

A Transcription of a Non-authorial Addition to Peter Idley's Instructions to his Son in Cambridge, Magdalene College, Pepys MS 2030

メタデータ	言語: eng 出版者: 公開日: 2021-03-30 キーワード (Ja): キーワード (En): 作成者: KUDO, Yoshinobu, 工藤, 義信 メールアドレス: 所属:
URL	https://doi.org/10.24517/00061565

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 3.0 International License.



A Transcription of a Non-authorial Addition
to Peter Idley's *Instructions to his Son*
in Cambridge, Magdalene College, Pepys MS 2030*

Yoshinobu KUDO

Introduction

Cambridge, Magdalene College, Pepys MS 2030 is a paper manuscript dated from around the last quarter of the fifteenth century, which records three English texts: Thomas Brampton's verse paraphrase of the penitential psalms, a fragment of the preface to *Fifteen Oes*, and Peter Idley's *Instructions to his Son* (both Books I and II).¹ It has recently been shown by Joni Henry that both this manuscript and Cambridge, Cambridge University Library MS Ee.2.15 most probably constituted parts of a single collection, either as one book or as a series of volumes in its original form. Because the whole collection is likely to have been owned by a merchant whose surname was Fisher, Henry has named this collection the Fisher Miscellany.² While there is much to discuss

* This work was supported by JSPS KAKENHI Grant Number JP17K13416. I would like to express my thanks to Katherine Mason for proofreading the draft of this article.

¹ See *Catalogue of the Pepys Library at Magdalene College Cambridge*, V: Manuscripts, Pt. i: Medieval, ed. by Rosamond McKitterick and Richard Beadle (Cambridge: D. S. Brewer, 1992), pp. 46-48.

² Joni Henry, 'The Fisher Miscellany: Reconstructing a Late Medieval Merchant Family's Book and its Fashionable Hagiography', in *Saints as Intercessors between the Wealthy and the Divine: Art and Hagiography among the Medieval Merchant Classes*, ed. by Emily Kelley and Cynthia Turner Camp (London: Routledge, 2019), pp. 156-76.

concerning this newly identified collection, the present article focuses on fourteen stanzas added to the section on Lechery in Peter Idley's *Instructions to his Son*, which are recorded between fols 131^r-32^v of the Pepys manuscript. The text of Idley's *Instructions* in the Pepys manuscript ends incompletely at II. B. 2555 at the second stanza on fol. 131^r, and the additional stanzas begin on the same page.³ This addition to Idley's poem has been recognised by those who have an interest in Idley or in the manuscript itself, but because it is obviously non-authorial and does not even continue on the same topic, the addition has never drawn substantial attention.⁴ However, it may be of interest to those who explore the late medieval vernacular poetry on sins or writings containing biblical references, and this is one reason I provide my transcription of these hitherto unpublished stanzas. Moreover, a close investigation into this addition, as I present below as an introduction to my transcription, elucidates its significant implications pertaining to Idley's text, its reception, and the biblical knowledge of either the Fisher Miscellany's scribe or copying team.

The issues that must be first examined are who added these stanzas and when they were added. No scholarly consensus has ever been reached as to whether the hand of the additional stanzas is the same as that of the preceding stanzas. Charlotte D'Evelyn views the hands as different, but Matthew Sullivan questions this.⁵ In line with Sullivan's view, Rosamond McKitterick and Richard Beadle note that the Pepys manuscript is written by '[o]ne scribe throughout'.⁶ On the other hand, Henry, the first critic who looked at the

³ References to Idley's authorial text are to *Peter Idley's 'Instructions to his Son'*, ed. by Charlotte D'Evelyn, Modern Language Association of America Monograph Series, 6 (Boston: Heath, 1935) by line numbers.

⁴ D'Evelyn concentrates on analysing Idley's authorial text and dismisses these stanzas as 'a spurious addition' (p. 62).

⁵ D'Evelyn, p. 62; and Matthew Thomas Sullivan, 'The Original and Subsequent Audiences of the *Manuel des Péchés* and its Middle English Descendants' (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Oxford, 1990), pp. 243, 255 n. 71.

⁶ McKitterick and Beadle, p. 47.

hands of both the Pepys and CUL manuscripts and viewed them as part of one collection, argues that most texts of the two manuscripts were written by one and the same hand, with some exceptions (which include the fourteen additional stanzas).⁷

Indeed, concluding this issue of hand is difficult because some pieces of evidence are conflicting, and others are not decisive by themselves. First, a difference in the size of letters between the first two and the final two stanzas on fol. 131^r is evident (see **Figure**). The final two are written in smaller letters than the first two, and the space between the lines is narrowed. Nevertheless, the shapes of their letters bear many commonalities, both being based on a secretary script. What McKitterick and Beadle describe as ‘marked tapering shafts and a slight forward slope’ certainly characterise both hands, especially their lowercase **f** and long **s**.⁸ Henry identifies three characteristics of the ‘main scribe’ (i.e. the hand of nearly all the lines before the fourteen stanzas), but in my view, all three are also shared by the hand of the fourteen stanzas: the hand certainly shows ‘a narrow form of lower case **h**’; the ‘flourishes [...] added to the ascenders of the top line’ also appear on fols 131^v-32^v; and the hand shows the same ‘two versions of capital **T**’ as seen in the previous stanzas, although the **T** with more complicated strokes is now the majority.⁹ In fact, the proportion of the two types of uppercase **T** differs between the folios, even within the range of the ‘main’ hand, and this makes it difficult to claim that any proportion of a letter with a certain feature is a hard basis for distinguishing different hands. I find that in the additional stanzas, many of the lowercase

⁷ Henry, pp. 161, 171 n. 23. The sample letters from fol. 18^r of the CUL manuscript are provided in Linne Mooney, Simon Horobin, and Estelle Stubbs, ‘Late Medieval English Scribes’ <<https://www.medievalscribes.com>> [accessed 16 November 2020].

⁸ McKitterick and Beadle, p. 47.

⁹ Henry, p. 161. The simpler form of capital **T** is used on fol. 132^r, line 19, and fol. 132^v, line 11, at their beginning. For the complex form of **T**, see the sample letter in Mooney, Horobin, and Stubbs.

w have a low-hanging edge of their first stroke.¹⁰ This feature is relatively few in all the rest, although there are some such w.¹¹

It seems possible that the hand of the previous lines continues in the additional lines. If the additional lines were written by a different hand, the styles of these hands are so closely related that they certainly worked as a team. One point that seems obvious but that has never been mentioned is that the colour and the strength of ink is exactly the same between the first and the final two stanzas on fol. 131^r. Along with this fact, the red full and broken lines filling in the right space, the running titles on the margins, and the correcting practice – crossing out miscopied words in red ink – all in the same way in fols 131^r -32^v as in the previous folios indicate the continuity of the work. Either a scribe or a copying team who worked on the previous lines went on to write the additional lines, rather than the lines having been added by someone else in a later period.

This indication is important in two ways. First, it now seems likely that the reason the team stopped copying Idley's poem was that their exemplar copy of it broke off at II. B. 2555. Among the extant texts of the Fisher Miscellany, there are no other texts to which substantial non-authorial lines have been added. If they had had a longer exemplar of Idley's *Instructions*, the team would certainly have continued copying the authorial text. Seeing that the section on Lechery they had as the exemplar ceased short, the copyists themselves must have supplemented relevant passages in the same verse scheme (the rhyme royal) as the authorial text to make a fuller section. Notably, Idley's text in Cambridge, Cambridge University Library MS Ee.4.37 also stops at II. B. 2555. Moreover, as D'Evelyn points out, Idley's texts in that manuscript and in the Pepys manuscript are closely related.¹² These do not seem likely to be coincidences. On this

¹⁰ See, for example, fol. 131^r, line 22, the word 'wiche'.

¹¹ See, for example, the CUL manuscript, fol. 111^r, line 9, the word 'ware', and the Pepys manuscript, fol. 77^v, line 11, the word 'wyse'. None of the three samples of the lowercase w provided in Mooney, Horobin, and Stubbs presents this feature.

¹² D'Evelyn, pp. 66-67.

point, Sullivan only notes: ‘Both scribes clearly were working with faulty exemplars’, but it may in fact be possible that a common ancestor for the two manuscripts ended at that line.¹³ Exactly how closely the two manuscripts could be related needs re-evaluation, along with two other manuscripts found after D’Evelyn’s study, which Sullivan insists are also textually close to the Cambridge and Pepys manuscripts.¹⁴

Second, the content of the additional stanzas demonstrates the scribe’s or the copying team’s acquaintance with the Bible. The biblical passages relevant to specific lines are shown in the notes below. No direct source for these stanzas is known, and they may be the copyists’ own composition. As Sullivan argues, such knowledge of the Bible makes it probable that the copyists are the clergies.¹⁵ This could be a clue to the environment in which the Fisher Miscellany was produced.

Finally, this substantial addition should be appreciated fairly as constituting a part of one version of the *Instructions to his Son* received within the fifteenth century, a part that witnesses the variety in the poem’s reception. It is true that the beginning of the addition does not take up what has specifically been discussed in the five preceding authorial stanzas of the Lechery section. In particular, the fourth and fifth stanzas (II. B. 2542-55) explain how the cases of David, Sampson, and Solomon in the Old Testament are incorrectly cited to justify the sin of lechery. These stanzas should be immediately followed by the explanation of why citing them in that way is wrong, as they are in the authorial poetic sequence (II. B. 2556-69), but this does not occur in the Pepys manuscript version. However, it should not be viewed as a problem of continuity, because the exposition parts of Idley’s *Instructions to his Son* always shift their discussion from one point to another. Rather, the additional stanzas aptly provide the exposition expected

¹³ Sullivan, ‘Original and Subsequent Audiences’, p. 256 n. 91.

¹⁴ The two manuscripts are Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Eng. poet. d. 45 and London, British Library, Additional MS 57335. See Sullivan, ‘Original and Subsequent Audiences’, pp. 243-44.

¹⁵ Sullivan, ‘Original and Subsequent Audiences’, p. 243.

in this section: it begins with the close relationship between gluttony and lechery and how pleasing lechery is to humans (lines 1-14 below), and proceeds to describe what punishment a lecherous woman will receive according to Moses' law (15-28); how the ancient five cities were destroyed for the sin of lechery committed by their citizens (29-35); the consequences of adultery (36-49); what a marriage requires of the married couple (50-56); and that the lust triggered by the sight of a woman is itself sinful and dangerous for the soul (57-98). Clearly, this non-authorial version of the later part of the Lechery section is different from the authorial version known by London, British Library, Arundel MS 20 and London, British Library, Additional MS 57335.¹⁶ Still, being well-organized and supported by authoritative references, the additional stanzas serve the purpose of this section in their own way, even though they cease incompletely. Once they were recorded, they must have been regarded as an integral part of the textual sequence on Deadly Sins. This case may have an inference as to the role of copyists more generally: like a repairperson, they sometimes created substantial passages in order to amend what they had, and what they supplemented became an essential part of a text as the copyists intended.

¹⁶ See D'Evelyn, II. B. 2556-2813. For lines after II. B. 2813 of the Lechery section, see Matthew Sullivan, 'More Poetry by Peter Idley: Transcribed from British Library MS. Additional 57335', *Neuphilologische Mitteilungen*, 97 (1996), 29-55 (pp. 31-36). British Library, Additional MS 57335 reveals that Idley completed the Lechery section. For further lines before II. B. 2813, see Yoshinobu Kudo, 'Reinstalling Clerical Authority, Juridical and Didactic: The Unique Rearrangements of Book II of Peter Idley's *Instructions to his Son* in London, British Library, Arundel MS 20', *Medium Ævum*, 88 (2019), 265-300 (pp. 292-93, Appendix B. 1-4, and p. 297 n. 27). Furthermore, for one exemplum presumably included in the original Lechery section, see Kudo, p. 300 n. 65; H. L. D. Ward and J. A. Herbert, *Catalogue of Romances in the Department of Manuscripts in the British Museum*, 3 vols (London, 1883-1910), III (ed. by Herbert, 1910), 316; and Sullivan, 'Original and Subsequent Audiences', p. 253 n. 41.

In the transcription below, abbreviations have been silently expanded. Word divisions and capitalisations have been modified according to the modern convention. Punctuation has been modernised based on my interpretation of clause divisions. Those letters that are faint and difficult to confirm are shown in italics. In the first line only, I have supplemented one word, indicated by square brackets.

A transcription of non-authorial lines added to Peter Idley's *Instructions to his Son in Cambridge, Magdalene College, Pepys MS 2030, fols 131^r-32^v*

(fol. 131^r, from the third stanza onwards)

Iff lecherrye [has] the ryght for to declare,

Be glotenye fyrst hit begen;

So nere sybbe and cosyn they are

That seldom they parten a twyn;

Thus Powle seyde in epistyll withinne 5

To the Ephesios wretyn in thys wise:

“Be ye not dronkkyn with wynys of pryse.”¹⁷

By the wiche lecherye hathe hys myght

And to mankynde ys so plesaunt;

And that displesyth most Godys son ryght 10

And specially of thoo þat it haunt;

That to chastite theyre wit did graunt,

ffor Cryst hymselfe sayde hys postelys tyll:

“Teche the peple that þey do noon evill.”

(fol. 131^v)

In honest lyfe hem for to kepe, 15

¹⁷ Ephesians 5:18.

Hevenys blysse and they wille wynne,
 Helle to ascape bothe dirke and depe,
 ffulle grevons, peynes bee therinne;
 And most especyall ffor that synne,
 ffor in the olde lawe Moyses did make 20
 And a woman thralle therin were take.

She sholde be betyn with stonys to dethe
 A poure woman yf that she were;¹⁸
 And a gentyll wooman to hyr sethe
 Wyth stonys slayne on other manere; 25
 A boshoppys doughter and she were,
 In a fyre she shulde be brent
 After the lawe of Godys comavndment.

ffor the fowle synne of lecherye,
 God drowned the worlde and all therinne 30
 ffyve ceteys, alle for gret memorye,
 With thondyr and levynlete synke for þat synne:
 Sodome and Gomer, Adamas to myne,
 Also the cete of Seloune and Solere—
 In helle that synne þey byen it dere.¹⁹ 35

¹⁸ Cf. John 8:5.

¹⁹ According to Genesis 19:24, Sodom and Gomorrah were destroyed by ‘fire and brimstone’ (cf. fol. 132^r, line 2); see also Deuteronomy 29:22-23. As in the present passage, the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah was historically interpreted as punishment for their citizens’ sexual sins; see M. R. Godden, ‘The Trouble with Sodom: Literary Responses to Biblical Sexuality’, *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library*, 77 (1995), 97-119. The ancient five cities are Sodom, Gomorrah, Admah, Zeboiim, and Zoar (or Bela). To date, no reference to

A Good ensavmple may ye here
 Of avoutre what synne it ys;
 Of weddid folke ys good to lere.
 Of twoo I telle you þat dedyn amysse,
 ffor wiche they lostyn thayre heuyn blysse.²⁰ 40
 As Seynt John seythe in hys Gospelle,
 In greet doloure all suche folke dwelle.²¹

(fol. 132^r)

And they be dampned for that mysdede,
 In brvmston they brenne as any fyre
 ffor that ordure brekyng; take hede 45
 Bothe yonge and oolde þat dothe desyre
 To leve in synne helle hathe to hyre;
 God it ordeyned ffyrst in paradyse²²
 To mankynde to voyde all vise.

Seynt Mathewe seythe in the Gospell, 50
 “A man shall fader and moder forsake
 And wyth hys wyfe bothe byde and dwelle

two cities' names in line 34, Seloune and Solere, has been found; they might be the results of misreading Zeboiim and Zoar, respectively.

²⁰ Lines 36-40 seem to announce that an example of two people who committed lechery will follow, but what actually follows only explains the result of their 'mysdeed' (lines 42-45), and its details are not included. Perhaps one exemplum might be missing between lines 42 and 43 (i.e. between fols 131 and 132).

²¹ Cf. Revelation 2:22.

²² This line bears some similarity to Idley, II. A. 1620 (the Sixth Commandment).

And only hyr vse and alle other forsake.

Two bodyes they are I vndertake:

Oone flesshe and blode bothe varrament 55 *verrament: truly*

Knyttid togeder be the sacrament.²³

That betokenys Cryste and Holy Chyrche

Not oonly that God forbad that synne

But for he badde noo man soo to wyrke

Nough for to coveyte be manne thyng 60

Thy neyghburs wyfe fro hym to wynne,²⁴

And Seynt Awstyn seythe ryght in þis heste:

“Alle synne ys for boodyn to most and leeste.”²⁵

ffor the text tellyth after Seynt Mathewe:

“He that coveytyth a wooman be hys syght— 65

He synneth in hys hert afore Criste Ihesu

Yeffe he doo noo dede day nor nyght.”²⁶

And whoo that it havnteth, squyer or knyght—

Hys soule he byndyth to eternall dethe,

And he sodaynly dye without a sethe.²⁷ 70

(fol. 132^v)

²³ Cf. Genesis 2:24.

²⁴ Cf. Exodus 20:17.

²⁵ For St. Augustine of Hippo’s thought on the human body, see David G. Hunter, ‘Augustine on the Body’, in *A Companion to Augustine*, ed. by Mark Vessey (Malden: Blackwell, 2012), pp. 353-64.

²⁶ Cf. Matthew 5:28; Proverbs 6:25.

²⁷ Cf. Deuteronomy 22:22 (but not very close); see also Leviticus 20:10.

Hys bodi hit noyethe wonder sore;
 ffyrste it wastethe hys holsom blood,
 And to þe fende he graunteth yit more,
 ffor be vngrace it spendeth hys good
 And hys good fame; þen ys he wood. 75
 And to the devill it ys so plesaunt
 As worldly goodys are to a marchavnt.

Moost in these he getyth avauntage by
 And ryght soo delytysse the foule fende;
 ffor fyue fyngres he hathe full treuly 80
 To kayche the sowlys where so swyche wynde
 An avaryce loke to hym ys full hende;
 Be it of man weddid of another wyfe,
 Bothe body and soule he puttys in stryfe.

ffor, as the basaliske hathe that myght²⁸ 85
 ffolke to slee, and she in the grovnde
 Be in specte of hyr eyne so bryght;
 So dothe a wooman man hyr wovnde
 Be syght of eyn yeffe he be sounde;
 ffor yeffe hys body be hooll and querte, 90
 After sewyth þe auaryce in herte.

The seconde fynger ys the towchyng
 To grope a woman in violens;
 Salaman seythe suche handelyng

²⁸ A basilisk is an imagined serpent which is able to kill with a glance.

Ys like a skorpyoun—so foule affens—
That sodanly styngyth not to presens
But inwerde slethe be hert and wylle;
And thou touche pyche, it clevyth style.

(金沢大学国際基幹教育院外国語教育系)

Figure: Cambridge, Magdalene College, Pepys MS 2030, fol. 131^r

By permission of the Pepys Library, Magdalene College Cambridge

Appeare also howe the cones of honde ys fea
 And so a forse hem her parte to justifie
 By example of davyd that lodes barake
 Whyche saine was her husbond by a twayne
 And so of wedlok beate the lausit twayne
 They alleage also agayn vyrgy and reason
 howe dakhon was beloved of samson

The story also they feowlyd applye
 howe for a woman that spendent salaman
 Offendunt her god did aduortee
 Whyne in defens of her fals exorsydon
 They reherchyng thes storyes in exensacydon
 As in her evens appoychyng for to hymne
 As to for god. lechery were no hymne

If lechery the vyrgy for to declave
 The tholme first hit be ten
 So was syde and whye com thee are
 That seldom they parton a dayn
 Whyne poble fode in exorsy don't name
 So the epistole recygn in this wyse
 The ye not denythyn don't recygn of poyse

By the doncle lechery herte her myght
 And to manynde ys so plesant
 And that dyspleyret moste godys son myght
 And specially of thes part it want
 That to charyte theyre don't die greunt
 For eygh hym selfe saine hys poyse
 And the poble that paye do noon don't

ケンブリッジ・モードリン・コレッジ・ピープス図書館所蔵写本
Pepys MS 2030 収録のピーター・イドリー作『息子への教え』への
非著者による追加詩連

工 藤 義 信

要旨

本論文は、1475-1500年頃成立のケンブリッジ・モードリン・コレッジ・ピープス図書館所蔵写本 Pepys MS 2030 に収録されたピーター・イドリー作『息子への教え』に非著者によって追加された14詩連の翻刻を初めて公表し、本詩連の存在の重要性について論じる。まず、追加詩連の書き手がそれ以前の詩連の書き手と同一か否かに関し研究者間で見解が一致をみないことを踏まえ、両者の筆跡を詳細に検討し、本問題を結論づけることの難しさを示す。同時に、両者の間でインクの色・濃さが変わらないことや特徴的なレイアウトが継続していることを指摘し、追加詩連は少なくとも後の時期の追加ではなく、写本制作時の追加であると考察する。更にそのことが2つの重要な示唆を含むことを指摘する。ひとつは、当該写本の筆耕者たちが使用していた『息子への教え』の手本のテキストが詩行 II. B. 2555 までしかなかった可能性が高いことであり、この点は当該写本と他の写本に収録された『息子への教え』とのテキスト上の相互関係を考察するうえで重要な手がかりとなる。いまひとつは、追加詩連に聖書への言及が多く含まれており、その知識から推定するならば、当該写本の筆耕者たちが聖職者であった可能性が考えられるということである。最後に、本事例は手本に不足しているものを補うという、写本筆耕者の役割のひとつを示していると論じる。著者イドリーによる詩連ではないとは言え、当該セクションに求められている内容を追加しており、また、ひとたび追加されれば、イドリーの教訓詩の一部として読まれることを踏まえ、追加詩連が正当な批評を受けるべきであると主張する。