

1999

'The Wryttar to the Reidaris': Editing Practices and Politics in the Bannatyne Manuscript

Evelyn S. Newlyn

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarcommons.sc.edu/ssl>



Part of the [English Language and Literature Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Newlyn, Evelyn S. (1999) "'The Wryttar to the Reidaris': Editing Practices and Politics in the Bannatyne Manuscript," *Studies in Scottish Literature*: Vol. 31: Iss. 1.

Available at: <https://scholarcommons.sc.edu/ssl/vol31/iss1/4>

This Article is brought to you by the Scottish Literature Collections at Scholar Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in *Studies in Scottish Literature* by an authorized editor of Scholar Commons. For more information, please contact digres@mailbox.sc.edu.

Evelyn S. Newlyn

‘The Wryttar to the Reidaris’: Editing Practices and Politics in the Bannatyne Manuscript

Within the anthology that bears his name, George Bannatyne is neither a mere collector nor a passive scribe.¹ He appends his own moral assay in titles and rubrics he creates for various poems, and provides Explicit, Implicit, and other “signposts” that suggest to the reader interpretive direction—moral, religious, and aesthetic. Prominent among these signposts signaling Bannatyne’s editorial presence in the manuscript are four poems of his own composition that he labeled with some variations, “The wryttar to the redar.”² Editorial

¹See W. Tod Ritchie’s diplomatic transcription, *The Bannatyne Manuscript Writtin in Tyme of Pest, 1568*, STS, 2nd Series, 22, 23, 26; 3rd Series, 5 (London, 1928-34). James Barclay Murdoch edited an earlier edition for the Hunterian Club, *The Bannatyne Manuscript Compiled by George Bannatyne, 1568*, which contains various memoirs and documentary evidence concerning the Bannatyne family. See also the Scolar Press Facsimile Edition, *The Bannatyne Manuscript, National Library of Scotland Advocates’ MS. 1.1.6* (London, 1980), with an introduction by Denton Fox and William A. Ringler. Joan Hughes and W. S. Ramson edit about a third of the manuscript in *Poetry of the Stewart Court* (Canberra, 1982).

²These four poems include the Implicit to the manuscript as a whole, “The Wryttar to the reidaris” (1); the poem introducing Part IV, “To the reidar” (238); the poem introducing Part V, “The wryttar to the redar” (381); and the Explicit to the whole anthology, “The wryttar to the redar” (410). Poems are quoted from Ritchie’s edition and follow his numbering; I have not reproduced the italicized letters indicating Ritchie’s editorial expansions. For poems in the Draft manuscript the letter “D” precedes the number. References to Bannatyne’s editorial comments are either to Ritchie, citing volume and page, or to the Facsimile edition (Facs.),

comment as specific as these poems of course provides the reader some access into the editor's intentions and assumptions, but other less overt aspects of an anthology, reflected in such editorial decisions as the choice of works and their arrangement, also help to provide insight into an editor's assumptions about readers and attitude toward the materials.³

A number of Bannatyne's editing decisions appear to have taken place late in 1568 when, he tells us in poem 410, he put his manuscript into its complete form: recopying poems, adding new poems, rearranging; determining the anthology's ultimate five-part structure; composing and adding his signpost poems and comments. Examination of that final editing can help illuminate not only Bannatyne's attitudes and assumptions, but also the values and perspectives that formed his vision of the book. In his editorial comments, in his careful shaping and ordering of the manuscript, and in his assignment of poems to his various categories, Bannatyne reflects and vigorously reifies not just literary but political and cultural values he obviously considered paramount.

Given our certainty about Bannatyne's identity as compiler and scribe of the manuscript, scholars have generally felt confident in asserting that the anthology represents his particular aesthetic sense,⁴ that his taste and judgment are responsible for the selection of poems and the nature of their presentation in the manuscript. Inevitably, the anthology also expresses his politics, and critics such as MacDonald have discussed possible connections between the anthology's shape and content and events then occurring in religion and government.⁵ I consider here a more personal and at the same time socio-political

citing folio or page. For quotations from the Facsimile I silently provide conventional expansions, and in all quotations from the poems I modernize thorn and yogh.

³See, for example, Julia Boffey, *Manuscripts of English Courty Love Lyrics in the Later Middle Ages* (Cambridge, 1985), p. 1; and Derek Pearsall, *Manuscripts and Readers in Fifteenth-Century England* (Cambridge, 1983), p. 1. For a collection of useful essays on book production, see Jeremy Griffiths and Derek Pearsall, *Book Production and Publishing in Britain 1375-1475* (Cambridge, 1989).

⁴Among them see W. S. Ramson, "On Bannatyne's Editing," in *Bards and Makars*, eds. Adam Aitken, et al. (Glasgow, 1977); Helena Shire, *Song, Dance and Poetry of the Court of Scotland Under King James VI* (Cambridge, 1969); and Hughes and Ramson.

⁵Several critics have commented on Bannatyne's Protestant emendations. See Shire (pp. 15-17, 21-23) and Alasdair MacDonald's essays: "The Bannatyne Manuscript—A Marian Anthology," *Innes Review*, 37 (1986), 36-47; "Censorship and the Reformation," *File: A Literary Journal*, 1.3 (1992), 9-15; and "Poetry, Politics, and Reformation Censorship in Sixteenth-Century Scotland," *English Studies*, 64 (1983), pp. 410-21. Additionally, Ramson discusses Scots poets as "northern artists" differing from southern poets; see "The Northern Imagination," *Proceedings of the Third International Conference on Scottish Language and Literature (Medieval and Renaissance)*, eds. Roderick Lyall and Felicity Riddy (Stirling, 1981), pp. 11-29.

aspect of Bannatyne's editing, revealed in the manuscript's content, form, and collation, and particularly in his extensive addition of misogynistic verse to Part IV of his anthology during its final compilation.⁶

To provide a context for a close analysis of Part IV, the next section briefly discusses Bannatyne's stated motivations in compiling the anthology, considers the significance of the dates he wrote in his manuscript, and describes in detail his principle methods of writing and assembling the first three parts of the manuscript, the "ballatis of theologie," the "ballatis full of wisdome and moralities," and the "mirry ballettis." Following this context, the last section of this essay focuses on Bannatyne's final editorial attentions to Part IV, where the values and attitudes that form a significant strand of his social politics are particularly evident to the reader.

Although the Bannatyne Manuscript (National Library of Scotland Advocates' Manuscript 1.1.6) is well known as an extensive and invaluable anthology of late medieval Scots poetry, various aspects of the anthology's begetting and its *raison d'être* continue to elude scholars, even as other aspects are quite clear. In his Implicit to the entire manuscript, Bannatyne straightforwardly enough announces his intention to preserve the verse then existing in "copeis awld mankit and mvtillait"(1). Indicating some of his collection criteria, Bannatyne in this initial poem outlines his anthology's five-part structure. Part I, he explains, contains the "ballatis of theologie," concerned with god's glory and human salvation, while Part II offers "morale / grave" poems "full of wisdome and moralitie." Part III contains the "mirry ballattis," made for our consolation, and Part IV houses the "ballattis of luve," which are further divided into four sub-sections. Part V offers "tailis and storeis," fables, and other "poeticall workis." Obviously wishing to record and save the Scots literary heritage, Bannatyne also intended to represent the range and variety of Scots poetry, resulting in an encyclopedic manuscript containing nearly 400 poems.⁷

Bannatyne thus reveals some of his motives for creating the anthology, but his intention for the manuscript's presentation to a readership, which would certainly have affected his preparation of the final text, is unknown. Some scholars assume he intended the anthology for publication, while others believe he would have known that, despite his editorial efforts to remove offending

⁶When used in regard to the Bannatyne Manuscript "final" is a somewhat elastic term, since Bannatyne may have written a few additional poems into his manuscript sometime after 1568; see William A. Ringler, "Description of the Bannatyne Manuscript" (Facs., p. xvi).

⁷Bannatyne's act of literary preservation was of immense importance, not the least because approximately half the poems are unique to this manuscript; Bannatyne is, for example, the only witness for nine of Dunbar's poems and for six of Henryson's; see Denton Fox, "Contents of the Manuscript" (Facs., p. xli). In another example, of the thirty poems Bannatyne added to the second sub-section for Part IV, for poems on evil women, twenty-four are unique to the Bannatyne manuscript.

elements,⁸ his manuscript would not at the time he completed it have received Protestant approval for publication. In either case, his modifications of the final text clearly reflect a deference to the sensitivities and restrictions of the prevailing political and religious climate.

The exact dates of Bannatyne's writing and compilation of the manuscript area as uncertain as his intention for publication. Yet the time and duration of that last editing period are actually of some importance, in no small part because of Bannatyne's seeming disingenuousness about the parameters of his editing.⁹ Uncertainly about the compilation period has been in part generated by the Explicit to his full collection, in which Bannatyne claims to have written the manuscript in three months time, when he was obliged to rest from his labors "in tyme of pest" at the end of 1568 (410). The date 1568 written at other places in the manuscript would seem to support this assertion, except that the final digits of those dates appear to have been altered.¹⁰ Although some scholars have questioned whether Bannatyne could have written 375 folios of poetry in three months, Ringler has calculated that, writing no more than three hours a day, Bannatyne could indeed have produced in three months both the Draft manuscript and the Main manuscript.¹¹ That he could have, however, does not mean that he did so, and various pieces of evidence in the manuscript itself suggest instead a somewhat longer period of compilation and writing than October, November, and December of 1568.

⁸In addition to MacDonald's essays, see Priscilla Bawcutt's comments on "Protestantizing" in Bannatyne's two versions of Dunbar's "The Tabill of Confession," with stanzas omitted that list the "sevin commandis of the kirk": "Text and Context in Middle Scots Poetry," in *Actes du 2è colloque de langue et littérature écossaises*, eds. Jean-Jacques Blanchot and Claude Graf (Strasbourg, 1979), pp. 31-32.

⁹Remarking on Bannatyne's deception in regard to this date, Denton Fox observes that his usual method of correction was to cross out the error; see "Some Scribal Alterations of Dates in the Bannatyne MS," *Philological Quarterly*, 42 (1963), 262.

¹⁰See J. T. T. Brown, "The Bannatyne Manuscript: A Sixteenth Century Poetical Miscellany," *Scottish Historical Review*, 1 (1904), 136-58; and Fox, "Some Scribal Alterations," Ringler dismisses the changes on 290v and 298r as "slips of the pen" (p. xv).

¹¹Ringler, p. xv. I use the terminology "Draft manuscript" and "Main manuscript" as employed in the Facsimile edition. Also, when referring to Bannatyne's anthology one must frequently use conditional verbs, adverb, and adjectives since, for example, absolute statements about the manuscript's collation are now virtually impossible. Since the folios were trimmed at the edges and bound into carrier leaves, some roman foliation may have been excised. Although I have examined the manuscript myself, for this essay I rely on Ringler's collation in the Scholar facsimile, mindful the while of his caveat that conclusions in this regard should often be considered conjectural.

Why Bannatyne wished the reader to believe he wrote the manuscript in such a short period is unclear; given his references to the plague, to leaving the city, and to a concentrated period of writing, he may have been deliberately echoing the circumstances of Boccaccio's *Decameron*. In any event, perhaps to reinforce his assertion about the compilation period, he seems to have altered the earlier dates of 1565 and 1566, that were written in f. 290v and f. 298r, so that they corresponded with the date of 1568 that he cites in his final poem. These misleadings of the reader about date and compilation period are not in themselves grievous faults, but are significant as they attest Bannatyne's determination to perpetuate a particular view of the manuscript's creation, and as they are part of a constellation of editorial practices that position Bannatyne as an ongoing presence in the manuscript, an insistent shaper of the reader's response, interpretation, and understanding. His apparent deception in regard to the date, and his insistence on a short compilation period that seems contradicted by other evidence in the manuscript, indicate a desire to control and a willingness to manipulate the information the reader receives.

While the date of Bannatyne's final editing of the manuscript is thus somewhat uncertain, the date of his initial work on the anthology, perhaps in the form of small collections of poems, is even less definite, various dates from 1558 onward having been proposed.¹² MacDonald, for example, suggests that Mary's marriage to Darnley in 1568 may have stimulated the anthology's beginning in a group of love poems that Bannatyne collected and that ultimately became the first sub-section of the Main manuscript's Part IV. While the precise date of his commencing may never be absolutely determined, it seems clear that at some point earlier than 1568 Bannatyne started collecting late Middle Scots poetry, copying poems of various kinds onto gatherings he had at hand, perhaps grouping them according to their focus on religion, morality,

¹²See Shire, p. 11; Fox, "Some Scribal Alterations," p. 263; and Brown, p. 138. Hughes and Ramson and, most recently, MacDonald have sketched chronologies for the manuscript's writing and assemblage; Macdonald, in "The Bannatyne Manuscript—A Marian Anthology" (p. 44), proposes the following sequence:

- 1565, collecting the love poems.
- after July of 1567, assembling the Draft manuscript.
- (?Late 1567-1568), arranging Parts I and II, copying items from the Draft.
- compiling Part III, except for extracts from Lindsay's "Satyre," and Part IV.
- adding to Part III extracts from the "Satyre."
- (Late 1568), compiling and writing Part V.

—(End of December, 1568), changing the dates, completing the rubrics, and adding more poems from Baldwin-Paulfreyman and Bannatyne's own four poems addressed to the reader.

entertainment, or love, and thereby creating what is now termed his Draft manuscript.

When he then began, perhaps in October of 1568, to pen and to assemble¹³ the final version of his manuscript, Bannatyne seems to have envisioned only four parts, probably corresponding to the four different groups of poems he had already accumulated. In addition to those earlier collections, he had among his exemplars other manuscripts and printed books such as the July 1567 edition of Baldwin and Paulfreyman's *Treatise of Morall philosophye*, from which he selected several works.¹⁴ Bannatyne seems at that time to have employed two methods for his final compilation: one method was to create some sections of his Main manuscript afresh, copying some poems from his Draft and some from his other sources onto new gatherings; his second method was to lift gatherings and leaves wholly from his Draft manuscript and transfer them directly into what is now called the Main manuscript.¹⁵ His moving of material directly from the Draft is in part attested by different series of earlier roman foliation on leaves now in the Main manuscript, one series in the upper middle of the leaves and one series on the upper right, foliations which at times pick up and continue numerical sequences from leaves still located in the Draft manuscript.¹⁶ These systems of roman foliations, that preceded Bannatyne's final Arabic foliation of the whole manuscript, also suggest that preparation of the anthology took place over a longer period than his final poem signifies.

Consideration of these differences of foliation in, and between, the Draft and final version of the manuscript, along with an analysis of other features of

¹³Bannatyne may have been familiar with the technique of *compilatio*; for a discussion of *compilatio* as signifying a kind of book or a kind of writing, see M. B. Parkes, "The Influence of the Concepts of *Ordinatio* and *Compilatio* on the Development of the Book" in *Medieval Learning and Literature*, eds. J. J. G. Alexander and M. T. Gibson (Oxford, 1976).

¹⁴Ringler discusses the various editions of Baldwin and Paulfreyman and provides evidence for Bannatyne's use of the 1567 edition (pp. xv-xvi). For an analysis of Bannatyne's use of prints as sources, see Denton Fox, "Manuscripts and Prints of Scots Poetry in the Sixteenth Century," in *Bards and Makars*, eds. Adam Aitkin et al. (Glasgow, 1977).

¹⁵Not only did Bannatyne add new poems to those he recopied from the Draft, but he often rearranged Draft poems and reassigned them to new categories in the Main manuscript. For example, of the first twenty-four poems in the Draft manuscript, seventeen poems, rearranged, were copied into the first section of Part I; four poems became part of the fifth section of Part I for "exortationis of chryst to all synnaris"; and one poem was placed second in Part II. The numbers are off by two because Henryson's "Ane Prayer for the Pest" (D15-16) was divided in the Draft by a "finis" wrongly placed, and because the lines of D17 are canceled.

¹⁶Leaves sometimes have both middle-roman and right-roman numerals, as on ff. 98-102; leaves may also have two series of right-roman numerals, as on ff. 85 and 95. Ringler considers the middle-roman foliation to be earlier than the upper-right-roman foliation (p. xiii).

collation, can lead to some understanding of how the final manuscript was constructed. Such an analysis is worth conducting as it reveals the high degree of intentionality in selection, categorization, and ordering of material that is associated with Bannatyne's final editing. The careful mixing of old and new poems, the rewriting, the inattention to some parts of the manuscript compared to the extensive attention to others, and the insertion of a quantity of additional poems, combine to reveal Bannatyne's judicious control over his manuscript as well as information about himself as editor. Each poem, not just its inclusion but its placement in the manuscript, is the product of Bannatyne's careful thought and deliberate design.

In the anthology's final stages, Bannatyne created for the Main manuscript some new sections, notably the ends of Parts III and IV and all of Part V, which seem to have had no counterparts in the Draft. At the end of Part III, for example, Bannatyne added to the "mirry ballettis" three new works, including his lengthy extracts from Lindsay's *Satyre of the Thrie Estaitis*. Toward the end of Part IV, at one stage of compilation an Explicit had announced the completion of the entire book; later, however, this Explicit was written over, except for the date of 1565, which was changed to 1568. As a new end to Part IV, Bannatyne then added Douglas's "prolog of the fourt buik of Virgell," and created an additional new section, Part V, for fables and tales.

Other sections of the manuscript that seem to have been freshly written at the time of final compilation combine both new and Draft poems. The first two gatherings of Part I, the "ballatis of theologie," contain on 26 folios a mix of 28 poems, some copied from the Draft and some from other sources. Bannatyne began his first gathering in the Main manuscript with two poems by Bellenden; the first poem, "the benner of peetie" (3), had held first place in the Draft while the second (4) was new. In the second gathering are three other new poems (5, 6, 7), among them Douglas's "prolog of the tent buik of Virgill," as well as three poems from the Draft (8, 9, 10). Into the second gathering Bannatyne then wrote a new sequence called "Certane godly versis of the sawle The conscience etc.," using from the Draft a series of three poems from Baldwin-Paulfreyman concerning the soul, life, and prayer (D20, D21, D22), a new poem from Baldwin-Paulfreyman on the conscience (11), and four other new poems from Baldwin-Paulfreyman (13-16), to make in Bannatyne's new manuscript a new series of eight poems from that particular source. Bannatyne then included two versions of psalms by Alexander Scott, one from the Draft (17/D4) and one new version (18). Then, to complete the second gathering, Bannatyne copied ten (19-28) of thirteen poems in a sequence from the Draft (D5-18), among them Dunbar's "Tabill of Confessioun" (19/D5) and Henryson's "prayer for the pest" (27/D15-16), and placed them in the same order at the end of the second gathering. From that same sequence in the Draft of thirteen poems Bannatyne selected two poems (D9, D14) that he placed later on in Part I in the fifth gathering, in proximity to a sub-section established for "exortationis of chryst to all synnaris." These two poems (45, 46) in the form

of sinners' prayers to Christ may have seemed particularly appropriate to follow Christ's exhortations. Bannatyne's careful arrangement of these poems testifies to his awareness of context and his concern with individual poetic place in his anthology.

After these first two gatherings of newly-copied poems, Bannatyne began to use his second method of compilation, since the third and fourth gatherings in Part I, consisting of twelve folios (ff. 27-38) with sixteen poems (29-44), seem to have been wholly lifted from the Draft; the roman foliation still visible on the upper right corner of six of those twelve folios¹⁷ seems to confirm both their origin in the Draft and their proximity there. Moreover, none of the sixteen poems of these gatherings 3 and 4, which contain principally three clusters of poems focusing on Christ's Nativity (29-35), Passion (36-38), and Resurrection (39-41), are now found in the Draft, thus differentiating these two gatherings from gatherings 1 and 2 and gathering 5, all of which contain a mix of new poems and poems still found in the Draft. In preparing his final compilation of Part I, then, Bannatyne was evidently satisfied with the content of gatherings 3 and 4

This pattern of compilation that puts together newly copied work with sections lifted wholly from the Draft is evident throughout Parts II and III, as well. In Part II, the "ballatis of wisdome and moralitie," the remainder of the fifth gathering and the sixth gathering contain a mix of seventeen new poems and twelve poems copied from the Draft; in contrast, gatherings 7, 8, and 9 seem to have been substantially lifted from the Draft, indicated both by earlier roman foliation and by those poems' absence from the present Draft manuscript. These last three gatherings in Part II contain orderly sub-sections for "preceptis of medecyne and "Documenta," as well as two groups of "sentences" and "sayings" from philosophers such as Plato, Socrates, and Pythagoras.

Part III, the "mirry ballettis," similarly reveals both of Bannatyne's methods of compilation. Three of the first four gatherings, 10, 12, and 13, wherein traces of roman foliation are evident in several sequences on most of the leaves, appear to have been lifted from the Draft.¹⁸ Gathering 11, however, with no roman foliation, seems in contrast to have been newly added in the

¹⁷The foliation, though not sequential, is numerically close, and may be the remnants of a sequence that ran from around xxvij to around xxxv (Facs., ff. 28-35).

¹⁸In the 10th gathering the six central leaves (ff. 104-09) have no roman foliation; however, Ringler notes that f. 110 is foliated two numbers too low, and in that case ff. 104-09 may nonetheless be part of the original gathering, since those six leaves are sufficient to fill the lacuna in the surrounding sequence of roman foliation, which goes from xc on f. 103 to xciiij on f. 110.

final compilation.¹⁹ Although the “mirry ballettis,” throughout, contain misogynistic poems, the content and ordering of the poems that Bannatyne added in gathering 11 reveal severe attitudes toward women, their behavior, and their treatment. For example, among the nine poems on these added folios are a warning to women that recites a litany of female sexual sins (190), and a renunciation of love that, attacking women generally, advises men to treat women with deception and falseness (185). Bannatyne also includes in this new gathering three poems concerning women who appear to be prostitutes. One poem uses colors to refer to three “tapstaris” said to be “slicht wemen,” concluding, after various considerations and comparison, that “the reid” is worth both the “violet” and the “quhyt” (188). With less subtlety, “The ballat maid vpoun Margret fleming” compares Margret to a ship which all in Edinburgh can board, a ship that requires not a “landwart Iok” but a “stowt” and skilled man to handle her (186). The third of these poems, “The defence of crissell sandelandis,” purports to champion an accused woman found with “ane clerk of godly conversatioun,” but Bannatyne overtly condemns the woman in his title, which states that she was “vsing hirsself contrair the ten commandis” (187).

Surely not by accident these poems about “wanton women” are followed by a poem narrating the story of a pregnant and unmarried young woman who attempts an abortion. In a denouement most unrealistic, the young woman finally expresses joy at the birth (189); given the realities at that time for an unmarried mother, this poem seems to bespeak naïve conjecture by an unreliable and romanticizing narrator. Bannatyne clearly considered these poems to be comic, since he placed them among the “mirry ballettis,” those poems that he labeled “blyith and glaid Maid for our consollatioun”; their comic end, however, is achieved by disparaging women. The misogynistic effect of these poems is only slightly mitigated by the presence in this gathering of “The wyf of auchtirmwchty,” a poem offering a portrait of a competent woman within an entertaining account of a marital role reversal (183).

The second section of the “mirry ballettis,” gatherings 14-17, seems clearly to have been added to the end of Part III after Part IV had been copied, as evidenced by the sequence of roman foliation which stops on the last folio of the thirteenth gathering in Part III, skips over gatherings 14 through 17, and resumes on the second leaf of the eighteenth gathering that begins Part IV. Onto those four gatherings (14-17) that created a new ending to Part III, Bannatyne copied three new poems (229, 230, and 233),²⁰ among them his version

¹⁹In Ringler’s collation table, gathering 11 is italicized, indicating the presence of roman foliation; this must be a typographical error, however, since no roman foliation seems evident there and in his discussion following the table, Ringler indicates that those leaves have no roman foliation.

²⁰The poems numbered 231 and 232 may have been added later.

of Lindsay's play. The unique "Cupar Banns" announcing the performance of Lindsay's play in Fife, and Bannatyne's version of the play, together occupy some 46 folios at the end of Part III, constituting a substantial addition in the manuscript's final stages. MacDonald speculates that in including this material from Lindsay's play Bannatyne had an eye to the censors, for whom he was making "a display of 'safe' authors."²¹ A change such as this in Bannatyne's final editing indicates both the Protestant influence on creative work and Bannatyne's corresponding political astuteness, but it also manifests Bannatyne's awareness that literature functions in the culture in ways quite apart from the aesthetic.

In Bannatyne's editing of Part IV, the "ballattis of luve," we see revealed most clearly Bannatyne's sexual politics; his attitudes toward women and relationships between the sexes surely informed his editing of this part of his anthology and influenced in particular his choice of a large number of misogynistic poems that he added to this part of the manuscript. In his *Implicit* to Part IV Bannatyne announces his division of the "ballattis" into four sub-sections for "songis of luve," for "contempis of luve And evill wemen," for "contempis of evill fals vicus men," and for "ballattis detesting of luve And lichery" (III, 240). Bannatyne seems thus to promise a nicely balanced approach to his presentation of poems concerned with love, women, and men.

The first sub-section for "songis of luve," which with 81 poems is the largest of the four sub-sections, appears to have been lifted entirely from the *Draft*; this sub-section has attracted considerable attention from editors and critics.²² The other sub-sections in Part IV, especially the second and third sub-sections focusing respectively on women and men who behave badly in love, have been the subject of much less attention. The proportions of these paired sub-sections are particularly worth noting. The sub-section for "Contempis of luve And evill wemen" contains 39 poems, of which 32 are contempts of women and seven are contempts of love; in contrast, the sub-section for "contempis of evill fals viscius men," which Bannatyne tells us also includes poems in "prayiss of guid wemen" (IV, 48), contains altogether a scant nine poems, only three of which are genuine contempts of men, while three poems praise women and three poems do both.²³ Bannatyne seems to have had difficulty in achieving, in these sub-sections on evil women and evil men, the balance implied in his poem introducing Part IV.

²¹Macdonald, "The Bannatyne Manuscript—A Marian Anthology," p. 42.

²²John MacQueen edited a selection of lyrics in *Ballattis of Luve* (Edinburgh, 1970); see also Hughes and Ramson.

²³360, 363, and 365 are "contempis" of men; 362, 364, and 366 praise women either because Mary was a woman or because women give birth to men; and 361, 367, and 368 seem to do both.

According to Ringler's collation, the four sub-sections of Part IV consist of nine gatherings, numbered 18 through 26. The first sub-section, the "songis of luve," is contained in gatherings 18, 19, and 20, on folios 212r-249v; these folios have on both the middle and upper right hand corners sequences of roman foliation that are numerically close and that run between cxliiij and clxxxj.²⁴ Bannatyne seems, then, to have moved the gatherings with the "songis of luve" directly from the Draft manuscript into his ultimate collection with almost no editorial tinkering. He appears to have handled in the same way the third sub-section of Part IV for "contempis of evill fals vicus men," and the fourth sub-section for "ballattis detesting of luve and lichery," moving the gatherings for those sub-sections without change from the Draft into the Main manuscript; he did, of course, add to the end of the fourth sub-section Douglas's "Prollog" and another poem now missing due to the loss of ff. 295-7. Since roman foliation appears on all leaves in the third sub-section, and all but one of the leaves in the fourth sub-section, that is, on gatherings 24 and 25 prior to Douglas's poem, we can assume these two gatherings as they now exist were part of Bannatyne's earlier vision of the anthology and required no further editing.²⁵ Since Bannatyne was evidently not moved at the time of final compilation to address the skimpiness of the third sub-section, with its sum of three poems focused on "evill fals vicus men," his marked editorial attentions at that same time to the second sub-section concerning evill women, and particularly his addition in that second sub-section of both many new poems and new categories of poems, stand out in sharp relief.

That sub-section in Part IV for "contempis of luve And evill wemen" begins with gathering 21 but is introduced at the bottom of f. 249v, where a rubric written in what appears to be the same writing as that of the preceding poem announces that "Ballattis of remedy of luve / as followis." Testifying to the expansion of his vision regarding this sub-section, Bannatyne added to his existing rubric, in a much larger and less careful hand, "And to the reproche of evill wemen" (Facsim., f. 249v).²⁶ The first leaf of gathering 21 (f. 250), which has right-roman foliation of clxxxij, is followed by five leaves with no roman

²⁴Folios 232 and 233 are missing from the manuscript; since those two missing folios are preceded by f. 231, with roman foliation of clxiii, and followed by f. 234, with roman foliation of clxvi, the two missing folios were presumably numbered clxiv and clxv.

²⁵The first four folios of gathering 24, containing Hoccleve's "lettre of cupeid," have both middle-roman and right-roman foliation. Although the middle-roman foliation ends here, the right-roman foliation continues to the end of gathering 25, ending in Part IV with f. 290, where Bannatyne had at one time intended his book to conclude. The one leaf lacking roman foliation, f. 288, probably lost it to trimming.

²⁶Other similarly written rubrics can be seen in the Facsimile edition on, for example, ff. 250r, 262r, and 280v.

foliation; that sequence of roman foliation then appears to continue on the first folio of the next gathering, f. 256 in gathering 22, suggesting that during his final editing Bannatyne added the five intervening leaves (ff. 251-55).²⁷ The handwriting in those five leaves, larger and appearing more quickly written than the smaller and more deliberate writing on the folios preceding and following, may also suggest a different time of writing.²⁸ Those five new leaves add to this sub-section reproaching evil women an additional ten poems (323-32) which portray women as cruel, perverse, pitiless, hypocritical, sadistic, and stony-hearted, as false and fickle creatures whose hideous flaws lurk under a deceptively attractive exterior.

Of these ten new poems, several are statements renouncing love after unhappy experiences, or laments about individual women who are false or unresponsive (323, 324, 327, 328, 331). In addressing an individual woman, these poems are not overtly misogynistic in the same way as other poems added at this juncture. Nevertheless, in their underlying assumption that if women were more malleable and compliant with men's wishes then men would not suffer in love, these complaints concerning an unresponsive lady connect to those poems more blatantly misogynistic.

Of the other poems on these five leaves, two can be categorized as "rebellious lover" poems in which the speakers swear they will no longer suffer at the hands of their recalcitrant ladies. One speaker, claming with braggadocio to have found "ane freschar feir to fang / baith of hyd hew and hair," articulates the misogynistic belief that all women are alike and interchangeable, derisively announcing that "Ye saw nevir so fair a caik / of meill that milar mais / bot yit ane man wald get the maik" (325). The speaker of the other poem, alleging that women sadistically enjoy seeing their lovers suffering, vows aggressively to retaliate in the future if his lady is unfaithful (332). In each poem the narrator displays the cynical attitude toward love and women that is expressed in the aphorism, "as gud luv cumis as gais"²⁹

Other poems Bannatyne added here explicitly criticize the entire female sex. A dissatisfied lover in one poem extrapolates from his own mistress's "hairt of stone" to assert the perversity of all womankind, raging that "The facultie of famenene" is such that women want men they do not have, while making enemies of their (male) friends and thus killing them (329). Another

²⁷The roman foliation of f. 26 is trimmed at the right margin, but since "clxxxii" remains, the number intended was at least clxxxij (Facs., f. 26).

²⁸Of course, a change in a scribe's writing is not in itself necessarily significant, since it may simply signal a different scribal stint; when other evidence exists as well, however, such changes may be meaningful.

²⁹This common saying is found in a number of other poems, including 336 and 337, nearby in the manuscript.

poem, seeming to reveal the influence of courtly love, charges that loving a woman makes a man become pale and miserable, turn sick, and collapse nearly to death (331).

This group of poems also develops a theme favored in misogynistic verse, that women's attractive exterior masks their real coldness, depravity, and sinfulness, thus grievously misleading men. Mildest of these statements may be the assertion in a poem by Alexander Scott that there are many women "that semis gud and ar not sa" (326). Another poem develops this theme with considerably more relish and enthusiasm. Beginning in a relatively controlled manner, the narrator muses about how to express the "quent consaitis of wemenkynd," since he finds "thair haill affectioun / So contrair thair complexioun" (330). Quickly deciding how to do so, he declaims in an extensive inventory examples of female duplicity. Women are hypocritical in demanding loyalty, he charges, while themselves deceitful and false; intolerant of men who are unwise, women are themselves foolish; unable to keep secrets, women yet expect men to keep theirs. Pitiless, they want pity; liars, they want truth; cold and ungiuing, they want men to nourish them. Moreover, even as women insist on being free, they want to enslave men. Women are, the poem stresses, the exact opposite of what they say, what they do, and how they look.

In itself, this group of negative poems about women makes a forceful statement. However, Bannatyne maintains and builds ideological momentum by interpolating another group of similar poems almost immediately, at the beginning of gathering 22, after a leaf with the right-roman foliation, trimmed, of clxxxii. The leaves appearing to have been inserted in this next interpolation (ff. 257-8) lack roman foliation and are also in somewhat larger and quicker writing. These two leaves add to the sub-section reproaching evil women a new category Bannatyne labels "Schort Epegrammis Aganis Women," and seven additional poems (336-42). In order to fit these two leaves into the existing gathering that he had taken from the Draft, Bannatyne appears to have recopied on the verso of the second new leaf, f. 258v., the beginning of an excerpt from "The Remedy of Love" (343), a poem that is continued onto the gathering's last leaf, f. 259, which has the right-roman foliation clxxxij. The stanzas written on the bottom of f. 258v. are written in the more sprawling hand of the other new poems on ff. 257-8, while the stanzas on f. 259 that continue "The Remedy of Love" are written in a smaller, more careful hand that seems virtually identical to the hand that wrote the poem at the bottom of f. 256v (335), before the two new leaves.

The first of the seven new poems on ff. 257-8 is cast as a lover's letter of renunciation to his false lady, but in cautioning other men about women's deceit and fickleness, the poem also falls into the category of "warning poem." The lover applies to his misfortune in love a number of proverbs, some traditional and some less so: "All glittrand thing is not of gold / And ilk fair apill Is not gude / Ane seik heid in a skarlet huid" (336). Like the poems added to ff. 251-55, this poem propounds the deceptive difference between women's at-

tractive appearance and their inherent evil. Untypically, however, this lover seems to assume some responsibility for his state, or perhaps he flagellates himself, as he observes sardonically, “the blind Eitis mony a fle.”

Bannatyne begins his new category, “Schort Epegrammis aganis women,” with a “rebellious lover” poem. Indicating his disregard for the lady’s “un-kyndnes,” the lover in this poem stoutly avers that, in spite of her mistreatment, he “sall not weir the sicing bene / Nor walk on nichttis” (337), and he observes, along with other unsuccessful lovers, “als gud luve cumis as gangis.” That Bannatyne included the poem in this section, and in fact placed it first, is significant, since his assigning of this poem to a category he established for poems “aganis women” suggests that he recognized the general, rather than simply the particular, anti-woman essence in such poems, reflected in the saying “als gud luve cummis as gangis.”

The other “Epegrammis” are clear and unmistakable pieces of misogynist verse. One six-line poem, for example, warns against women’s “wrinkis” and “wylis” (338), while another conventionally details the wickedness of Jezebel, whom the poem labels “Ane of the warst that evir was in erd” (339). Two other poems take the form of the “Sambhavana,”³⁰ claiming that all of the earth’s resources are insufficient to record “the cursitnes And disset of wemen” (341) or the “fals dissaitful dispyt / And wicketness contenit in a wyfe” (340). At the end of this group a brief but sharply misogamous poem caustically observes that if one compares a wife to the devil, the devil appears to definite advantage (342).

Gathering 23, which continues the sub-section for poems reproaching evil women, is similar in structure to gathering 22, since Bannatyne appears to have inserted seven new leaves between the leaves he took from the Draft. The gathering’s first leaf (f. 260) and its last two leaves (ff. 268-9) have sequential series of roman foliation in both the middle (cxciij-cxcvj) and right corner (clxxxiiij-clxxxvj), both series skipping over the intervening seven leaves of ff. 261-267. Those seven new leaves add to the “Contemptis of luve And evill wemen” thirteen new poems (346-58), including another new category Bannatyne entitled “Ballatis Aganis evill wemen” (IV, 32).

The poems in these seven leaves offer a cross-section of popular misogynistic verse. After two initial poems that chastise ‘Lady Solistaris’ at court (346, 347), Bannatyne clusters a group of three poems under his title “Ballatis Aganis evill wemen.” These three poems accuse all women of all manner of evil, with two of the three poems (348, 349) employing the traditional catalog of male victims such as Samson who, even though they possessed exceptional strength or virtue, were nonetheless overcome by bad women. The third poem in this cluster, slanderously attributed to “chauceir,” is little more than a lexi-

³⁰The Sambhavana is an ancient rhetorical figure employed by Sanskrit critics; see Irving Linn, “If All the Sky were Parchment,” *PMLA*, 53 (1938), 953.

con in alliterative verse of every conceivable nasty adjective that could be applied to the female sex; women are said to be, for example, "Dowgit / dispytfull / dour and dissavable," "Vnkynd crewall curst and covettus," and "Angry / awstern / And till all evillis able" (350). While Chaucer could not possibly have written this hate-filled cascade of vituperation, one does indeed wonder who could.

The poem following these "Ballatis Aganis evill wemen," which Bannatyne titles "Aganis mariage of evill wyvis," demonstrates the fundamental connection existing between misogyny and misogamy; the poem's speaker thanks "god and his appostillis twelf" that he is unmarried, since any wife, whether rich or poor, is evil, and since in consequence "thair is no difference / Betuix the gallowis and the spowsing claith" (351). After this verse Bannatyne places a poem in which the narrator announces with no small satisfaction that the recalcitrant woman who rejected him is afflicted with syphilis (352). Presenting a dreadful picture of women and of love, these poems assert that love of women saps men's strength, positions men in a marital hell-on-earth, and connects men with creatures who are heartless, cruel, or disgustingly diseased.

Had doubt remained regarding women's true nature, after two poems on love (353, 354), the second of which conventionally asserts the general superiority of divine over earthly love, Bannatyne places three poems that employ against women the form and substance of the "impossibility" or lying-song. The first poem reflects as well the *chanson d'aventure*, as the narrator goes out in the morning into the natural world; there encountering "Pandarius," the narrator asks him "Quhen ladeis to thair luvaris salbe leill" (355). The question of course invites certain generic traditions, and Pandarius replies with a series of impossible events: "when gud reid wyne growis On the roddyne treis," for example, and when "hony and walx Ar maid but werk of beis." When the narrator soberly responds that "that tyme may nevir cum," Pandarius explains that those things will nonetheless happen before the situation posed in the narrator's question will occur. Bannatyne continues his selections from this genre with two other "impossibility" poems that pronounce women incapable of truth (356, 357). Interestingly, Bannatyne entitles the first of these "Ane vthir ballat of vnpossibiliteis compaird to the trewth of wemen in luve." He concludes the group of "Ballatis Aganis evill wemen" with a poem by a forlorn lover who comments not only on his own loss but who broadens his condemnation to the entire female sex, swearing that "trewth is nocht / in wemen wrocht" (358) and that all women are false, unfaithful, and wild.

Bannatyne forcefully underscores the socio-political message of these poems by his placement of them in the manuscript: he locates these seven new leaves to precede directly one of the anthology's most woman-hating poems, a poem situated as the culminating piece of verse for the sub-section established for "Contemptis of luve And evill wemen." In this poem doubly serving as an end-bracket, an embittered octogenarian curses his life-long attentions to the "thankless mouth" (359). Embodying one of the most malevolent strands of

late medieval misogyny, this poem reduces women not just to sexual objects but to genitalia.³¹

In his final stage of editing, then, Bannatyne thus deliberately increased the weight of his anthology's misogynistic verse. Although we can only speculate as to Bannatyne's motives, we can assume that he was writing for posterity in accord with his own idea of the book, deliberately creating an anthology that he believed people would at some time read and that would reflect "the personal interest and knowledge of its maker...and also those of a particular period."³² Inevitably, of course, the anthology is a product of Bannatyne's culture, and his literary accommodations and concessions to the religious and political realities of his time are certainly manifest in Bannatyne's editing of the first three parts of his manuscript.³³ Some of Bannatyne's editing, then, was clearly a response to, and a result of, exterior political and religious forces.

The editing that greatly increased the misogynistic voice in Bannatyne's manuscript, however, results from no such manifest exterior force. Misogyny was indeed rampant in the culture and is to be expected in Bannatyne's manuscript, and perhaps an intention to approach the subject of women equitably may have prompted Bannatyne to create the two separate sub-sections in Part IV for poems that castigated women and men alike.³⁴ However, when he came to his ultimate compilation, Bannatyne displayed an exceptional vigor and enthusiasm in incorporating into his manuscript additional misogynistic material, not just new poems, but also his own titles and rubrics as well. Certainly an obvious result of his energetic approach to this socio-political material is that the category for "contempis of evill wemen" is filled to the brim. During his

³¹Not unique in this poem the image of the "thankless mouth" is also found, for example, in poem 222; the image is certainly connected to that of the *vagina dentata*.

³²Lynn Thorndike, "The Problem of the Composite Manuscript," *Studi e Testi*, 126 (1946), 95.

³³His accommodations to Protestant censors are also evident in Part V of the manuscript in, for example, some of Henryson's fables.

³⁴The presence of those sub-sections in Part IV may also indicate his knowledge of the "*querelle des femmes*" which had raged in the Middle Ages. On this controversy see Joan Kelly, *Women, History, and Theory* (Chicago, 1984), pp. 65-109; Katherine Usher Henderson and Barbara F. McManus, *Half Humankind: Contexts and Texts of the Controversy about Women in England, 1540-1640* (Chicago, 1985). For an index of the writings in England and Scotland on both sides of the argument, see Francis Lee Utley, *The Crooked Rib: An Analytical Index to the Argument about Women in English and Scots Literature to the End of the Year 1568* (Columbus, OH, 1944).

final editing, Bannatyne thus revealed not only some of his ideas about books and poetry, but also some of his personal politics.³⁵

State University of New York at Brockport

³⁵My thanks to Janet E. Robinson, who read the essay in draft and made many valuable suggestions toward its improvement.