*Regiment*, 41), we can be confident, following John A. Burrow, that

In such cases [when a medieval author names himself in a text] it is ... either false historicism or undue scepticism to deny that the author is most likely 'telling the truth' about himself. ... [I]n many medieval texts the reasons which lead an author to speak of himself are, precisely, practical. ... When seeking the favour of God or some earthly patron, an obvious prime requirement is that one should be identified – otherwise the favour might go to the wrong person.⁴⁵

Burrow's statement highlights some of the similarities but also the essential differences between the petitioner–patron relationship in Hoccleve's devotional verse and those in his begging poems. In both, the speaker's entreaty is for a superior's *remembrance*, either of the recompense due for his poetic, bureaucratic, or personal service, or for the grace of the divine. Such an elevated address is not without a degree of anxiety – real or affected – and when a medieval author 'speaks of himself' to an earthly patron it is often through strategies of indirection such as those observed in Hoccleve's lyrics to the Virgin above. In *La Male Regle de T. Hoccleue* (1405 × 1406), the first 416 lines of the poem are directed not to Hoccleve's historical benefactor, 'my lord the Fourneval ... þat now is tresoreer' (lines 417f.),⁴⁶ but to an allegorical Lord Health who the speaker claims has abandoned him to poverty after his wanton youth in the city. Eva M. Thornley has identified affinities between this pseudo-autobiographical confession and the tone and structure of the penitential lyric.⁴⁷ It is only in the *Male Regle*'s final four stanzas that Furnivall, and the payment of Hoccleve's 'yearly .x. li. [£10] in theschequeer' (line 421), are directly addressed.⁴⁸ Similarly, in the three *chaunceons* at the end of HM 744, another financial 'conpleynante' is inoffensively directed not to a neglectful superior but 'a la dame monoie'; in this case, the historical circumstances of the petition are never made explicit.⁴⁹ In HM 111, the balade and chanceon which 'feurent faites a mon Meistre .H. Somer quant il estot Souztresorer', a speaker playfully compares the Under-Treasurer, Henry Somer's intercession for the payment his salary to the nourishment provided by his celestial namesake, the Sun.⁵⁰ And in a later balade written on behalf of the Temple dining club, 'la Court de la bone compaignie', the same Somer is reminded of his promise to provide dinner for the Court on the following Thursday, framed as a mock-apologetic reply to a letter sent by the Chancellor in which he criticizes the extravagance of previous occasions!⁵¹

In these works, Hoccleve's chief influences are most likely Chaucer's three short begging poems, 'Fortune', 'The complaint of Chaucer to his purse', and 'Lenvoy de Chaucer a Scogan', or perhaps the balades and rondeaux of the late fourteenth-century French courtier-poet Eustache Deschamps.⁵² In Chaucer's begging poems, the 'practical' purpose that motivates these compositions is

less explicit than in Hoccleve. In 'Fortune', commentators may only guess that behind the references to 'povre' (line 2), 'haboundance' (line 29), 'negardye' (line 53), and 'richesse' (lines 53, 58) 'lurks the request for payment of some annuity or grant'.⁵³ In 'To his purse', 'Lenvoy de Chaucer' begs that the 'kyng' (line 24), Henry IV, 'Have mynde upon my supplicacion' (line 26), though the terms of this request never extend beyond the speaker's mock love complaint for the replenishment of his feminized purse.⁵⁴ 'Scogan' is still more obscure. The poem's addressee is most likely Henry Scogan, a squire in the household of Richard II and later tutor to the sons of Henry IV. Chaucer's mention of 'Michelmesse' (line 19) may intimate towards an overdue annuity payment like that cited by Hoccleve in the Prologue to the *Regiment* and the *Male Regle*.⁵⁵ The 'Envoy' exhorts Scogan, 'that knelest at the stremes [the Thames's] hed' (line 43), to 'tenke on Tullius kyndnesse' (line 47) – i.e. the precepts of good friendship set out in Cicero's *De amicitia* – and to 'Mynne [remember] thy frend' (line 48), 'Chaucer', who is 'Forgete in solytarie wildernesse' (line 46). Indirection and an appeal for *remembrance* are both at play here: Scogan is to put in a good word at Westminster for his friend Chaucer, who is prevented either by distance or more likely favour from presenting his petition there himself. The strategy is the same in each of Chaucer's ostensible 'begging' poems: the speaker's complaint is addressed 'not to the potential benefactor [the unspecified "Princes" in "Fortune" (line 73), Henry IV in "To his purse" (line 24), and the Westminster potentates in "Scogan"] but to a third party [his purse, Fortune, and Henry Scogan], as if the former is to be spared any unduly direct or insistent pressure'.⁵⁶ In 'Scogan', the appeal is to friendship, in 'His purse' to love, whilst in 'Fortune', it is the goddess herself who speaks 'Lenvoy de Fortune', begging the princes to relieve the plaintiff's pain so as to put an end to his railing against her! In each, the poet might be said to employ a truly *conuenient* mode of petition – at once persuasive in his plea, but loath to concede a purely fiscal self-interest beneath the Ciceronian, amatory, or Boethian discourse.

Whether Hoccleve lacks his master's subtlety, or Chaucer his follower's need, the younger poet is never so comfortable as to entirely obscure the specifics of his complaints. Beyond allusions to particular debts and obligations, there is internal evidence – in HM III, 16. *Item au Roy que dieu pardoint*, reference to 'The somme þat we in our bill expresse' (line 13), and in HM III, 17. 'Balade to my maister Carpenter', the creditors 'whos names I aboue expresse' (line 8) – that a more formal bill may have accompanied earlier 'presentation' copies of the poems.⁵⁷ This is, as stated by Burrow, only good petitionary practice, yet these invocations of contractual obligation somewhat distance Hoccleve's begging poetry from the *conuenient* or morally appropriate petitioner–patron relationships envisaged in his devotional verse. This is the result, in part, of the marked difference between the 'practical' purpose served by the begging

poem and that traditionally assumed of religious poetry. Acknowledging this difference should alert us to what are diverging applications of a nevertheless shared petitionary register.

Karen Saupe, writing of the Middle English Marian lyric in particular, judges that, '[u]ntil the fifteenth-century, medieval vernacular religious lyrics were composed primarily for functional, not aesthetic, purposes.'⁵⁸ In what Douglas Gray describes as 'the reflective or meditative lyric', the immediate purpose of the text ranges from the hortatory to the contemplative to the paraliturgical; yet in every case, as observed in the devotional verse of HM 744 and HM III, that purpose is relevant to the relationship between God and *all* mankind, not a single lord and his indigent subject.⁵⁹ In contrast even to the penitential mode identified in the *Male Regle*, Hoccleve's interest in his devotional verse transcends the merely personal. By Gray's assessment, as a writer of religious verse, Hoccleve is concerned with the construction of an enduring object not 'for other people to admire, but rather for other people to *use*'; in the second *Item de beata virgine*, the 'Mother of God', and the 'Monk who clad the Virgin', the speaker 'speaks not only for himself, but in the name of many', all desirous of the mediation of the Virgin.⁶⁰ What is more, the petition in these poems is not simply a request; the agency to endow the desired reward – salvation – does not lie solely with the addressee or dedicatee, Mary. The 'Monk who clad the Virgin' requires that the speaker of the prologue (and, by extension, the reader or the auditor of the poem) participates, just like the monk depicted in the legend, in an act of reciprocal *remembrance* – the recitation of the legend and/or the Psalter as the converse to Marian intercession. To understand that *remembrance* only as the inert textual object introduced in the prologue is obviously inadequate; it is endlessly generative: a process of, and the stimulus for, devotion. The legend itself is at once an account of the monk's exemplary worship – his prayers, their emblemizing in the sleeves, and his dissemination of Mary's teaching – and also the material for a textual memorial both of the founding of the Psalter and of the Marian intercession that it invokes. The inscription of the legend, nominally by Hoccleve, constitutes a personal act of *remembrance*, but one in which the reader too is invited to participate and to extend. The legend, its written record, and the Psalter that they mutually propagate, 'directs the reader's mind to the *memoria* of an event in the divine scheme [i.e. the Annunciation, the Nativity, and the Assumption]'.⁶¹ The revelation of God's mercy is consequent, indeed inherent, to that recollection.

Hoccleve's begging poetry and his devotional verse re-converge, I suggest, in this notion of reciprocal *remembrance* encoded in the production or performance of remembrative texts. The complaint of the devotional verse may be spoken 'in the name of many', but the fact remains that in each rehearsal it is the voice of an individual. The 'T. Marleburgh' of the 'Monk who clad the Virgin'

is not the only instance of a named patron for Hoccleve's devotional verse – a quintessentially Hocclevean reminder of the personal significance that pertains to even the most conventional discourse.⁶² In the religious poetry of HM 744 and HM III, the devotee, like all Christians, is accounted for by the contract of redemption signed by Christ's death; yet as is demonstrated by the repeated recourse to *remembrance* in these poems, an agency of one's own, and in particular, the capacity to produce and recite remembrative texts in a quasi-salvific exchange, is a powerful consolation for the Christian soul.

Knapp, writing of the 'Monk who clad the Virgin', is concerned by the apparently unstable identity that this proposed salvific exchange ascribes to the poem's dedicatee, Mary:

As Mary's capacity to act as mediatrix was made dependent on the memorial act of the supplicant in 'Item de beata virgine' [see my discussion of HM 744, 5. above], so is Mary's physical state [her clothing in the miraculous sleeves] made dependent on the action of the monk. ... In each poem, we see the presence of a peculiarly self-reflexive spirituality, one in which the agency of the intercessor and supplicant are curiously mixed. ... [T]heir imbrication of the agencies of supplicant and intercessor suggest, remarkably, that Mary's identity is not entirely self-sufficient, that it requires the supplemental action of worshippers.⁶³

Given that what Knapp is approaching here is a conception of the reciprocal *remembrance* that underpins Hoccleve's devotional verse, it is somewhat surprising – in his study of the 'bureaucratic' element in Hoccleve's poetry – that he has not considered the petitionary strain evident in this 'imbrication of the agencies of supplicant and intercessor'.

The most illustrious instances in Hoccleve's shorter secular verse of an act or object of *remembrance* that not only honours but in part constitutes the capacity for patronage of the dedicatee are HM III, 15., the balade which 'fuest mise en le fin du liure del Regiment des Princes',⁶⁴ and the similar items, HM III, 9. 'Balade to my gracious Lord of York' and HM III, II. 'Ce feust mys en le liure de monseigneur Iohan lors nommez / ore Regent de France & Duc de Bedford'. In each poem, Hoccleve has adopted another distinctly Chaucerian strategy of indirection, addressing his verse to the 'littel book [i.e. the *Regiment*]' (HM III, 15., 1), the 'litle pamfilet' (HM III, 9. 1), and in the final stanza of the Bedford balade, 'Thow book [probably another copy of the *Regiment*]' (line 19), in which copies of each item would have originally been included.⁶⁵ The book is admonished for its rudeness but redeemed by its good intentions to the dedicatee, 'Thogh thow nat do him due reuerence / In words / thy cheertee nat is the lesse' (HM III, 15., 13f.). It is hardly an imaginative leap for the 'cheertee' of the book and the favour requested from its prospective patron to be reapplied to the actual supplicant, the poet, himself. These balades propose a mutually ameliorative relationship between the book and its writer and the aristocratic

dedicatee and the realm, much like that envisaged in the prologue proper to the *Regiment*. Meyer-Lee amongst others has observed the implicit reciprocity in the exemplary rule prescribed by the *Regiment* and its preliminaries – ‘if Hoccleve may perform a service for the prince while improving his own condition, then, by analogy, the prince may best serve his own interests by improving the conditions of the realm’.⁶⁶ Whether we choose to read Hoccleve as an authorized participant within a Lancastrian policy of royal self-representation, or credit him with a rather more independent, commentating voice, the fact remains that in such requests for the ‘benigne audience’ (*Regiment*, line 2149) of his superiors the poet is not only acknowledging but *creating* patrons for his work.⁶⁷ The balades at once petition but also advertise the ‘licence of my lords grace’ (HM III, II. 19).⁶⁸ As in the *Regiment*, in each poem the dedicatee is constructed as a benevolent and praiseworthy lord, but, more importantly, as a discerning *literary* patron.⁶⁹ The full extent of these mutually ameliorative writer–reader/petitioner–patron relationships in Hoccleve’s vernacular literary projects must be the subject for another study; it should be clear, however, that *remembrance* in Hoccleve’s verse can be reciprocal, even *conuenient*, without necessarily involving the divine.

A final and perhaps the most direct secular analogue for the reciprocal *remembrance* encoded in the ‘Monk who clad the Virgin’ is the first balade to Henry Somer cited above. Here, the presentation of a remembrative text ‘imbricating’ the agencies of both supplicant and intercessor is re-purposed to a more familiar address. In this item, Somer, Under-Treasurer in the Exchequer, is compared to the Sun which ‘*wit*h his bemes of brightnesse / To man so kindly is & norisshynge’ (HM III, 13. 1f.). Continuing the Somer/‘Sonne’ conceit, the speaker appeals on behalf of ‘Hoccleue & Baillay / Hethe & Offorde’ (line 25f.) that Somer ‘Haastith our heruest [the Michaelmas annuity payment alluded to in line 14] / as soone as yee may’ (27) and envisions that, were their salaries paid, the clerks’ Christmastime revels might begin.⁷⁰ The balade ends ‘And yit this roundel shul we synge & seye | In trust of yow / & honour of your name’ (lines 31f.), followed by a roundel with a decorated initial transcribed in full below:

Somer þæt ripest mannes sustenance
 With holsum hete of the Sonnes warmnesse
 Al kynde of man thee holden is to bless
 Ay thankid be thy friendly gouernance
 And thy fresh looke of mirthe & of gladnesse
 Somer &c

To heuy folke / of thee the remembrance
 Is salue & oynement to hir seeknesse
 For why / we thus shul synge in Cristemesse
 Somer &c

(HM III, 13. 33–40)

The reappearance of 'remembrance' in the seventh line of the roundel should alert us to the multiple available readings for this proffered laudatory text. The verses have ostensibly been inscribed in 'trust' and 'honour' of Somer and his anticipated remuneration of the speaker and his associates. Yet this usage of *remembrance* introduces an equivocality much like that in the opening lines of the second *Item de beata virgine* above. Is the 'salue' to 'heuy folke' described in lines 38f. the *remembrance* that Somer has for the needy; or is this instead the comfort derived from the petitioners' own meditation on their benefactor's 'friendly gouernance'? That the roundel will only be performed should the clerks receive their payments would imply that the giver of this particular *remembrance* is Somer. Yet by appearing in the holograph, the text, if it has not already performed this laudatory purpose, certainly does now. That the piece is arranged as a roundel, with a repeated refrain as if to be sung, suggests that, within the fiction of the balade at least, this is an object not simply to be admired but to be used, a stimulus rather than an artefact of *remembrance*. It will be sung, it seems, regardless of whether Somer pays; indeed, it is crucial in securing that payment. The 'trust' which it celebrates it also enacts; Somer not only warrants such praise, the praise is his reminder to warrant it. The roundel's final line before the last burden does not determine who is holding who in *remembrance* in this text; it is unambiguous, however, in the necessity of that act, 'For why [i.e. for this reason] / we thus shul synge in Cristemesse.'

The similarities here to reciprocal *remembrance* encoded in the prologue to the 'Monk who clad the Virgin' are manifold. 'And to þat ende / heere is a remembrance' presents the ensuing legend as at once a textual memorial of the Virgin's mercy towards the monk but also, in the emblem of the recited *Aves* weaving her garment, an aetiology for the Psalter – how it 'primo erat inuentum' – and the means by which the Christian devotee might seek similar favour. Like the roundel to Somer, and the monk's prayer in the legend itself, this text/textile honours and implicitly motivates the intercession of the patron. This motivation purports to operate not simply through self-interest but rather *conuenience* – the mutual compulsion of the supplicant and addressee towards a relationship of patronage that is beneficial to both. Such 'imbrication of agencies' should hardly startle us, the prologue and the legend of the 'Monk who clad the Virgin' enacts a properly functioning textual–patronage exchange of the type envisaged, but awaiting reciprocation, in the Prologue to the *Regiment* and the balades to Prince Henry, the Duke of York, and the Duke of Bedford. Yet as has been seen, as a devotional verse with universal utility, the specifically salvific exchange depicted in the 'Monk who clad the Virgin' is not restricted to a single supplicant. The narrator's final exhortation, 'Hir psalter for to seye / let vs fonde', directs the reader, like the incumbents of the abbey, to imitate the monk's exemplary practice. In a final amplification of the 'seruice / honore &

plesance' prescribed in the prologue, the devotee is directed not merely to recite but to *fonde* – 'attempt' or 'undertake' – the Psalter. Mary is finally consolidated as a patron of remembrative texts, and every participant in the reduplication of her Psalter is the shared beneficiary of the monk's commission.

The intention of this study has been to draw critical attention within the still burgeoning field of Hoccleve studies to the devotional verse that makes up so considerable a proportion of the poet's literary output. One strategy of revalorizing Hoccleve's somewhat unfashionable religious poetry has been to suggest its points of intersection with the 'Hocclevean' poetic constructed from his overtly bookish and self-referential secular works. In late medieval England, there are few aspects of literature or life in which 'religion' is entirely invisible, though it is important to remember that influence can work in both directions. I would urge caution in overstating the analogy between Hoccleve's devotional verse and his begging poetry in its entirety. Not least amongst their differences, devotional verse is typically conceived as a depersonalized mode with universal significance, whilst begging poems are shaped to the needs of an individual on a particular occasion. That said, it is difficult to ignore the striking moments in which the petitionary register identified in Hoccleve's religious poetry is redeployed in the service of the financial complaint. The techniques of indirection and evocations of *conuenient* and reciprocal *remembrance* evident in the 'Monk who clad the Virgin', the 'Mother of God', and the other devotional items in HM 744 and HM III can be utilized for petitions of a more earthly nature. My analysis of this register has been largely confined to Hoccleve's shorter works in the Huntington Holographs; I would suggest, however, that an alertness to its potential may inform our readings of some of the most familiar and less obviously supplicatory passages in Hoccleve's longer works. Whether his justification of the Chaucer portrait included in the *Regiment* – 'That they that han of him lost thought and mynde | By this peynture may ageyn him fynde' (lines 4997f.) – the admonition in the 'Address to Sir John Oldcastle' that the heretic 'Haue of thy synnes heuy remembrance' and 'Ryse vp a manly knight out of the slow' (HM III, 2. 92 and 105), or in 'Thomas Hocclives complaint' in the *Series*, the destabilizing account of how '... the substaunce / of my memory | went to pley ...' (Cosin V.iii.9, 1. 50f.), anxious evocations of memory and *remembrance* are recurrent in Hoccleve. In these last instances, the figure to be remembered is dead, absent, or staring back from a mirror. Yet even here, each appeal is to the promise of an ostensibly pre-existing concord or authority, reactivated by the agency of the subject seeking favour. They are a reaction, perhaps, to the financial and confessional solvency that is 'hard to gete adayes' – essays in a supplicatory poetics where literary, spiritual, or mental integrity is facilitated, yet in theory already assured, by acts and objects of *remembrance*.

NOTES

This work was supported by AHRC Northern Bridge (grant number AH/L503927/1).

¹ See the seminal, oft-cited essays on Hoccleve's holograph manuscripts and their significance as early manifestations of literary self-consciousness in English: John A. Burrow, 'Hoccleve's *Series*: experience and books', in *Fifteenth-Century Studies: Recent Essays*, ed. Robert F. Yeager (Hamden, Conn., 1984), pp. 259–73; and John M. Bowers, 'Hoccleve's Huntington holographs: the first "Collected Poems" in English', *Fifteenth Century Studies*, 15 (1989), 27–51. In the past twenty years, important book-length studies on Hoccleve have similarly characterized the poet as above all a reader and maker of books; see *Thomas Hoccleve's 'Complaint' and 'Dialogue'*, ed. Burrow, EETS, os 313 (Oxford, 1999), esp. pp. ix–lxv; Nicholas Perkins, *Hoccleve's 'Regiment of Princes': Counsel and Constraint* (Cambridge, 2001); Ethan Knapp, *The Bureaucratic Muse: Thomas Hoccleve and the Literature of Late Medieval England* (University Park, Pa, 2001); and David Watt, *The Making of Thomas Hoccleve's 'Series'* (Liverpool, 2013). For physical descriptions of the holograph manuscripts, see *Thomas Hoccleve: A Facsimile of the Autograph Verse Manuscripts*, ed. Burrow and A. I. Doyle, EETS, ss 19 (Oxford, 2002), pp. xx–xxviii. For the dating of Hoccleve's death early in 1426, and certainly before 8 May 1426, when his corrody in Southwick Priory was granted to Alice Penfold to be held 'en manere et fourme come Thomas Ocle ja trespasse', see Burrow, *Thomas Hoccleve* (Aldershot, 1994), pp. 29f. My datings for the composition of Hoccleve's works follow Burrow's conclusions in *Hoccleve* and 'Thomas Hoccleve: some redatings', *Review of English Studies*, 46 (1995), 366–72.

² Bowers, 'Huntington holographs'. Bowers develops Doyle and M. B. Parkes's suggestion that HM 744 – with its incomplete or lost final quire(s) – and HM 111 – which is missing at least one initial leaf – might have originally been intended to form a single volume. See Doyle and Parkes, 'The production of copies of the *Canterbury Tales* and the *Confessio Amantis* in the early fifteenth century', in *Medieval Scribes, Manuscripts and Libraries: Essays Presented to N. R. Ker*, ed. Parkes and Andrew G. Watson (London, 1978), pp. 163–210 (p. 182 n. 38). This suggestion is withdrawn in Burrow and Doyle's discussion of the relationship of HM 111 and HM 744 in their facsimile edition, p. xxvii.

³ 'The compleynte of the Virgin before the Cross', in HM 111, 'Lerne to dye', in HM 744, and 'Thomas Hocclives complaint', in Cosin V.iii.9 are incomplete. A complete scribal text of the 'Compleynte of the Virgin', together with five final stanzas probably not by Hoccleve, appears in London, British Library, Egerton MS 615, fols 63^v–66^v; 'Lerne to dye' is included in the holograph *Series* as well as seven scribal copies; the first 308 lines of the 'Complaint' in Cosin V.iii.9 are supplied in the hand of John Stow and there are also five complete scribal texts. See Burrow, *Hoccleve*, 50–4. Linne R. Mooney has argued that the early revision of the *Regiment* in London, British Library, Royal MS 17.D.xviii is also in Hoccleve's hand. See Mooney, 'A holograph copy of Thomas Hoccleve's *Regiment of Princes*', *Studies in the Age of Chaucer*, 33 (2011), 263–96.

⁴ A reception initiated by the sympathetic if condescending assessment of Hoccleve and his works by his first modern editor, Frederick J. Furnivall. See *Hoccleve's Works: The Minor Poems*, ed. Furnivall and Israel Gollancz, rev. Doyle and Jerome Mitchell, EETS, es 61 and 73 (London, 1970 (first published 1892 and 1925)), pp. vii–xlix. Characteristically

disparaging remarks on Hoccleve's metre, his apparently insipid character, the poet's uninspired imitation of Chaucer, and his 'dullness' also notably appear in H. S. Bennett, *Chaucer and the Fifteenth-Century* (Oxford, 1947), pp. 148f.; C. S. Lewis, *The Discarded Image* (Cambridge, 1964), p. 204; and Derek Pearsall, 'The English Chaucerians', in *Chaucer and Chaucerians: Critical Studies in Middle English Literature*, ed. D. S. Brewer (London, 1966), pp. 20–9 (pp. 222–5).

⁵ Views espoused by Perkins, Knapp, and Watt. Important essays on Hoccleve's deliberate self-anthologizing and literary reflexivity include Burrow, 'Experience and books' and 'Autobiographical poetry in the Middle Ages: the case of Thomas Hoccleve', in *Middle English Literature: British Academy Gollancz Lectures*, ed. Burrow (Oxford, 1989), pp. 223–46; D. C. Greetham, 'Self-referential artifacts: Hoccleve's persona as a literary device', *Modern Philology*, 86/3 (1989), 242–51; James Simpson, 'Madness and texts: Hoccleve's *Series*', in *Chaucer and Fifteenth-Century Poetry*, ed. Julia Boffey and Janet Cowen (London, 1991), pp. 15–29; and John J. Thompson, 'Thomas Hoccleve and manuscript culture', in *Nation, Court and Culture*, ed. Helen Cooney (Dublin, 2001), pp. 81–94. Notable studies of Hoccleve's engagement with Lancastrian politics and systems of patronage include Anthony J. Hasler, 'Hoccleve's unregimented body', *Paraph*, 13 (1990), 164–83; Pearsall, 'Hoccleve's *Regiment of Princes*: the poetics of royal self-representation', *Speculum*, 69 (1994), 386–410; Judith Ferster, *Fictions of Advice: The Literature and Politics of Counsel in Late Medieval England* (Philadelphia, Pa, 1996), pp. 137–59; Robert Meyer-Lee, *Poets and Power from Chaucer to Wyatt* (Cambridge, 2007), pp. 88–124; Jenni Nuttall, *The Creation of Lancastrian Kingship: Literature, Language and Politics in Late Medieval England* (Cambridge, 2007), pp. 55–72 and 'Thomas Hoccleve's poems for Henry V: anti-occasional verse and ecclesiastical reform', *Oxford Handbooks Online* (Oxford, 2015), 1–24. <<http://oxfordhandbooks.com/view/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199935338.001.0001/oxfordhb-9780199935338-e-61>> (accessed 11 Apr. 2018).

⁶ The *Hoccleve Bibliography* (in progress) compiled by the International Hoccleve Society lists twenty-four articles and book chapters published since 2015. Only one, Heather Blurton and Hannah Johnson, 'Reading the *Prioress's Tale* in the fifteenth century: Lydgate, Hoccleve, and Marian devotion', *The Chaucer Review*, 50/1–2 (2015), 134–58, treats Hoccleve's short, devotional verse in detail. <<https://hocclevesociety.org/the-hoccleve-bibliography/>> (accessed 24 Sept. 2018). Rare dedicated discussions of Hoccleve's devotional verse include Beverly Boyd, 'Hoccleve's Miracle of the Virgin', *The University of Texas Studies in English*, 35 (1956), 116–22; Charity Scott Stokes, 'Thomas Hoccleve's "Mother of God" and "Balade to the Virgin and Christ": Latin and Anglo-Norman sources', *MÆ*, 64/1 (1995), 74–84; Knapp, *Bureaucratic Muse*, pp. 129–58; Jennifer E. Bryan, 'Hoccleve, the Virgin, and the politics of complaint', *PMLA*, 117/5 (2002), 1172–87 and *Looking Inward: Devotional Reading and Private Self in Late Medieval England* (Philadelphia, Pa, 2008), pp. 176–203; and Blurton and Johnson, 'Reading the *Prioress's Tale*'. This imbalance in Hoccleve studies will hopefully begin to be redressed by Sebastian J. Langdell's study, forthcoming at the time of writing, *Thomas Hoccleve: Religious Reform, Transnational Poetics, and the Invention of Chaucer* (Exeter, 2018).

⁷ Discussed in Boyd, 'Miracle of the Virgin'; Knapp, *Bureaucratic Muse*, pp. 152–4; and Blurton and Johnson, 'Reading the *Prioress's Tale*' and *The Critics and the Prioress: Antisemitism, Criticism, and Chaucer's 'Prioress's Tale'* (Ann Arbor, Mich., 2017), pp. 176–9.

Boyd's commentary is a useful literary-historical introduction to the text; Knapp and Blurton and Johnson incorporate their brief treatments of the 'Monk who clad the Virgin' into arguments concerning Hoccleve's use of 'figural hagiography' in his religious poetry (see n. 27) and Chaucer's fifteenth-century reception as a Marian poet.

⁸ Meyer-Lee, *Poets and Power*, p. 89.

⁹ In the past decade, contributions by Andrew Cole, 'Thomas Hoccleve's heretics', in *Literature and Heresy in the Age of Chaucer* (Cambridge, 2008), pp. 103–30; and Shannon Gayk, *Image, Texts, and Religious Reform in Fifteenth-Century England* (Cambridge, 2010), pp. 45–83, have been interested to contest Hoccleve's assumed orthodoxy within the atmosphere of religious censorship and reform after Arundel's *Constitutions* of 1409. In the *Regiment* in particular, Hoccleve has been seen to adopt 'a more merciful orthodoxy against its severest, juridical forms' (Cole, 'Hoccleve's heretics', p. 106); yet, as noted above, there have been few sustained studies of Hoccleve's own, most overtly religious writings in HM 744 and HM 111 as part of his broader corpus.

¹⁰ Bennett, *Chaucer and the Fifteenth Century*, p. 147.

¹¹ Quotations from Hoccleve's verse, excluding the *Regiment*, are transcribed (with expanded abbreviations) from Burrow and Doyle's facsimile. In-text references give the manuscript (HM 111, HM 744, or Cosin V.iii.9), the position of the item in the holograph section, and the line number. All references to the *Regiment* are to Hoccleve, *The Regiment of Princes*, ed. Charles Blythe (Kalamazoo, Mich., 1999).

¹² The title ascribed to the work in *The Minor Poems*, pp. 290f. This revision of Furnivall and Gollancz's two volumes remains the only edition of Hoccleve's complete minor poems. Doyle and Mitchell retain many of the original editors' editorial errors and inconsistencies; for the sake of accuracy, I have therefore returned to the holographs for all quotations (see n. 11) and occasionally use Furnivall and Gollancz's titles only for convenience. The poem is also printed as 'The monk and Our Lady's sleeves' in Boyd, *The English Miracles of the Virgin* (Princeton, NJ, 1964), pp. 50–5; and in *'My Compleinte' and Other Poems*, ed. Roger Elis (Exeter, 2001), pp. 88–91. The alternative title is from the Latin incipit to the copy of the text in Cambridge, Trinity College, MS R.3 21, fols 274^v–275^v: 'quomodo psalterium beate marie primo erat inuentum per quendam monachum monasterij sancti Egidij in regno Francie miraculose'. The only other extant text, Oxford, Christ Church, MS 152, fols 229^r–231^r, is presented as a Canterbury Tale assigned to the Ploughman; it is printed in *A New Ploughman's Tale: Thomas Hoccleve's Legend of the Virgin and her Sleeveless Garment, with a Spurious Link*, ed. Arthur Beatty (London, 1902); and *The Canterbury Tales: Fifteenth-Century Continuations and Additions*, ed. Bowers (Kalamazoo, Mich., 1992), pp. 26–30.

¹³ HM 744, 4. *Ad beatam virginem* and 5. *Item de beata virgine* at fols 31^r–32^v and 33^r–36^r respectively.

¹⁴ 'Ce feust faicte a linstance de .T. Marleburgh'. Identified as Thomas Marleburgh, a London stationer and warden of the Limners and Textwriters Guild in 1423. Burrow, *Hoccleve*, p. 25.

¹⁵ For an accessible account of the development of the monastic 'Marian psalters', originating around 1130, through to the proliferation of rosary confraternities and the *Vita Christi* rosary at the end of the fifteenth century, see Anne Winston-Allen, *Stories of the Rose: The Making of the Rosary in the Middle Ages* (University Park, Pa, 1997).

Boyd gives an overview of those Middle English miracles that treat the recital of the *Ave Maria* and its associated texts; each legend 'was evidently intended to teach what someone considered the correct way to recite Our Lady's Psalter'. Boyd, 'Miracle of the Virgin', pp. 118f. Earlier Middle English versions of the 'The monk who clad the Virgin' appear in Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Digby 86, fols 130^v–132^r and Edinburgh, National Library of Scotland, Advocates' MS 19.2.1, fols 259^v–260^r, though the 'scripture' cited at line 22 of Hoccleve's work is unknown. Blurton and Johnson, in 'Reading the *Prioress's Tale*', contend that the 'Monk who clad the Virgin', like Lydgate's *Legend of Dan Joos* (see below), may have been written as a response to Chaucer's *Prioress's Tale* (the suggestion had been made of *Dan Joos* in Boyd, 'The literary background of Lydgate's *The Legend of Dan Joos*', *Modern Language Notes*, 72 (1957), 81–7 (pp. 86f)).

¹⁶ Unlikely to connote nakedness, but rather the absence of the fashionably laced sleeves worn over an undergarment; compare the 'bastyng' of the dreamer's 'slevis' in Chaucer's translation of *The Romaunt of the Rose*, in *The Riverside Chaucer*, ed. Larry D. Benson (Boston, Mass., 1987), line 104. All references to the works of Chaucer are to this edition.

¹⁷ *OED*, s.v. 'remembrance', *n.*

¹⁸ See *OED*, s.v. 'memory', *n.*; 'memorial', *adj.* and *n.*; and 'commemoration', *n.*

¹⁹ *MED*, s.v. 'remembren', *v.*, 1 (a) and 2.

²⁰ See Mary Carruthers's classic study of *memoria* in the rhetorical tradition, *The Book of Memory: A Study of Memory in Medieval Culture* (Cambridge, 1990).

²¹ *MED*, s.v. 'remembrance' *n.*, 1 (a), 2 (a), and 3. John Gower, *Confessio Amantis*, 3 vols, ed. Russell A. Peck, trans. Andrew Galloway (Kalamazoo, Mich., 2006). II, book IV, lines 448–50.

²² On fols 165^v–167^r and 236^r–237^v; also extant, with stanzas xiv–xvii omitted, in London, British Library, Harley MS 2251, fols 70^v–72^r.

²³ Not specified in Lydgate's text, but named in his source for the legend: Vincent de Beauvais's *Speculum historiale* (completed c.1247), book VII, ch. cxvi.

²⁴ Lydgate, *The Legend of Dan Joos*, in *The Minor Poems of John Lydgate*, 2 vols, ed. H. N. MacCracken, EETS, ES 107 and OS 192 (London, 1961), I, 311–15. All references to *Dan Joos* are to this edition.

²⁵ The interjection of the narrator at lines 43f., 'Dystynctly in Latyn here may ye rede echone, / Folowyng these baladys as for youre plesaunce', suggests that earlier copies of the legend may have been followed by the text of the psalms themselves – a further record, representation, and rehearsal of Dan Joos's *MARIA remembrance*.

²⁶ *MED*, s.v. 'fonden' *v.*, 7 and 8.

²⁷ Not included here (with the exception of those examples in the 'Monk who clad the Virgin') are the related (but not perfectly cognate) apostrophes that God the Father, the Son, Mary, or man 'considere', 'reuolve in thy thought', 'haue in mynde', or most frequently, 'beholde' Christ's Passion or alternatively, the souls of mankind. For a more dedicated discussion of the aspects of affective piety in Hoccleve's religious poetry, see Knapp's provocative chapter, 'Hoccleve and heresy: image, memory, and the vanishing mediator', in *Bureaucratic Muse*, pp. 129–58. Knapp's contention, that 'Hoccleve's religious poetry is largely based on a technique I refer to here as figural hagiography, an extension of the use of the visual image into the creation of verbal icons representing exemplary devotional figures' (p. 133), intersects with the emblematic sense of *remembrance* described above.

²⁸ Quotations from 'Lerne to die', lines 673–938 (not extant in the incomplete HM III text) are from Cosin V.iii.9.

²⁹ From the lost opening of the poem (lines 1–43, at 22f.) extant in Egerton 615 (see n. 3), printed as 'A lamentacioun of the grene tree, complaynyng of the losyng of hire appil', in *Hoccleve's Works: III. The Regement of Princes*, ed. Furnivall (London, 1897), pp. xxxvii–xlv.

³⁰ *mingen*, from the Old English *mynegian* or *myndgian* ('to remember, be mindful of'), is a near cognate of *remembren*, though in the fifteenth century it is found mostly in romance, hagiography, and devotional works. See *MED*, s.v. 'mingen' *v*.

³¹ A single poem only is addressed to God the Father (HM 744, 1. *Inuocacio ad patrem*), two to the Son (HM 744, 2. *Ad filium Honor et Gloria* and HM III, 19. *Ceste balade ensuyante feust translatee au commandement de mon Meistre Robert Chichele*), and one to the Holy Spirit (HM 744, 2. *Ad spiritum sanctum*).

³² This conception of the Passion as a contract securing man's salvation is gratuitously expressed in the popular Middle English tradition of the 'Charter of Christ', in which the charter endowing man with the kingdom of heaven is imagined as written in Christ's blood on the parchment of his skin; see Hoccleve's reference to the tradition in the *Regiment*: 'Him [Christ] lothid nat His precious body sprede / Upon the Crois, this lord benign and good; / He wroot our charte of mercy with His blood' (lines 3337–9). I owe this observation to Perkins, *Counsel and Constraint*, p. 148.

³³ The relationship between the latter section of the 'Mother of God' and *O intemerata* is examined in Stokes, "Mother of God" and "Virgin and Christ", pp. 76–9.

³⁴ See *MED*, s.v. 'conuenient' *adj.*, 1. The appearances in the *Regiment* of *conuenient* and its antonym, *inconuenient*, are illustrative of the sense of duty but also personal advantage implicit in the term: in the section 'de fide observanda', 'inconvenience' is used as a synonym for oath-breaking (line 2242); in 'De justitia', it is acknowledged that 'it be leful and convenient' for a skilled man to offer advice for a fee (line 2711); 'De castitate' begins, 'To chastitee purpose y now to haste, / Which covenable is and convenient / Unto a kyng for to savoure and taast' (lines 3627–9); and in the same section, attention is drawn to the 'inconvenience', specifically lechery, that follows intoxication by wine (line 3831).

³⁵ Hoccleve's rigid use of the decasyllabic line has been long observed and maligned for its apparently thwarted stresses. Burrow, in one of a number of more sympathetic reappraisals of Hoccleve's metre in the holographs, concludes that '[t]here can be no doubt that wherever Hoccleve writes <e> in unstressed position (most often, but not always, final) it is to be pronounced as a syllabic /ə/, despite the likelihood that, by the 1420s, 'pronunciation of final /ə/ had already become a thing of the past in spoken English.' *'Complaint' and 'Dialogue'*, ed. Burrow, p. xxix. Judith A. Jefferson has proposed that for Hoccleve, 'the maintenance of the decasyllabic line is a metrical requirement but this does not appear to be the case as far as the five-beat line is concerned'. Jefferson, 'The Hoccleve holographs and Hoccleve's metrical practice: more than counting syllables?', *Parergon*, 18/1 (2000), 203–26 (p. 223). In HM 744, 5. 3, Hoccleve's syntactic gymnastics have produced a line of the type identified by Jefferson in which the final *-e* must be elided in order to avoid an extra-metrical syllable (see p. 219).

³⁶ Knapp, *Bureaucratic Muse*, p. 156.

³⁷ The date for Hoccleve's entry into the office of the Privy Seal is based on Hoccleve's statement in the *Regiment*, composed between 1410 and 1413, that he serves and dwells

'Unto the Seel, and have twenti yeer | And foure come Estren, and that is neer' (lines 804–5); he is described in an entry in the Issue Rolls dated 4 March 1426 as 'nuper uni clericorum in officio privati sigilli regis'. Burrow, *Hoccleve*, p. 2 and pp. 29f.

³⁸ Knapp, *Bureaucratic Muse*, p. 23; the most authoritative account of this transition remains T. F. Tout, *Chapters in the Administrative History of Medieval England*, 6 vols (Manchester, 1920–33), V, 1–160; see further A. L. Brown, 'The Privy Seal clerks in the early fifteenth century', in *The Study of Medieval Records: Essays in Honor of Kathleen Major*, ed. D. A. Bullough and R. L. Storey (Oxford, 1971), pp. 260–81.

³⁹ A sum to be paid out of the Exchequer in two instalments at Easter and Michaelmas. The first record of a payment made in this way appears in the Issue Rolls for 1356, where the annuity is described as the king's gift ('de dono regis'). Tout, *Chapters*, pp. 85f.

⁴⁰ Burrow, *Hoccleve*, p. 8.

⁴¹ A comprehensive record of the known documentary references to Hoccleve, mostly in the Issue and Patent Rolls, is given in Burrow's Appendix, *ibid.*, pp. 33–49; hundreds more documents written by Hoccleve for the Privy Seal and other government offices have been identified in Mooney, 'Some new light on Thomas Hoccleve', *Studies in the Age of Chaucer*, 29 (2007), 293–340; and Helen Katherine Spencer Killick, 'Thomas Hoccleve as poet and clerk' (unpub. Ph.D. diss., University of York, 2010), pp. 17–51 and 187–34.

⁴² Patent Roll, 10 Henry IV, pt 2. PRO C66/381. Burrow, *Hoccleve*, Appendix no. 28.

⁴³ Forty-three complete or substantial manuscript copies of the *Regiment* survive, along with two fragments of a forty-fourth. All but two contain or originally contained the entire poem, including two manuscripts, London, British Library, Arundel MS 38 and Harley MS 4866, which were almost certainly made as presentation copies, perhaps under Hoccleve's supervision, but do not appear to have been intended for the prince. Kate Harris has drawn attention to the arms of John Mowbray, Duke of Norfolk (1392–1432), appearing in Arundel 38 as evidence for the manuscript's original patron. Harris, 'The patron of British Library MS. Arundel 38', *Notes & Queries*, NS 31 (1984), 462f. M. C. Seymour has suggested that John, Duke of Bedford (1389–1435), or Edward, Duke of York (c.1373–1415), may have been the original recipient of Harley 4866, although the two dedicatory balades in HM 111 (see below) upon which Seymour bases these conjectures appear to have been intended rather for a collection of shorter poems and a holograph *Regiment* respectively. Seymour, 'The manuscripts of Hoccleve's *Regiment of Princes*', *Edinburgh Bibliographical Transactions*, vol. 4, pt 7 (1974), 255–97 (p. 269); refuted in Burrow, *Hoccleve*, p. 18 n. 71.

⁴⁴ Issue Roll, Easter, 11 Henry IV, PRO E403/605. See Burrow, *Hoccleve*, Appendix no. 32. Recent studies, including Nuttall's contribution to the *Oxford Handbooks* series, have challenged the largely unsubstantiated critical convention that, after the publication of the *Regiment*, Hoccleve briefly enjoyed favour as 'a kind of official court poet' (Pearsall, 'Royal self-representation', p. 410). Nuttall, 'Anti-occasional verse', pp. 4f.

⁴⁵ Burrow, 'The poet as petitioner', in *Essays on Medieval Literature*, ed. Burrow (Oxford, 1984), pp. 161–76 (pp. 161f.).

⁴⁶ Thomas Nevill, 5th Baron Furnivall (c.1362–1407), head of the Exchequer from Dec. 1404 to Mar. 1407.

⁴⁷ Thornley, 'The Middle English penitential lyric and Hoccleve's autobiographical poetry', *Neophilologische Mitteilungen*, 68 (1967), 295–321.

⁴⁸ The sidenote to lines 423f. in HM 111 (fol. 25^v, lines 7f.), 'Annus ille fuit annus restrictionis annuitatum', allows the poem to be dated between Michaelmas 1405 and 26 March the following year. The Issue Rolls of this period record no payments to Hoccleve, despite that due for the twelve months between Easter 1404 and 1405, during which Parliament had suspended all payment of annuities because of a financial crisis. Burrow, *Hoccleve*, p. 15.

⁴⁹ HM 744, 9. 'Cy ensuent trios chaunceons / l'une . conpleynante a la dame monoie . & lautre la response dele a cellui qui se conpleynt & la tierce / la commendacion de ma dame.'

⁵⁰ HM 111, 13. 'Cestes Balade & chanceon ensuyantz feurent faites a mon Meistre .H. Somer quant il estoit Souztresorer;' Henry Somer (1370–1450) was Under-Treasurer at the Exchequer 1408–10 and Chancellor from 1410.

⁵¹ HM 111, 18., 'Ceste balade ensuyante feust par la Court de bone compaignie enuoiee a lonure sire Henri Somer Chaunceller de Leschequer & vn de la dicte Court.'

⁵² The relationship between Chaucer and Hoccleve's begging poetry (as well as that of Gower and the Scottish makar William Dunbar) is discussed in Burrow, 'Poet as petitioner'; for the suggestion of the influence of Deschamps, see Burrow, 'Hoccleve and the Middle French poets', in *The Long Fifteenth Century: Essays for Douglas Gray*, ed. Helen Cooper and Sally Mapstone (Oxford, 1997), pp. 35–49 (p. 45).

⁵³ A. J. Minnis, V. J. Scattergood, and J. J. Smith, *Oxford Guides to Chaucer: The Shorter Poems* (Oxford, 1995), p. 506.

⁵⁴ See also the amplification of this conceit in the mortally ill purse of Lydgate's only begging poem, the 'Letter to Gloucester'. *Minor Poems*, ed. MacCracken, II, 665–7.

⁵⁵ For the suggestion that Chaucer may have been motivated to write 'Scogan' and also 'His purse' by the non-payment of a Michaelmas annuity towards the end of his life, see Minnis, Scattergood, and Smith, *Shorter Poems*, pp. 509f.

⁵⁶ Burrow, 'Chaucer as petitioner: three poems', *Chaucer Review*, 45/3 (2011), 349–56 (p. 350).

⁵⁷ John Carpenter was a London town clerk 1417–38. In HM 111 (fol. 41^r), the sidenote 'A de B & C de D & c' may be a cryptic identification of the creditors in question, though the insertion of 'Carpenter' over an erasure in the balade's first line would suggest that the original addressee may have been a different potential mediator; see also HM 111, 12. 'Balade to my Lord the Chancellor', an address to the head of the Chancery, probably Thomas Langley, Bishop of Durham 1406–37, which states that 'my patente bere may wnesse / That myne arerages been granted me' (lines 5f.). This 'patente' is the Chancery letter patent granting Hoccleve's annuity, Patent Roll, 1 Henry IV, pt 2. PRO C66/355 m. 21. See Burrow, *Hoccleve*, p. 16, p. 15, and Appendix no. 6.

⁵⁸ *Middle English Marian Lyrics*, ed. Karen Saupé (Kalamazoo, Mich., 1997), p. 12.

⁵⁹ Gray, *Themes and Images in the Medieval Religious Lyric* (London, 1972), p. 60.

⁶⁰ *Ibid.*

⁶¹ *Ibid.*

⁶² See also HM 111, 19. 'Ceste balade ensuyante feust translatee au commandement de mon Meistre Robert Chichele.' Robert Chichele (d. 1439), brother of the Archbishop of Canterbury Henry Chichele, was a member of the London Grocers Company and twice Lord Mayor.

⁶³ Knapp, *Bureaucratic Muse*, pp. 153f.

⁶⁴ HM 111, 15. 'Ceste balade fuest mise en le fin du liure del Regiment des Princes.'

⁶⁵ The Bedford balade also occurs in two fifteenth-century *Regiment* manuscripts, Royal

17.D.xviii and Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Dugdale 45, though neither is believed to be the Bedford presentation copy. Burrow, *Hoccleve*, p. 23.

⁶⁶ Meyer-Lee, *Poets and Power*, p. 109.

⁶⁷ Nuttall, 'Anti-occasional verse' offers an important rebuttal of this depiction of Hoccleve as a willing agent of the Lancastrian regime. See n. 44.

⁶⁸ In the York balade, one wonders just how concrete was the Duke's commission 'To haue of my balades swich plentee / As ther weren remeynyng vn to me' (HM III, 9. 13f.) before the poet reminded him of it in his dedication of the book!

⁶⁹ Even if, in both the Bedford and York balades, it is 'Maistir Massy' and 'Maister Picard' – identified as William Massy, a financial and legal officer in the household of John, Duke of Bedford, and John Picard, who may have held a similar office in the household of Edward, Duke of York – who are imagined as looking over the book for literary defects and would have been responsible for administering any financial reward. See Thorlac Turville-Petre and Edward Wilson, 'Hoccleve, "Maistir Massy" and the *Pearl* poet: two notes', *Review of English Studies*, NS 26 (1975), 129–43.

⁷⁰ For Baillay, Hethe, and Offorde, see the list of Privy Seal clerks in Brown, 'Privy Seal clerks', p. 262 n. 2 and their appearances alongside Hoccleve in Burrow, *Hoccleve*, Appendix nos 1, 5, 9, and 23.