DAVID J. FALLS

# NICHOLAS LOVE'S *MIRROR* AND LATE MEDIEVAL DEVOTIO-LITERARY CULTURE

## Theological politics and devotional practice in fifteenth-century England

ROUTLEDGE

# Nicholas Love's *Mirror* and Late Medieval Devotio-Literary Culture

Surviving in 59 complete manuscript versions, few English texts of the late medieval period seem to have achieved the popularity of Nicholas Love's fifteenth-century translation and adaptation of the Latin *Meditationes Vitae Christi—The Mirror of the Blessed Life of Jesus Christ*. *The Mirror* has received surprisingly little scholarly attention and is often contextualized in terms of its role in the theological conflict between English ecclesiastical orthodoxy and heresiarch John Wycliff. David Falls presents a new account of the text's history which de-centralises, but does not disregard, the influence of the Wycliffite controversy. Falls interrogates preconceptions and investigates new possibilities for understanding the composition, circulation, function and use of Love's *Mirror* by examining both the textual modification and additions made by Love in his adaptation of the Latin, and places these alterations in context by examining individual copies of the *Mirror*. The manuscript copies are read as both sites of literary consumption and nexuses of textual transition, demonstrating that it was Love's ability to inscribe his work with 'functional diversity' which explains the *Mirror's* popularity. This book presents a nuanced picture not only of the *Mirror's* production, circulation and function, but also the dynamic and flourishing devotio-literary culture of late medieval England in which Love's text operated.

**David J. Falls**, Queen's University, Belfast, Northern Ireland.

This page intentionally left blank

# Nicholas Love's *Mirror* and Late Medieval Devotio-Literary Culture

## Theological politics and devotional practice in fifteenth-century England

**David J. Falls**

Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group
LONDON AND NEW YORK

First published 2016
by Routledge
2 Park Square, Milton Park, Abingdon, Oxon OX14 4RN

and by Routledge
711 Third Avenue, New York, NY 10017

*Routledge is an imprint of the Taylor & Francis Group, an informa business*



*British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data*
A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

*Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data*
Names: Falls, David J.
Title: Nicholas Love's Mirror and late medieval devotio-literary culture : theological politics and devotional practice in fifteenth-century England / by David J. Falls.
Description: Farnham, Surrey, England ; Ashgate Publishing Limited : Burlington, VT : Ashgate Publishing Company, 2015. | Includes bibliographical references and indexes.
Identifiers: LCCN 2015020325 | ISBN 9781472420794 (hardcover : alk. paper) | ISBN 9781472420800 (ebook) | ISBN 9781315598260 (epub)
Subjects: LCSH: Love, Nicholas, active 1410. Mirrour of the blessed lyf of Jesu Christi. | Jesus Christ—Devotional literature. | Devotional literature, English (Middle)—History and criticism. | Devotional literature, Latin (Medieval and modern)—History and criticism.
Classification: LCC BT306.43.L683 F35 2015 | DDC 232.9/01—dc23
LC record available at http://lccn.loc.gov/2015020325

ISBN: 9781472420794 (hbk)
ISBN: 9781315598260 (ebk)

Typeset in Times New Roman
by Apex CoVantage, LLC

# Contents

# Preface

This volume began as a doctoral dissertation attached to the Arts and Humanities Research Council funded "Geographies of Orthodox" project jointly hosted by Queen's University Belfast and the University of St Andrews. The "Geographies" project sought to reshape our understanding of late medieval vernacular and religious textual culture through a detailed codicological and textual analysis of the entire manuscript corpus of the English devotional phenomenon and affective literary tradition usually characterized as "pseudo-Bonaventuran," primarily by examining the actual reading practices of patrons and readers of vernacular pseudo-Bonaventuran texts and locating both manuscripts and texts in their specific cultural settings, enabling the identification of diverse networks of patrons, owners, copyists and readers. This volume presents some of the project's findings on the most popular expression of this tradition, Nicholas Love's *Mirror of the Blessed Life of Jesus Christ*, a pseudo-Bonaventuran text that might justifiably claim attention as one of the most commonly copied Middle English prose religious texts now known. As such, it owes a debt to the Arts and Humanities Research Council who funded the research.

It also owes a debt to the "Geographies" research team. Ian Johnson and Allan Westphall at the University of St Andrews, with whom I spent much time both in St Andrews and at the annual IMC at the University of Leeds, were always welcoming hosts and reassuring companions. At Queen's Ryan Perry and my doctoral supervisor Stephen Kelly were constant sources of information and guidance who supported this work from research proposal to publication and provided helpful and constructive critical and editorial advice throughout.

A number of other medievalists also made significant contributions to this volume. Hugh Magennis, William Marx and Janet Burton who graciously encouraged me to convert my doctoral material into this monograph. Vincent Gillespie, Anne Hutchinson, Sarah James and all the scholars who visited Belfast for the "Mapping Medieval Lives of Christ" conference which concluded the "Geographies" project who provided valuable insights and advice. And Michael Sargent, a scholar and a gentleman who generously shared both his time and his expertise on Love's *Mirror*.

Thanks are also due to Ashgate's anonymous reader who made a number of suggestions which greatly strengthened the final version of the text and Ulrike

Hogg, curator at the National Library of Scotland, who helped secure permission for the use of the image from the magnificent Advocates' Library manuscript of Love's *Mirror*.

While researching and writing are often lonely pursuits the incredible graduate community at Queen's University was a constant source of support. My thanks to Daniel McCann, Stuart McWilliams, Amy Kiernan, Eamon Byers, Christopher Jackson, Paul Murphy and Clara Neary who lightened both the mood and the load. Particular thanks are due to Kath Stevenson who shared the journey and Elizabeth Scarborough who read every draft of the many versions of this work and without whose support this volume would never have come to completion.

Finally, and ultimately, thanks are due to my parents Joan and Trevor Falls, whose love and support are the foundation of all that followed.

David J. Falls
Queen's University Belfast, 2015

This page intentionally left blank

# Introduction

## A book of ghostly fruyte

> For als miche as in þis boke bene conteynede diuerse ymaginacions of cristes life, þe which life fro þe bygynnyng in to þe ending euer blessede & withoute synne, passyng alle þe lifes of alle oþer seyntes, as for a singulere prerogatife, may worþily be clepede þe blessed life of Jesu crist, þe which also because it may not be fully discriuede as þe lifes of oþer seyntes, bot in a maner of likenes as þe ymage of mans face is shewed in þe mirroure.' þerfore as for a pertinent name to þis boke, it may skilfully be cleped, þe *Mirrour of þe blessed life of Jesu criste*.[1]

Surviving in 59 complete manuscript versions, few English texts of the late medieval period seem to have achieved the popularity of Nicholas Love's early fifteenth-century translation and adaptation of the Latin *Meditationes Vitae Christi—The Mirror of the Blessed Life of Jesus Christ*. To judge from manuscript statistics, the key index for judging popularity in pre-print culture, Love's *Mirror* would sit comfortably in any English vernacular bibliophile's collection alongside texts such as the Wycliffite Bible translation, the prose *Brut* chronicle, the long didactic penitential poem the *Prick of Conscience*, and Chaucer's *Canterbury Tales*. That religious texts feature so prominently amongst the most popular late-medieval English works seems to support Ralph Hanna's assertion that in the Middle Ages, one's primary responsibility was saving one's soul—"thus, every book owner's first purchase (and probably a continuing drain on any book budget) must have been volumes that would help do this"[2]—creating what Vincent Gillespie has described as a "rapidly developing interest in and market for vernacular guides to godliness."[3] In turn, Nicole Rice has suggested that pious Christians' persistent question of how to live the "best life" led vernacular authors to respond in varied ways to the question of how lay Christians should seek spiritual fulfillment.[4] Central to providing satisfaction for these impulses were texts concerning the earthly life of Christ: the universal, personal and infinitely adaptable metanarrative of Christian culture and appropriate Christian living.[5] Indeed, Love's *Mirror* is far from simply a literary harmonization of the gospel accounts of Christ's life; rather, it is one of those "bokes of gostly fruyte" described by Love's near contemporary, the author of the *Myroure of Oure Ladye*, as providing "moche grace and comforte to the soulle yf yt be well and dyscretely used."[6] The

key term here is "used," for the *Mirror* was not simply a text to be read. As Love himself comments in the *Mirror's* "Proheme," there is

> grete confort & gostly profite in deuoute contemplacion of cristes blessede lif. Wherefore þou þat coueytest to fele treuly þe fruyt of þis boke.' Þou most with all þi þought & alle þin entent, in þat manere make þe in þi soule present to þoo þinges þat bene here written seyd or done of oure lord Jesu, & þat bisily, likyngly & abydyngly, as þei þou herderst hem with þi bodily eres, or sey þaim with þin eyen don.' Puttyng awey for þe tyme, & leuyng alle oþer occupacions & bisynesses.[7]

While such "bokes of gostly fruyte," and the contemplative practices that they outline, were traditionally produced and used within a monastic milieu, Carol Meale has noted how Love inscribed "a potential for social diversity" amongst those who encountered his work.[8] His text, suggests Meale, was envisaged as "a work which would be accessible to individuals and communities representative of virtually every rank and degree within the higher echelons of contemporary society, from prelates, enclosed religious (male and female), and lay clergy, to earls, and countesses, wealthy gentry, and members of the urban bourgeoisie."[9] In her survey of the early ownership and readership of Love's text, Meale concludes that the "evidence offered by a study both of extant manuscripts of his work—their marks of ownership, and their level of production—and of surviving documentary records of its circulation and use, confirms that his intention was fulfilled."[10] As such, we might view the *Mirror* as a text designed with what might be termed "functional diversity,"[11] whose composer envisioned a range of reception contexts and attempted to engage with a range of contemporary theological and devotional issues. The success of such a strategy may be assumed not only from the wide and diverse circulation of the *Mirror* noted by Meale, but also in its dominant position within the genre of English Christological writing. While texts such as the *Southern Passion*, the *Meditations on the Supper of Our Lord*, the *Privity of the Passion*, the Middle English *Meditationes de Passione Christi*, the *Liber Aureas de Passione et Resurreccione Domini*, the *Short Reule of the Liif of Oure Lady*, the *Life of the Virgin and the Christ* and the *Speculum Devotorum* all demonstrate some form of debt to Love's own source text, the *Meditationes Vitae Christi* (itself *the* most popular medieval text concerning the life of Christ), few survive in more than a handful of manuscripts. The anonymous author of the *Speculum Devotorum* even recalls that he was

> sterred oftymes to haue left þis besynes, both for myne vnworthynesse, and also for Boneauenture, a cardynale and worthi clerk, made a book of þe same matire, þe which is called *Vita Christi*. And moste of all when I herde tell þat a man of our Ordoure hadde turned þe same booke into Englysshe.[12]

We might, therefore, agree with Michael Sargent's suggestion that the *Mirror* answered the need for devotional writings on the life and Passion of Christ in English well enough to render other versions superfluous.[13]

Given that the *Mirror* was undoubtedly late-medieval England's most popular expression of a tradition of religious writing focusing on the humanity of Christ, it is perhaps surprising that very little scholarly attention has been paid to the text. This volume represents only the second dedicated monograph on the *Mirror* following Elizabeth Salter's *Nicholas Love's "Myrrour of the Blessed Lyf of Jesu Christ"* (Analecta Cartusiana 1974), the only other sustained scholarly discussion coming in the form of detailed introductions to Sargent's critical editions of the text (Garland 1992 and University of Exeter Press 2005), and the published proceedings of the sole conference on Love's text hosted at Waseda University: *Nicholas Love at Waseda* (Brewer 1995). When the *Mirror* is discussed in modern scholarship, it is most often contextualized as an agent in a fifteenth-century "culture war" between orthodoxy and heresy. This occurs most notably in Nicholas Watson's seminal *Speculum* article "Censorship and Cultural Change in Late-Medieval England: Vernacular Theology, the Oxford Translation Debate, and Arundel's Constitutions of 1409."

"The year 1400," claims Watson, "is one of those loudly proclaimed milestones in English literary history in which the vagaries of human life and human chronological systems appear to come together with unusual appropriateness. The year not only of a new century's beginning but of the death of the old century's most important poet, 1400 has often been taken by Middle English scholars to mark one of those crucial transitions between an age of gold and one of brass."[14] However, while Watson admits that it is now "becoming possible to recognize [this] model as a construct inherited from the fifteenth century itself: a cultural formation, founded on half-truths, which deserves attention as an object, more than a tool, of critical analysis,"[15] it is often hard not to see his own work on "vernacular theology"—describing a similar "cultural change" from a fourteenth-century "golden age" of theological writing to a "dull" fifteenth century—as anything other than a similarly flawed construct requiring equivalent attention as an object, rather than a tool, of critical analysis. Although Watson claims that his aim is to produce a more "nuanced picture in which the transformation, shortly after 1400, of an impressively innovative tradition . . . into its derivative successor is seen not as a centennial coincidence, the product of a new zeitgeist, but as the result of specific historical forces and acts,"[16] both the forces and acts to which Watson assigns such a "cultural change," as well as the change itself, have recently been challenged.

Watson's argument revolves around the 1409 "anti-Wycliffite" Lambeth Constitutions of Archbishop Thomas Arundel which acted as both the "linchpin of a broader attempt to limit religious discussion and writing in the vernacular" and a "capstone of the increasingly systematic campaign of opposition to the Lollards," leading to an era of self-censorship in which "original theological writing in English was, for a century, almost extinct."[17] While Watson has described the Constitutions as "one of the most draconian pieces of censorship in English history,"[18] Kathryn Kerby-Fulton has argued that, while they have long been understood as having some sort of impact on fifteenth-century literary culture—even granted that the all-embracing interpretation that Watson gives them was what the authorities intended—they were not, in fact, very draconian, and their actual impact was historically minimal.[19]

Problems have also been identified in the "abrupt" changes in vernacular religious writing described by Watson as occurring in the period following the Constitutions: namely, the "sharp decline both in the quantity of large theological works written in the vernacular and in their scope and originality";[20] the fact that much of what was written in the fifteenth century "consists of translations from Latin, Anglo-French, or Continental vernacular texts";[21] and the reduction of the copying of original fifteenth-century texts,[22] all of which are seemingly illustrated in the list of vernacular texts provided in the "Appendix" to Watson's "Censorship" article.[23] These conclusions have, however, been challenged by scholars such as Sargent, who has suggested a number of caveats in response to Watson's findings: that "the impression of the richness of fourteenth-century vernacular theological literature that modern critics have is a result of the fullness of our view of these writings, which would probably have been available to very few contemporary readers";[24] that "it is a characteristic of the production of literature in manuscript, as opposed to print, that the number of copies in circulation is cumulative [. . . as such] works originally written in the fifteenth century are liable to be under-represented in any survey of surviving manuscripts";[25] that "we have only a limited ability to date the composition of many of these works";[26] and that translation is not "merely the movement of a text across a linguistic boundary" but can be "applied to many kinds of crossing and changing of existing boundaries" such as when, as is the case with the *Mirror*, "a work is appropriated by readers, scribes and later writers for uses other than those envisaged by the original author."[27] In fact, it is not only in the process of translation in which such appropriation problematizes ideas of orthodoxy and heterodoxy. In a number of recent essays on religious writing in the fifteenth century scholars have begun to address how the gathering together of texts can problematize such binary oppositions.

In her analysis of Cambridge, Trinity College, MS B.14.38, a fifteenth-century manuscript containing both the *Meditationes de Passione Christi* and a number of Wycliffite sermons, Mishtooni Bose has noted "homologies between identifiably Wycliffite and mainstream devotional and literate tastes."[28] These same homologies can, in fact, be found in the manuscript corpus of Love's *Mirror*—most notably in New York, Pierpont Morgan Library, MS M. 648 in which a Wycliffite tract on translation follows the text of the *Mirror*. Similarly, Amanda Moss has noted that the gathering together of texts "originally composed for diverse audiences, from lay readers through to priests, nuns and anchorites" in London, Westminster School MS 3 is mirrored by its "mixture of reformist, Lollard-leaning and orthodox material,"[29] attesting "to a lively culture of vernacular theology in the early fifteenth century, in which scribes and compilers were not constrained by the copying of fourteenth-century texts, but instead used them as a springboard from which to extract new meanings or to highlight issues of continuing concern of relevance to a new generation of readers."[30] This mixing of materials, notes Moss, "fits with the concept of 'hospitable reading' put forward by Stephen Kelly and Ryan Perry in their discussion of a series of devotional anthologies produced in London in the first half of the fifteenth century."[31]

Oxford, Bodleian Library, MSS Bodley 789 and Laud 23 are two devotional miscellanies dating from the first half of the fifteenth century. Noting a blending of orthodox and heterodox texts—and readers' textual interpretations and modifications—Kelly and Perry argue that such devotional compilations sponsor what they term "devotional cosmopolitism": "a radical openness to the suggestions of antithetical theologies which produces among readers a form of 'hospitable reading' in which difference is tolerated, re-thought, adapted and appropriated."[32] Such manuscripts, suggest Kelly and Perry, "elide completely the fixities of that pervasive—and all too persuasive—sectarian historiographical binary of 'orthodoxy' and 'heterodoxy' which has come to define pre-Reformation English religious history."[33] Given the existence of manuscript miscellanies such as Cambridge, Trinity College, MS B.14.38, London, Westminster School MS 3, and Oxford, Bodleian Library, MSS Bodley 789 and Laud 23 it may be more accurate to follow Ian Johnson in viewing the fifteenth century as "not so much a period of post-Arundelian self-censorship and restricted vernacular spiritual choice, but a time when pre-Arundelian fourteenth-century texts of vernacular theology were most copied and circulated and when codices might contain mixed populations of English religious works and of relative theological adventurousness."[34] As such, Watson's model of a dull, conservative and restrictive age of vernacular theology in the fifteenth century seems more and more unsustainable as we investigate and uncover more about the composition and circulation of religious texts in the later Middle Ages. Indeed, in both his closing address to the "After Arundel" conference held at St John's College Oxford in 2009, and his closing essay in the volume of papers based on the conference (*After Arundel: Religious Writing in Fifteenth-Century England*, Brepols 2011), Watson acknowledges significant opposition to his article—chiefly in its "excessive concern with dissenting religiosities, hinting that the interest in religious heterodoxy, especially by scholars of Wycliffism, has glamorized dissent and defined its opposite, orthodoxy, only in relation to mechanisms of repression."[35] Seldom is this model more dominant than in the study of Love's *Mirror*. In his article, Watson actually speculates that the *Mirror* may in fact have been "written in part to order" as part of a deliberate campaign prearranged between Thomas Arundel, an archbishop crusading against the heretical beliefs of Oxford theologian John Wyclif and his "Lollard" followers, and Nicholas Love, the head of a monastic foundation whose institution was reliant upon the economic and political support of the prelate during the period of political upheaval following the Lancastrian usurpation of the English throne.[36] Although this volume will argue that the text may indeed have been re-purposed as a rebuttal of Wycliffite heresy at some point in its history, the dominant position of this narrative of the *Mirror*'s production in modern scholarship actually elides the complex textual and manuscript history of Love's work.

While Johnson has recently commented that "Love and his work have entered the consciousness of many, if not most, modern scholars through Watson's implacably hostile readings of the work,"[37] Gillespie has, rather, suggested that "the boldness of [Watson's] argument has, perhaps inevitably, led to some overstatement and tabloidization in writings of other scholars building on his observations."[38]

In either case, it is damagingly reductive of Love's text in particular and of the situation of English spirituality in the early fifteenth century in general to assert that his translation was made with the express purpose of acting first and foremost as a scourge of heresy. Rather, as this volume will argue, the *Mirror* should be viewed as a functionally diverse text which speaks to a plurality of audiences and whose composition and circulation actually offers a remarkable insight into how texts, books and religious praxis combined in the later Middle Ages to form a rich and complex devotio-literary culture which often goes overlooked in studies of pre-Reformation English literary and religious history.

Love's text would, in fact, seem to better reflect the fifteenth century described by John Van Engen: a period of "options," "multiple, competing, contested, coexistent, negotiated, overlapping, local [and] personally appropriated,"[39] a fifteenth century in which people were "cracking open niches across a wide and diverse spectrum, finding ways to appropriate religion for themselves,"[40] a fifteenth century when "acts largely accounted clerical, or aspirations associated with the religious, increasingly were undertaken by interested laypeople,"[41] and in which books of religion, foundations and confraternities of religious orders and the formation of guilds allowed individuals to follow their own spiritual paths.[42] While Van Engen notes that these forms of appropriating religion had earlier histories, especially amongst the highest social classes, he also acknowledges that "their multiplication across the horizon, their diversity, [and] their implicit offering of choice is a vital part of the fifteenth-century story."[43] In essence, in the fifteenth century religion was no longer the preserve of the professed religious.[44] This period, notes Van Engen, was also one in which "religious writing in the vernacular spread as never before, writing which was meant, it seems for private religious women . . . as well as for lay brothers attached to religious houses—that is, for the religiously intense."[45] As such, it might be possible to see Love's *Mirror* not as a restrictive text, but rather as one of the crowning achievements of English devotio-literary culture.

The present volume, therefore, offers a new account of the composition, circulation and function of Nicholas Love's *Mirror of the Blessed Life of Jesus Christ*. It interrogates traditional preconceptions as well as investigating new possibilities for understanding the *Mirror's* place in late-medieval devotio-literary culture. While it initially examines the modifications and additions Love made to both "lengh" and "abregge" the "processe" of Christ's life found in the *Meditationes Vitae Christi* in order to provide his English readers with a book of "gostly fruyte," it also places these alterations in context by examining individual copies of the *Mirror*. These manuscript copies are read primarily as sites of literary consumption by examining how the text actually functioned in reception contexts in which we know the *Mirror* was present, and which were envisaged by Love. They are also, however, examined as nexuses of textual transmission in order to examine how the *Mirror* spread out from its production context, and to demonstrate that it was Love's ability to inscribe his work with functional diversity that explains much of the *Mirror*'s popularity. Such a methodological approach allows the development of a more nuanced picture, not only of the *Mirror*'s production,

circulation and function, but also of the devotio-literary culture of late-medieval England in which Love's text operated—and was operative.

Chapter 1 examines the genesis of the *Mirror* through an investigation of the process by which the *Meditationes* became the *Mirror*. Primarily, it argues that the composition of the *Mirror* was inherently linked to the pastoral responsibilities associated with Love's position as prior of the Mount Grace Charterhouse. It then explores how Love may have accessed the *Meditationes* based on a possible manuscript exemplar of his Latin source and new research into his monastic career before he entered the charterhouse. This information is used to develop a new interpretation of some of the material in the *Mirror* in order to demonstrate how monastic politics are integral to understanding the *Mirror*'s composition.

Chapter 2 expands on the exploration of late medieval monastic tensions evidenced by Love's text and career through an examination of how the milieu of the charterhouse influenced the composition of the *Mirror*. Specifically, it explores how the audience of "symple soules" outlined in the "Proheme" may have been misread in traditional scholarship. Instead, it offers a reading of many of the modifications and additions Love made to the *Mirror* as both constructed for, and directed to, residents of his own house and order. By examining the influence of the Franciscan milieu on the *Meditationes*, the chapter suggests that this is an entirely traditional model of religious writing. In particular, it draws on new research linking the Latin text with the Franciscan "spirituals," and examining the implications of both Love's excision of a number of Franciscan references from his English text and his inclusion of a number of references to Carthusian spirituality and practice.

Chapter 3 examines the influence of an important group connected to Love's charterhouse who may have affected the composition of the *Mirror*: the secular "affinity," who provided both the impetus for his house's foundation, and the economic support which ensured its survival. It focuses on the Mount Grace house's Ricardian founders and examines how the *Mirror* could be seen as a form of "devotional dialogue" between Love and a particular supporter of the Mount Grace house and owner of an early manuscript of the *Mirror*: Joan Holland, wife of the house's first founder. The potential relationship between Love and Joan is used to examine how female interest in devotio-literary culture may have affected Love's translation of the *Meditationes*. Such interest is then further demonstrated through an examination of the *Mirror*'s ownership and circulation by a number of female readers closely connected to another element of the Mount Grace house's affinity: the Ingelby family.

Chapter 4 expands on the suggestion that the *Mirror*'s popularity was rooted in its ability to speak to a wide range of female readers in diverse states of pious living. Specifically, it explores the devotio-literary practices of owners of the *Mirror* such as Sybil de Felton, Abbess of Barking Abbey, and Cecily Neville, Duchess of York in order to demonstrate how such functional diversity was vital in its circulation. The importance of such functional diversity is demonstrated through a comparative analysis of the *Mirror* and the *Speculum Devotorum*—a work composed within a similar milieu and drawing on similar sources, but with a much

more limited circulation. It concludes with an examination of how contemporary patterns of female piety not only shaped the composition and circulation of the *Mirror*, but also how they may have had wider implications for the copying and circulation of texts concerning female piety by the Carthusian Order more generally.

Chapter 5 focuses on the so-called α version of the *Mirror*. It explores how this version of the *Mirror* can be read as a later recension probably produced by Love during a period in which his charterhouse was navigating a difficult transition from Ricardian to Lancastrian patronage. In particular, it investigates how this version of the *Mirror* responded to the specific needs of the later supporters of Love's house, most notably, how the anti-Lollard polemic—accentuated in this version of the *Mirror*—can be linked to the support of the Mount Grace Charterhouse by Archbishop Arundel; the role played by Arundel in legitimizing the usurping Lancastrian regime; and the often-problematic relationship between Arundel and members of the Lancastrian apparatus. It also examines the close relationship that developed between this Lancastrian apparatus and the Carthusian Order in general in the fifteenth century, how this can be seen as part of a wider European tradition, and how it may have aided the popularity and circulation of the *Mirror*.

Chapter 6 examines how the *Mirror* may have traveled to an owner who shared an interest in the devotio-literary milieu in which the *Mirror* was produced. In particular, it examines Oxford, Bodleian Library MS Bodley 131, a miscellany containing a range of religious texts—including the *Mirror*—copied by one John Morton of York. This manuscript is examined as a nexus of transmission indicative of the complex and dynamic fifteenth-century devotio-literary culture in which the *Mirror* was produced and circulated. In particular, it examines how the York Corpus Christi Guild could be seen as a nexus of devotio-literary culture in which "cultural elites" shared religious texts and pious praxis. It then moves on to examine a similar "devout society" in Norwich to demonstrate that such societies may actually be indicative of specific "regional pieties."

These investigations will demonstrate that the *Mirror* was much more than a simple tool of cultural censorship; rather, it was a work of great ingenuity that deftly treated a range of issues concerning theological politics and devotional practice which were central to the development of a vibrant fifteenth-century devotio-literary culture—a culture which is itself illuminated through the connections and interactions which allowed the text to travel throughout late-medieval England.

## Notes

1 Michael G. Sargent, ed., *Nicholas Love, The Mirror of the Blessed Life of Jesus Christ: A Full Critical Edition based on Cambridge University Library Additional MSS 6578 and 6686 with Introduction, Notes and Glossary* (Exeter: University of Exeter Press, 2005), 11: 9–18.

2 Ralph Hanna III, "Literature and the Cultural Elites," in *The Oxford Handbook of Medieval Literature in English*, ed. Elaine Treharne and Greg Walker (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010), 115.

3 Vincent Gillespie, "Vernacular Books of Religion," in *Looking in Holy Books: Essays in Late Medieval Religious Writing in England*, ed. Vincent Gillespie (Turnhout: Brepols, 2011), 145.
4 Nicole R. Rice, *Lay Piety and Religious Discipline in Middle English Literature* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008), ix.
5 Ian Johnson, *The Middle English Life of Christ*: *Academic Discourse, Translation, and Vernacular Theology* (Turnhout: Brepols, 2013), 5.
6 John Henry Blunt, ed., *The Myroure of Oure Ladye* (London: N Trübner and Co., 1873), 65.
7 Sargent, *Mirror*, 12: 38–13: 4.
8 Carol M. Meale, "'Oft Siþis with Grete Deuotion I þought What I Miȝt Do Pleysyng to God': The Early Ownership and Readership of Love's *Mirror*, with Special Reference to Its Female Audience," in *Nicholas Love at Waseda*, ed. Shoichi Oguro, Richard Beadle and Michael G. Sargent (Cambridge: Brewer, 1997), 20.
9 Meale, "'Oft Siþis,'" 20.
10 Meale, "'Oft Siþis,'" 20.
11 I thank Allan Westphall for suggesting this term to me in conversation during our preparation of the textual profile of Love's work hosted on the "Geographies of Orthodoxy" website. "Nicholas Love's *Mirror of the Blessed Life of Jesus Christ*: Textual Profile," www.qub.ac.uk/geographies-of-orthodoxy.
12 Paul Patterson, "Myrrour to Devout People" (PhD diss., University of Notre Dame, 2006), 72: 19–23. I thank Prof. Patterson for sharing his edited text of the *Myrrour* with the "Geographies of Orthodoxy" project team.
13 Sargent, *Mirror*, intro 21.
14 Nicholas Watson, "Censorship and Cultural Change in Late-Medieval England: Vernacular Theology, the Oxford Translation Debate, and Arundel's Constitutions of 1409," *Speculum* 70 (1995), 822.
15 Watson, "Censorship," 822.
16 Watson, "Censorship," 823.
17 Watson, "Censorship," 824–5, 835.
18 Watson, "Censorship," 826.
19 Kathryn Kerby-Fulton, *Books Under Suspicion*: *Censorship and Tolerance of Revelatory Writing in Late Medieval England* (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 2006), 397–8.
20 Watson, "Censorship," 823.
21 Watson, "Censorship," 823.
22 Watson, "Censorship," 834–5.
23 Watson, "Censorship," 860–64.
24 Sargent, *Mirror*, intro 76.
25 Sargent, *Mirror*, intro 76–7.
26 Sargent, *Mirror*, intro 78.
27 Sargent, *Mirror*, intro 81.
28 Mishtooni Bose, "Reversing the Life of Christ: Dissent, Orthodoxy, and Affectivity in Late Medieval England," in *The Pseudo-Bonaventuran Lives of Christ*: *Exploring the Middle English Tradition*, ed. Ian Johnson and Allan F. Westphall (Turnhout: Brepols, 2013), 68.
29 Amanda Moss, "'þat þine opun dedis be a trewe book': Reading Around Arundel's Constitutions," in *After Arundel*: *Religious Writing in Fifteenth-Century England*, ed. Vincent Gillespie and Kantik Ghosh (Turnhout: Brepols, 2011), 396.
30 Moss, "'þat þine opun dedis be a trewe book,'" 411.
31 Moss, "'þat þine opun dedis be a trewe book'," 399.
32 Stephen Kelly and Ryan Perry, "Devotional Cosmopolitanism in Fifteenth Century England," in *After Arundel*: *Religious Writing in Fifteenth-Century England*, ed. Vincent Gillespie and Kantik Ghosh (Turnhout: Brepols, 2011), 365.

33 Kelly and Perry, "Devotional Cosmopolitanism," 363.
34 Ian Johnson, "Afterword," in *Vernacularity in England and Wales c. 1300–1550*, ed. Elisabeth Salter and Helen Wicker (Turnhout: Brepols, 2011), 333.
35 Nicholas Watson, "'A clerke schulde have it of kinde for to kepe counsell,'" in *After Arundel*: *Religious Writing in Fifteenth-Century England*, ed. Vincent Gillespie and Kantik Ghosh (Turnhout: Brepols, 2011), 579.
36 Watson, "Censorship," 852–3.
37 Johnson, *The Middle English Life of Christ*, 27.
38 Vincent Gillespie, "Vernacular Theology," in *Oxford Twenty-First Century Approaches to Literature*, ed. Paul Strohm (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007), 406.
39 John Van Engen, "Multiple Options: The World of the Fifteenth-Century Church," *Church History* 77:2 (2008), 284.
40 Van Engen, "Multiple Options," 269.
41 Van Engen, "Multiple Options," 269.
42 Van Engen, "Multiple Options," 269–70.
43 Van Engen, "Multiple Options," 270.
44 Van Engen, "Multiple Options," 270.
45 Van Engen, "Multiple Options," 277.