

# UC Berkeley

## UC Berkeley Electronic Theses and Dissertations

### Title

Reading Across Languages in Medieval Britain

### Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/9zf9b4bx>

### Author

DeAngelis, Jamie

### Publication Date

2012

Peer reviewed|Thesis/dissertation

Reading Across Languages in Medieval Britain

By

Jamie Ann DeAngelis

A dissertation submitted in partial satisfaction of the

Requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

in

Comparative Literature

in the

Graduate Division

of the

University of California, Berkeley

Committee in charge:

Professor Jennifer Miller, Chair

Professor Joseph Duggan

Professor Maura Nolan

Professor Annalee Rejhon

Spring 2012

Reading Across Languages in Medieval Britain  
© 2012  
by Jamie Ann DeAngelis

Abstract

Reading Across Languages in Medieval Britain

by

Jamie Ann DeAngelis

Doctor of Philosophy in Comparative Literature

University of California, Berkeley

Professor Jennifer Miller, Chair

*Reading Across Languages in Medieval Britain* presents historical, textual, and codicological evidence to situate thirteenth- and fourteenth-century vernacular-to-vernacular translations in a reading milieu characterized by code-switching and “reading across languages.” This study presents the need for—and develops and uses—a new methodological approach that reconsiders the function of translation in this multilingual, multi-directional reading context.

A large corpus of late thirteenth- through early fourteenth-century vernacular literature in Britain, in both English and Welsh, was derived from French language originals from previous centuries. These texts include mainly romances and *chansons de geste*, and evidence suggests that they were produced at the same time, and for the same audience, as later redactions of the texts in the original language. This evidence gives rise to the main question that drives this dissertation: what was the function of translation in a reading milieu in which translations and originals shared the same audience? Because a large number of the earliest or sole surviving translations into English from French language originals appear in Edinburgh, National Library of Scotland, Advocates’ MS 19.2.1 (the Auchinleck Manuscript), my study focuses on the translations preserved in this manuscript. Although it is known for being the earliest virtually monolingual anthology of Middle English texts, I illuminate the multilingual milieu in which the Auchinleck Manuscript circulated and argue that an audience of multilingual readers who were familiar with the original French language sources of the texts enabled an extratextual discourse for reading in translation. The practice of reading across languages gave rise to a particular mode of discourse in which translative revisions could generate an intertextual dialogue with source texts. In many cases, this dialogue was both subversive and interrogative, in that it prompted an extratextual discussion that revised values expressed in the source texts and, in so doing, commented on ideological issues that were important to an early fourteenth-century audience. Moreover, the act of moving into the English language texts which had been read in French for approximately a hundred years mimetically effected a revision of another sort by urging the cultural reorientation of the Anglo-Norman reader and generating a significant dialogue about vernacular literary production in England. The Auchinleck translations represent a method of inscribing significance and receiving information that alters the way we think

about the transmission of ideas and the use of the English language, which invites new questions regarding the role of English as its use increased and developed through the fourteenth century.

In chapter one I argue that Middle English translations were produced with the knowledge that readers would put them in dialogue with their French language source texts, and I contextualize the Auchinleck Manuscript in particular within this multilingual milieu. I further describe the historical and cultural context that made this manuscript a rich site for the subversive interrogation of traditional values, an important context for my discussion, in later chapters, of the translative revisions in the Auchinleck texts.

Chapter two considers the Auchinleck *Guy of Warwick* and *Reinbroun*, which, taken together, translate the Anglo-Norman *Gui de Warewic*. I provide new evidence to argue that these were original translations composed in conjunction with the production of the Auchinleck Manuscript, a theory first proposed by Laura Hibbard Loomis, but which has been summarily dismissed in recent scholarship.

Chapter three reexamines the same texts in light of the arguments presented in chapters one and two. I consider how the multilingual cross-reader may have interpreted translative revisions as rhetorical gestures, and I identify what I call an interrogative translative pattern that questions some of the values depicted in the source text, thereby generating an extratextual dialogue about the fourteenth-century cultural and political issues I described in chapter one.

Chapter four steps back in time to consider the small handful of French-to-English translations that clearly pre-date those discussed in chapters two and three, including *King Horn*, *Floris and Blancheflour*, and *Havelok*. Manuscript evidence shows that these texts also circulated in a multilingual reading milieu, but they did not operate in a discursive mode that generated an intertextual dialogue with their source texts. A description of the translative methodology exhibited in these texts helps us understand how later examples of French-to-English translation developed in interesting ways.

Chapter five considers four other translations that appear in the Auchinleck Manuscript, all of which preserve evidence to suggest that they, too, may have been translated in conjunction with the production of this manuscript. A study of *Lay le Freine*, *Horn Childe and Maiden Rimnild*, *Amis and Amiloun*, and *Beves of Hampton* gives rise to the main argument of this dissertation, discussed above, and shows that the Auchinleck translations represent an important development in the function of translation and the use of the English language in medieval England.

Chapter six considers Welsh translations of several of the same texts that appear in translation in the Auchinleck Manuscript and contextualizes them within a discussion of English-Welsh political and cultural relations. The Welsh texts that tell the stories of *Beves of Hampton* (*Bown o Hamtoun*), *Otinell* (*Rhamant Otuel*), and *Amis and Amiloun* (*Kymdeithas Amlyn ac Amic*) were probably translated from French and Latin at the same time that they were translated into Middle English, and cultural and historical evidence suggests that the producers of the English and Welsh translations should have been aware of one another's work. A study of these parallel translation projects reveals interesting differences in the methods of translation that reflect the cultural concerns of the Welsh after Edward I's conquest and that also point to the genuinely innovative rhetorical function of translation in the Auchinleck Manuscript.

This dissertation is dedicated to my Noni and Papa, who wanted very much to live long enough to see me complete it. I imagine they are toasting highballs in heaven in celebration—*salute!*

## Table of Contents

Acknowledgements	iii
Prologue	1
Chapter One Multilingualism and the Cultural Context of the Auchinleck Manuscript	3
Chapter Two Anglo-Norman and Middle English in the Auchinleck <i>Guy of Warwick</i> and <i>Reinbroun</i> and their Structure in the Auchinleck Manuscript	30
Chapter Three Reorientation of Text and Reader in <i>Guy of Warwick</i> and <i>Reinbroun</i>	75
Chapter Four French-to-English Translation Before the Auchinleck Manuscript	94
Chapter Five Translation in the Auchinleck Manuscript	109
Chapter Six Welsh Translation in the Context of British Multilingualism	155
Conclusion	185
Bibliography	187

## Acknowledgements

I am deeply grateful to my committee members, who make up a remarkably dedicated, supportive, and inspiring group. When Joe Duggan phoned ten years ago to discuss beginning my doctoral work at Berkeley, I did not know that I was speaking with one of the most devoted advisors with whom I could have chosen to work. He taught me the intricacies and joys of working with medieval manuscripts and showed incredible patience when I incessantly interrupted his work in the Bancroft Library to ask for his help with mine. He has been my “go-to person” for most questions, since the depth and breadth of his knowledge on just about any subject borders on uncanny, and he handles all quandaries with kindness and finesse, a skill from which I have benefitted a number of times. Annalee Rejhon patiently taught me to read Middle Welsh and introduced me to the fascinating world of early Welsh literature and Celtic mythology. She is an exceedingly generous mentor who has offered wise advice on everything from codicology to motherhood to which cocktail I should order. Maura Nolan provided, with kindness, constructive criticism that significantly improved this project, and she has offered heartening encouragement on a number of matters over the years; I am grateful to her for these things. My greatest intellectual debt is to my dissertation director, Jennifer Miller. Her formidable intellect and innovative approach to studying medieval texts have challenged and guided me and shaped my development as a scholar in every respect. I am sure, however, that with more experience I will look back and realize that I was not, at this stage, even equipped to understand all that she had to offer. I am grateful to her for being candid without ever being judgmental, and for creating a comfortable space for exploring even the most undeveloped or improbable ideas. I am also enormously thankful for her mentorship as an academic mother. She has offered unending support, enthusiastic encouragement, and practical advice on everything from how to work in twenty-minute increments while the kids are quiet to how to get through the fourteenth hour of natural childbirth. She has cared for my children and offered to arrange for their care, and she has taught me to combine motherhood and academia in ways that I would not have had the courage to do without her guidance.

Other exceptional academic mothers have offered invaluable support in this area as well. I am especially grateful to three of them: Sophie Volpp, H el ene Bilis, and Dorothy Kim. These strong women may not realize the extent to which our candid conversations, their inspiring example, and their warm encouragement supported me as I completed this dissertation while raising two small children.

Three professors who were not directly involved in this dissertation, but whose influence surely permeates it, also deserve my thanks: David Hult and Albert Ascoli were influential teachers in my pre-dissertation years, and I would not have pursued this degree without the extraordinary mentorship of my undergraduate advisor, Debora Schwartz. For support, laughter, and camaraderie, I thank my colleagues and teaching partners, especially Marisa Libbon and Amelia Borrego.

I thank the Department of Comparative Literature, the Graduate Division, the UC Berkeley Center for British Studies, and the Foreign Language and Area Studies Program, without whose financial support this work would not have been possible.

Finally, I could not have accomplished any of this without the support of my

wonderful parents, who have provided encouragement, made me dinner, cared for my children, and so much more so that I could work. My dear husband allowed me to spend a decade pursuing a passion while he supported us financially; for that I am very grateful. This dissertation was begun near the birth of our first son, Lucas, and it was completed near the birth of our second, Asher. They have nursed through meetings, played with toys on blankets under microfilm machines, bounced on my hip while I gave a conference paper, and tagged along to libraries and archives near and far. Most importantly, they have put this work in healthy perspective.

## Prologue

Paris, Bibliothèque nationale, MS nouv. acq. fr. 4532 is a small, quarto-size codex that preserves an incomplete early fourteenth-century Anglo-Norman verse text of *Boeve de Haumtone*. Like most Anglo-Norman texts, it is justified to the left, with the first letter of each line set apart in a ruled column. But even among small volumes, it is unusual to see an Anglo-Norman text appear in a single column, as this example of *Boeve de Haumtone* does; this presentation is reminiscent of texts in English, Latin, and Continental French. The unusual amount of space in the right margin, however, did not go to waste. The Anglo-Norman lines are extended across the page by a line-by-line translation into English. Some lines, and even some blocks of lines, are not translated, but most are translated in full, rather than providing a simple gloss of the more difficult Anglo-Norman words.<sup>1</sup> The English text is not justified in its own column; rather, the English words lengthen each Anglo-Norman line, beginning right next to the last Anglo-Norman word of each line and providing a rare and interesting visual representation of seamlessly *reading across languages* in translation.

The English hand has never been dated, and from my own examination it appears to be significantly later than the Anglo-Norman text. *Boeve de Haumtone* is the only medieval text preserved in this manuscript, and it is bound with a collection of English manorial accounts on paper that could date from the sixteenth, seventeenth, or eighteenth century.<sup>2</sup> Although more work needs to be done to date the English hands throughout this manuscript, the hand that translates *Boeve de Haumtone* does not appear to be the same one that wrote the English manorial accounts.<sup>3</sup>

What was this translation for? Was it for textual access or language learning? BnF, MS nouv. acq. fr. 4532 raises interesting questions regarding our expectations about the function of translation. It might preserve one of the earliest parallel text translations, and as such, we as modern readers are at ease with the idea of translation that it suggests. As a practice, the tradition of translating medieval texts is something we still participate in today, and we frequently provide our students with parallel text translations both to give a larger group of people access to medieval texts and to teach them medieval languages. The English translation in BnF, MS nouv. acq. fr.

---

<sup>1</sup> The final few folios, ff.77<sup>r</sup> – 82<sup>v</sup>, do not include the English translation. Note that the catalogue description of this manuscript does not include notice of the English translation transcribed next to *Boeve*, nor is it mentioned in any published description of the manuscript, of which I am aware.

<sup>2</sup> It is dated to the sixteenth century by Delisle and Stimming (Delisle 1891, p. 58; Stimming 1899, p. iv). Weiss suspects, however, that it is in a seventeenth or eighteenth century hand, since there is a reference in the beginning to the antiquary who once owned it, Peter Le Neve (1661-1729) (Weiss 2008, p. 9 and n. 27). The statement that the book belonged to Le Neve is written on the recto of the first folio, and the manorial accounts begin on the recto of folio two. The reference to Le Neve's ownership could have been added after the manorial accounts were written, however, so more work needs to be done to date the hand of these accounts.

<sup>3</sup> I make this statement from my own examination of the hands. It does not seem that *Boeve* was bound with the manorial accounts at the time that they belonged to Peter Le Neve (1661-1729), since the statement that the book belonged to him does not include *Boeve* in its reference to the contents: "This book is cald in Peter le Neves catalogue. An account of several mannors in divers counties." (BnF, MS nouv. acq. fr. 4532, f. 1<sup>r</sup>.) The manuscript was later owned by William Constable of Burton Constable House, Yorkshire (Delisle 1891, p. 58).

4532 therefore seems in line with our familiar modes of understanding and receiving literary translation.

But does continuity of practice necessarily imply continuity of purpose? Should we project backward, onto medieval texts, our modern understanding of the function of literary translation? From a medieval perspective, BnF, MS nouv. acq. fr. 4532 is extraordinary. Although we frequently see difficult words glossed by and for readers reading non-native languages in medieval manuscripts, with the exception of the *Eadwine Psalter*, which I will discuss in chapter one, no other text resembling a parallel translation exists from the medieval period in England.<sup>4</sup> This English translation of *Boeve de Haumtone* occupies an ambiguous space, midway between medieval and modern textual traditions. Insofar as we do not see parallel text translations in the medieval period, it seems strikingly modern. On the other hand, visually, the handwritten text on parchment and the seamless multilingualism that the *mise-en-page* represents seem very medieval.

---

<sup>4</sup> Although it is not in “parallel” format, however, one late medieval manuscript, Cambridge University Library, MS li.3.21 (dating to the first half of the fifteenth century) preserves Chaucer’s *Boece* along with the whole Latin text, in alternating sections of English and Latin. See Seymour 1995, pp. 43-53 for a description of this and all surviving manuscripts of Chaucer’s *Boece*, many of which preserve varying amounts of the Latin text along with Chaucer’s.

## Chapter 1

### Multilingualism and the Cultural Context of the Auchinleck Manuscript

Although the *mise-en-page* is unusual from a medieval perspective, the late inscription of a parallel text translation in Paris, Bibliothèque nationale, MS nouv. acq. fr. 4532, discussed in the prologue, comes out of a long tradition of writing in several languages and reading across them. There does survive a unique medieval example that both hints at the notion of a “parallel text translation” and illustrates the seamless multilingualism of post-Conquest Britain.<sup>1</sup> The *Eadwine Psalter*, preserved in Cambridge, Trinity College, MS R.17.1, is a mid twelfth-century psalter produced at Christ Church, Canterbury. It preserves three versions of St Jerome’s Latin psalter in a tri-columnar arrangement.<sup>2</sup> Jerome’s Gallicanum is “written in a formal script twice the size of the other two versions, and occupies the outermost column on recto and verso.”<sup>3</sup> This text is accompanied by a Latin commentary between the lines and in the margins. Another, narrower column is written next to this one and preserves Jerome’s Romanum version of the psalter; between the lines is “a literal Old English rendering of the psalter text.”<sup>4</sup> Jerome’s Hebraicum is written on the innermost column of the page on both recto and verso, parallel to the Romanum version. “Between the lines of the Hebraicum and parallel, inter-line for inter-line with the adjacent Old English gloss is one of two surviving Anglo-Norman examples of a translation of the Hebraicum.”<sup>5</sup> Jennifer Miller argues that the *mise-en-page* suggests that the translations offer a kind of commentary and access, but only in reference to the main text (i.e., the Old English and Anglo-Norman “translations” are not meant to be read independently from the Latin), and she notes that visually, the English and French translations seem to be parallel text translations of one another, alternating the order of translation on the recto and the verso.<sup>6</sup> That is, because the version of the Latin psalter that is translated into Anglo-Norman is always written in the innermost column on the recto and verso, and the one that is translated into Old English is always written next to it, in the middle of the three columns, then reading from left to right on the recto, English translates French, but on the verso French translates English. This, of course, is triangulated by both of the texts’ relationship to Latin, and Miller sees the *Eadwine Psalter* as “an icon of linguistic relations in twelfth-century Britain.”<sup>7</sup>

The presentation in the *Eadwine Psalter* is unique, and full translations did not typically appear right next to their originals on the manuscript page or even within the

---

<sup>1</sup> The following description of the *Eadwine Psalter* is taken from Jennifer Miller, “La3amon’s French.” I thank Professor Miller for providing me with a copy of this conference paper.

<sup>2</sup> The three versions are the Romanum, Jerome’s first Latin version, the Gallicanum, his first revision of the Latin text with consideration of the Greek and Hebrew versions, and the Hebraicum, his translation directly from the Hebrew.

<sup>3</sup> Miller “La3amon’s French.”

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*

same manuscript.<sup>8</sup> Textual evidence suggests, however, that in post-Conquest Britain translation always took place in a climate characterized by code-switching and the kind of linguistic interplay that is symbolically represented in the *Eadwine Psalter*. Herbert Schendl discusses code switching in written texts, stating that it “was clearly not an exception but a widespread specific mode of discourse over much of the attested history of English. It occurs across domains, genres, and text types—business, religious, legal, and scientific texts as well as literary ones.”<sup>9</sup> Code-switching was so socially acceptable that it was used even in formal communications with the king. For example, Schendl quotes a letter written in 1403 from Richard Kingston, Dean of Windsor to King Henry IV:

*Please a vostre tresgraciously Seignourie entendre que a-jourduy apres noone . . . qu'ils furent venuz deinz nostre countie plus de .cccc. des les rebelz de Owyne, Glyn, Talgard, et pluseours autres rebelz des voz marches de Galys . . . Warfore, for goddesake, thinketh on your beste frende, god, and thanke hym as he hath deserued to yowe! And leueth nought that ye ne come for no man that may counsaile yowe the contrarie . . . Tresexcellent, tresbuissant, et tresredouté Seignour, autrement say a present nieez. . . .*<sup>10</sup>

In fact, Laura Wright reports: “It is easier to find macaronic documents for the late medieval period in the Record Office than it is to find monolingual ones.”<sup>11</sup>

Code-switching is also attested in late medieval sermon literature in England, a further indication of the pervasive presence of this type of communication. Siegfried Wenzel has studied late fourteenth- and early fifteenth-century macaronic sermons in England. Whereas it was previously thought that code-switching was not a significant feature of English sermon literature, Wenzel has published a body of “fully macaronic” sermons that challenge this view and show how English and Latin were artfully woven together in medieval sermons. He describes one of them: “the writer’s thought moves forward without glossing, quoting, translating or announcing a coming development, but it does so in a way that switches back and forth between Latin and English in the middle of sentences.”<sup>12</sup> Wenzel argues that “macaronic texture” was “an effective instrument of pulpit oratory,”<sup>13</sup> and he argues that these sermons may have been preached to lay as well as clerical audiences. Wenzel’s study corroborates other evidence that code-switching

---

<sup>8</sup> Another notable exception, mentioned in the prologue, is the fifteenth-century Cambridge University Library, MS Ii.3.21, which alternates, in sections, Chaucer’s English *Boece* with a full transcription of the Latin text. Many of the manuscripts that preserve Chaucer’s *Boece* begin each *prosa* and *metrum* with quotations from the Latin text that range from one or two words to substantial sections of the text, a strategy which would facilitate easy cross-reading. See Seymour 1995, pp. 43-53 for a description of all of the extant manuscripts that preserve Chaucer’s *Boece*.

<sup>9</sup> Schendl 2000, p. 92.

<sup>10</sup> quoted in Schendl 2000, p. 81.

<sup>11</sup> Wright 1992, p. 2.

<sup>12</sup> Wenzel 1994, p. 22.

<sup>13</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 104.

was a rather ordinary mode of communication and that engaging with more than one language was a recognized way to impart meaning and provide nuance to a text.

In literature, famous fourteenth-century texts such as Langland's *Piers Plowman* seamlessly weave Latin with English, and Middle English romances frequently include interjections in French, sometimes composed anew, sometimes preserving French lines from the texts they are translating.<sup>14</sup> Although many of these short interjections do not seem important to the "plot," they carry great significance, broadly, as markers of the multicultural milieu in which these texts functioned. Moreover, they are not always formulaic, and the choice to express certain things in other languages often carries localized significance in the individual texts as well, which indicates an awareness that multilingualism could be used as a tool to express distinct shades of meaning.<sup>15</sup> These texts require only minimal knowledge of languages other than English to understand them, but a much greater command of several languages is required to understand medieval macaronic poetry, for instance, which intricately rhymes lines in English, Latin, and/or French. Macaronic poetry is found in many medieval manuscripts, and one macaronic poem is even preserved in the fourteenth-century Edinburgh, National Library of Scotland, Advocates' MS 19.2.1, commonly known as the Auchinleck Manuscript.<sup>16</sup> This manuscript, other aspects of which will be the primary focus of the following chapters, is most famous for being the earliest manuscript to preserve an anthology of texts almost entirely in English. However, in addition to other exceptions, the first twenty lines of the ninety-eight-line poem, *The Sayings of the Four Philosophers*, is a preamble that seamlessly rhymes English and French lines together:<sup>17</sup>

*L'en puet fere & defere,  
ceo fait-il trop souent;  
It nis nouþer wel ne faire,  
þerfore Engelond is shent.  
Nostre prince de Engleterre,  
per le consail de sa gent,  
At Westminster after þe feire  
maden a gret parlement.  
La chartre fet de cyre –  
ieo l'enteink & bien le crey –  
It was holde to neih þe fire  
And is molten al away.*

---

<sup>14</sup> For example, see chapter three for a discussion of the French interjections in the Auchinleck *Guy of Warwick*.

<sup>15</sup> I am not aware of any studies of code-switching in English romance, despite the fact that French interjections are frequently found in them. On the significance of code-switching in Langland, see Alford 1992 and 1977 and Machan 1994.

<sup>16</sup> For an excellent introductory survey of macaronic poetry in England, including many examples, see Archibald 2010. Henceforth I will refer to Edinburgh, National Library of Scotland, Advocates' MS 19.2.1 as the "Auchinleck Manuscript."

<sup>17</sup> Other exceptions include occasional French interjections in some of the romances, and a list of the names of Norman barons who fought at Hastings and for whom Battle Abbey was founded in celebration of the Norman victory.

*Ore ne say mes que dire,*  
*tout i va a tripolay,*  
 Hundred, chapitle, court & shire,  
 Al hit goþ a deuel wey.  
*Des plu sages de la tere,*  
*ore escotez vn sarmoun,*  
 Of .iiij. wise men, þat þer were,  
 Whi Engelond is brouht adoun.<sup>18</sup>

These introductory lines turn the general complaint of a rather popular sermon poem into a specific indictment of Edward II for disregarding the 1311 Ordinances that he had formally accepted.<sup>19</sup> Not only are the French and English lines linked together through interlingual rhyming, but poetic significance is also brought about by playing with interlingual homophones, so the Anglo-Norman “fere et defere” [do and undo] (referring to the reason Edward is being criticized), resurfaces for the reader again and again through the English “faire” and “feire,” a rich symbol of the interconnectedness of French and English in medieval England.

Elizabeth Archibald has argued that medieval macaronic poetry should not be read simply as “an occasional *jeu d’esprit*, but rather as a reflection of the multilingual society of England”<sup>20</sup> We can be relatively certain that in the fourteenth century, a majority of the general population of England was monolingual. Working with a unique set of documents that allowed him to make statistical computations on the subject, Ian Short estimates:

En prenant comme base une évaluation de la population de l’Angleterre à quelque 5,5 millions à l’époque (c’est à dire avant la Peste Noire de 1348), nous arriverions à la conclusion, extrêmement provisoire, pour ne pas dire conjecturale, que le nombre de francophones dans la première moitié du XIVe siècle ne s’élevait guère au-dessus d’un million. En d’autres termes, il y avait dans la population laïque plus de quatre fois plus d’anglophones monolingues que de francophones bilingues.<sup>21</sup>

Yet, the documentary evidence discussed above suggests that among people who *were* multilingual, it was common to make use of several languages interchangeably. Moreover, as Archibald points out, “multilingualism was certainly not restricted to a

---

<sup>18</sup> Burnley and Wiggins, ed., 2003, “The Sayings of the Four Philosophers,” ll. 1-20. All texts from the Auchinleck Manuscript will be cited from the online editions by Burnley and Wiggins, because: 1) they are usually the most recent editions; 2) the online editions construct the texts strictly from this manuscript (or are very clear when other manuscripts are used to fill in large gaps); 3) because the edited lines may be compared easily with the manuscript itself on this site.

<sup>19</sup> Thomas Wright originally identified this context in Wright 1839, p. 253. The poem was subsequently found in another manuscript, Cambridge, St. John’s College MS 112. There, it seems to refer to earlier events, but the general consensus is that it was, there, applied retrospectively and that its original context was indeed the one described by Wright. See Matthews 2010, pp. 118-119.

<sup>20</sup> Archibald 2010, p. 287.

<sup>21</sup> Short 2009a., p. 74.

highly educated élite.”<sup>22</sup> Latin, French, and English were commonly used in legal matters and business administration in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries.<sup>23</sup> Robert Stein argues that in the thirteenth century, proficiency in spoken and written French was “a matter of practical urgency,”<sup>24</sup> and he points out that books of instruction in the French language, whether in Latin or the vernacular, were not addressed to beginners; they assume rather that the student already had some proficiency in French.<sup>25</sup> Even those requiring instruction in French at this time, then, require it for improving their fluency, not developing it anew.

Among literate people, especially in urban settings where business was conducted, it seems multilingualism was the rule. Literary code-switching and macaronic poetry are not the only literary reflections of this cultural multilingualism. Texts that are themselves monolingual are often preserved in multilingual manuscripts, indicating a multilingual readership. Monolingual Latin and monolingual French manuscripts were common throughout post-Conquest England, but in the thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries, English texts were most often preserved in multilingual manuscripts. With respect to literature, the English language was most frequently used in a multilingual context during this time.<sup>26</sup>

For example, one of the earliest Middle English poems, *The Owl and the Nightingale*, is a debate poem typically dated to the cusp of the thirteenth century and is preserved in two thirteenth-century multilingual manuscripts. London, British Library, Cotton Caligula MS A.ix is a late thirteenth-century manuscript from the West Midlands that preserves La3amon’s *Brut* in the first half (though this was not originally joined with the second half); the second half preserves *The Owl and the Nightingale* along with seven English religious texts and a number of texts in French, including Chardri’s Anglo-Norman debate poem, *Petit plet*.<sup>27</sup> With respect to the mise-en-page, *The Owl and the Nightingale* is written in the style of Anglo-Norman texts, not in the style of its Old English predecessors. Like the Anglo-Norman debate poem in the same manuscript, it appears in two columns, justified to the left, with the first letter of each line pricked out in red.<sup>28</sup> The second manuscript that preserves this text is Oxford, Jesus College, MS 29,

---

<sup>22</sup> Archibald 2010, p. 278.

<sup>23</sup> See Rothwell 1994 and Clanchy 1993, especially pp. 207 and 222.

<sup>24</sup> Stein 2009, p. 26.

<sup>25</sup> Stein 2009, p. 27.

<sup>26</sup> During the twelfth century, there was very little new writing in English (Hahn 1999, p. 71). However, Old English texts continued to be read and recopied in post-Conquest England, and Seth Lerer writes that from a codicological standpoint, the period from about 1000 until the end of the twelfth century “is one of the most productive for the dissemination of Old English writing” (Lerer 1999, p. 8). In the late twelfth and early thirteenth centuries, new writing in Middle English begins to reflect the multiculturalism that characterized post-Conquest England. Linguistically, too, the period between the Conquest and the early thirteenth century, when English was written down much less frequently, contributed to massive changes in the English language, which was not only influenced by Anglo-Norman but which also saw an “intensified . . . influence of largely pre-literate languages (principally Celtic and Scandinavian)” (Hahn 1999, p. 66).

<sup>27</sup> For more information on this text and its manuscript and social context, see Cartlidge, ed., 2001 (an edition and study of the poem).

<sup>28</sup> However, the first letter is not set apart from the rest of the text, which is the common practice in presenting Anglo-Norman texts of this period and a practice that is followed in the presentation of Chardri’s Anglo-Norman debate poem and other texts by Chardri in this manuscript. The presentation of *The Owl and the Nightingale* contrasts with the presentation of La3amon’s *Brut* in the first part of the

which also dates to the second part of the thirteenth century and originates in the West Midlands. It is a trilingual manuscript which preserves texts in French, English, and Latin, and it preserves many of the same texts as Cotton Caligula A.ix. Here too, Seth Lerer notes, *The Owl and the Nightingale* visually participates in the tradition of presenting Latin and French verse texts, as it is written out in lineated couplets rather than in continuous prose.<sup>29</sup> The multicultural context of this poem is also evident in its composition in rhymed octosyllabic couplets instead of long alliterative lines and in the knowledge the poem displays of Latin and French literary terms, while at the same time drawing material from Old English texts such as *The Proverbs of Alfred* in addition to French texts such as the *Fables* of Marie de France.<sup>30</sup> The same trilingual manuscript preserves several other famous early Middle English texts, such as *Luv Ron*, by Friar Thomas of Hales, who is thought to have composed texts also in Latin and Anglo-Norman. As Thomas Hahn reminds us, this spiritually inflected English love lyric presupposes a multilingual audience that could recognize its allusions to biblical narratives and traditional romance.<sup>31</sup>

Oxford, Bodleian Library, Digby MS 86 is another famous trilingual manuscript from the second half of the thirteenth-century, and the interesting organization of its contents seems to pave the way for the appearance of monolingual English manuscripts in the fourteenth century. This manuscript preserves one hundred and one texts in Latin, French, and English; twenty-two texts are in English, and the genres range from “prayers and devotional texts, romances, fabliaux, humorous lyrics, a game and party tricks, medical receipts for both humans and birds, prognostications and tidbits of useful information.”<sup>32</sup> Two of the more famous early Middle English texts preserved in this manuscript include a unique copy of *The Fox and the Wolf*, the only pre-Chaucerian beast fable in English, and a unique copy of *Dame Sirip*, the only pre-Chaucerian fabliau in English. The English verses in this manuscript are presented visually in the same lineated double columns as the French and Latin texts (though some French and Latin texts in this manuscript, in prose or in verse forms that take up more space, are written out in long lines).<sup>33</sup> Whereas most trilingual manuscripts in England do not exhibit any sense of organization with respect to languages, Marilyn Corrie has argued that Digby 86 was deliberately arranged into linguistic blocks.<sup>34</sup> This presentation suggests that even in the radically multilingual climate of thirteenth-century England, there is a growing recognition of how languages can be different from one another, while at the same time

---

manuscript, which participates in some ways in the Old English style of manuscript presentation, in that the verse text is justified both to the left and the right and is written out as continuous prose. However, unlike typical Old English texts, La3amon’s *Brut* is presented in two columns rather than one. The Middle English *Brut* also preserves Latin comments in the margins. These observations are based on my own viewing of the manuscript.

<sup>29</sup> Lerer 1999, pp. 32-33.

<sup>30</sup> Ibid., pp. 32-34.

<sup>31</sup> Hahn 1999, p. 79

<sup>32</sup> Except where otherwise noted, the description below is taken from the facsimile and study of the manuscript in Tschann and Parkes 1996. This citation is from Tschann and Parks 1996, p. xi.

<sup>33</sup> For more on the presentation of texts in this manuscript, see Tschann and Parks 1996, pp. xli-l.

<sup>34</sup> Corrie 1997, pp. 238-39. In addition to the linguistic organization, Corrie argues that the texts were also arranged according to the “status of the works as items of prose, as verse in short lines or as verse in long lines” (Ibid., p. 239).

continue to function within a multilingual milieu. Even within the major block of English texts, there is a reflex of multilingualism, since most of the texts bear titles in French, some in Latin, and some in English. The linguistic segregation in this manuscript may represent the kind of thinking that paved the way for full manuscripts in Middle English, such as the Auchinleck Manuscript, but it also exemplifies the fact that even that which appears to be monolingual continues to function in an environment characterized by multilingualism.

London, British Library, Harley MS 2253 is a manuscript from the first half of the fourteenth century which not only preserves texts in Latin, English, and Anglo-Norman, but it also preserves indications that these texts were influenced by Welsh literary traditions as well.<sup>35</sup> This manuscript preserves over one hundred secular and religious texts, and it is most important because of its unique copies of English secular love poems and political poems. One of the scribes responsible for copying texts in this manuscript is also responsible for copying and compiling texts in two other early fourteenth-century trilingual manuscripts, London, British Library, Harley MS 273, and London, British Library, Royal MS 12.C.xii.<sup>36</sup> O'Rourke notes that the number of English texts in each of these three trilingual manuscripts increases in inverse relation to the age of the manuscript.<sup>37</sup> Harley 273 dates to around 1310 and preserves only five English lines in a macaronic charm, with the remainder of the texts in Anglo-Norman and Latin.<sup>38</sup> Royal 12.C.xii dates between c. 1312 and c. 1340 and contains a longer English text, *The Short English Metrical Chronicle*, a charm in English, and English lines in some macaronic texts; the remaining texts are in Anglo-Norman and Latin.<sup>39</sup> Harley 2253 dates to around 1340 and includes fifty-six English texts and additional English lines in macaronic poetry.<sup>40</sup> The large number of English texts in this manuscript reflects the progression towards monolingual English manuscripts at the same time that it shows that even as late as the mid fourteenth century, roughly contemporaneous with the monolingual Auchinleck Manuscript, English texts circulated in a decidedly multilingual milieu.

As a product of the Welsh Marches, this manuscript gives us a glimpse also into another aspect of England's multicultural and multilingual climate in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries.<sup>41</sup> The extraordinarily multilingual climate of the Welsh Marches is well documented; in addition to Anglo-Norman, many Welshmen spoke English, and Englishmen spoke Welsh.<sup>42</sup> With respect to literary influence, Constance Bullock-Davies writes: "*Cyfarwyddiaid* [storytellers], latimers, and French, Welsh and English minstrels lived together in the same castles along the Welsh Marches from the time of the Conquest. They could not have failed to import to one another something of each of their native literatures."<sup>43</sup> Although Harley 2253 does not preserve full texts in Welsh as part

---

<sup>35</sup> See Ker 1965 for a full description and facsimile of this manuscript.

<sup>36</sup> See O'Rourke 2005.

<sup>37</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 49.

<sup>38</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 48.

<sup>39</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 48.

<sup>40</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 48.

<sup>41</sup> See Ker 1965 for details on the provenance and history of this manuscript.

<sup>42</sup> See Richards 1970, especially p. 91. See also Matonis 1988 for an excellent overview of Welsh-English contact in the Welsh Marches, and see chapter six for more on Welsh-English literary relations.

<sup>43</sup> Bullock-Davies 1966, p. 18.

of its multilingual presentation, some of the English lyrics indicate knowledge of Welsh literary traditions by alluding to Welsh legends in such a way that the reader is expected to understand the references.<sup>44</sup> One such allusion, to the figure *Tegau*, may be the first written reference to her in any language, which is interesting, but not surprising, since Welsh literary tradition remained oral until very late in the Middle Ages.<sup>45</sup> The English lyrics in this manuscript also preserve a few linguistic borrowings from Welsh, and Matonis has argued that Welsh verse forms also may have influenced the verse form of some of the English lyrics in this manuscript.<sup>46</sup> This manuscript illustrates the deeply multicultural context of writing in England; even where a particular language is not visibly presented, multilingualism is engrained in the fabric of the texts. Here, Welsh literary traditions lie behind the surface of the English texts, indicating the richly multilingual literary and cultural milieu in which they were composed and circulated.

It is within this multilingual and multicultural literary climate of the late thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries that translation from French language texts into Middle English and Middle Welsh seemed to explode onto the literary scene and developed into the dominant mode of secular literary expression in these languages, apart from short poetry. This mass movement of French language texts into Middle English and Middle Welsh, which is the subject of this dissertation, seems strikingly “unnecessary” in the multilingual climate in which it took place. There were distinctive secular literary traditions in both of these languages for hundreds of years before these “derivative” texts appeared. To the thirteenth-century Middle English works already mentioned above may be added *The Thrush and the Nightingale*, and the early thirteenth-century Anglo-Norman *Roman de Waldef* claims to be a translation of an English text.<sup>47</sup> Old English literature preserves a number of longer secular works, such as *The Wonders of the East*, *Beowulf*, *The Battle of Maldon*, *The Seafarer*, and *The Wanderer*. Though they were written down much later, native Welsh prose texts that date from the eleventh and twelfth centuries include works such as *Culhwch ac Olwen*, the texts that make up the Four Branches of the *Mabinogi*: *Pwyll*, *Branwen*, *Manawydan*, and *Math*, *Breudwyt Maxen Wledic* [The Dream of Emperor Maxen], and arguably *Breudyt Ronabwy*<sup>48</sup> [The Dream of Rhonabwy]. Despite a rich history of composing secular literature in the native language, the English virtually ceased such literary production in the late thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries in favor of reproducing French language texts in translation; as

---

<sup>44</sup> Matonis 1988, pp. 6-8.

<sup>45</sup> *Tegau* is a female figure associated with Arthur’s court. She appears in Welsh triad 66, which can be read in Bromwich 1978. Matonis writes that the reference to her in the English lyric in London, British Library, Harley MS 2253 “may be earlier than the first extant reference to her in Welsh” (Matonis 1988, p. 7).

<sup>46</sup> For a review of the linguistic borrowings, see Matonis 1988, p. 6. For a thorough discussion of the similarities between Welsh verse forms and those in the Harley Lyrics, see Matonis 1988, pp. 11-21. For a dissenting view, see Fulton 1985.

<sup>47</sup> The focus of this discussion has been on largely secular literature, but the late twelfth century and the thirteenth century also produced a substantial body of more spiritually inflected literature in English, such as the *Ormmulum*, *Hali Meidhad*, *Sawles Ward*, *St. Juliana*, *St. Margaret*, *St. Katherine*, *Cursor Mundi*, *Poema Morale*, *Ancrene Wisse*, and others. For a useful review of early Middle English literature, see Hahn 1999. Religious works were also written in Welsh in the thirteenth century (Huws 2000a., p. 58).

<sup>48</sup> The earliest possible date is after 1160, but it is generally considered not to be earlier than the 1220’s. See Lloyd-Morgan 1991a., pp. 191-92.

for the Welsh, they continued to produce native poetry into the sixteenth century, and as for Welsh prose, they started to show a marked interest in including reworkings and translations of French texts. This appropriation of French texts from previous centuries into both English and Welsh included mainly romances and *chansons de gestes*, such as the Middle English *Beves of Hampton* (Anglo-Norman *Boeue de Haumtone*, Middle Welsh *Bown o Hamtoun*), *Otuel a Knight* (Old French *Otinell*, Middle Welsh *Rhamant Otuel*), and *Amis and Amiloun* (Anglo-Norman *Amis e Amilun*, Middle Welsh *Kymdeithas Amlyn ac Amic*, this last based on the Latin *Amici et Amelii Carissimorum*). Some of these texts, such as *Beves of Hampton* and *Guy of Warwick*, continued to be popular in England well into the sixteenth and even the seventeenth century, and the same may be said for the Welsh *Bown o Hamtoun*, since it continues to appear in sixteenth- and seventeenth-century manuscripts.<sup>49</sup>

Despite the common belief that these translations were made for an emergent class of relatively uneducated monolingual readers,<sup>50</sup> evidence suggests that they did not circulate in an environment different from the one I described above. As I will discuss in later chapters, some of the translations contain unique intertextual references to untranslated French works, and some include highly sophisticated scenes which rely on a great familiarity with topoi from French *chansons de geste* to convey their meaning. These translations were sometimes preserved in multilingual manuscripts, and the French language originals did not fall by the wayside; they continued to be recopied in Britain, so that many of the manuscripts that preserve them date from the same period of time as the translations into Middle English and Middle Welsh.<sup>51</sup>

For example, the Middle English *King Horn*, a translation of the Anglo-Norman *Roman de Horn*, was likely composed in the last quarter of the thirteenth century. It is

---

<sup>49</sup> For more on the medieval and post-medieval manuscripts of the Welsh *Bown*, see chapter six and Poppe & Reck 2009, pp. xi-xii.

<sup>50</sup> For example, J.D. Burnley writes about medieval translation: “The very fact that he [the translator] was writing in English was, of course, a tacit admission that a linguistic barrier had to be crossed and that his audience were not equipped to cross it for themselves” (Burnley 1989, p. 41). He further describes the transition of a text from French to English as a “cultural descent” and writes that translations were made “for the benefit of those with a lesser competence” (Burnley 1989, p.43).

<sup>51</sup> This simultaneous production of texts in multiple languages should cast doubt on our most basic assumptions about the trajectory of influence, which is always assumed to be directly from French to English or from French to Welsh. However, since many of the Anglo-Norman manuscripts we study are actually contemporaneous with the translated texts, it is not usually possible to know which version influenced which, and where there is innovation in later versions of a text, it is entirely possible that the Middle English tradition of a text, for example, influenced later copies of the Anglo-Norman text. In a 2007 article on *Guy of Warwick*, Ivana Djordjević made the point that many of the maneuvers that are considered ‘typical’ practice for a Middle English romance translator and that are evident in the Middle English version of *Guy of Warwick* found in the Auchinleck Manuscript can actually be explained if we compare the text to the unedited Anglo-Norman text found in Wolfenbüttel, Herzog August Bibliothek, Cod. Aug. 87.4 (Djordjević 2007). Djordjević gives plentiful examples with the goal of showing that the Middle English text is indebted to this particular Anglo-Norman manuscript, and that the innovations are not, therefore, characteristic of Middle English translation. However, the Anglo-Norman manuscript to which she compares the Middle English text is actually dated to around the same time as the Middle English translation, so the innovations could be explained by the opposite trajectory of borrowing—from the Middle English tradition back to the Anglo-Norman tradition. In fact the version contained in this manuscript is considered a strange anomaly among the many extant Anglo-Norman texts, which might further indicate influence from another tradition, quite possibly the Middle English tradition.

preserved in Harley 2253, the trilingual miscellany from the first half of the fourteenth century discussed above. It is also preserved, along with *Havelok* (another Middle English translation of Anglo-Norman texts), in Oxford, Bodleian Library, Laud Misc. MS 108, which dates to the late thirteenth century or the very early fourteenth century. Guddat-Figge notes French rubrics and other ‘scraps’ of French in the margins of this manuscript and suggests that the English versions of these poems were copied in this manuscript for a circle of French speakers.<sup>52</sup> The third manuscript that preserves *King Horn* is Cambridge, University Library, MS Gg.4.27, which dates to the cusp of the fourteenth century. The manuscripts that preserve the Anglo-Norman text, *Roman de Horn*, all date to the thirteenth century, including one set of fragments that dates to the end of the thirteenth century and possibly overlaps, then, not only with the composition of the Middle English translation but also with two of the three manuscripts that preserve the Middle English text.<sup>53</sup>

The story about Guy of Warwick (Anglo-Norman *Gui de Warewic*, Middle English *Guy of Warwick*) is preserved in a particularly large number of Anglo-Norman and Middle English manuscripts, which allows us to glean more information about the circulation of these works than we usually have about Anglo-Norman and Middle English romances. The Anglo-Norman text, *Gui de Warewic*, is extant in six short fragments and ten manuscripts, the earliest of which—London, British Library, MS Additional 38662—is dated to the second quarter of the thirteenth century. Apart from this one early to mid thirteenth-century text and one (Ripon Cathedral, MS XVII.F.33) which has not been dated, the other fourteen extant Anglo-Norman texts of *Gui de Warewic* are dated to the end of the thirteenth century or the early fourteenth century.<sup>54</sup> Of those which are extant

---

<sup>52</sup> Guddat-Figge 1976, p. 11.

<sup>53</sup> The Anglo-Norman *Roman de Horn* is preserved in three manuscripts and two sets of fragments, all dating to the thirteenth century: Oxford, Bodleian Library, Douce MS 132 (mid thirteenth century), Cambridge, University Library, MS Ff.6.17 (first half of the thirteenth century), London, British Library Harley MS 527 (mid thirteenth century). The fragments include Cambridge, University Library, Additional MS 4407 (late thirteenth century), preserving 21 lines from one leaf and pieces of another, and Cambridge, University Library Additional MS 4470 (first half of the thirteenth century), preserving two leaves (discontinuous) with 237 lines and a colophon.

<sup>54</sup> What follows is a complete list of Anglo-Norman manuscripts and fragments, including their presumed dates. The manuscripts are all briefly described in Ailes 2007. The short fragments include: Cambridge, University Library, MS Additional 2751 (thirteenth or fourteenth century); Nottingham University Library, Oakham Parish Library, MS Bx 1756 S 4 (last third of the thirteenth century); Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Rawlinson D 913 fols 86-89 (thirteenth or fourteenth century); Oxford, Corpus Christi College, MS 491, fol. 8r no. 28 (end of the thirteenth century); York Minster, MS 16.1.7 (thirteenth or fourteenth century); Ripon Cathedral, MS XVII.F.33 (not dated). Two single-text manuscripts include: Wolfenbüttel, Herzog August Bibliothek, Cod. Aug. 87.4 (end of the thirteenth or beginning of the fourteenth century); New Haven, Yale University, Beinecke Library, MS 591 (early fourteenth century). Four copies are extant in compilations which were likely not “planned” compilations: London, College of Arms, MS Arundel 27 (fourteenth century); London, British Library, MS Harley 3775 (early fourteenth century); Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, MS français 1669 (early fourteenth century); London, British Library, MS Royal 8. F.IX (early fourteenth century). The following copies are extant in planned compilations: London, British Library, MS Additional 38662 (second quarter of the thirteenth century); Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, MS 50 (second half of the thirteenth century or fourteenth century); Cologny-Geneva, Bibliotheca Bodmeriana, MS 67 (second half of the thirteenth century); Cologny-Geneva Bib. Bodmeriana MS 168, formerly Phillipps MS 8345 (end of the thirteenth century).

in compilations, four of the compilations preserve texts in Latin and French,<sup>55</sup> three preserve texts in French only,<sup>56</sup> and one preserves texts in Anglo-Norman and English.<sup>57</sup>

This manuscript evidence suggests that the Anglo-Norman *Gui de Warwic* was still very popular, and continued to be circulated, read and even quite frequently copied anew in the late thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries, which is also when it was translated into Middle English. It was frequently copied in multilingual manuscripts containing Latin and French dialects, and we also know at least one manuscript, London, College of Arms, MS Arundel 27, contains English poetry, in a scribbled hand that is contemporaneous with the hand that produced the Anglo-Norman text.<sup>58</sup>

The Middle English *Guy of Warwick* is preserved in one fourteenth-century manuscript, (the Auchinleck Manuscript), and two fifteenth-century manuscripts (Cambridge University Library, MS Ff.2.38, and Cambridge, Gonville and Caius College, MS 107/176). Two sets of fourteenth-century fragments also preserve parts of the text. The set comprised of Aberystwyth, National Library of Wales, MS 572 and London, British Library, Additional MS 14408 is dated by Daniel Huws to the first quarter of the fourteenth century, based on features of the script.<sup>59</sup> London, British Library, Sloane MS 1044 (item 248), is a single-folio fragment dated more generally to the fourteenth century.<sup>60</sup>

The manuscript evidence therefore indicates that the Middle English translation was being circulated, read, and copied (perhaps translated) anew during a period in which the Anglo-Norman text still enjoyed energetic appeal and circulation. Furthermore, it has been proposed that all five of the extant Middle English texts represent five different redactions, and each of the five redactions represents its own independent translation from Anglo-Norman.<sup>61</sup> That the Middle English *Guy of Warwick* may have been

---

<sup>55</sup> London, British Library, MS Harley 3775, London, British Library, MS Royal 8. F.IX, Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, MS 50, and Cologny-Geneva, Bibliotheca Bodmeriana, MS 67. It is likely that most of the “French dialect” texts in these manuscripts and the following three that I mention are in Anglo-Norman, but I cannot be certain, as I do not have access to dialect information for every text in these manuscripts.

<sup>56</sup> Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, MS français 1669, London, British Library, MS Additional 38662, and Cologny-Geneva Bib. Bodmeriana MS 168, formerly Phillipps MS 8345.

<sup>57</sup> London, College of Arms, MS Arundel 27.

<sup>58</sup> As a long, narrow, single column manuscript, this particular example of the text also seems to be familiar with Latin literature, since the *mise-en-page* is quite rare for a secular Anglo-Norman text but is more frequently used for Latin texts.

<sup>59</sup> Mills and Huws 1974, p. 5.

<sup>60</sup> This date is reported in Wiggins 2007, p. 63, with no reference to the basis of the dating.

<sup>61</sup> See Wiggins 2007, p. 65. Although there is at least enough evidence to suggest that not all five extant texts derive from the same translation into Middle English, one piece of evidence does trouble Wiggins’s finding that all five extant Middle English texts must have been derived from independent translations. Many Middle English translations contain brief interjections in Anglo-Norman, where the translator has either retained or recomposed certain Anglo-Norman lines. If all of the Middle English *Guy* texts were based on independent translations one would not expect that the translators would have chosen exactly the same lines to retain in Anglo-Norman, but the Auchinleck couplet *Guy* text and the text in Cambridge, Gonville and Caius College, MS 107/106 have one Anglo-Norman line in common. See Burnley and Wiggins, ed., 2003, *Guy of Warwick (couplets)*, l. 90: “Bieus amis, molt gramerci” and Zupitza 1883, 1887, and 1891, Caius l. 222: “Beaux amye, moult gramercye.” The Anglo-Norman text in Ewert’s edition reads: “Bels sire, la sue merci” (Ewert 1932). It is an isolated case, and therefore it could be an extremely

translated frequently from the Anglo-Norman *Guy de Warewic* independently, rather than merely copied from existing Middle English translations, is a further indication that the Anglo-Norman texts continued to be circulated and read even while Middle English translations of the romance existed, and that perhaps the act of translating this text, not merely transmitting it in a different language, carried with it some cultural cachet or meaning.

In addition to the new copying and composition of Guy texts simultaneously in Anglo-Norman and Middle English in the early fourteenth century, both the Anglo-Norman and the Middle English texts continued their appeal and readership well into the fifteenth century and beyond. Two fifteenth century prose French “translations,” thought to represent an updated version of the older Anglo-Norman couplet texts, provide interesting later examples. The prose French version, titled *Le Rommant de Guy de Warwik et de Herolt d'Ardenne*, is extant in London, British Library, Royal MS 15 E. VI, and Paris, Bibliothèque nationale, MS français 1476. The latter belonged to Marguerite de Rohan, wife of John le Bon, Count of Angouleme, who spent over thirty years in exile in England. The former was given to Margaret of Anjou on the occasion of her marriage to King Henry VI of England, presented by John Talbot, the husband of Marguerite de Beauchamp, elder daughter of Richard de Beauchamp.<sup>62</sup> Scholars agree that although the dialect of this text represents a literary Parisian dialect rather than an Anglo-Norman one, it is strongly associated with England, and it was most likely written in England by an Englishman who was carefully avoiding a local dialect. It is also generally agreed that Richard de Beauchamp probably commissioned the work in approximately 1425.<sup>63</sup>

The late medieval updating of this work in French at the same time that it continued to be copied (and potentially translated) anew in Middle English indicates consistent simultaneous circulation in both languages, not a phasing out of the French and replacement by the English. In fact, at roughly the same time that Richard de Beauchamp commissioned the work to be rewritten in French prose, Lydgate’s poem on Guy in English was probably commissioned by his daughter.<sup>64</sup> It has been suggested that it is likely that Lydgate borrowed from the French prose romance in his own composition,<sup>65</sup> which he claims is based on Gerald of Cornwall’s Latin chronicle, and Frankis has argued that both the French prose text and Lydgate’s English text were commissioned for the same occasion.<sup>66</sup> That the same family was involved in commissioning both French and English versions of the story, perhaps for the same occasion, and that Lydgate may have used both a Latin and a French source for his English composition, is a testament to the enduring multilingual readership for this material.

---

unlikely coincidence. Or, it could indicate that the same translation into Middle English was used at some point in the copying history.

<sup>62</sup> Richmond 1996, p. 77.

<sup>63</sup> For a more detailed history of the prose French text, see the following, from which the brief history above was taken: Richmond 1996, p. 77, Edwards 2007, pp. 87-88, Griffith 2007, p. 130, and Frankis 1997. The copy commissioned by Richard de Beauchamp, discussed further below, may be the text from which the one in London, British Library, Royal MS 15 E. VI was copied. See Frankis 1997, p. 82.

<sup>64</sup> At only 592 lines, Lydgate’s *Guy of Warwick* is not directly based on a romance Guy narrative. For more on the patronage of both works, see Frankis 1997, especially pp. 88-89.

<sup>65</sup> Edwards 2007, pp. 87-88.

<sup>66</sup> Frankis 1997, pp. 88-89.

It is clear that at least some segment of the audience for this text not only could but did read the story in several languages. Wiggins's assessment that all five Middle English manuscripts represent independent translations from Anglo-Norman indicates frequent engagement with the text in both languages. Lydgate wrote his poem in English, using a Latin and a French source, and the same immediate family that commissioned that work also commissioned a work on Guy in French, at the same time. The English writer of this prose French romance makes it clear that at least some of the audience for this text was reading across multiple versions: "Aucuns aucteurs le metent aultrement, mais au plus des escriptures je treuve ycellui terme le plus certain et m'y conforme."<sup>67</sup> Here, the author is referring to the forty days that he writes Guy and his new wife, Felice, spent together before Guy left to go on a spiritual adventure. The reference clearly provides an image of somebody poring over and comparing the minute details of several written versions of the story. This is likely not just a "truth" topos. The fact that this number does actually vary among the versions extant today suggests that this reader was actually reading across multiple versions and comparing minute details.<sup>68</sup> Furthermore, the fact that this minor discrepancy was noticed by the author at all suggests either that he had enough prior experience reading various manuscript versions to know that the number differed among them, or that he was comparing across multiple manuscript versions as he prepared his "translation" into French prose (or both). This and other similar references show a keen awareness of the differences between small details in different textual examples of the same story, and given the simultaneous circulation and creation of manuscripts in multiple languages, the likelihood is that this comparison was happening across multiple languages, not isolated to a single linguistic trajectory.<sup>69</sup>

The only extant manuscript which preserves more than a short fragment of the Anglo-Norman *Boeve de Haumtone* overlaps with the earliest manuscript that preserves the Middle English translation, which in turn is not much older than the earliest manuscript that preserves the Welsh translation.<sup>70</sup> Paris, Bibliothèque nationale, MS

---

<sup>67</sup> Conlon, ed., 1971, *Le Rommant de Guy de Warwik et de Herolt D'Ardenne*, paragraph 147, ll. 37-39.

<sup>68</sup> Auchinleck gives fifteen days, Cambridge, Gonville and Caius College, MS 107/106 does not indicate how many days, Cambridge, Cambridge University Library, MS Ff.2.38 gives fifty days, and Ewert's Anglo-Norman edition gives fifty days.

<sup>69</sup> Another more famous example is the Middle English *Kyng Alisaunder*, which, like many of the translations discussed in this study, also appears in its earliest form in the Auchinleck Manuscript. In this text the author frequently acknowledges the differences between his French source and his Latin source.

<sup>70</sup> The Anglo-Norman *Boeve de Haumtone* is extant in one manuscript and two sets of short fragments, and it was also preserved in a manuscript that was burned in 1940. The only manuscript which survives today is Paris, Bibliothèque nationale, MS nouv. acqu. fr. 4532. It is dated to the early fourteenth century, and it is incomplete, breaking off at line 1268 of Stimming's edition (See Stimming 1899). Leuven, Univ. Bibl., MS G.170 (the Firmin Didot MS) is dated to the second half of the thirteenth century. Unfortunately this manuscript was burned in 1940, but Stimming used it after line 1268 for his edition. The two sets of fragments include London, Lambeth Palace, 1237, Nos. 1, 2, dated to the second half of the thirteenth century. This set of fragments preserves text corresponding to lines 1641-63 and 1672-96 of Stimming's edition. Finally, University of Glasgow, Hunterian Library, MS 466, is a 62-line fragment corresponding to lines 1003-65 of Stimming's edition, which was discovered on a pastedown in the Hunterian Library. Judith Weiss suggests that they date to the early thirteenth century (Weiss 2000). The earliest extant version of the Middle English translation is preserved in the Auchinleck Manuscript, which is traditionally dated to around the 1330's. See chapter five for a discussion of this version of the translation along with a list of other manuscripts in which the translation is preserved. The earliest manuscript that preserves the

nouv. acqu. fr. 4532 dates to the early fourteenth century, putting this manuscript copy of *Boeve de Haumtone* around the same time, or possibly even much later than the original composition of the Middle English and Middle Welsh translations, and two of the three other known manuscripts and sets of fragments that preserve the Anglo-Norman text may also overlap with the original composition of the Middle English and Middle Welsh texts.<sup>71</sup>

In fact, the simultaneous reception of the Anglo-Norman and Middle English versions of this story is suggested by a small, Anglo-Norman book of hours from around 1325-1335. London, British Library, Yates Thompson MS 13, commonly known as the Taymouth Hours, preserves *bas de page* scenes from popular romances, including *Beves of Hampton* and *Guy of Warwick*.<sup>72</sup> From *Beves of Hampton*, the *bas de page* scene in the Taymouth Hours depicts Josiane, the central female figure, helping Beves fight two lions. Linda Brownrigg has analyzed the details of these scenes and concluded that they display an interesting mix of details from the Anglo-Norman and Middle English versions of the story: “It is clear that the *bas de page* scenes in the Taymouth Hours illustrating the romance of *Beves of Hampton* derive from both the English and the French versions of the story, which may suggest some close relationship between the milieu in which the artist worked and that in which the romance was translated into English.”<sup>73</sup> In order to produce these images, there had to be a multilingual cross-reader.

The artist has been identified as the same one who created the historiated initials and miniatures in Glasgow, University Library, Hunter MS 231, which was apparently made for Roger of Waltham, canon of St. Paul’s, London.<sup>74</sup> This puts the illustrator of the Taymouth Hours in the same milieu in which the earliest extant copy of the Middle English *Beves of Hampton* was produced, since the Auchinleck Manuscript was produced in London and dates from around the same period of time. Moreover, the Taymouth Hours preserves scenes from at least two romances preserved in the Auchinleck Manuscript (*Guy of Warwick* is the other). This evidence from the Taymouth Hours not only shows detailed knowledge of both the original and the translated text, but it also suggests a number of interesting things about the Auchinleck Manuscript and its translations, which is the primary subject of this dissertation.

---

Middle Welsh text is Aberystwyth, National Library of Wales Peniarth MS 4-5, commonly known as *Llyfr Gwyn Rhydderch* [the White Book of Rhydderch], which dates to the mid fourteenth century. See chapter six for more on the Welsh text and its manuscript context.

<sup>71</sup> The Middle English translation might date as late as the first quarter of the fourteenth century, but there are also indications that this text resonates with the political climate of England in the 1260’s and 1270’s, which would put the translation much earlier. See Weiss 1979, especially p. 74; see also chapter five for more details. If we were to accept an earlier date for the translation, then that would mean that three of the four known manuscripts and sets of fragments that preserve the Anglo-Norman text date to around the same time or later than the production of the Middle English and Middle Welsh translations. The Middle Welsh translation dates to the second half of the thirteenth century. See chapter six for more on the Welsh text and its manuscript context.

<sup>72</sup> Many of the illustrations in this manuscript, including those discussed here, may be viewed online through the British Library’s website, at

<http://molcat1.bl.uk/illcat/record.asp?MSID=8148&CollID=58&NStart=13>

<sup>73</sup> Brownrigg 1989, pp. 226-235

<sup>74</sup> See Sandler 1986, vol. 1 p. 32 and vol. 2 pp. 107-109.

The Auchinleck Manuscript is traditionally dated to around 1330-1340 and is famous for being the earliest virtually monolingual anthology of Middle English texts and one of the earliest manuscripts written almost entirely in Middle English. Although we are missing at least twenty items, forty-three texts from this London manuscript survive, including romances, hagiography, prayers, and other devotional and spiritually inflected texts. Many of the earliest or sole surviving translations from French language texts into Middle English are preserved in it, and only a very small handful of translations from French texts into Middle English definitively pre-date those in the Auchinleck Manuscript.<sup>75</sup> Before this proliferation of translations of popular texts, translation was largely reserved for academic and spiritual texts, and the trajectory was typically from Latin into French or English.<sup>76</sup> The explosion of these translations in the context of the first virtually monolingual anthology of Middle English texts amplifies the perception, discussed above, that they were translated for an emergent class of monolingual readers. However, despite the unique monolingualism of the Auchinleck Manuscript, there is no question that it circulated within the same multilingual milieu outlined above.

It was mentioned earlier that the Auchinleck Manuscript preserves macaronic poetry, and several texts preserve French interjections, two indications of an often overlooked reflex of the multilingual climate in which this manuscript is working. The contents of the manuscript put it in dialogue with multilingual manuscripts, since it preserves a number of texts analogous to those preserved in two of the trilingual manuscripts discussed above, Oxford, Bodleian Library, Digby MS 86 and London, British Library, Harley MS 2253.<sup>77</sup> The Taymouth Hours were produced in the same London literary milieu as the Auchinleck Manuscript, and the illustrations of the French and English versions of *Beves of Hampton* in the Taymouth Hours suggests the multilingual reception of at least one of the texts preserved in the Auchinleck Manuscript. If Brownrigg's suggestion is correct—that the illustrations suggest that the Taymouth Hours manuscript was produced in an environment that translated French dialect texts into Middle English—it may even corroborate the idea, discussed in chapters two and five, that *Beves of Hampton* and other texts were translated specifically for the Auchinleck Manuscript.<sup>78</sup> The presence of Welshmen in the literary milieu that produced the Auchinleck Manuscript is reflected by the fact that it shares many features, including some translations of the same texts, with the contemporaneous *Llyfr Gwyn Rhydderch*

---

<sup>75</sup> These translations will be discussed in chapter four. They include La3amon's *Brut*, presumably translated from Wace's *Roman de Brut*; *King Horn* translated from the Anglo-Norman *Roman de Horn*; *Floris and Blancheflour*, translated from the Old French *Floire et Blanchefleur*; and *Havelok*, based on the Anglo-Norman *Lai d'Haveloc* and the story about Haveloc preserved in Geoffrey Gaimar's *Estoire des Engleis*.

<sup>76</sup> Notable exceptions include Geoffrey Gaimar's early-mid twelfth-century *Estoire des Engleis*, the first chronicle written in French, and indisputably based on the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*. The anonymous Anglo-Norman *Waldef* also claims to be a translation from an English story, and most famously Marie de France writes that she translated her *lais* from Breton. Geoffrey of Monmouth claims that his *Historia Regum Britanniae* was translated from a British source, which may have been written in the Welsh language.

<sup>77</sup> Hanna 2005, p. 104.

<sup>78</sup> However, the depiction of scenes from both the Middle English and Anglo-Norman versions of *Beves* need not suggest that the Taymouth Hours were produced in an area in which the text was translated, since, as I argue above, Anglo-Norman originals continued to circulate in the same environment as Middle English translations.

[The White Book of Rhydderch], a similarly important anthology of Welsh texts, and also the earliest of its kind in Wales.<sup>79</sup> With respect to the *mise-en-page*, the Auchinleck collection of Middle English texts looks very Anglo-Norman: most of the texts are written in two columns, with the first letter of every line pricked out in red and isolated with a ruled column. In fact, with such a large number of the longest texts being translations from Anglo-Norman texts, even the content of this manuscript appears Anglo-Norman.

Despite the dominant appearance of the English language, Auchinleck is unquestionably the product of a multilingual milieu. Since Ralph Hanna suggested that allusions to Chrétien de Troyes' *Yvain* in the Auchinleck *Guy of Warwick* presuppose an audience literate in French who would "get" the allusion, subsequent scholars have begun to recognize and accept a multilingual readership for this and other texts in the Auchinleck Manuscript, replacing the previous notion that this virtually monolingual collection was destined for a monolingual readership.<sup>80</sup> The implications of this observation have not been explored, however, and a significant question arises from it: what might be the purpose of translating French texts for such a French-savvy audience, who could simply read the originals that were clearly circulating at the same time the translations were produced? Although the appearance of Middle English translations of popular French texts permanently adjusted the linguistic fabric of the literary scene in medieval England, these texts sat side-by-side with their French originals. What was the function of translation in this multilingual reading context?

Recent scholarship on multilingualism has done important work in repositioning English texts within a multilingual environment, including especially the large volume of essays in *Language and Culture in Medieval Britain: The French of England c. 1100-1500*.<sup>81</sup> The goal of this volume is to "articulate something of the difference it makes if we reposition what has been often treated as a monoglot English culture within its multilingual actualities, and use more open and less prescriptive models of language and language-contact for thinking about the French of England."<sup>82</sup> Many of the essays in this volume show that considering Middle English texts from the perspective of a multilingual literary culture indeed affects our reading and understanding of the texts. However, the editors choose not to treat Middle English romance translation because, Wogan-Brown states, "thirteenth- and fourteenth-century Middle English romance studies have long been in dialogue with French."<sup>83</sup> However, this dialogue looks very different from the dialogue I am proposing here. Historically, this dialogue is configured in a way that treats French as a distant source, familiar only to the translator who serves as an intermediary, but unfamiliar to the audience of the Middle English texts. French texts are studied in relation to their Middle English translations only to identify sources, and perhaps to provide modern scholars with an understanding of how the texts developed

---

<sup>79</sup> Welsh translation and the White Book of Rhydderch will be explored in further detail in chapter six.

<sup>80</sup> See Hanna 2005, pp. 104-147. There are also other allusions to French texts that were not, as far as we know, translated into English at the time the Auchinleck Manuscript was produced and that are unique to the Middle English translations in this manuscript, for example a reference to Lancelot du Lak in *Beves of Hampton*.

<sup>81</sup> Wogan-Browne et. al. 2009.

<sup>82</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 10

<sup>83</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 11

over time and across languages, and of how they came to speak to a “new,” less competent class of readers. In such a model, multilingualism is envisioned as the occurrence of distinctive literary traditions that existed at the same time, in the same place, but never crossed paths after the initial production of texts by multilingual authors. Multilingualism is reserved only for a very narrow class of authors and translators who are seen to have produced texts in a tiny enclave of multilingualism before pushing them out into a hypothesized vast monolingual reading community. Middle English romances (largely translations from French sources) have not been positioned within the multilingual reading environment I described above. That environment suggests a model of multilingualism in which texts in the various languages should have been in conversation with one another, and in which texts were produced and translated with the knowledge that they would be in conversation with texts in other languages, not just with other texts in the same language.

Jennifer Miller’s work on multilingualism has questioned the validity of what she calls the “access model,” which assumes that all texts in Middle English, including translations, were destined for less competent, monolingual readers.<sup>84</sup> Miller argues that even translated texts were probably read by multilingual readers who may have been familiar with the originals, and she calls these readers “cross-readers,” a term I have adopted here.<sup>85</sup> The framework for the following study is indebted to this model of reading that Miller has proposed, and my findings here corroborate her argument, in that they show that the particular group of translations in this study must have been read by multilingual cross-readers. In fact, I argue that these readers were the target audience for many of these translations. Moving beyond this framework, my study explains the intricate details of how reading across languages in translation worked and how texts were produced for and spoke to an audience of cross-readers. In the case of the translations in the Auchinleck Manuscript, I argue that this audience enabled an extratextual discourse for reading in translation. The translator’s knowledge that the reader is in the same position that s/he is in—that the reader, too, is familiar with the text that is being translated—produced decisions about translative revisions<sup>86</sup> designed to provoke an interrogative response. The multilingual cross-reader is as aware as the translator is that the Middle English text differs from the Anglo-Norman text, and the reader is encouraged to think across languages, to put the original and the translated texts

---

<sup>84</sup> Miller has worked especially on La3amon’s use of English in translating Wace’s *Roman de Brut*. On multilingualism, see the following: Miller forthcoming, *La3amon’s Brut and English Historiography*, Miller, *Multilingualism in Medieval Britain* (book manuscript in progress), and Miller “La3amon’s French.” I thank Professor Miller for generously sharing some of her unpublished work with me, and for our many stimulating conversations about multilingualism and translation that have influenced profoundly my thinking and my work here.

<sup>85</sup> Personal communication. See also the work listed in note 84 above. The type of reading Miller proposes might have had its roots in Old English translation circles. Anne Savage has noted about translation from Latin to Anglo-Saxon: “Except at the very beginning of Anglo-Saxon Christianity, it cannot have been a process of translation of a foreign culture into familiar terms; it must have been, in the centuries following, that bilingual poets were engaged in the process of translating themselves to themselves, from a Latin embodying Christianity in familiar terms to the vernacular, also embodying Christianity in familiar terms. The difference between the two media was itself a source of inspiration” (Savage 1989, p. 123).

<sup>86</sup> “Translative revisions” is a term I will use throughout this dissertation to refer to revisions to the original text that were made in the process of translation.

in conversation with one another, and to consider the significance of the translative revisions.

As I mentioned above, at the same time that these French texts were being translated into Middle English, many of them were also translated into Middle Welsh. Those texts, and the small number of French-to-English translations that definitively pre-date those in the Auchinleck Manuscript, also circulated among a multilingual crowd.<sup>87</sup> However, my study of them in chapters four and six suggests that the extratextual discourse produced by the Auchinleck translations is unique.<sup>88</sup> Translation in the Auchinleck Manuscript seems to have developed into a particular mode of discourse characterized by interrogative translative revisions that invite readers to question many of the values that the original texts advocate. This is a radically different way of inscribing and receiving significance, and it opens new doors for studying the transmission of ideas in multilingual medieval Britain. This method of transmitting ideas is both subversive and interrogative, a reflection of the very significance of many of the translative revisions, as chapters two, three, and five will show. For example, traditionally bifurcated categories in the original texts—sinner and saint, Christian and Saracen, right and wrong—are troubled through the translative revisions, which reveal a consistent interrogative pattern that invites the reader to reexamine traditional cultural values. Some translations ask important questions about religious difference: How do we view the cultural and religious “other” in relation to ourselves, and how different are we, actually, from the “other?” How do we react when the “other” seems to embody, more than we do, the values we ourselves espouse, and what is the appropriate reaction when s/he does not? It is significant that it is through the method of translation that these kinds of questions are entertained. Mimetically, as translations, the texts in fact perform a cultural revision by moving into a new language texts which had been read, for a century, only in French, and in so doing they also compel the cultural reorientation of the Anglo-Norman reader. In the early to mid fourteenth century, it was something of a literary novelty and a cultural revolution to reproduce French texts in English, as much as interrogating the ideas espoused in the original texts represents a cultural revolution of another sort.

What was it about the cultural context of the Auchinleck Manuscript that made it a rich site for transmitting ideas and questioning values in this way? Above, I discussed some aspects of the multilingual context in which the manuscript was produced. Early fourteenth-century London was a particularly multicultural site, with merchants communicating with one another in several languages and frequently code-switching in their communications, administrative workers interacting with documents in French, Latin, and English—oftentimes macaronic—and a court populated not only by French and English speakers but also by speakers of Welsh.<sup>89</sup> This environment provided a built-in multilingual readership that could access the translations in the way that I describe. And this multicultural social atmosphere also provided an environment that

---

<sup>87</sup> See above, and see chapters four and six for more on this.

<sup>88</sup> Although it is beyond the scope of this study to explore later translations in England, my initial research indicates that the mode of discourse that seems to have developed with the Auchinleck translations did indeed affect later medieval translation in England.

<sup>89</sup> See chapter six for more on Welshmen in London; see above for information on multilingual and macaronic administrative documents, and see Rothwell 1994, especially p. 53 for information on code-switching among merchants.

was ripe for asking the particular political and cultural questions with which some of the translative revisions engage. Siobhain Calkin has argued that the texts in the Auchinleck Manuscript engage with issues surrounding English identity vis-à-vis the French. England's contentious relationship with France in the early and mid fourteenth century put it in an interesting position vis-à-vis its own cultural history, since Edward III's claim to the French throne required an articulation of his hereditary ties to France at the same time that the conflict with France required that England differentiate itself from France.<sup>90</sup> It is possible that massively moving Anglo-Norman textual culture into the English language was one way to create an alliance that intricately interwove Anglo-Norman culture with something—the English language—that was exclusively Insular and decidedly not French, while at the same time continuing to embrace Anglo-Norman. Through their celebration of the land of England and fictional heroes from England's past, many of the original Anglo-Norman texts already participated in a particularly Insular British culture and signified a pride in that culture; moving them into the English language was not necessary to effect a sense of pride in England. However, the movement of these Anglo-Norman texts into the English language could help to embrace the cultural contributions of Anglo-Norman while differentiating that culture from Continental French culture. Yet, instead of actively constructing a clearly defined English identity, many of the translative revisions seem to ruminate on the difficulty of such a task and engage interesting questions centering on the ambiguity and hybridity of what we call "English."<sup>91</sup> One Middle English translation, *Lay le Freine*, explicitly positions itself within a literary discussion about multiple cultures, multiple languages, and hybrid cultures in Britain, reversing the terms of the extratextual discussion that Marie de France initiated on these topics in her French-language *lais* and putting pressure on the hegemonic structures that made Anglo-Norman French the dominant literary language in Britain at the time that the Auchinleck translations were produced.<sup>92</sup> Another translation, *Horn Childe and Maiden Rinnild*, invites questions about the cultural identity of the English, Irish, Welsh, and Scots. As Calkin has pointed out, English efforts to subject Wales and Scotland to English rule brought about issues surrounding assimilation and "raised the question of whether the Welsh and Scots could, in some way, be made 'Inglish' by their subjugation to an English king."<sup>93</sup> As chapter five will show, although *Horn Childe and Maiden Rinnild* does seem to engage with this issue, it was not revised from an exclusively English perspective, or at least not one that we might typically consider "English." Rather than exploring how Celtic cultures can be "made 'Inglish,'" the translative revisions in this particular text present a sense of cultural unity that preserves a notion of Celtic sovereignty and legitimacy while refiguring a conception of "English" that incorporates and even embraces "Celtic," all the while requiring a reader of this Middle English text who is familiar with both Celtic and Anglo-Norman literary

---

<sup>90</sup> Calkin 2005, pp. 14-15.

<sup>91</sup> For a slightly different view, see Calkin 2005. Calkin's study is nuanced and recognizes the multiplicity of "identities" that might have been considered "English" in the fourteenth century, but she argues that the Auchinleck texts endeavored to assert a *particular* English identity, specifically one contrasted with French.

<sup>92</sup> *Lay le Freine* is a translation of Marie de France's *Lai le Fraisne*. See chapter five for a thorough discussion of the details of this argument.

<sup>93</sup> Calkin 2005, p. 9.

traditions. This is a text that truly engages with the ambiguities and hybridity that characterize multiculturalism in medieval England.<sup>94</sup>

Although there are many studies of the individual texts that appear in the Auchinleck Manuscript, there are very few studies of the manuscript as a whole or of large groups of texts in it.<sup>95</sup> Those that have studied groups of texts in this manuscript have identified ethnic and religious identity as a key issue. Siobhain Calkin's book, *Saracens and the Making of English Identity*, is the only book-length study of the manuscript, and in it she outlines two important political backdrops for the texts. Above I cited her engagement with the issues of assimilation brought about by England's efforts to subject Wales and Scotland to English rule, and her more extensive treatment of the problems inherent in the Hundred Years' War, which brought England into a contentious relationship with France despite its own cultural and political heritage that intimately links it to France.<sup>96</sup> Calkin explores these issues as a context for her study of the Saracens in this manuscript and argues that many of the depictions of Saracens are used to signify other, more familiar enemies, and to explore issues concerning cultural differentiation.<sup>97</sup> The next longest study of identity in the Auchinleck Manuscript is a chapter in Turville-Petre's book *England the Nation*, in which he discusses the importance of the English language and the many references to English audiences and places in the Auchinleck Manuscript.<sup>98</sup> In addition to the political issues outlined by

---

<sup>94</sup> See chapter five for a more details on this argument and on the translative revisions in *Horn Childe and Maiden Rinnild*, based on the Anglo-Norman *Roman de Horn*.

<sup>95</sup> Notable exceptions include Hanna 2000, Shonk 1985 and Cunningham and Mordkoff 1982. For more on these studies, see chapter two.

<sup>96</sup> Calkin 2005.

<sup>97</sup> The similar literary depiction of Christians and Saracens is not new to the Auchinleck Manuscript, and it is frequently noted in relation to Anglo-Norman and Old French *chansons de geste*. For example, William Comfort notes the Christians' "failure to differentiate seriously the Mahometans from themselves except on the ground of religion" (Comfort 1940, p. 659). Paul Bancourt and Norman Daniel have written extensively on the depiction of Saracens, and on this particular topic, see for example Bancourt 1982 pp. 278-80; 326-33; 402-03 and Daniel 1984 pp. 158-9 and pp. 38-46. Calkin's study contributes interesting insights about the particular ways that the texts in the Auchinleck Manuscript use Saracens to represent enemies closer to home. Indeed, the Auchinleck texts seem to make extensive use of Saracens in this way. I would add that these texts seem to be expanding on the common slippage between Saracens and more familiar enemies found in many *chansons de geste*. For example, the Saracens are confused with Saxons in Jean Bodel's *Chanson des Saisnes*, with Northmen in *Aquin*, with the Irish in *Gormont et Isembart*, with the Danes in *Chron. de Phil. Mouskes*, with the Vandals in *Garin le Loherain*, and more (Comfort 1940 p. 630). What makes the similarities between Saracens and Christians in the Auchinleck texts stand apart from their similarities in earlier literature, however, is that the Auchinleck texts invert this common theme in significant ways. In these texts it is not so much that the Saracens resemble Christians (in that direction) in manners, nobility, strength, et. cetera. The Auchinleck translative revisions dangerously invert this common topos by depicting instead Christians that resemble Muslims in various ways, including even engaging in Muslim prayers and blessings, as chapters two, three, and five discuss with respect to *Guy of Warwick*, *Reinbroun*, and *Beves of Hampton*.

<sup>98</sup> Turville-Petre 1996, pp. 108-141. Turville-Petre associates the English language with the English nation. On the other hand, Tim Machan has argued that the English language could not construct or symbolize culture and nationhood in England in the Middle Ages in the way that it does today or in the way that identity in other medieval countries was connected with language, and he argues that the multilingual situation in England allowed English to interact with the other languages in much more complex ways (Machan 2003, especially p. 68, and pp. 23-65). My argument suggests that the use of the English language in the Auchinleck Manuscript was indeed complex and multicultural and did not necessarily

Calkin, Turville-Petre has outlined the extent to which the crusades provide another important context. As he has discussed, some texts, such as *be King of Tars*, are based on actual events that occurred during the crusades; some, such as *Of Arthour and of Merlin*, bring native British material into a Crusading context, and many texts involve the conversion of Saracens and fighting in Eastern lands.<sup>99</sup> Turville-Petre's focus is on the intersection of the crusading ideal with notions of English nationhood, and he sees the heroes of the manuscript—Guy of Warwick, Beves of Hamptoun, Richard, St. Margaret, and others—as “models of Christian chivalry” from the past that fourteenth-century people are called to emulate.<sup>100</sup>

It is no accident that both of these important studies of the Auchinleck Manuscript have focused on issues of English identity, Christianity, Crusades, and Saracens. What I am interested in is why translation was the vehicle for exploring these issues. What characterized the cultural moment that made translation an interrogative mode that could pose serious questions about current controversies? The translative revisions I discuss in this study suggest that the “models of Christian chivalry” in the Auchinleck Manuscript are far from perfect and differ in significant ways from their Anglo-Norman counterparts. At the same time that the texts, as English translations, disrupt and disorient the expectations of the Anglo-Norman reader, their revisions engage with a serious crisis in cultural, moral, and religious values that accompanied some of the events mentioned above and others in the fourteenth century.

In the thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries, England experienced a crisis of moral and cultural values brought about by the complexities of crusading practices and England's relationship with Rome, and complicated by England's own social and political problems both at home and in relation to France. The infamous atrocities committed by crusaders on both Muslims and Christians during the Fourth Crusade seem to represent a turning point in the crusades. Crusaders savagely raped, pillaged, and desecrated holy places.<sup>101</sup> One crusader, Simon de Montfort, withdrew from the crusader camp after the 1202 attack on Zara stating, “I have not come here to destroy Christians.”<sup>102</sup> The pope was appalled by the sack of Constantinople and “voiced a common view that the crusaders had ‘pursued temporal wages’ not the way of Christ.”<sup>103</sup>

But as the thirteenth century progressed, the secular direction taken by the Fourth Crusade, abhorred by the most righteous *crucesignati* and by the pope as well, became an officially sanctioned practice. Tyerman reports: “between the late thirteenth and early fifteenth centuries, crusades launched against Christians, in the heart of Christian society, formed the most consistent application of papal holy war.”<sup>104</sup> Rome's moral aberration, particularly its demand for and use of crusade funds for many secular wars against Christians for power and land in Italy, caused resentment about crusade taxes<sup>105</sup> and

---

signify England as a nation, at least not to the exclusion of Anglo-Norman or even Celtic languages and cultures.

<sup>99</sup> Turville-Petre 1996, pp. 108-141.

<sup>100</sup> Turville-Petre 1996, p. 134.

<sup>101</sup> Tyerman 2006, p. 553.

<sup>102</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 529.

<sup>103</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 524.

<sup>104</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 894.

<sup>105</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 895-900 and pp. 904-05.

generated discomfort surrounding the identity of the enemy of the crusades, who looked all too much like the faithful who were funding these endeavors.<sup>106</sup> In fact, Rome's sacralization of secular politics directly affected the English. In the first Barons' War, Innocent III and Honorius III both participated in recruiting for the royalists, granted indulgences to anyone who fought for King John, and allowed crusaders to fulfill their vows by fighting for the king instead of heading east.<sup>107</sup> Innocent III called the rebel barons "worse than Saracens" and excommunicated them from the church.<sup>108</sup> The second Barons' War in England was caused in part by Rome's own secular crusades in Italy. Tyerman reports that Pope "Alexander IV persuaded Henry III of England to accept the crown of Sicily on behalf of his second son, Edmund, hoping to add the resources of a secular kingdom to those of the church. English involvement proved abortive, as the financial obligations of the project and the extravagance of its ambition helped provoke opposition and civil war in England (1258-65)."<sup>109</sup> The cause was specifically criticized because it was "not pious."<sup>110</sup> Just as in the first Barons' War, the papacy was on the side of the Royalists, and the barons were warned that Pope Urban IV was sending a legate to preach a crusade against them and excommunicate them. They were excommunicated, but that very legate returned to Italy as the newly elected Pope Clement IV; he in turn sent another legate to preach the cross against Simon de Montfort and the rebel barons.<sup>111</sup> The barons were doubly dismayed with Rome for its involvement in secular warfare. In 1264 the barons stated that they were appalled by the diversion of the Holy Land crusade to Sicily and that the crusading vows of the English people were converted "from a crusade against the Saracens who are the foes of Christ's cross into an attack on fellow-subjects of the same Christian religion,"<sup>112</sup> and the righteous Christian barons and crusaders themselves wound up being the target of another of the papacy's crusades against Christians.

Despite the barons' opposition to Rome's crusades against fellow Christians, however, they were not above using crusade rhetoric and symbolism themselves in this civil war. They had themselves tonsured before one battle and wore white crosses, and "were promised remission of their sins by Walter Cantilupe, the Montfortian bishop of Worcester."<sup>113</sup> Simon de Montfort is reported to have stated that he was a "*crucesignatus* and was very gladly willing to die fighting wicked Christians for the liberty of England and the Holy Church as against pagans."<sup>114</sup> Invoking his status as a *crucesignatus* while fighting in a sort of counter-crusade against Christian enemies that included the pope himself, Simon de Montfort is an example of the extent to which the ideology behind the crusades had become very complex indeed.

---

<sup>106</sup> Ibid., p. 894.

<sup>107</sup> Ibid., pp. 895-96, and Tyerman 1988, p. 137.

<sup>108</sup> Tyerman 1988, p. 136.

<sup>109</sup> Tyerman 2006, p. 898.

<sup>110</sup> Tyerman 1988, p. 121.

<sup>111</sup> Ibid., p. 144-45.

<sup>112</sup> Treharne and Sanders 1973, p. 279.

<sup>113</sup> Lloyd 1985, p. 116.

<sup>114</sup> From the chronicle of St. Benet Holme, quoted in Tyerman 1988, p. 146.

Whereas the attack on Christians in the Fourth Crusade was condemned by the pope and by Simon de Montfort's own grandfather, discussed above,<sup>115</sup> by now it had become common practice for Rome to undertake official crusades against Christians for political purposes and for all sorts of political factions to appropriate crusade ideology, rhetoric, and symbolism in their battles, whether they had the support of Rome or were fighting against groups that enjoyed such support.<sup>116</sup>

By the fourteenth century in England, crusades against Christians and knights fighting for the wrong reasons (e.g., vainglory as opposed to spiritual regeneration) were "common targets of criticism."<sup>117</sup> Certainly, there were always individuals and groups of crusaders who strayed from the crusading ideal, and who were criticized by moralists.<sup>118</sup> What was new beginning in the mid to late thirteenth century, however, was the mass sacralization of secular warfare, backed by the papacy, which involved frequent crusades against fellow Christians. Some of these endeavors "provoked vocal and significant opposition in England,"<sup>119</sup> and as I discussed above, these practices became intimately entangled in Insular politics, putting England in a unique position vis-à-vis the abuse of crusade taxes and the use of God's name to justify wars for secular gains.

Criticism of various aspects of the crusades is commonly recognized in literary discussions of later fourteenth-century texts, such as of Chaucer's ideal crusader-knight who specifically does not seem to have been involved in the Italian crusades, with which Chaucer himself was quite familiar.<sup>120</sup> Gower famously questions the legitimacy of violence even against Saracens in his *Confessio Amantis* and also criticizes crusaders who take the cross only to impress women, and in *Vox Clamantis* he criticizes the clergy for declaring war on Christians instead of fighting Muslims.<sup>121</sup> In *Piers Plowman* Langland criticizes the clergy's love of war and condemns the Pope for slaughtering fellow

---

<sup>115</sup> His grandfather is the Simon de Montfort who withdrew from the crusader camp after the 1202 attack on Zara.

<sup>116</sup> For example, English troops in the fourteenth century were identified by a red crusaders' cross, and English troops also appropriated the symbolism of Saint George, typically the patron saint of crusaders. In his 1300 campaign against the Scots, Edward I is said to have marked himself and his troops with the cross, and both sides considered this war a sort of holy war. Though neither side enjoyed the official support of Rome, both France and England used crusade rhetoric in the Hundred Years' War, and "in England, liturgy, church processions and prayers similar to those devoted to the recovery of the Holy Land were directed in support of royal wars" (Tyerman 2006, p. 911). See Tyerman 2006, pp. 908-911.

<sup>117</sup> Tyerman 1988, p. 261.

<sup>118</sup> For example, Ralph Niger criticized the materialism prevalent during the Third Crusade. See Tyerman 1988, p. 88.

<sup>119</sup> Tyerman is describing opposition to the Papacy's fight with the Hohenstaufen. Tyerman 1988, p. 121.

<sup>120</sup> See for example Tyerman 2006, p. 905.

<sup>121</sup> Elizabeth Siberry discusses Gower's criticism in 1985, pp. 129-30. The criticism against the violence of the crusades may be read Gower's *Confessio Amantis*, ll. 1620-33, 1656-82, 2241-44, 2484-515. See Macaulay, ed., 1899-1902, vol. iii. His criticism of the clergy in *Vox Clamantis* is found in Book III, c. 9, ll. 650-70. See Macaulay, ed., 1899-1902, vol. iv. Siberry argues that the crusade criticism in *Confessio Amantis* should be seen as ironic, particularly considering the position Gower takes in *Vox Clamantis* (Siberry 1985, p. 130). Even if it is meant to be ironic, however, the irony suggests that general opposition to the violence of the crusades was probably expressed by some sector of society, even if Gower himself did not agree with it.

Christians.<sup>122</sup> And, historically in the same time period, Wycliff and the Lollards are known to have condemned the crusades in general, crusades against Christians in particular, and violence against or the killing of Christians and Muslims alike.<sup>123</sup>

Although these ideas are discussed most explicitly in the literature surrounding the Lollard movement, they did not just appear suddenly in the literature of the late fourteenth century. Though less overt in their expression, the translative revisions in a number of the Auchinleck texts discussed in this study show deep concern with many of the same issues. The original texts were written in Anglo-Norman right around the time of the Fourth Crusade, before which time the “enemy” of the church was still clearly delineated and flagrant abuse of God’s name for secular gains and goals was still an aberration. The translation of these texts in the late thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries, after years of moral corruption surrounding the crusades and the identity of the enemies of the church, reveals an interrogative agenda that calls attention to an atmosphere in which the clearly delineated categories presented in the original texts—such as sinner and saint, right and wrong, Christian and Saracen—are now much more difficult to discern.

In the Auchinleck Manuscript, the longer romances, many of which are set in the East or feature Saracen enemies, are frequently separated by shorter “filler texts,” many of which are religious in nature and feature Christian prayers and philosophy. This presentation interweaves short texts treating ideal Christian beliefs and behaviors with longer texts that, as this study shows, frequently question their practical application, and readers are invited to contemplate the crusades and the spiritual and moral issues surrounding them.

Some of the short “filler” texts, and the translative revisions in some of the longer texts discussed here indicate clearly that the Englishmen involved in creating this manuscript revised, wrote, and compiled texts to evoke the particular political and spiritual context I have described.<sup>124</sup> For example, the Auchinleck Manuscript preserves a unique copy of the A redaction of *þe Simonie*, and it is also the earliest copy of any redaction. In this text, knights are criticized for fighting against “Holy Church” and engaging in civil war instead of crusading in the Holy Land:

And þilke þat han al þe wele in freþ and in feld,  
Boþen eorl and baroun and kniht of o sheld,  
Alle þeiþ beþ isworne holi churche holde to rihte;  
Þerfore was þe ordre mad, for holi churche to fihte  
Sanȝ faille.

---

<sup>122</sup> Langland’s condemnation of the pope, as Siberry points out in 1985, p. 129, is in the B text of *Piers Plowman*, *Passus XIX*, ll. 442-46. See Kane and Donaldson, ed., 1975.

<sup>123</sup> Siberry notes that Wycliff never condemned the crusades in general, but rather specifically the 1383 Despenser crusades and any crusade against Christians. Denunciation of homicide and force against Muslims was part of the 1395 list of Lollard propositions affixed to the doors of Westminster Abbey and St. Paul’s Cathedral, and there were numerous Lollard sermons preached against killing Christians and Muslims alike. Siberry argues that it is uncertain, however, how widespread these ideas were and notes that there were Lollards who were themselves crusaders as well (Siberry 1985, pp. 128-129).

<sup>124</sup> See chapter two for a discussion of the arguments surrounding the original composition and translation of many of the texts in the Auchinleck Manuscript.

And nu ben þeih þe ferste þat hit sholen assaille.

Hij brewen strut and stuntise þereas sholde be pes.  
Hij sholde gon to þe Holi Lond and maken þere her res  
And fihte þere for þe croiȝ and shewe þe ordre of knihte  
And awreke Ihesu Crist, wid launce and spere to fihte  
And sheld.

And nu ben þeih liouns in halle and hares in þe feld.

.....  
Allas, þat euere sholde hit bifalle þat in so litel a þrowe,  
Swiche men sholde swich deþ þole and ben ileid so lowe.  
Of eorles and of barouns, baldest hij were;  
And nu hit is of hem bicomme riht as þeih neuere ne were  
Iborn.

God loke to þe soules þat hij ne be noht lorn.<sup>125</sup>

Another short work that is also unique to this manuscript, *On the Seven Deadly Sins*, closes with a call for peace at the same time as it calls for a crusade against Saracens:

Biseche we þanne God in heuene,  
For hise blessed names seuene,  
þat made boþe mone and sterre,  
Sende pees þere is werre,  
And ȝiue Cristenemen grace,  
Into þe holi lond to pace  
And sle Saraxins þat beȝ so riue,  
And lete be Cristenemen on liue,  
And saue þe pes of holi cherche,  
And ȝiue vs grace so to werche,  
þat we mowen gode acountes make  
Of þat God vs haueȝ itake<sup>126</sup>

The prayer to send peace where there is war, followed by an injunction to send Christians on crusade to kill Saracens, seems odd.<sup>127</sup> However, this passage makes sense if we consider the contrast between the plea to “sle” Saracens while letting Christian men “liue” in the historical context I have described. It seems that this is a prayer to bring peace to Christian lands, where wars against Christians are threatening the “pes of holi cherche” and are preventing crusades against Saracens in the Holy Land, where they ought to be undertaken.

The translative revisions in some longer texts also evoke the historical context described above. For example, *Beves of Hampton* adds a fight in the city of London that

---

<sup>125</sup> Burnley and Wiggins, ed., 2003, “þe Simonie,” ll. 241-52; 439-44.

<sup>126</sup> Burnley and Wiggins, ed., 2003, “On the Seven Deadly Sins,” ll. 285-96.

<sup>127</sup> Turville-Petre also calls this moment incongruous, but he does not address the problem (Turville-Petre 1996, p. 121).

resembles Simon de Montfort's historical battle against the papacy-backed royalists, discussed in greater detail in chapter five. Rebecca Wilcox has argued that the Middle English version of *Guy of Warwick* reveals an agenda to revise the history of the Fourth Crusade so as to mitigate anxieties about its atrocities.<sup>128</sup> Revised with the hindsight that one hundred years of political and crusade history gives to the original texts, the translative revisions frequently invite readers to reconsider the spiritual values inherent in the original texts. For example, in *Gui de Warewic*, in a moment of penitence, Gui confesses that while he was attempting to increase his reputation for bravery, he burned abbeys, an act the text never depicts. As an act of repentance for this and other deeds he committed while focused on his reputation, he embarks on a spiritual journey and engages in martial acts, motivated by his love of God, to protect Christians against Saracens. Written on the heels of the atrocities of the Fourth Crusade, this strange confession might represent the remorse felt by the most righteous Christians, and Guy's penitential journey could represent an attempt to return to a more pious crusade ideology. The Middle English translation of *Gui de Warewic*, composed in the middle of what would become a long new history of crusades against Christians, emphasizes a bleaker outlook and a more ambiguous reality. The text removes this particular aspect of Guy's confession but highlights the ways in which the martial actions displayed by the "penitent Guy" do not seem to differ from the actions displayed by the "sinful Guy" who was focused on his reputation, blurring the boundary between secular and sacred warfare. Chapters two, three, and five discuss in detail the translative revisions in *Guy of Warwick*, *Reinbroun*, and *Beves of Hamton* that blur boundaries that were previously clearly delineated between Christian and Saracen, ally and enemy. For example, Guy is uniquely depicted wearing the armor of a Saracen in a fight that symbolically represents the Saracens' destruction of idols commonly depicted in Anglo-Norman and Continental French *chansons de geste*; Beves knows less about Christian High Holy days than the Saracens do and participates in a fight that represents a symbolic inversion of the topos depicting a Saracen who refuses to worship the Christian God and chooses to fight instead, putting Beves in the same position as the traditional Saracen, choosing to fight instead of worshiping God. Although *Amis and Amiloun* does not involve Saracens or an Eastern landscape, for a fourteenth-century audience its setting in Lombardy, a major center of the papacy's secular crusades in Italy, also evokes the context described above, and the translative revisions, beginning with the pledge the friends make to support one another "in wrong and right," engage the reader in a series of questions that provoke consideration about what it means to be a Christian and what actions are "right" to undertake in God's name. The translative revisions in all of these texts create an interrogative structure that invites multilingual cross-readers to reconsider the spiritual and moral values espoused in the original texts by highlighting the outward appearance of Christian honor while displaying actions that indicate, upon further contemplation, some sort of moral or spiritual turpitude. The following chapters will show that, to the reader familiar with the original texts, the translative revisions in *Guy of Warwick*, *Reinbroun*,

---

<sup>128</sup> Wilcox 2004. For a dissenting view, see Rouse 2007, especially p. 99. Rouse argues, on the contrary, that the text reaffirms Western military and cultural superiority over Eastern Christians. For yet another view, see chapter three, where I propose that the revisions in some ways highlight, rather than mitigate, the malaise people may have felt over the Fourth Crusade.

*Beves of Hamptoun*, and *Amis and Amiloun* consistently invert generic and literary expectations and blur boundaries between traditionally bifurcated categories so as to interrogate and revise some of the spiritual and moral values presented in the original texts. These texts engage the reader in questions surrounding the identity of the Christian in a way that reflects historical concern about the use and abuse of God's name for secular gains, and about what kinds of actions differentiate Christians.

The Auchinleck Manuscript repeatedly violates the expectations of the reader. An early fourteenth-century reader does not expect to see an entire anthology of texts written in English; s/he does not expect romances and *chansons de geste* to be written in English, and s/he does not expect that these popular texts will engage the reader in a serious interrogation of moral, spiritual, and cultural values. As the context I outlined above suggests, what the reader *does* expect at this time, however, is that English texts will be in dialogue with French ones. The authors of the Auchinleck translations capitalized on the multilingual readership of Middle English texts at the time, using translation as a subversive and interrogative mode of discourse that created an extratextual dialogue between texts and across languages. This method of inscribing significance and receiving information dramatically changes the way we think about the transmission of ideas and the use of the English language in medieval Britain, and it opens new doors for studying the role of English as its use increased and developed throughout the fourteenth century. In fact, Sara Torpey's study of later medieval English romances argues that the late fourteenth- and early fifteenth-century texts she studies are "about argument itself,"<sup>129</sup> that they "generate indeterminacy and multivalence"<sup>130</sup> and "provide a space for serious and open-ended speculation about important issues."<sup>131</sup> Torpey's study suggests that the shifting of perspective, the ambiguity, and the interrogation of traditional values that the Auchinleck translations express through their translative revisions later become constitutive of Middle English writing on its own terms.

---

<sup>129</sup> Torpey 2002, p. 4.

<sup>130</sup> Ibid., p. 274.

<sup>131</sup> Ibid., p. 4.

## Chapter 2

### Anglo-Norman and Middle English in the Auchinleck *Guy of Warwick* and *Reinbroun* and their Structure in the Auchinleck Manuscript

Together, the Middle English romances of *Guy of Warwick* and *Reinbroun* that are preserved in the fourteenth-century Edinburgh, National Library of Scotland Advocates' MS 19.2.1 (hereafter the Auchinleck Manuscript) may form the earliest extant Middle English version of the story told in the Anglo-Norman *Gui de Warewic*.<sup>1</sup> The Anglo-Norman *Gui de Warewic* tells the story of Gui, a steward's son, who falls in love with his lord's daughter, Felice. After gaining the reputation as the best knight in the world, he is allowed to marry her. However, soon after their marriage he laments having done so much for the love of a woman but nothing at all for God. He leaves his pregnant wife to go into exile as an anonymous pilgrim and fighter, this time fighting for the love of God. Meanwhile, the text interlaces the story of Gui's son, Reinbroun, who is born back home in England but kidnapped by Russian merchants and taken to Africa.<sup>2</sup> The text then returns to the story of Gui's adventures undertaken for God; ultimately he dies a close to saintly death in a hermitage. After Gui's death, the story returns to Reinbroun's adventures and his ultimate return to England.

The most frequently discussed difference between the Anglo-Norman *Gui de Warewic* and the Middle English version of the story presented in the Auchinleck romances of *Guy of Warwick* and *Reinbroun* is the unique structure of the material in the Auchinleck Manuscript. All parts of the Anglo-Norman *Gui de Warewic* that deal with Gui's son, Reinbroun, are removed from the interlace structure in which they are presented in *Gui de Warewic* and made into a separate romance, the Auchinleck romance of *Reinbroun*. This Middle English romance is told in tail-rhyme stanzas. The codicological evidence which indicates that this Reinbroun material should be viewed as an independent romance in the Auchinleck Manuscript is indisputable. As I will discuss in further detail below, regardless of which of the five or six writers<sup>3</sup> actually wrote the

---

<sup>1</sup> Many scholars accept that the fragments of the Middle English *Guy of Warwick* preserved in London, British Library Additional MS 14408 and Aberystwyth, National Library of Wales MS 572 are earlier than the Auchinleck *Guy of Warwick* and *Reinbroun*. Daniel Huws dates these fragments to the first quarter of the fourteenth century based on features of the script, though he cautions that the Northern language of the text means that some allowance should be made for "Northern backwardness" with respect to dating the script. See the edition and study of these fragments in Huws and Mills 1974, p. 5. The Auchinleck Manuscript is traditionally dated between 1330-1340. In light of Huws's caution, in my view the difference is negligible enough that we cannot determine with certainty which text is earlier.

<sup>2</sup> Interlace is a common structure in Old French and Anglo-Norman romances, where various threads of a story are woven together in complex ways; for instance a main story might be paused to introduce a related story, which is then paused to return to the main story, which might be paused again to return to the first related story or even to introduce a second related story, and so on.

<sup>3</sup> Here and elsewhere I will refer to "writers" rather than "scribes." Although scholars recognize the various roles scribes may inhabit in the copying and creation of texts, the term "scribe" nevertheless implies rote copying or a lack of sophistication or both in any deliberate changes made to the texts being copied. I prefer the term "writer" because it, too, can indicate merely the act of copying or the act of composing, but it lacks the derogatory implications with respect to creation of texts that "scribe" sometimes carries. Later in this chapter I will discuss in greater detail the debate about whether there were five or six

texts in this manuscript, each new text is indicated by a title written in red by Writer 1, who also assigned a roman numeral to each individual text in the manuscript, and that numeral is typically written at the top of each folio. Many texts are also introduced by miniatures. *Reinbroun*, written by Writer 5, is introduced by Writer 1 with the title *Reinbrun Gij sone of Warwicke*, followed by a miniature depicting Reinbroun about to cut off the head of another knight. Writer 1 labeled this text item number twenty-nine. However, it is less clear how we should view the text that comes before *Reinbroun* in the Auchinleck Manuscript. This text, written by Writer 1, includes a Middle English version of all of the material from *Gui de Warewic* that does *not* involve Reinbroun. The Auchinleck Manuscript is missing the beginning of the text, but Writer 1 identified the entire text as item number twenty-eight. Since *Reinbroun* is identified as item twenty-nine, the number indicates that all of this material that comes before it should be considered one single text. However, the text presents an odd transition part way through. At first it is told in rhyming couplets, but the verse form unexpectedly changes to twelve-line tail-rhyme stanzas (the same form in which *Reinbroun* is written) just before Guy marries Felice. Although there is no new title, new miniature, new item number, or even a line space, this change in verse form is accompanied by what appears to be an introductory prologue, unique to this manuscript:

God graunt hem heuen-blis to mede  
 Pat herken to mi romaunce rede  
 Al of a gentil kni3t;  
 Þe best bodi he was at nede  
 Pat euer mi3t bistriden stede  
 & freest founde in fi3t.  
 Þe word of him ful wide it ran  
 Ouer al þis warld þe priis he wan,  
 As man most of mi3t.  
 Balder bern was non in bi,  
 His name was hoten sir Gij  
 Of Warwike wise & wi3t.  
 Wi3t he was for soþe to say  
 & holden for priis in eueri play  
 As kni3t of gret bounde.  
 Out of þis lond he went his way  
 Þurth mani diuers cuntray  
 Pat was bi3ond þe see.  
 Seþþen he com into Ingland  
 & Aþelston þe king he fond  
 Pat was boþe hende & fre.  
 For his loue ich vnderstond  
 He slou3 a dragoun in Norþhumberlond

---

writers involved in the production of the Auchinleck Manuscript. See also Shonk 1985 for an excellent codicological study of this manuscript.

Ful fer in þe norþ cuntre.<sup>4</sup>

If one were to remove the “prologue” above, the Middle English couplet lines just before it and the stanzaic lines just after it dovetail perfectly.<sup>5</sup> The last line of the couplet section is a perfect translation of line 7408 of the Anglo-Norman *Gui de Warewic*, and the first set of stanzaic lines just after the prologue represent a translation of the lines that follow line 7408 in *Gui de Warewic*.<sup>6</sup> The prologue seems to be truly “inserted” between two lines. The only visual marker of the transition is an ambiguous one: at the point where the verse form changes, the script appears to be significantly larger, but palaeographers agree that Writer 1 wrote both the couplet and the stanzaic material.<sup>7</sup> Despite the oddities, it seems clear that Writer 1 did not view the stanzaic part of this text as an independent work, and because he is recognized as both the meticulous “editor” and “organizer” of the volume, and the writer of both parts of the Guy material, the likelihood is that this is a deliberate presentation.<sup>8</sup>

These unique structural features give rise to numerous questions about the status of the Anglo-Norman *Gui de Warewic* vis-à-vis the texts which tell the same story in the Auchinleck Manuscript. The Anglo-Norman *Gui de Warewic* likely circulated for at least one hundred years before the date of the earliest extant Middle English versions, and it also continued to be reproduced throughout the period when the Middle English

---

<sup>4</sup> Burnley and Wiggins, ed., 2003, *Guy of Warwick (stanzas)*, ll. 6924-48. Although I argue that both the couplet and the stanzaic parts of the Auchinleck *Guy of Warwick* were meant to be read as a single text, I will nevertheless distinguish the two parts in my citations because I frequently discuss the ways in which the two parts of the single text are working together, and because I must discuss the views of other scholars, who frequently separate the two. The couplet part of the text, which Burnley and Wiggins title *Guy of Warwick (couplets)*, will be cited by line number as “Auchinleck *Guy* I,” and in future references the stanzaic part of the text will be cited by line number as “Auchinleck *Guy* II.” Citations from *Reinbroun* will be cited by line number as “Auchinleck *Reinbroun*.” No other extant manuscript version of the tale, in Anglo-Norman or in Middle English, includes this prologue. This and all subsequent statements about the Anglo-Norman *Gui* texts and manuscripts are based on Ewert’s variants (see Ewert 1932) and on my own examination of the following manuscripts: London, British Library, Royal MS 8.F.ix; London, British Library, Additional MS 38662; London, British Library, Harley MS 3775 [frag]; London, College of Arms, Arundel MS 27; and Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, MS français 1669). As I will discuss in further detail below, the English texts in Gonville and Caius College, MS 107/176 and Cambridge University Library, MS Ff.2.38 read much like the Anglo-Norman text.

<sup>5</sup> Later in this chapter, I will provide quotations and discuss this dovetailing in further detail. Laura Hibbard Loomis was the first to discuss this (see Loomis 1942, p. 609), and later I note further significant details about the way the Auchinleck writers seemed to work with the Anglo-Norman text.

<sup>6</sup> For the only edition of the Anglo-Norman text, see Alfred Ewert, ed., *Gui de Warewic: roman du XIII<sup>e</sup> siècle*, Classiques français du Moyen Âge 74-75. (Paris: É. Champion, 1933). All references to the Anglo-Norman text will be taken from this edition and cited by line number as *Gui*.

<sup>7</sup> See Cunningham and Mordkoff 1982, p. 291 and Pearsall 1977, p. ix.

<sup>8</sup> As I discuss in greater detail below, Writer 1 frequently edited and corrected even very minor mistakes throughout this manuscript (his own mistakes and those of the other writers); it seems unlikely that such a meticulous editor would have taken care to stop copying the couplet text at the precise line that the stanzaic text starts after the prologue, then accidentally copy the prologue, then fail to correct it. See Mills 1988, p. 17, especially note 20 for examples of Writer 1’s corrections. See Shonk 1985 for further explanation of the codicological evidence which suggests the extensive role Writer 1 played in the organization of this manuscript.

versions were being produced.<sup>9</sup> What is the relationship between the surviving examples of the story in Anglo-Norman and the Middle English version of the story in the Auchinleck Manuscript? It is clear that the Anglo-Norman *Gui de Warewic* is a pre-text for the Auchinleck version, but is it also a source text? To what extent can we consider the version of the story presented in the Auchinleck Manuscript a “translation” of the Anglo-Norman *Gui de Warewic*, and why does that matter?

Except when the translated text is clearly making a significant revision, such as in the case of major interpolations, our scholarly bias tends to be to treat less obviously intentional differences between French texts and Middle English versions of them as errors in copying and transmission. The assumption that differences are errors is partially rooted in the tendency to view access for a relatively monolingual audience as the primary purpose of translating these popular texts. The multilingual, cross-reading milieu that I described in chapter one complicates this assumption, but how can we really tell whether evident differences between Middle English translations and their French sources are intentional translative revisions or errors in copying and transmission?

Oxford, Bodleian Library Ashmole MS 33, commonly known as the Ashmole Manuscript, is a late fourteenth-century manuscript that preserves a unique example of a holograph translation along with approximately five hundred lines from the original draft translation of the Old French *Fierabras* into the Middle English *Sir Ferumbras*. The draft is preserved, along with two Latin documents, on a triple envelope of parchment in which the manuscript was originally bound. The fair copy changes verse form in the midst of the text from couplets to tail-rhyme strophes, an oddity that puts it in the same company as several of the translations in the Auchinleck Manuscript, including *Guy of Warwick*. Stephen Shepherd has compared the Old French *Fierabras* with the Middle English fair copy and with the original draft translation, both of which are in the same hand.<sup>10</sup> His study gives fascinating insight into the process of translating this Old French text into Middle English. Shepherd has identified three translation “states”: line-for-line translation, a second type characterized by “occasional passages, lines, or portions of lines in which draft and fair copy are practically identical but which alter the content . . . of the corresponding OF,” and a third state in which the draft adheres faithfully to the Old French but the fair copy departs significantly from the draft.<sup>11</sup> He observes that it seems clear that the original Old French was in front of the translator the entire time, even between draft and fair copy,<sup>12</sup> and he notes that some of the changes show a deliberate attempt to highlight or amplify an existing moral or ethical issue in the original text.<sup>13</sup> Some minor details seem to have been changed deliberately, such as the reversal of the combatants’ roles in a battle or the reordering of an incident that is otherwise told the same way.<sup>14</sup> Many of the differences Shepherd notes in his study—such as the mixing of character roles and reordering of events—are the types of things that are traditionally attributed to some sort of “confusion” on the part of the translator or to some historical

---

<sup>9</sup> See chapter one for further details on the Anglo-Norman and Middle English manuscripts preserving this story.

<sup>10</sup> Shepherd 1989.

<sup>11</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 109.

<sup>12</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>13</sup> For example *ibid.*, pp. 110-111.

<sup>14</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 112-113.

accident in the transmission and copying of texts multiple times. However, this unique opportunity to compare the translator's draft copy with his fair copy shows, according to Shepherd's study, that even these types of changes represent thoughtful revisions to the original text. Although we are not fortunate enough to be able to make such comparisons in studying all Middle English translations, Shepherd's study of the Ashmole *Sir Ferumbras* is important because it provides tangible evidence that Middle English translators of French texts were not just translating, but were thoughtfully revising the original texts, and that even where we are not able to discern an obvious reason for a revision, it might not be appropriate to determine that it is, therefore, a "mistake." We know, for instance, that the Ashmole copy of *Sir Ferumbras* represents an original translation, and we cannot therefore attribute the odd change in verse form to the use of a different exemplar; whether or not we understand it, in all likelihood it was a conscious stylistic choice made by the translator.

In the case of the Auchinleck *Guy of Warwick*, the change in verse form is accompanied by the strange "medial prologue" cited above, and together these features are frequently used to argue that the stanzaic part of this text must have circulated independently for years before it was sloppily joined with the couplet part of the story in the Auchinleck Manuscript, presumably because the scribe was working with an incomplete couplet exemplar. This is certainly a reasonable hypothesis, but is there any more evidence for it than there is for the hypothesis that the change in verse form and the "medial prologue" represent an intentional translative revision? Although it seems counter-intuitive because of the strangeness of a "medial prologue," this chapter will show that there is in fact more evidence that the prologue is part of a series of intentional translative revisions produced specifically for the Auchinleck compilation than that it represents a sloppy mistake in copying. The stakes of this argument are high, because as we will explore in greater depth below, the claim that the stanzaic part of the Auchinleck *Guy of Warwick* was composed in a different environment and circulated for years before being joined with the couplet part of the story in the Auchinleck Manuscript is the linchpin in a series of arguments that attempt to close the door on what is commonly known as the "bookshop theory." This theory, proposed by Laura Hibbard Loomis, argues that the texts in the Auchinleck Manuscript were created through a collaborative effort by a team of translators and scribes who manufactured popular romance for sale.<sup>15</sup> More recent scholarship has summarily dismissed Loomis's theory, favoring the notion that the entire manuscript was created from pre-existing Middle English exemplars which were translated in diverse environments and had been circulating for years before coming together in the Auchinleck Manuscript. The bookshop theory, and whether or not we reject it, significantly impacts our understanding of book production in fourteenth-century England, and it also impacts the questions we pose about medieval translation, which is prominently featured in the Auchinleck Manuscript.

This chapter examines the Auchinleck romances of *Guy of Warwick* and *Reinbroun* that translate the Anglo-Norman *Guy de Warewic* and shows that, even without the benefit of a draft and "definitively" holograph copy of the text, there are indeed other ways to suggest whether or not translative revisions are original and intentional. In this chapter, I will examine the textual and scholarly history of the

---

<sup>15</sup> Loomis 1942, especially p. 626.

Auchinleck romances of *Guy of Warwick* and *Reinbroun* because this history raises fundamental questions about how one arrives at current assumptions about the relationship between the Anglo-Norman *Gui de Warewic* and the Middle English Auchinleck version of the story. The first reason to scrutinize the scholarship is to reveal and question the assumptions implicit in the dominant methodology for reading these texts and to suggest that the assumptions, rather than the evidence, are what drive the conclusions that have been made. The second reason is to reexamine the particular evidence and conclusions that have been offered about these texts in order to open the door to new questions, which will be explored in the next chapter. I show that the evidence scholars have given for the claim that the Auchinleck *Guy* and *Reinbroun* texts do not represent an original translation does not necessitate this conclusion, and I provide additional evidence to re-open the possibility—and indeed argue for the probability—that the Auchinleck romances of *Guy of Warwick* and *Reinbroun* might represent an original translation of the Anglo-Norman *Gui de Warewic*.

If the Middle English texts in the Auchinleck Manuscript represent an original translation of *Gui de Warewic*, a new set of questions emerges. Without an identifiable Anglo-Norman manuscript as a source text, how can we perceive the story in the Auchinleck Manuscript to be a translation? How would the translator have worked with the Anglo-Norman story as a source, and what motivated the choices s/he made? If we ascribe conscious intent and agency to the writer of this material, we are forced to ask how the unique aspects of it might be viewed as rhetorically motivated translative revisions. Given the literary milieu I described in chapter one, we must also ask how multilingual cross-readers might have received such rhetoric. These questions will be explored in the next chapter, and the arguments in this chapter will lay the groundwork for them by showing that despite the trend in recent scholarship, it is much more likely that these texts represent an original translation than that they do not.

### **Guy of Warwick, *Edited***

Since the late nineteenth century, three scholarly editions of the Auchinleck *Guy of Warwick* have been published. There are dramatic differences among the three of them, and none of them clearly resembles the material as it is presented in the manuscript. Because of the confusing and differing representations in these editions, it is difficult for students and scholars to know how to read the Auchinleck texts of *Guy of Warwick* and *Reinbroun*. The three editions have moved—both implicitly and explicitly—more and more definitively towards an argument about the pre-Auchinleck textual history of this material, and the arguments made by the editions significantly affect our reading of the Middle English material as well as our understanding of its relationship to the Anglo-Norman pre-text. Below I examine these editions and the arguments they make before contrasting them, in the following section, with the manuscript evidence.

From the late nineteenth century through the early twenty first century, students of English literature came to know the Middle English *Guy of Warwick* through two editions edited by Julius Zupitza for the Early English Text Society. These editions edit separately all three of the complete Middle English manuscript versions that are extant. The text edited from the early fourteenth-century Auchinleck Manuscript is presented in a

facing page format with the text edited from the later fifteenth-century Cambridge, Gonville and Caius College, MS 107/176.<sup>16</sup> A separate volume presents the text from the late fifteenth- or early sixteenth-century Cambridge University Library, MS Ff.2.38 (olim More MS 690).<sup>17</sup> The overall plot structure presented in these editions, with some variation, is as follows:

Guy of Warwick is a steward's son who falls in love with his lord's daughter, Felice. Felice will not marry Guy until he has proven that he is the best knight in the world, and the first half of the romance follows Guy's exploits through Europe to the East and back to England. After gaining the reputation that Felice desires, Guy is allowed to marry her. But Guy immediately laments the fact that he has caused much destruction, and that he has done so much for the love of Felice but nothing at all for God. Consequently, he leaves his pregnant wife and goes on a sort of "crusade for Christ." Again the romance follows Guy's exploits through Europe to the East and back to England, a journey in which his deeds do not seem to differ in nature from those of the first half, but this time he performs them in the name of God and not in the name of Felice. While he is in Constantinople, two of the texts (Gonville and Caius College, MS 107/176 and Cambridge University Library, MS Ff.2.38) present part of the story of Guy's son, Reinbroun, in interlace structure. Reinbroun is kidnapped by Russian merchants and taken to Africa, and Guy's mentor, Heraud (also Reinbroun's tutor while Guy is away), departs in search of him but is imprisoned. The texts then return to Guy as he leaves Constantinople for Germany. (Auchinleck does not present this Reinbroun material here.) Ultimately, Guy returns to England, disguised and unnoticed, retires to a hermitage, and dies a close to saintly death. Felice follows him there and dies shortly after Guy. The text in Gonville and Caius College, MS 107/176 ends here. The Cambridge University Library, MS Ff.2.38 text returns to the Reinbroun story at this point, and the Auchinleck text begins to tell about Reinbroun for the first time, including the material referenced above that is presented earlier in both the Caius and the Cambridge University Library manuscripts. In this final section, we learn about Reinbroun's encounter with Heraud and their adventures together on the way back to England, where Reinbroun returns to Warwick to receive homage.

---

<sup>16</sup> Julius Zupitza ed., *The Romance of Guy of Warwick*. (London, New York: Published for the Early English Text Society by the Oxford Univ. Press, 1883, 1887, 1891). Citations from the *Guy of Warwick* text in Cambridge, Gonville and Caius College, MS 107/176 will be taken from this edition and cited by line number as "Caius *Guy*." (Citations from the Auchinleck Manuscript will not be taken from this edition but rather from the online edition by Burnley and Wiggins. See above for the reference.)

<sup>17</sup> Julius Zupitza ed., *The Romance of Guy of Warwick, Second or 15<sup>th</sup>-Century Version*. (London: Published for the Early English Text Society, by N. Trübner & Co. 1875). Citations from the *Guy of Warwick* text in Cambridge University Library, MS Ff.2.38 will be taken from this edition and cited by line number as "CUL *Guy*."

Because all three extant complete manuscript versions are edited separately in Zupitza's nineteenth century editions, we have a clearer picture of the Middle English manuscript versions of the story than we often have of medieval texts from modern editions. Yet, there are some unexplained oddities in Zupitza's presentation of the text, specifically with respect to his edition of the Auchinleck version, the one most frequently read because of the fame of its manuscript and its earlier date.

The manuscript versions in Gonville and Caius College, MS 107/176 and Cambridge University Library, MS Ff.2.38 are told in rhyming couplets. The Auchinleck text is also told in rhyming couplets, up through line 7306 in Zupitza's edition, where Guy has just killed a dragon for King Athelstan before returning to Felice to marry her. After line 7306 of the couplet text, the edition prints a short line (literally, a straight line less than an inch long), and begins the line numbering anew, at number one. The text that begins here is told in twelve-line tail-rhyme stanzas rather than couplets, and seems to present a prologue to a new romance, yet Zupitza does not give it a new title; it is told right in the midst of the single text he entitled *Gij of Warwike* at the beginning. It is clear from the facing page edition of the text in the Caius manuscript that as soon as the unique Auchinleck "prologue" ends, the two manuscripts match nicely again with respect to content, and this "prologue" seems to appear awkwardly in the midst of a romance, separated only by the strange short line in the edition. Curiously, although Zupitza gives detailed paleographic notes throughout his edition concerning superscript letters, abbreviations, and erased or expunctuated lines and letters, he provides no note at all about the manuscript presentation that led him to print this strange line and begin the line numbering anew. Is this a new text? Or is it part of the text that comes before it? Why is there a prologue, a new verse form, and new line numbering, but no new title, and why does all this appear in the midst of what the edition from the Caius manuscript presents as a continuous text? There is no explanation for this presentation, and the reader has no idea whether the Auchinleck Manuscript presents this stanzaic section as a new text or as part of the couplet text. Following the deaths of Guy and Felice in both the stanzaic portion of the Auchinleck *Guy of Warwick* and the text presented in the Caius manuscript, the EETS edition ends the romance it entitles *Gij of Warwike*. We turn the page, and a text entitled *Reinbrun, Gij sone of Warwike* appears, with an indication that it is from the Auchinleck Manuscript. This text includes the final Reinbroun material discussed in the plot summary above, as well as the part of Reinbroun's story that is included in interlace structure in Gonville and Caius College, MS 107/176 and Cambridge University Library, MS Ff.2.38. However, EETS entitles the entire volume *The Romance of Guy of Warwick*, giving no indication that within the volume one will find a separate romance called *Reinbrun Gij sone of Warwike*. What is this text? Is it a part of *The Romance of Guy of Warwick*, or is it a different but related text that Zupitza felt would be interesting to read after reading *Guy of Warwick*? Since it does not appear in the facing page edition of the text in the Caius manuscript, it seems that it is not part of *The Romance of Guy of Warwick*, which is the title of the entire volume. However, if we read the EETS volume containing the text from Cambridge University Library, MS Ff.2.38, we see that all of this material is presented there as part of the same text, also entitled *The Romance of Guy of Warwick*. In his edition of the text from the Cambridge

University Library manuscript, Zupitza includes footnotes before and at the start of the final Reinbroun material to indicate that part of a page is left blank before the final Reinbroun material begins, with larger letters, “as they use (*sic*) to be at the beginning of a poem,”<sup>18</sup> yet he does not present the material in his edition as if it is a new poem.

From Zupitza’s editions, students cannot be certain about what, precisely, the text of *Guy of Warwick* is in Middle English. Although the separate editions of the three extant complete manuscript versions give an indication of the multiplicity of possibilities, the peculiarities of Zupitza’s presentation lead to many questions: Is the final Reinbroun material ever part of the *Romance of Guy of Warwick*, or is it merely closely related to it? Is the stanzaic portion of the Auchinleck *Guy of Warwick* a separate romance, or is it part of the same text as the couplet portion? Zupitza’s “editorial equivocation” reflects the fact that the manuscripts with which he was working do not give clear answers to these questions. Moreover, his presentation of the Auchinleck texts only adds to the confusion rather than elucidating the problem at the level of the manuscript: without explanatory notes, he presents the Auchinleck stanzaic Guy material in such a way as to suggest that it is separated from the couplet text in the manuscript, whereas the manuscript does not present it this way.<sup>19</sup> In his edition of the text in Cambridge University Library, MS Ff.2.38, Zupitza does the opposite. Although he briefly describes that the manuscript separates the final Reinbroun material from the main Guy narrative, he presents the text in his edition as if the Reinbroun material continues unbroken from the Guy material.

More recently, the Auchinleck Guy and Reinbroun material has been edited online along with all of the other texts in the Auchinleck Manuscript.<sup>20</sup> The editors, David Burnley and Alison Wiggins, equivocate in a different way. Because, as I described above, the Auchinleck Manuscript gives the final Reinbroun material its own title and clearly presents it as a separate romance, the editors give *Reinbroun* its own title and its own link in the table of contents. However, despite the fact that the Auchinleck Manuscript does not give the stanzaic portion of *Guy of Warwick* a separate title or even a separate item number, these editors also provide two separate titles and two separate links in the table of contents for the couplet and stanzaic portions of the romance. They entitle the first part *Guy of Warwick (couplets)*, and the second part *Guy of Warwick (stanzas)*, and in the notes they treat the latter as an independent text, calling it a “unique copy” (and they do the same for *Reinbroun*). Although the editors seem to take a position by giving the couplet and stanzaic parts of *Guy of Warwick* independent titles and links, they nevertheless continue the line numbers of *Guy of Warwick (stanzas)* from the line numbers of *Guy of Warwick (couplets)*. One of the many great benefits of this online edition is that it usually reflects the texts uniquely as they are presented in this particular manuscript, but here the strangely continuous line numbers provide our only indication, outside of the notes, that the manuscript itself does not identify two different texts of *Guy of Warwick*, as the online table of contents with separate links does.<sup>21</sup> This edition

---

<sup>18</sup> Zupitza 1883, 1887, 1891, p. 310 n. 1 & 2.

<sup>19</sup> See above for a brief description of the manuscript presentation, and see below for a more detailed discussion of the presentation of the Guy and Reinbroun material in the Auchinleck Manuscript.

<sup>20</sup> Burnley and Wiggins 2003, *The Auchinleck Manuscript*.

<sup>21</sup> Note that Zupitza’s earlier strategy was the opposite, in that he did not provide separate titles for the two parts, but he did begin numbering the lines of the stanzaic part anew rather than continuing them from the couplet part, as the online editors do.

provides sufficient explanatory notes, and a student can simply click on a link to view the manuscript page if s/he would like to see how the material is presented there. However, like Zupitza, the online editors engage in creative editorial equivocation that does not give a clear indication on the level of the edited text of whether or not the couplet and stanzaic parts of the Guy material represent one single romance or two, though their method of presentation leans strongly towards suggesting that they represent two different romances.<sup>22</sup>

With this online edition, Wiggins took a small step, with Burnley, towards introducing to the canon of Middle English romance an independently titled work called *Guy of Warwick (stanzas)*, despite the fact that there is no extant manuscript version of such an independent text. More recently, Wiggins published a TEAMS (Consortium for the Teaching of the Middle Ages) edition which puts an end to the editorial equivocation discussed above, but presents a different set of problems. Her most recent edition drops the parenthetical titles and continuous line numbering that she and Burnley use in the online edition and presents to students and scholars for the first time a work she entitles: *Stanzaic Guy of Warwick*.<sup>23</sup> This title reflects a clear attempt to draw a definitive distinction between the couplet and stanzaic portions of the Auchinleck *Guy of Warwick*, as it likens the stanzaic part to other texts in the TEAMS series such as the *Stanzaic Mort Arthur*, a text found in a completely different manuscript from the *Alliterative Morte Arthur*, for instance.

In her introduction, Wiggins assumes an independent Middle English exemplar for the stanzaic portion of the Auchinleck *Guy of Warwick* and asserts that it represents its own unique romance that was composed, circulated, and was originally intended to be read independently. She calls it a “sequel” to the couplet portion of *Guy of Warwick*, and she calls *Reinbroun* “a third installment of the legend.”<sup>24</sup> For Wiggins, *Guy of Warwick*, *Stanzaic Guy of Warwick*, and *Reinbroun* comprise three separately composed and independently circulating romances.

The recent publication of the online editions of the Auchinleck Guy and Reinbroun material and especially of the TEAMS *Stanzaic Guy of Warwick* has a profound impact on what students think of when the romance of *Guy of Warwick* is mentioned. Both editions of the material are much more easily accessed than the nineteenth-century out of print EETS editions by Zupitza; both are available online for free, and the TEAMS edition is available for a nominal fee in paperback. Unlike the exclusively online publication, the TEAMS edition normalizes much of the spelling for students, includes copious explanatory notes, and glosses all Middle English words that may be difficult for a reader unfamiliar with the language. With respect to “readability,” it is an ideal text for undergraduates to use, and it is indeed frequently assigned for reading both by undergraduates and graduate students not specializing in medieval romance.

---

<sup>22</sup> The problematic nature of the disjunction between the online editorial presentation and the manuscript presentation is reflected in the title(s), which is (are) essentially the same for the work(s) (except for the parenthetical asides, which make them different).

<sup>23</sup> Wiggins 2004b.

<sup>24</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 4.

As a result, the youngest generation of scholars is being trained to think predominantly of the material presented in the TEAMS *Stanzaic Guy of Warwick* when they hear “Guy of Warwick,” and the above plot summary is reduced to the following:

Guy of Warwick, famous for his feats of bravery, laments the fact that he has caused much destruction in his life, and that he has done so much for the love of his lover, Felice, but nothing at all for God. Consequently, after marrying Felice, he leaves his pregnant wife and goes on a sort of “crusade for Christ,” fighting Saracens and other wrongdoers in the name of God. After many adventures abroad, Guy returns to England, disguised and unnoticed, retires to a hermitage, and dies a close to saintly death. Felice follows him there and dies shortly after Guy.

When students consult the exclusively online publication, which lists the stanzaic portion as an independent entry in the table of contents, their impressions are confirmed. Both editions give the impression that the couplet section students may also come across is merely another “version,” much like the TEAMS *Stanzaic Mort Arthur* and *Alliterative Morte Arthur* represent independently circulating versions of a similar story, each focusing on different aspects of it. Based on the recent editions, the Reinbroun material is likely not considered at all when students think of the text of *Guy of Warwick*, and the couplet portion may be considered only infrequently.

### **Guy of Warwick, *Unedited***

With respect to the field’s presentation of the romance of *Guy of Warwick* in modern editions, we have progressed from Zupitza’s editions of all three extant complete manuscripts which present texts from multiple manuscripts, but which cause great confusion about the place of the Reinbroun material in the story and about how the stanzaic portion of the Auchinleck text fits into the literary tradition, to the online edition of the Auchinleck material which clarifies the place of the Reinbroun material in that manuscript and takes a noncommittal step toward suggesting that the stanzaic portion of the Auchinleck *Guy of Warwick* should be viewed as a separate text, to the TEAMS edition which makes a firm argument for the independent composition and circulation of the second half of the Auchinleck Guy material, calling it the *Stanzaic Guy of Warwick*. This view is quickly gaining popularity, and because of the accessibility of the TEAMS text, it is coming to be viewed by non-specialists as “the” text of *Guy of Warwick*, one which was far removed from the Anglo-Norman *Gui de Warewic* by the time it reached the Auchinleck Manuscript.

If we look to the manuscript tradition rather than to modern editions, however, we are presented with a very different picture. The romance about Guy of Warwick and his son Reinbroun circulated in England both in Anglo-Norman and in English, and it was likely first composed in Anglo-Norman in the early thirteenth century.<sup>25</sup> We have twelve

---

<sup>25</sup> In his edition, Ewert suggests that the Anglo-Norman poem was composed between 1232 and 1242 (Ewert 1933, p. vii). More recent research by Jeanne Wathelet-Willem, Emma Mason, and Judith Weiss dates the poem to before 1215 and possibly even as early as 1204. (See Wathelet-Willem 1975, pp. 512-514; Mason 1984; and Weiss 2007.) I did not discuss the Anglo-Norman edition in the above section

non-fragmentary texts in Anglo-Norman and English, spanning three hundred years, all with both “halves” of *Guy of Warwick* told together, and all except the Middle English Cambridge, Gonville and Caius College, MS 107/176 and the late (c. 1300) Anglo-Norman London, British Library, MS Royal 8.F.ix including the Reinbroun material.<sup>26</sup> Auchinleck is the only manuscript in Middle English or Anglo-Norman which clearly presents the Reinbroun material as a separate text.<sup>27</sup> Despite the fact that Wiggins’s edition of only the stanzaic portion of the Auchinleck Guy material is causing students and scholars to view this part of the Auchinleck text as an independent romance, there is not a single surviving copy of the hypothetical “pre-existing” stanzaic *Guy of Warwick* or *Reinbroun* that Wiggins claims circulated independently for several decades before the compilation of the Auchinleck texts. As medieval manuscripts go, there are quite a large number of surviving manuscripts of the romance about Guy of Warwick in England, and none of them supports the argument advanced by the separate edition of the *Stanzaic Guy of Warwick*.

The presentation of *Gui de Warewic* in the Anglo-Norman manuscripts is much more straightforward than it is in the Middle English manuscripts, and it will be useful to review the typical Anglo-Norman presentation in order to understand why some of the Middle English manuscripts seem so peculiar. The Anglo-Norman text, *Gui de Warewic*, is extant in seven fragmentary copies and nine more or less complete manuscript copies, all from the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries.<sup>28</sup> Except in London, British Library, MS Royal 8.F.ix, which lacks the final Reinbroun material, all three parts of the Guy and Reinbroun material discussed above always appear together, as a single romance, in the large number of non-fragmentary manuscripts in Anglo-Norman. However, although

---

because the unfortunate lack of engagement with Anglo-Norman texts by many students of English means that Ewert’s Anglo-Norman edition does not actually play a significant role in how English students view the romance.

<sup>26</sup> See below for a list of the Anglo-Norman manuscripts of *Gui de Warewic*.

<sup>27</sup> However, see below for an explanation of the indications that the final Reinbroun material was added on after the composition of the main *Gui* narrative. Nevertheless, there are no indications that the final Reinbroun material ever circulated without the main *Gui* narrative or that it was ever presented as an independent text in any way, outside of the Auchinleck copy.

<sup>28</sup> What follows is a complete list of Anglo-Norman manuscripts and fragments, including their presumed dates. The manuscripts are all briefly described in Ailes 2007. The short fragments include: Cambridge, University Library, MS Additional 2751 (thirteenth or fourteenth century); Nottingham University Library, Oakham Parish Library, MS Bx 1756 S 4 (last third of the thirteenth century); Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Rawlinson D 913 fols 86-89 (thirteenth or fourteenth century); Oxford, Corpus Christi College, MS 491, fol. 8r no. 28 (end of the thirteenth century); York Minster, MS 16.1.7 (thirteenth or fourteenth century); Ripon Cathedral, MS XVII.F.33 (not dated). Two single-text manuscripts include: Wolfenbüttel, Herzog August Bibliothek, Cod. Aug. 87.4 (end of the thirteenth or beginning of the fourteenth century); New Haven, Yale University, Beinecke Library, MS 591 (early fourteenth century). Four copies are extant in compilations which were likely not “planned” compilations: London, College of Arms, MS Arundel 27 (fourteenth century); London, British Library, MS Harley 3775 (early fourteenth century); Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, MS français 1669 (early fourteenth century); London, British Library, MS Royal 8. F.IX (early fourteenth century). The following copies are extant in planned compilations: London, British Library, MS Additional 38662 (second quarter of the thirteenth century); Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, MS 50 (second half of the thirteenth century or fourteenth century); Cologny-Geneva, Bibliotheca Bodmeriana, MS 67 (second half of the thirteenth century); Cologny-Geneva Bib. Bodmeriana MS 168, formerly Phillipps MS 8345 (end of the thirteenth century).

there is no manuscript evidence which should lead us to question that all of the main Gui material was originally composed as a single unit, there is some manuscript evidence to suggest that the final Reinbrun material (though not the Reinbrun material that is interlaced into the main narrative about Gui) may have been added later, potentially by the same author of the main Gui narrative.<sup>29</sup> Certainly, if this is the case, the main Gui narrative must not have circulated for very long before the final Reinbrun material was added, since only one of the nine extant non-fragmentary texts does not include it, and since the earliest extant manuscript, dated not long after the proposed date of composition of *Gui de Warewic*, does include it.<sup>30</sup> A majority of the Anglo-Norman manuscripts present some sort of visual separation between the main narrative about Gui and the final adventures of Reinbrun, whether it be just a short space of two lines, a uniquely large initial beginning the Reinbrun section, or a space of up to ten lines.<sup>31</sup> With respect to the content, however, there is no tidy separation between Guy's story and Reinbrun's, as in most cases the "separated" Reinbrun section still includes material that belongs with Guy's story, for instance a description of how Guy's body was honored. Although it is entirely possible for the main Gui narrative to stand alone, there is no indication that the final Reinbrun material was ever meant to circulate without the Gui material, since the epilogue to the final section of Reinbrun material concludes with a summary of Gui's life: "De Guiun nus aprent l'escrit, / Ço fu la sume de sa valur, / Qui tut guerpi pur sun criatur."<sup>32</sup> This epilogue would make no sense as a conclusion to the Reinbrun material alone, as Gui is already dead by this point and does not play a part in the final narrative about Reinbrun at all.<sup>33</sup> However, the *mise-en-page* in many Anglo-Norman manuscripts does give a sense of closure with the deaths of Guy and Felice, and the final Reinbrun material may have been viewed (and perhaps even composed) as a continuation of the main narrative, a set of episodes that was somewhat separate from the main Guy material, but not so separate as to be considered an independent text.

---

<sup>29</sup> Judith Weiss suggests: "One can envisage the poet being persuaded, soon after the success of Gui's story, to write a sequel around Reinbrun" (2008, p. 20). This is possible, but on the other hand, there is no trace of a proper conclusion to the part of the story involving Gui, and because the precise textual moment where the beginning of the final Reinbrun material is signaled by a large initial or a line space or two actually differs in several of the Anglo-Norman manuscripts, it does not seem likely.

<sup>30</sup> The romance is thought have been composed in the early thirteenth century, and the final Reinbrun material must have been in circulation with it from at least the second quarter of the thirteenth century, since the earliest extant manuscript, London, British Library, MS Additional 38662, is dated to somewhere between 1225 and 1250, and it does include the final Reinbrun material. On the other hand, the one manuscript that does not include this material, London, British Library, Royal MS 8.F.ix, is a late manuscript, dated to c. 1300. Because of the late date of this manuscript, one cannot rule out influence from the Middle English translation in the decision to leave out the final Reinbrun material.

<sup>31</sup> See Weiss 2008, pp. 19-20 for a more complete description of each instance.

<sup>32</sup> *Gui*, ll. 12920-22. Gui's life is summarized in this way in the epilogue to the Reinbrun material in every extant manuscript that includes this material that I have been able to examine. Manuscripts I have seen include London, British Library, Royal MS 8.F.ix; London, British Library, Additional MS 38662; London, British Library, Harley MS 3775 [frag]; London, College of Arms, Arundel MS 27; and Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, MS français 1669.

<sup>33</sup> On the contrary, for example, the Cambridge University Library, MS Ff.2.38 *Guy of Warwick*, which does seem to isolate the Reinbrun material (see above discussion), does not mention Guy in the epilogue at all.

The Middle English *Guy of Warwick* is extant in three manuscripts and two sets of fragments, all dated to the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries (with Cambridge University Library, MS Ff.2.38 possibly as late as the early sixteenth century).<sup>34</sup> The structure of *Guy of Warwick* in each of these manuscripts is of significant interest, each showing peculiarities with respect to the manuscript presentation.<sup>35</sup> Although the focus of this chapter is on the Guy and Reinbroun material in the Auchinleck Manuscript, the structure of the Middle English material in much later manuscripts has influenced the way scholars have read and edited the Auchinleck material, so a brief review of the material as it is presented in them is necessary.

The latest manuscript containing a complete version of the Middle English *Guy of Warwick*, Cambridge University Library, MS Ff.2.38, is dated to the late fifteenth or early sixteenth century and is a large miscellany, including religious and didactic lyrics, prose saints' lives, and nine Middle English romances, more or less grouped together in that order. It is a paper manuscript written by a single scribe in double columns with red initials throughout. It may have been produced in the North Midlands. Wiggins observes an increased interest in chivalric ideals as well as an increased association with Warwick in the copy of *Guy of Warwick* preserved in this manuscript.<sup>36</sup>

The structure of the text in the Cambridge University Library manuscript is presented in a way that is similar to the presentation in many Anglo-Norman manuscripts. However, the separation is tidier with respect to plot, in that Guy's story, including the material about his burial, completely ends before the separation. It is also tidier with respect to the *mise-en-page*, in that this manuscript leaves a full column blank between Guy's death and the continuation of the Reinbroun material, presenting the continuation in such a way that the final Reinbroun material looks like a new text. The main narrative about Guy ends on f. 231<sup>ra</sup>, and f. 231<sup>rb</sup> is left blank. The final Reinbroun material begins on f. 231<sup>va</sup> with a large initial and slightly larger script, which is consistent with the way this manuscript presents new texts. However, with respect to the content of the text, there is no real indication that it should be viewed as an independent romance. It begins:

Lystenyth now, y schalle yow telle,  
As y fynde in parchement spelle,  
Of syr Harrowde, þe gode baron,  
That lyeth in Awfryke in prison.  
Porely he ys besemydde,  
That lyfe hym vnnepeys beleuedde;  
For lytull he etyth and lasse drynketh:

---

<sup>34</sup> The manuscripts and fragments, including how some are dated, are briefly described in Wiggins 2007. The two sets of fragments include: Aberystwyth, National Library of Wales MS 572, London, British Library, Additional MS 14408 (NLW/BL), early 14th c., and London, British Library, Sloane MS 1044 (Sloane), 14th c. There is one single-text manuscript: Cambridge, Gonville and Caius College, MS 107/176 (Caius), second half of the 15th c. Two texts survive in collections: the Auchinleck Manuscript, 1330-1340, and Cambridge University Library, MS Ff.2.38 (olim More MS 690). (CUL), late 15th or early 16th century.

<sup>35</sup> For brief descriptions of each, see Wiggins 2007 and Guddat-Figge 1976, from which the basic descriptions, though not the comparisons and conclusions below, are taken.

<sup>36</sup> Wiggins 2007, pp. 70-72.

There ys none, þat hym forthynketh;  
And bemoonyth sore hys lordys sone,  
For whome he ys there in prysone.<sup>37</sup>

There is no general overview of the tale to come, no descriptive introduction to the protagonist, and no invocation of God, all of which are normally characteristic of Middle English romance prologues.<sup>38</sup> It reads just as any other beginning of a new “episode” in a romance with interlace structure. In fact, the Anglo-Norman texts, which certainly present the material as another episode interlaced within the romance of *Gui de Warewic*, read much the same:

Or dirra de Healt, le bon barun,  
Ki en Afrike gist en prison;  
Poi I beit, meins i mangue,  
A peine est sa vie sustenue.  
Ore plaint le fiz sun seignur,  
Pur qui il suffre duel e tristur.<sup>39</sup>

The only real addition to this material in Cambridge University Library, MS Ff.2.38 is a reference to the parchment in which the writer found the text,<sup>40</sup> which seems to be there just for the rhyme, is consistent with typical scribal interjections in Middle English romance, and does not constitute a proper prologue to a new romance. Additionally, these first few lines make reference to the Reinbroun material that is presented in the midst of the larger narrative about Guy by alluding to (but not explaining) the fact that Haraud is in prison because he was searching for Reinbroun, who was previously kidnapped. Without knowledge of the Reinbroun material involving the kidnapping, presented previously in the Cambridge University Library *Guy*, lines 8397-744 (which suggest that Haraud is in prison because of his lord’s son for whom he sorrows) are rather confusing. Although the *mise-en-page* gives the suggestion that the final Reinbroun material represents a separate romance, the content makes it improbable that it was intended to be read that way or that it circulated independently in this form.

Like many Anglo-Norman manuscripts which separate the final Reinbroun material from the main Gui narrative with some sort of visual marker, the presentation in Cambridge University Library, MS Ff.2.38 seems to treat this material as a continuation of the main Guy narrative, but not as a romance that should be read independently. Although the final Reinbroun material never appears without the rest of the Guy narrative in any manuscript in Anglo-Norman or Middle English, it does appear that there was occasionally, with respect to the *mise-en-page* only, a sense of closure with the deaths of

---

<sup>37</sup> CUL *Guy*, ll. 10787-96.

<sup>38</sup> Although some medieval heroes, like Arthur, Roland, or Guy were well-known enough that tales about them might begin without a significant introduction to the protagonist, there is no indication that “Harrowde” is so well-known a figure that he needs no introduction, and the beginning of this part of the story also lacks other traditional introductory elements.

<sup>39</sup> *Gui*, ll. 11657-62.

<sup>40</sup> CUL *Guy*, l. 10788.

Guy and Felice, and that the final Reinbroun material may have been viewed as a continuation of the main narrative.

Gonville and Caius College, MS 107/176 is thought to have been produced in London in the 1470's and is a single-text manuscript. It is written in a single column, and there are blue initials with red filigree lacework throughout. The opening page has a large, eight-line gold initial. The manuscript contains 136 paginated folios. Two writers produced the text. Writer 2 began the text, writing the first eight lines. Writer 1 continued on line nine and finished the first page and all of the second page, and Writer 2 began again on the third page and copied all the way through page 149. Writer 1 then finished the text, picking up on page 150 and continuing through page 271. Wiggins discusses apparent cuts and adaptations in this text which seem to update the story, make it more courtly and fashionable, and remove violence and morally problematic episodes.<sup>41</sup>

The text of *Guy of Warwick* in the Caius manuscript ends with the death of Guy and the description of honoring his body and does not present the final Reinbroun adventures at all. However, like every extant text in Anglo-Norman and English (apart from Auchinleck) it does present the story of Reinbroun's kidnapping in interlace structure within the main Guy narrative, and the relatively unique decision to leave out the final Reinbroun material leaves this part of the story incomplete.

One of the earliest extant Middle English translations of the Anglo-Norman *Gui de Warewic* is preserved in the early fourteenth-century Auchinleck Manuscript. Auchinleck, a large book which contains a variety of secular and religious texts, including saints' lives, romances, historical texts, and others, is most notable for its extensive collection of Middle English romances, many of which represent the earliest or sole surviving copies, and many of which either are or claim to be translated from Anglo-Norman or Continental French sources. It is a large, folio-sized volume mainly written in two columns with the first letter of every line pricked out in red and isolated with a ruled column.

Timothy Shonk's study of the manuscript, from which the summary in this paragraph is taken, provides us with excellent codicological information about the make-up of the book.<sup>42</sup> Shonk reports the traditional account that six writers were involved in producing this manuscript, but others count only five hands, claiming that the hand of Writer 6 is actually not different from the hand ascribed to Writer 1.<sup>43</sup> Writer 1 is seen as the organizer of the manuscript and wrote roughly seventy percent of it. Texts he wrote appear in five different places throughout the manuscript, and he is also responsible for

---

<sup>41</sup> Wiggins 2007, pp. 72-80. Wiggins further suggests: "The linguistic and codicological data indicate that the Caius text was copied from two different exemplars. . . . The presence of comparable revisions at both ends of the narrative, relating to both exemplars, therefore increases the likelihood that the revisions may have occurred at the Caius stage of production" (Wiggins 2007, p. 75, n. 42). Although Wiggins does not discuss the implications of her observation, it is clear that, if what she asserts is true, we have in the Gonville and Caius College, MS 107/176 copy of *Guy of Warwick* an example of "scribes" working together in the creation, not just the copying, of this text. They used multiple exemplars and had a joint creative vision for revising the text.

<sup>42</sup> Shonk 1985.

<sup>43</sup> See Hanna 2000, p. 92 and most recently Wiggins 2004a, who argues that Scribe 1 and Scribe 6 were indeed two different scribes.

the catchwords, the medieval titles that appear in red above each text,<sup>44</sup> and the roman numeration of the texts at the center of the upper margin of every recto. The work of Writer 2 appears in three different places, and the work of all of the remaining writers appears in only one place in the manuscript (even when writing more than one item). No text in the manuscript was written by more than a single writer, but some gatherings are shared by more than one writer. The layout of the manuscript was clearly a planned design, as the ruling of each page is roughly uniform, and each of the writers left marks to indicate where paraps should be added later and also had to leave enough space for the capitals to be added.

The Auchinleck Manuscript presents the Middle English translation of the Anglo-Norman *Gui de Warewic* in a way that is unique among all extant copies in Anglo-Norman or Middle English. Yet, it has had the most influence on scholars' arguments about the textual history of this story and has therefore greatly influenced what we think of when we consider "the text" of *Guy of Warwick*.

The Auchinleck translation is definitely divided into two separate romances, and some scholars treat the parts as three separate texts.<sup>45</sup> Writer 1 wrote the material that includes all of Guy's adventures, from the beginning until his death. One full folio is missing from the beginning of this material, so we do not know the medieval title given to it. After the deaths of Guy and Felice, the word "Explicit" is written on folio 167<sup>rb</sup>, and to the right of the word "Explicit," Writer 1 has written in red the title "Reinbrun Gij sone of Warwicke;" below that is a miniature depicting Reinbroun about to cut off the head of another knight, and below that, a different writer, Writer 5, begins writing the story of Reinbroun, Guy's son. Writer 1 also gives this second text its own item number in the manuscript, number 29, following number 28, the single item number assigned to both the couplet and the stanzaic parts of the translation involving Guy's adventures.

The Auchinleck *Reinbrun Gij sone of Warwicke* (hereafter *Reinbroun*) is the only extant copy of this material clearly presented as an independent romance, and although the last part of the Anglo-Norman *Gui de Warewic* is entirely devoted to Reinbroun's adventures, the Auchinleck *Reinbroun* is not merely a presentation of the final Reinbroun material from *Gui de Warewic* on its own. Much of the Reinbroun material that is presented in this independent romance appears in interlace structure throughout the main narrative about Guy, in every other extant manuscript in Anglo-Norman and Middle English, including in Gonville and Caius College, MS 107/176 and London, British Library MS Royal 8.F.ix, which both omit the final Reinbroun section but leave other material concerning Reinbroun intact in interlace structure within the narrative about Guy. In the Auchinleck Manuscript, the Reinbroun material that appears in interlace structure in every other extant manuscript is "unlaced" from the main Guy narrative and "relaced" into a unique romance that this manuscript entitles *Reinbrun Gij sone of Warwicke*.

One further unique aspect of the translation of *Gui de Warewic* presented in the Auchinleck Manuscript, which I described briefly in the introduction to this chapter, is

---

<sup>44</sup> Shonk notes that "the titles *Pater Noster* definitely and *Sinnes* probably are in the hand of Scribe III," and he also notes that the title "Liber Regum Anglie," the only one written at the end of a poem, may be in the hand of a rubricator. However, he ascribes the remaining titles to Scribe 1. See Shonk 1985, pp. 85-87.

<sup>45</sup> See for example Mehl 1969, p. 222, Pearsall 1977, p. ix, and Wiggins 2004b.

the odd change in verse form in the midst of the main narrative about Guy, and the appearance of what looks like an introductory prologue at the point at which this happens. Apart from Auchinleck, all extant Middle English and Anglo-Norman copies of this material are written in rhyming couplets. In Auchinleck, the first part of the main narrative about Guy, up to Guy's marriage to Felice, is told in rhyming couplets.<sup>46</sup> However, the text switches to twelve-line tail-rhyme stanzas at line 6924, and the rest of the Guy narrative, as well as the following romance of *Reinbroun*, is told in this verse form. This is actually one of several places in the Auchinleck Manuscript where the verse form changes part way through the work.<sup>47</sup> What is unique even in the context of the Auchinleck Manuscript is the fact that at the point at which the text changes the verse form, there appears to be a prologue in the midst of the romance. Although palaeographers agree that the hand did not change at this point, the section that begins the new verse form and prologue is presented in what appears at first glance to be a different hand.<sup>48</sup>

The couplet part of the text ends right after Guy has killed a dragon that was terrorizing King Athelstan's people and animals. After Guy brings the dragon's head to the king, "At Warwik þai henge þe heued anon, / Mani man wondred þerapon."<sup>49</sup> The Anglo-Norman text states similarly: "A Everwic unt le chef pendu, / A grant merveille l'unt tenu."<sup>50</sup> The Anglo-Norman text continues the story with a description of Guy's departure to Wallingford:

Gui al rei ad conge pris,  
Alé s'en est en sun pais;  
A Walingford s'en est alé,  
Ses homes de l'honor i ad trove,  
Qui pur lui grant joie firent,  
Maint jur de lui novele n'oient,  
Car sun pere mort esteit,  
Altre heir de li dunc n'aveit.<sup>51</sup>

The Auchinleck Guy material does present these lines in the stanzaic part of the text:

He & Herhaud for soþe to say  
To Wallingforþ toke þe way  
þat was his faders toun.

<sup>46</sup> This part represents lines 1-6923 of the online text. The couplet part corresponds to folios 108<sup>ra</sup> to 146<sup>vb</sup> of the manuscript.

<sup>47</sup> *Beves* switches from tail-rhyme stanzas to couplets at line 475, and *Richard* makes the same change after the prologue, at line 25. *Roland and Vernagu* changes from normal to short tail-rhyme stanzas at line 424. These changes all remain a mystery among scholars, and more work needs to be done on this phenomenon. See chapter five for further discussion of the verse form in *Beves*. All of the line numbers above are taken from Burnley and Wiggins's online edition of Auchinleck texts, 2003.

<sup>48</sup> See Cunningham and Mordkoff 1982, p. 291 and Pearsall 1977, p. ix.

<sup>49</sup> Auchinleck *Guy* I, ll. 6921-22.

<sup>50</sup> *Gui*, ll. 7407-08.

<sup>51</sup> *Gui*, ll. 7409-16.

þan was his fader soþe to say  
Ded & birid in þe clay;  
His air was sir Gioun.<sup>52</sup>

However, these lines are preceded in the stanzaic Auchinleck Guy material by two unique stanzas which seem to represent a prologue to an entirely new story:

God graunt hem heuen-blis to mede  
þat herken to mi romaunce rede  
Al of a gentil kni3t;  
þe best bodi he was at nede  
þat euer mi3t bistriden stede  
& freest founde in fi3t.  
þe word of him ful wide it ran  
Ouer al þis warld þe priis he wan,  
As man most of mi3t.  
Balder bern was non in bi,  
His name was hoten sir Gij  
Of Warwike wise & wi3t.  
Wi3t he was for soþe to say  
& holden for priis in eueri play  
As kni3t of gret bounde.  
Out of þis lond he went his way  
þurth mani diuers cuntray  
þat was bi3ond þe see.  
Seþþen he com into Ingland  
& Apelston þe king he fond  
þat was boþe hende & fre.  
For his loue ich vnderstond  
He slou3 a dragoun in Norþhumberlond  
Ful fer in þe norþ cuntre.<sup>53</sup>

---

<sup>52</sup> Auchinleck *Guy* II, ll. 6948-53.

<sup>53</sup> Auchinleck *Guy* II, ll. 6924-48. No other extant manuscript version of the tale, in Anglo-Norman or in Middle English, includes this prologue. The text in Gonville and Caius College, MS 107/176 reads much like the Anglo-Norman text quoted above:

At Warrewik he henge that hede anone:  
Many wondred theron anone full sone.  
Guy of the king his leeuē nome,  
In-to his contree to wende home.  
To Walingford he is come,  
His free men there he fonde some,  
That of him were blithe alle  
That of him they herde so telle.

(Caius *Guy*, ll. 7305-12)

The text in Cambridge University Library, MS Ff.2.38, though changing Warwick to York, presents a similar text as well:

At 3orke the hed was hangyd þan:

Nevertheless, despite the change in verse form and the inclusion of what clearly seems like a prologue to a new tale, no codicological evidence indicates that the stanzaic part of the romance should be viewed as a new text. As noted above, new texts in the Auchinleck Manuscript are indicated by titles written in red by Writer 1 (regardless of which writer actually wrote the text), and many new texts are preceded by miniatures depicting significant scenes from the text which follows. Neither a title nor a miniature nor even a line space appears above this prologue. Furthermore, Writer 1 assigned a roman numeral to each individual text in the manuscript, and that numeral is typically written at the top of each recto. The stanzaic Guy material shares the same roman numeral as the couplet Guy material (xxviii), and the following romance of *Reinbroun* is given the next sequential number (xxix). The one peculiarity with respect to the *mise-en-page* is that the script for the stanzaic portion of the romance appears to be significantly larger than that of the first portion; yet, it is generally agreed upon that Writer 1 wrote both parts.<sup>54</sup> Clearly, despite the oddities, Writer 1 did not view the stanzaic portion as an independent work, and because he is recognized as both the meticulous “editor” and “organizer” of the volume, and the writer of both parts of the Guy material, the likelihood is that this is a deliberate presentation.<sup>55</sup>

### ***The Structure of the Auchinleck Guy and Reinbroun, and the Debate about the London Bookshop***

According to the manuscript evidence presented above, it is clear that, to a medieval audience, the story of “Guy of Warwick” called to mind the complete set of material beginning with Guy’s love for Felice and subsequent adventures, followed by their marriage and his second set of “crusading” adventures, his retirement and death, and finally the adventures of his son, Reinbroun. The most recent modern editions tell a different story, mostly influenced by the unique presentation of the material in the Auchinleck Manuscript (which itself does tell the entire story, unlike the most recent edition, although the manuscript divides it into two separate texts).

The tendency in the most recent scholarship on *Guy of Warwick* is to deny the uniqueness of the presentation of the Guy and Reinbroun material in the Auchinleck Manuscript and propose a whole history of circulation in the form of three separate

---

Theron lokyd many a man.  
 He toke leue at þe kynge thare  
 And to Walyngforde dud he fare.  
 The kynge was then full blithe  
 And thankyd god fele sythe.  
 Longe was paste, wythowte lesynge,  
 Or he of hym harde more tythyng.  
 Hys fadur was dedde longe gone:  
 Odur heyre, bote he, was ther none.

(CUL *Guy*, ll. 6965-74)

<sup>54</sup> See Cunningham and Mordkoff 1982, p. 291 and Pearsall 1977, p. ix.

<sup>55</sup> See Shonk 1985 for further explanation of the codicological evidence which suggests the extensive role Writer 1 played in the organization of this manuscript.

romances prior to the appearance of this form in the Auchinleck Manuscript.<sup>56</sup> However, Auchinleck alone, among twelve extant manuscripts, changes verse form part way through the Guy material; Auchinleck alone, among twelve extant manuscripts, clearly presents *Reinbroun* as an independent romance, and Auchinleck alone, among twelve extant manuscripts, “unlaces” material from the interlace structure of the main Guy narrative in order to create the independent romance it calls “Reinbrun Gij sone of Warwicke.”

It is the peculiar structure of the Auchinleck Guy and Reinbroun material that has inspired a majority of the scholarship on this text and its history (even if in the end scholars have argued that the structure is not so peculiar). And it is the anomalous structure of this material that has also given rise to a whole body of scholarship on the production of the Auchinleck Manuscript in particular and on fourteenth-century English bookmaking in general. The issue of the textual history of *Guy of Warwick* is therefore inextricably linked with the issue of the making of the Auchinleck Manuscript, and in turn, the conclusions we make about these two issues affect our understanding of the status of Anglo-Norman *vis-à-vis* the Middle English text, its writers, and its readers.

In her seminal article, “The Auchinleck Manuscript and a Possible London Bookshop of 1330-1340,” Laura Hibbard Loomis proposed the theory of a secular bookshop modeled on a monastic scriptorium, in which scribes were not only copying but also composing and translating materials, working collaboratively on a unified project and “manufacturing popular romance for sale.”<sup>57</sup> Her theory is traditionally called “the bookshop theory,” and the presentation of the Guy and Reinbroun material in the Auchinleck Manuscript is central to her argument. Although Loomis believes that linguistic evidence points to different translators for the various parts of the Auchinleck Guy and Reinbroun material, she nevertheless believes that the translations were done under the supervision of an editor and were created specifically for the Auchinleck Manuscript. Loomis sees a clear interconnection among the three parts of the Guy and Reinbroun material. In addition to the “unlacing” of some Reinbroun material from the main Guy narrative and the “relacing” of that material in the separate romance, *Reinbroun*, discussed above,<sup>58</sup> Loomis points out the “exact dovetailing” between the couplet and stanzaic portions of the Guy narrative:

The author of these two stanzas [the two “prologue-like” stanzas which begin the stanzaic Guy material] obviously knew the antecedent text and fashioned his own lines to serve as an introduction to his own apparently new romance, since it was in an entirely different verse form. But in reality he continued the story from the precise point at which the couplet version stopped. Whatever the reason for the break or change, there can be no question but that he fitted his stanzas to the

---

<sup>56</sup> See especially Wiggins 2004b, Wiggins 2005, and Purdie 2008. Note that I contend that the manuscript divides the *Guy of Warwick* into two separate romances (what I have been calling the “Guy material” and the “Reinbroun material”), not three.

<sup>57</sup> Loomis 1942, p. 626.

<sup>58</sup> “Unlacing” and “relacing” are my terms, not Loomis’s.

preceding Auchinleck text. Chance could not possibly account for such exact dove-tailing.<sup>59</sup>

Furthermore, Loomis shows very clearly that the prologue to *Reinbroun* is verbally indebted to the stanzaic Auchinleck Guy material and that no other Middle English copy of this material contains corresponding lines.<sup>60</sup> Finally, Loomis concludes that another Auchinleck text, *Amis and Amiloun* (also the earliest extant copy in Middle English), clearly borrows lines from the Middle English stanzaic Guy material in the same manuscript. These lines in the Guy material are rather faithful to the Anglo-Norman they are translating, whereas they do not exist in the Anglo-Norman *Amys e Amillyoun*, and they do appear in all extant Middle English copies of *Amis and Amiloun*; however, no later copy of the Middle English *Amis and Amiloun* is consistently so close to the stanzaic Guy material in the Auchinleck.<sup>61</sup> Because of the significant amount of scholarly attention her theory has received, and because of the fact that it has been summarily dismissed in most recent scholarship (frequently without serious scrutiny and consideration of the facts Loomis presents), I will return to her theory in greater detail later.

Subsequent scholars have significantly revised or attempted to completely debunk Loomis's theory about the London "bookshop." Derek Pearsall, for instance, suggests in his introduction to the Auchinleck facsimile that a bookshop existed but that the works were not designed for inclusion in a single book. He argues: "the bookshop produced a series of booklets or fascicles, consisting of groups of gatherings with some integrity of contents . . . which were then bound up to the taste of a particular customer."<sup>62</sup> Nevertheless, Pearsall does subscribe to the notion that some collaboration must have existed among the translators of these texts, at an earlier stage of production. While Loomis first argued for a unified project based mainly on linguistic echoes among the texts in the manuscript, Timothy Shonk proves through a thorough codicological study that the manuscript indeed represents a unified project.<sup>63</sup> Combined, Loomis's textual evidence and Shonk's codicological evidence leave little doubt that the texts were at least copied, if not composed, specifically for the Auchinleck Manuscript.

However, on the matter of composition, Shonk argues that, because what we know of the history of book trading does not point to such elaborate workshops with translators, versifiers, and scribes working together, the texts were merely copied (not composed) for the purpose of the Auchinleck Manuscript. Circularly, however, what we know of the history of book trading in fourteenth-century England is based extensively on Auchinleck and how we read its evidence. Shonk views Writer 1 as the major organizer. He proposes the theory that a bourgeois client requested a book from Writer 1 with certain works in it, and Writer 1 controlled the effort but farmed copying of existing exemplars out to others in order to expedite the process, and he provided them with

---

<sup>59</sup> Loomis 1942, p. 609.

<sup>60</sup> Ibid., p. 611.

<sup>61</sup> Ibid., pp. 616-621.

<sup>62</sup> Pearsall 1977, p. ix.

<sup>63</sup> See Shonk 1985. Note that Loomis's original suspicion that a main editor played a role in the compilation of this manuscript is confirmed by Shonk's codicological evidence, though he does not subscribe to her bookshop theory.

elaborate “instructions concerning the format of the folios and plans for the illustrations.”<sup>64</sup> His argument for a unified project and for the idea that Writer 1 was generally the main organizer of the book is based on strong codicological evidence. But his theory about a bourgeois client’s request for certain works, and Writer 1’s role as a scrivener with *existing exemplars* on his shelf that he distributed to other scribes working independently with his instructions, remains just a hypothesis.<sup>65</sup> The hypothesis is a well-respected one and is certainly possible, and indeed other experts such as Ralph Hanna believe in its probability.<sup>66</sup> However, Shonk and others who believe in his theory ignore (rather than addressing and explaining) the textual evidence discussed by Loomis which suggests, whether or not one subscribes to her production theory in its entirety, that the composition, not just the copying, of these texts involved some collaboration. From where did Writer 1’s set of existing exemplars that Shonk hypothesizes come, why is there no evidence for prior circulation in English of the major texts that would have been sitting on his shelf waiting to be ordered, and how did there come to be so many connections among the texts? Although Loomis fails to consider important codicological evidence in her study, later theories based on codicological evidence (such as Shonk’s) or linguistic evidence (such as Wiggins’s, discussed below) do not consider the textual evidence uncovered by Loomis, and therefore still leave important questions unanswered and unexplained.

In fact, while he certainly believes in the probability of his theory, Shonk himself discusses his hypothesis in the language of possibility (“probably,” “could have been,” “perhaps”). Nevertheless, Alison Wiggins, who is quickly being viewed as one of the leading scholars on the Auchinleck Manuscript in general and on *Guy of Warwick* in particular, has cited Shonk’s hypothesis as “proof” that Loomis’s theory is untenable and that the entire Auchinleck Manuscript was created from “pre-existing texts,” which has led to her most recent statement: “We are now in a post-bookshop era.”<sup>67</sup> In her edition of the stanzaic part of the Auchinleck *Guy of Warwick* as a stand-alone text, which she entitles the *Stanzaic Guy of Warwick*, she extends Shonk’s theory to claim that it also provides proof of the independent production and circulation of the stanzaic *Guy of Warwick* prior to its inclusion in the Auchinleck Manuscript: “[Shonk’s work] shows that, although linked to these other romances [i.e., *Guy of Warwick (couplets)* and *Reinbroun*] in this manuscript, it was originally composed and intended to be read as an independent romance.”<sup>68</sup> However, while his codicological study is thorough and extensive and does show Writer 1’s role in controlling the production of the manuscript, it does not disprove

---

<sup>64</sup> Ibid., p. 91.

<sup>65</sup> Interestingly, Shonk uses the later examples of John Shirley and William Caxton as models for his conception of Writer 1 as a scrivener involved in the “publishing” business. Both Shirley and Caxton were known also to produce their own translations, a fact which Shonk mentions; however, Shonk nevertheless emphasizes a theory that envisions Writer 1 copying or distributing of preexisting exemplars and does not subscribe to the theory that he was, like Shirley and Caxton, a translator as well.

<sup>66</sup> See for example Hanna 2000, though Hanna does not necessarily subscribe to the hypothesis that the exemplars were all readily available on Writer 1’s shelf.

<sup>67</sup> The statement about the “post-bookshop era” is published in Wiggins 2005, p. 62. Wiggins cites Shonk’s hypothesis as proof that the Auchinleck was compiled using pre-existing texts in Wiggins 2004b, p. 4 and Wiggins 2005, p. 62.

<sup>68</sup> Wiggins 2004b., p. 4, emphasis mine.

Loomis's notion that the texts represent potentially collaborative innovation in translation, nor does it provide any proof of the prior circulation of any Auchinleck texts before their inclusion in this manuscript. Most importantly, Shonk himself does not claim that his research has proven these things.

Wiggins's definitive statements on the subject of the prior circulation of the Auchinleck *Guy* material (which, if true would go a long way towards debunking Loomis's bookshop theory), in turn, have been cited as the authoritative word on the subject.<sup>69</sup> However, her assertion that the independent composition and circulation of the stanzaic portion of the Auchinleck *Guy of Warwick* has already been proven is partially based on a confusing trail of scholarship that needs elucidating. In addition to Shonk's work, discussed above, Wiggins cites Maldwyn Mills:

It is important not to lose sight of the fact that the stanzaic *Guy* was composed independently and was likely to have circulated and been read on its own elsewhere, that is, without the couplet *Guy* or *Reinbroun*. Study of the language confirms the autonomy of the stanzaic *Guy*: Maldwyn Mills has pointed out that it derives from a version of *Gui de Warewic* different from that of the couplet *Guy* (and that they could not, therefore, have been translated under the same circumstances).<sup>70</sup>

However, what Mills writes about the stanzaic portion of the Auchinleck *Guy of Warwick* in the study cited by Wiggins is the following: "What is not in doubt, however, is that this new tail-rhyme version went back to a French source that was more akin to **E** [London, British Library, Additional MS 38662] or **C** [Cambridge, Corpus Christi College MS 50] than to **G** [Wolfenbüttel Herzog August Bibliothek MS Aug. 87.4]."<sup>71</sup> Earlier in the same article, Mills writes of the early couplet versions of *Guy of Warwick*:

. . . the earlier M.E. couplet versions are more often . . . related to this second redaction [Cambridge, Corpus Christi College MS 50 / Wolfenbüttel Herzog August Bibliothek MS Aug. 87.4] than to the first [London, British Library, Additional MS 38662], but their detailed affiliation is often complicated by eclectic tendencies of their translators. The text of **F** [fragments preserved in Aberystwyth, National Library of Wales MS 572 and London, British Library Additional MS 14408]

---

<sup>69</sup> See for example Purdie 2008, p. 107, who states that Wiggins has adequately explained the relationship between the three parts of the *Guy* and *Reinbroun* material in the Auchinleck Manuscript. Interestingly, Purdie does not agree with Wiggins's assessments regarding the dialect differences between the three parts of the Auchinleck *Guy* and *Reinbroun* material, which Wiggins presents as the most compelling evidence for her argument. Because she accepts Wiggins's conclusions, Purdie does not reconsider the points Loomis makes about the *Guy* and *Reinbroun* material, but she does thoroughly explore Loomis's points about the relationship between the Auchinleck *Guy* material and the Auchinleck *Amis and Amiloun*. See more on this below.

<sup>70</sup> Wiggins 2004b, p. 5.

<sup>71</sup> Mills 1991, p. 215. I have provided full manuscript shelfmarks in this quotation, where Mills provided only the sigla. See below for an explanation of the misunderstandings surrounding the Anglo-Norman redactions of *Gui de Warewic*.

becomes much more obviously dependent upon the second French redaction [the Cambridge and Wolfenbüttel manuscripts] in its later parts than in the earlier ones, while those of A [Auchinleck Manuscript] and C [Cambridge, Gonville and Caius College, MS 107/176], although close to this redaction [the Cambridge and Wolfenbüttel manuscripts] for much of their length, draw upon a text of the first version [London, British Library, Additional MS 38662] for quite substantial passages.<sup>72</sup>

---

<sup>72</sup> Ibid., pp. 210-211. I have clarified Mills's references above with full shelfmarks or abbreviated manuscript indications in brackets. There is some confusion surrounding the redactions of the Anglo-Norman *Gui de Warewic*. According to the article cited here, Mills understands there to be two versions of the Anglo-Norman *Gui de Warewic*. He writes that the editor of the Anglo-Norman text, Alfred Ewert, "noted that the first of these was best represented by the text contained in the Edwardes MS (British Library MS Additional 38662 (E)), while the second appears in its most respectable form in Cambridge Corpus Christi College MS 50 (C), and its most extreme and reworked form in Wolfenbüttel Herzog August Bibliothek MS Aug. 87.4 (G)" (1991, p. 210). Mills considers Additional 38662 an example of the first "version" and groups the Cambridge and Wolfenbüttel manuscripts together as representative of the second "version." However, this is not an accurate representation of Ewert's classifications (though Ewert's own discussion of the various versions is indeed confusing). Ewert states that there are two redactions, but that the Cambridge, Corpus Christi College MS 50 actually belongs with London, British Library Additional MS 38662, both representing the first of these redactions, while the Wolfenbüttel manuscript represents the second. Ewert writes: "Les manuscrits EFHMC [London, British Library, Additional MS 38662; Cheltenham, Phillipps MS 8345; London, British Library, Harley MS 3775; Marske Hall, Yorkshire, Library of Mr. d'Arcy Hutton; Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, MS 50] donnent la **première rédaction** du poème telle qu'elle se lit dans la présente édition. G [Wolfenbüttel, Herzog August Bibliothek MS Aug. 87.4] donne une **version** complètement **remaniée** et en grande partie refondue. AP [London, College of Arms, Arundel MS 27; Paris, Bibliothèque nationale, MS fr. 1669] s'accordent nettement avec EFHMC [London, British Library, Additional MS 38662; Cheltenham, Phillipps MS 8345; London, British Library, Harley MS 3775; Marske Hall, Yorkshire, Library of Mr. d'Arcy Hutton; Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, MS 50] jusqu'au vers 4807, mais à partir de ce vers ils donnent la même version que G [Wolfenbüttel, Herzog August Bibliothek MS Aug. 87.4]. R [London, British Library, Royal MS 8 F ix] présente un texte très corrompu qui suit en general la première rédaction, mais s'en écarte souvent pour donner la même leçon que G [Wolfenbüttel, Herzog August Bibliothek MS Aug. 87.4]" (1932, p. xv, emphasis mine; I have also provided the full shelfmarks in brackets). Here, Ewert clearly places Corpus Christi College 50 together with Additional 38662, calling both of them representative of the "première rédaction," and setting apart as a second version Wolfenbüttel, Herzog August Bibliothek MS Aug. 87.4 (and any that seem to have anything in common with it). The confusion lies partially in the fact that, although Ewert classifies Corpus Christi College 50 with Additional 38662 as a "première rédaction" text in his prose, he includes Corpus Christi College 50 in the beta group of his stemma along with the Wolfenbüttel manuscript, London, College of Arms, Arundel MS 27, and Paris, Bibliothèque nationale, MS fr. 1669, all texts which he calls "deuxième rédaction" texts (the Wolfenbüttel, text entirely, the Arundel 27 and BnF fr. 1669 texts only in part) (1932, p. xviii). Mills simplifies Ewert's complex (and admittedly confusing) explanations in such a way that leads to an inaccurate representation of his classification, and subsequent scholars of Middle English tend to accept Mills's inaccurate separation of London, British Library Additional MS 38662 and Cambridge, Corpus Christi College MS 50 into two separate versions. Any scholar attempting to make or refer to an argument about the use of various Anglo-Norman *Gui* redactions in the Middle English translations should not presume that Additional 38662 and Corpus Christi College 50 represent two different redactions. In his introduction to the edition of the Middle English *Guy* fragments, Mills simplifies Ewert's explanations slightly less, and is therefore a bit more accurate, but his discussion there is still simplified to the extent that it is not completely accurate, including the statement that Ewert called the entire beta group a second redaction of *Gui*, whereas Ewert clearly specifies that the second redaction begins with  $\beta^2$  (Ewert 1932 p. xvii). This means that Ewert does

To clarify, Mills has suggested that the couplet part of the Auchinleck Guy material draws from redactions of the Anglo-Norman *Gui de Warewic* represented by the manuscript versions preserved in *both* London, British Library, Additional MS 38662 and Cambridge, Corpus Christi College MS 50, and he writes that the stanzaic *Guy of Warwick* is akin to the redactions represented in the Anglo-Norman texts preserved in Additional 38662 or Corpus Christi College 50. Therefore, he argues that the early fourteenth-century fragment (preserved in Aberystwyth, National Library of Wales MS 572 and London, British Library Additional MS 14408), the Auchinleck couplet text, and the Auchinleck stanzaic text are all ultimately derived from the redactions represented by the Anglo-Norman *Gui de Warewic* texts preserved in Additional 38662 and/or Corpus Christi College 50. This is not a radical claim, since since these two manuscript versions merely represent minor variations on one single redaction of the Anglo-Norman romance. What Mills argues may suggest the use of multiple exemplars in translation, or it may just as easily suggest the use of a single Anglo-Norman manuscript which itself had already been affected by the use of multiple exemplars in its own copying. But contrary to what Wiggins writes, he does not claim to prove that the couplet and stanzaic parts of the Auchinleck Guy material “could not”<sup>73</sup> have made use of the same versions (manuscript versions or redactions) of *Gui de Warewic* in the process of translation. Furthermore, neither the use of multiple exemplars in general, nor even a (hypothetically) disproportionate reliance on different exemplars in the two parts of the Auchinleck Guy material, shows that the stanzaic portion was an autonomous and independently circulating creation. Because of the change in the appearance of the hand and the new prologue presented in the stanzaic portion of the Auchinleck *Guy of Warwick*, Mills speculates that it may have been copied from a different exemplar, or even that Writer 1 may have had to wait for the second part to be composed as an independent romance because he had an incomplete exemplar for the first part.<sup>74</sup> However, these suggestions remain in the realm of speculation, and nothing in his article gives proof of an autonomously composed and independently circulating *Stanzaic Guy of Warwick*, as Wiggins states it does.

Wiggins also presents linguistic evidence to support her argument for the earlier, independent circulation and composition of what she considers the three separate texts comprising the Auchinleck Guy and Reinbroun material. Wiggins writes: “whereas the couplet *Guy* was most likely to have been composed in London, examination of the dialect shows that the stanzaic *Guy* was composed in an East Midland dialect.”<sup>75</sup>

---

not include Corpus Christi College 50 (which does not descend from  $\beta^2$ ) in his second redaction group. See Mills and Huws, 1974, p. 11.

<sup>73</sup> This is the expression used in Wiggins 2004b, p. 4.

<sup>74</sup> Mills 1991, p. 215.

<sup>75</sup> Wiggins 2004b, p. 4. My findings differ from those of Wiggins. Both parts of the text contain examples of words and spellings that she argues distinguish the dialect of the stanzaic portion from that of the couplet portion. For example, the characteristic she finds most strongly indicative of an East Midland dialect in the stanzaic part of the text—the use of “he” to mean “they”—is found in both the stanzaic and the couplet parts. Wiggins writes that this form is “restricted to East Midland texts” and cites three instances of it in the stanzaic part of *Guy of Warwick* (2004b, p. 4), but she identifies the dialect of the couplet part of the text as a London dialect, despite the fact that this form appears there as well: “Yschent þai ben alle & some. / Gij & Herhaud & her meyne / Glad & bliþe alle ben he” (Auchinleck *Guy* I, 3712-3715). Here and elsewhere in the couplet text, “he” is also used to mean “they.”

However, already by the thirteenth century (and certainly in the fourteenth century), the London and East Midland dialects were mixing. Even conceding a stronger preference for East Midland forms in the stanzaic portion of the Auchinleck *Guy* material does not, however, prove that it was circulating as an independent romance. Scribes frequently use multiple exemplars (not necessarily always for reasons of necessity), and the use of a different exemplar for the stanzaic portion would explain the dialect variation without proving that this hypothetical exemplar necessarily presented only the second half of the romance. On the other hand, Purdie disagrees entirely with Wiggins's localization of the stanzaic part of the Auchinleck *Guy of Warwick*, saying that it "should be broadened to include the London-area generally,"<sup>76</sup> and elsewhere she states strongly: "The South-Midland or London-area quality of [stanzaic] *Guy*'s language is *beyond dispute*."<sup>77</sup> Purdie's assessment places the origin of the Auchinleck stanzaic *Guy* material in the same area as that of the Auchinleck couplet *Guy* material that Wiggins argues must have been composed in an entirely different milieu.

Wiggins similarly distinguishes the dialect presented in the stanzaic portion of *Guy of Warwick* from that of *Reinbroun*. Acknowledging that they "both contain the combination of southern and eastern dialect features and traditional northern rhyme-sequences which are characteristic of the literary language of East Midland stanzaic romances," she nevertheless asserts that they are not "dialectally (*sic*) identical."<sup>78</sup> She sees a "much higher proportion of south-eastern forms" in the stanzaic *Guy of Warwick* than she sees in *Reinbroun* and, based on a very small number of features (some which occur only once), asserts that *Reinbroun* was written by a redactor from an area further north than the redactor of the stanzaic *Guy* material.<sup>79</sup> Purdie, on the other hand, places the origin of *Reinbroun* in the London-Essex area but cautions, as I did above with respect to the stanzaic *Guy* material, that the "few more northerly EML features . . . may reflect the nature of London's linguistic mixture in this period."<sup>80</sup>

The cosmopolitan nature of the London area could provide an alternative explanation for the small number of features that indicate minute distinctions between the linguistic profiles of these texts. Indeed, as Wiggins argues, the stanzaic part of *Guy of Warwick* and *Reinbroun* are not "dialectally (*sic*) identical" texts.<sup>81</sup> However, no two medieval texts exist that are dialectally identical, even when definitively produced in the same area, and even when produced by the same scribe, using the same exemplar.<sup>82</sup>

---

<sup>76</sup> Purdie 2008, p. 195.

<sup>77</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 130, emphasis mine.

<sup>78</sup> Wiggins 2005, p. 65.

<sup>79</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>80</sup> Purdie 2008, pp. 222-23. Also note that Wiggins buttresses her argument for localizing the stanzaic *Guy* material outside of London but more south than Cambridgeshire or South Suffolk (to which she localizes *Reinbroun*) by commenting that there are similarities between the language of the stanzaic *Guy* material and *Sir Orfeo*, localized to Middlesex. But Writer 1 also wrote *Sir Orfeo* and could have picked up habits with respect to vocabulary and phrasing from it or elsewhere, as most of the similarities with respect to phrasing and vocabulary that she notes between the two texts actually occur in several other texts written by Writer 1 as well. Purdie, who disagrees with Wiggins's localization, points out that the language of *Orfeo* "is distinctly more W than [stanzaic] *Guy*'s" (2008, 197).

<sup>81</sup> Wiggins 2005, p. 65.

<sup>82</sup> See Miller, *Variant Reading* (book manuscript in progress). I thank Professor Miller for sharing her unpublished work with me.

There is always dialectal variation between and among medieval texts. Another possibility that could explain the minor variations Wiggins identifies is the interference of scribal dialect. Could Writer 1's London dialect account for the more "southerly" influences she notes in the stanzaic Auchinleck Guy material that he wrote? Could the writer's "literary language" account for them?

In fact, Purdie's recent work on Middle English tail-rhyme romances indicates that there was indeed a "literary language" used for some of them, and this language explains the northerly feel that many of them have. She notes that although many tail-rhyme romances, especially the Auchinleck stanzaic Guy material and *Amis and Amiloun*, have a northern feel to them because of the northern rhymes in –are, sometimes these rhymes "contrast markedly with other aspects of the text's linguistic profile."<sup>83</sup> Purdie concludes that these features cannot be seen to indicate a northern provenance and are more likely part of a "tail-rhyme style." The dialect evidence that Wiggins presents does not necessitate the conclusion that the Auchinleck couplet part of *Guy of Warwick*, the stanzaic part of *Guy of Warwick*, and *Reinbroun* represent three formerly independently circulating romances that were composed in diverse areas.<sup>84</sup>

Wiggins also discusses the Anglo-Norman and Middle English manuscript context of these works, arguing that Auchinleck's presentation of the Guy and Reinbroun material is actually "in many ways typical of the textual tradition" because "the re-arrangement and dislocation of the Reinbroun story is something that occurs regularly in the manuscripts of *Guy of Warwick* and *Gui de Warewic*. . . . This is a text which was often dismantled, presented piecemeal, or reassembled by authors, editors, and compilers."<sup>85</sup> Regarding the regular occurrence of the rearrangement and dislocation of the Reinbroun story in the Anglo-Norman manuscripts, she explains: "The French and Anglo-Norman manuscripts also vary in the way they arrange and present the Reinbrun material."<sup>86</sup> However, as I discussed above, the unlacing and re-lacing of the Reinbroun material is unique to the Auchinleck Manuscript. At the time that it was produced, a textual tradition in English might not have existed yet, so the Auchinleck Manuscript cannot be seen to have been participating in a "typical" textual tradition in Middle

---

<sup>83</sup> Purdie 2008, p. 129.

<sup>84</sup> Wiggins also presents evidence of phrasing and syntax, and my findings differ from hers in this area as well. For example, Wiggins analyzes the syntax of the similes in the "three" romances she discusses. She argues that they can all be distinguished from one another (and therefore must have been composed by different people and must have circulated independently prior to arriving in the Auchinleck Manuscript) partially because of the methods with which each text constructs similes. In the couplet Guy material, she notes that most of the similes are constructed around the phrase "as a lyoun," "though this phrase appears within a variety of syntactic constructions (for example, *he him beheld als a lyoun, als lyouns pai fouSten þo, aiþer semed a lyoun of mode*). (2005, p. 67). She contrasts this with the stanzaic Auchinleck Guy material, where she notes that "similes are constructed upon a fixed syntax but there is lexical variation. The majority of similes in the stanzaic *Guy* open with the construction *a(l)s [ . . . ] as* followed by the object to be compared with" (2005, pp. 67-68). Finally, she contrasts both methods with that of *Reinbroun*, which she claims "provides only one example of a simile and this defies both patterns: *Swift ase swalwe he com ride*" (2005, p. 68). My findings, however, show that *Reinbroun* contains at least three similes. Two are in fact syntactically identical to the pattern Wiggins writes is unique to the stanzaic portion of *Guy of Warwick*, and with respect to lexicon, they are identical to the pattern she claims is unique to the couplet *Guy of Warwick*: The simile "Ase sterne else eni lyoun" occurs in lines 1055 and 1478 of *Reinbroun*.

<sup>85</sup> Wiggins 2005, pp. 72-73.

<sup>86</sup> Wiggins 2005, p. 72, n. 16.

English. And in Anglo-Norman manuscripts, although minor aspects of the *mise-en-page* (such as the exact number of line spaces between the two parts and the size of the initial beginning the final Reinbroun material, discussed above) may indeed vary, the textual “arrangement” of the material (the inclusion of part of the Reinbroun material in interlace structure within the main Gui narrative, and the inclusion of the final Reinbroun material at the end of the main Gui narrative) is completely consistent and does not compare to the dramatic rearrangement presented in the Auchinleck Manuscript. Furthermore, as I mentioned above, the epilogue to this material in the Anglo-Norman manuscripts makes it clear that the Reinbroun material was intended to be read as the end of the romance about Guy, not as an independent romance, even if it may have been added on later.<sup>87</sup>

As a reminder of the manuscript information I presented earlier in this chapter, I will summarize what the manuscript tradition actually tells us in the areas that concern Wiggins: We have twelve non-fragmentary texts in Anglo-Norman and Middle English, spanning three hundred years, all with both “halves” of *Guy of Warwick* told together, and all (except the text in Cambridge, Gonville and Caius College, MS 107/176 and that in London, British Library MS Royal 8.F.ix) including the final Reinbroun material. Auchinleck is the only extant manuscript in Middle English or Anglo-Norman which clearly presents the Reinbroun material as a separate text (although Cambridge University Library, MS Ff.2.38 arguably gestures towards the same, over one hundred years later). Auchinleck is the only extant manuscript in Middle English or Anglo-Norman which unlaces and relaces (“rearranges”) sections of the Reinbroun material to create an independent narrative. There is not a single surviving copy of the hypothetical pre-existing *Stanzaic Guy of Warwick* or *Reinbroun* that Wiggins argues circulated independently for several decades before the compilation of the Auchinleck texts.

Because Wiggins’s work on the subject of *Guy of Warwick*, *Reinbroun*, and the Auchinleck Manuscript appears to provide pragmatic answers to many puzzling questions about the production of these texts and of the Auchinleck Manuscript, her conclusions are quickly becoming accepted as the definitive word on the subject. As a result, the field is on the verge of “closing the book” on the subject of the composition of the Middle English Guy and Reinbroun material, and on the compilation of the Auchinleck Manuscript in general. However, as we have seen, the evidence she presents does not necessitate the conclusions she draws.

Despite the leanings of scholars of late, we should not be so quick to move past the “bookshop era,” as Wiggins describes it. Although Loomis’s bookshop theory should be nuanced by more recent codicological evidence, the most recent does not sufficiently disprove her theory. Even Alison Wiggins admits that paradoxically, while we have moved “past the bookshop era,” scholars still seem to accept Loomis’s conclusions about the composition of the Auchinleck Guy and Reinbroun material (the foundation of Loomis’s theory), which is one of the problems that prompted Wiggins to attempt to close the book entirely by proposing what she feels is rather definitive evidence for the composition and circulation of this material prior to its inclusion in the Auchinleck

---

<sup>87</sup> On the contrary, for example, the Middle English text in Cambridge University Library, MS Ff.2.38, which does seem to isolate the Reinbroun material (see above discussion), does not mention Guy in the epilogue at all.

Manuscript.<sup>88</sup> Yet, the evidence remains debatable. Moreover, while several scholars have buried Loomis’s theory in piles of new evidence and have virtually unanimously—and somewhat offhandedly—rejected her theory, not a single one has sufficiently addressed or found a way to explain differently Loomis’s textual evidence, which remains a problem if the field is to move forward.

### ***Reconsidering Loomis***

I propose that we take a step back before deciding in which direction to move forward. What follows will be a presentation of the textual evidence, both that which Loomis presented and new evidence that I have uncovered, which suggests that some aspects of Loomis’s theory—most notably the often dismissed suggestion of collaborative authorship and translation at the level of Auchinleck production—should be reconsidered.

First, even if we entertain the possibility of a pre-existing stanzaic romance about Reinbroun and a pre-existing *Stanzaic Guy of Warwick* which treats only the middle part of the story as it is told in every extant manuscript, we still have a unique problem in the Auchinleck copy. If the second half of the Auchinleck Manuscript’s Guy material and its Reinbroun material were circulating independently prior to their inclusion in the Auchinleck Manuscript, why would Writer 1 gather both independent romances and “reattach” to the first part of the Guy material *only* the middle section of the romance, yet permit the final section about Reinbroun to remain an independent romance? Why would Writer 1 so carefully reattach the two parts of the story with the Guy material, but carelessly retain the prologue to the hypothetically independently circulating stanzaic *Guy of Warwick*, which seems odd indeed in the middle of a romance? Furthermore, if he was working with an incomplete exemplar for the couplet half and had to use a new exemplar for the stanzaic section, it would seem like too remarkable a coincidence that the very last line of the couplet section should be a perfect translation of *Gui* 7408, and the first set of lines that appears after the new prologue in the stanzaic section should represent a translation of the Anglo-Norman lines that come directly after *Gui* 7408.<sup>89</sup> Here, side-by-side, are the Anglo-Norman lines from Ewert’s edition and the Middle English lines from the Auchinleck Manuscript to illustrate:

A Everwic unt le chef pendu,  
 A grant merveille l’unt tenu.  
 Gui al rei ad conge pris,  
 Alé s’en est en sun pais;  
 A Walingford s’en est alé,  
 Ses homes de l’honor i ad trove,  
 Qui pur lui grant joie firent,  
 Maint jur de lui novele n’oient,  
 Car sun pere mort esteit,

At Warwik þai henge þe heued anon,  
 Mani man wondred þerapon.<sup>90</sup>  
 [. . . *medial prologue here* . . .]  
 He & Herhaud for soþe to say  
 To Wallingforþ toke þe way  
 Þat was his faders toun.  
 Þan was his fader soþe to say  
 Ded & birid in þe clay;  
 His air was sir Gioun.<sup>91</sup>

<sup>88</sup> See Wiggins 2004b and Wiggins 2005.

<sup>89</sup> Loomis notes this fact in her so-called “bookshop” article (1942, p. 609), but the detail is not treated by Wiggins, who does not consider this kind of textual evidence in her production theory.

<sup>90</sup> Auchinleck *Guy* I, ll. 6921-22.

Altre heir de li dunc n'aveit.<sup>92</sup>

It seems extraordinarily unlikely that Writer 1 could have been working with a couplet exemplar that was incomplete and ended at precisely the point that an independently circulating stanzaic second half of the romance picked up. Of course he could have taken care to be sure that he stopped copying the imperfect couplet exemplar early so as to match up with the stanzaic exemplar to follow, but had he done that, he would have had to read twenty-three lines through the stanzaic exemplar to find the line after the prologue at which it picked up translating the Anglo-Norman romance. If Writer 1 was working so carefully to end the couplet portion of the romance where the stanzaic portion begins, before copying the second half he had to have read the stanzaic prologue that would seem quite inappropriate in the middle of a romance. As mentioned above, codicological evidence indicates that he clearly did not intend for the stanzaic portion to be viewed as an independent romance, so presuming his goal was to join the two, why would he take such care to be sure that the lines of the romance that were translated from the Anglo-Norman followed one another exactly in the Middle English but keep them separated by an intrusive new prologue leftover from his exemplar? Even if copying the prologue were a careless mistake, given the extraordinary care and time and cross-reading that it would have taken him to ensure that the stanzaic portion followed precisely where the couplet portion left off, surely he would have corrected such a mistake, as he so frequently edited and corrected much more minor mistakes throughout the manuscript.<sup>93</sup> It seems, on the contrary, absolutely deliberate that he left the prologue there, yet absolutely certain that he did not leave it there so as to present the stanzaic half as a separate romance. Whether the text was translated specifically for the Auchinleck Manuscript (as I believe), or whether it was created using multiple Middle English exemplars, the prologue in the middle of the romance remains equally interesting and inexplicable by practical circumstances.

I will return to this point later to discuss possible reasons for keeping (or composing) a prologue in the middle of this romance. First, let us look at other important textual evidence which gives us information about how the Guy and Reinbroun material was manipulated for the Auchinleck Manuscript.

*Reinbroun* is unquestionably presented as an independent romance in the Auchinleck Manuscript.<sup>94</sup> It was written by Writer 5, whereas the Guy material was written by Writer 1. Yet, there are many peculiarities which suggest that the composition of this text is indebted specifically to the Guy material as it is presented in the Auchinleck Manuscript, and in no other manuscript. Laura Hibbard Loomis has called attention to the fact that certain lines in the Auchinleck *Reinbroun* are verbally indebted to lines in

---

<sup>91</sup> Auchinleck *Guy* II, ll. 6948-53.

<sup>92</sup> *Gui*, ll. 7407-16.

<sup>93</sup> See Mills 1988, p.17, especially note 20 for examples.

<sup>94</sup> See above for the codicological evidence which indicates this.

the stanzaic portion of the Guy material in the Auchinleck Manuscript alone. Below are the lines she mentions:<sup>95</sup>

**From Auchinleck Guy II**

A child þai *geten* yfere  
 He þou3t wiþ dreri mode,  
 Hou *he* hadde euer ben strong *werrour* . . .  
 In þe world *was non his pere*.  
*Mani man he* hadde slayn wiþ wrong;  
 'Leman' seyd Gij o3ain  
 Ac *for þi loue* ich haue al wrou3t,

Wiþ a knaue child þou art ycorn  
 Pat *douhti* beþ of dede . . .  
*As 3e may forþeward here*;  
 As 3e may forward here.<sup>96</sup>

**From Auchinleck Reinbroun**

His fader Gij þat him *get*,  
*He was a werrour swiþe gret*;  
 Þar *nas nowhar his per* . . .  
*Mani* batayle *he* began

*For þe loue* of o wimman  
 Þat was him lef & dere.  
 Siþe Rey[n]broun on hire he  
 wan  
 Þat was a swiþe *dou3ti* man,  
*Ase ee may forþeward here*.<sup>97</sup>

These lines from the beginning of *Reinbroun* are not merely translated, but are newly composed in Middle English for the purpose of introducing *Reinbroun* as a separate romance. They do not exist in any other manuscript in Anglo-Norman or in Middle English, and they are clearly indebted to the lines from the translation of the Guy material in the stanzaic portion of the Auchinleck text. If the three parts of the text were translated in different parts of the country and circulated independently prior to being copied into the Auchinleck Manuscript, as Wiggins argues, how might this indebtedness be explained? At the very least, it suggests that the *prologue* to the *Reinbroun* material was composed specifically for the Auchinleck Manuscript. If the prologue had to be composed anew for this unique presentation, it is likely because there was not previously a prologue written for the *Reinbroun* material on its own, as it is highly unlikely (given the extensive manuscript evidence discussed above) that the material ever circulated independently.

Wiggins does not address this textual similarity; however, someone arguing for the independent circulation of these three parts might suggest that the previously circulating prologue to *Reinbroun* could have been damaged, necessitating the composition of a new prologue for inclusion in the Auchinleck Manuscript.<sup>98</sup> Yet,

<sup>95</sup> See Loomis 1942, p. 611. The first column consists of lines from scattered places throughout the Auchinleck stanzaic Guy material; the second column consists of consecutive lines from the Auchinleck *Reinbroun* material. Although I am quoting from a different edition with different line numbers, I have separated them in the same way Loomis did and italicized the same words she did so as to illustrate the indebtedness she discusses.

<sup>96</sup> Auchinleck *Guy* II, ll. 7148, 7169-70, 9995, 7173, 7200, 7218, 7285-86, 7115, 9827.

<sup>97</sup> Auchinleck *Reinbroun*, ll. 13-15, 19-24.

<sup>98</sup> Some might be tempted to explain the similarities by calling the language generically “formulaic.” However, if these similar phrases and lines were attributable to generic formulae, we would expect to find them in other copies of *Guy of Warwick* as well, but we do not. More importantly, it is difficult to argue that any of the language in the Auchinleck Middle English romances is formulaic in the sense that we should not ascribe meaning to it, since most of these texts represent the earliest and sole surviving copies. It is certainly true that many of the conventions and much of the language in these romances later became

further evidence from throughout the remainder of *Reinbroun* indicates that there are many more connections between the texts as they are presented in the Auchinleck Manuscript alone. It is clear that whoever composed the stanzaic portion of the Auchinleck Guy material was working carefully with the person who composed the Auchinleck *Reinbroun*, if it was not indeed composed by the same person. Loomis was the first to discuss the fact that, although every other extant copy of the Guy material in Anglo-Norman and in Middle English includes part of Reinbroun's story embedded in interlace structure within it, the Auchinleck copy alone does not do this, but rather incorporates it into the Auchinleck romance of *Reinbroun*.<sup>99</sup> Loomis does not examine in detail how this material is extracted and reworked, but an examination of the "unlacing" and "relacing" of the material sheds even more light on the composition of these texts.

The Reinbroun material that is presented in interlace structure in all of the Anglo-Norman *Gui de Warewic* texts and in every other extant copy of *Guy of Warwick* in Middle English (including in Goville and Caius College, MS 107/176, which omits all of the final Reinbroun material), begins with a discussion of Felice, followed by an introduction of Reinbroun, her son with Guy:

De la dame voil ore parler,  
 La femme Gui, la bon moiller;  
 De bunté n'ad el mund sa per,  
 Ne que tant face a preiser.  
 Puis que sun seigneur en exil ala,  
 Unques puis pur veir ne fina  
 De povres pestre, de musters aprester  
 E povres abeies restorer,  
 De chalcees faire, de redrescer punz,  
 Sovent dona herneis as prisuns;  
 Ja pur deduit que hom li feist,  
 Pur rien rire ne la veist.  
 Iceste dame un fiz aveit,  
 Tant bel enfant al jur n'esteit;  
 A grant honor le leverent,  
 Reinbrun par nun l'apelerent.  
 A Heralte fu le emfes livré,  
 Cum sis peres l'out comandé.  
 Heralte le garda a grant honor,  
 Cum il dut faire fiz sun seigneur;<sup>100</sup>

Compare the introduction of the character of Reinbroun in the romance of *Reinbroun* in the Auchinleck Manuscript:

---

formulaic, but it is very possible that the "formulae" were being carefully developed in the creation of the textual examples which survive in the Auchinleck Manuscript (and were not, then, at the time they were created, 'formulaic' in the sense that we use the word in scholarship today).

<sup>99</sup> Loomis 1942, p. 610.

<sup>100</sup> *Gui*, ll. 8975-94.

Of a kni3t was to batayle boun,  
 Sire Gij is sone þat hi3te Rey[n3]broun,  
 Of him y make my mone.  
 His fader Gij þat him get,  
 He was a werrour swiþe gret;  
 Þar nas nowhar his per  
 In Fraunce, in Pycardy,  
 In Spayne, in Lombardy,  
 Neyþer fer ne ner.  
 Mani batayle he began  
 For þe loue of o wimman  
 Þat was him lef & dere.  
 Siþe Rey[n]broun on hire he wan  
 Þat was a swiþe dou3ti man,  
 Ase 3e may forþward here.  
     Þay were togedre fifti ni3t  
 After a spusede þat swete wi3t  
 Wiþ meche melody.  
 Þanne was be3ete þat baroun,  
 His sone þat was cleped Rey[n]broun,  
 Of þat kni3t sire Gij.  
 Fourti wikes wiþ child 3he was  
 & dilyured þour3 [Godes] gras  
 And is moder Mari.  
 Cristned hit was werschipliche,  
 Reinbroun men calde him sikerliche,  
 For soþe and nou3t ne lye.  
     Heraud hadde þat child to lore  
 Seue winter and wel more;  
 Ful wel he gan him lere.<sup>101</sup>

The introduction of the interlaced Reinbroun material in the Anglo-Norman text provides enough of a summary that it could have been perfectly suitable as a source for much of the introduction to the Auchinleck romance of *Reinbroun*. Yet, this material is rejected, and a new introduction is composed. The significance of this new introductory material will be discussed later, but here it is important to note that the introduction to the interlaced Reinbroun material as it is presented within *Gui de Warewic* is not simply discarded. The information about Felice's pious deeds is an important part of the second half of the Auchinleck Guy material, but with the extraction of the interlaced Reinbroun material, it no longer fits where it was originally placed. Therefore, the composer of the stanzaic section of the Auchinleck Guy material has moved an abridged version of this

---

<sup>101</sup> Auchinleck *Reinbroun*, ll. 10-39.

material to a different part of the stanzaic Guy section, where Guy appears to Felice as an anonymous beggar:

& Feliis þe countas was þer þan.  
In þis world was non better wiman -  
In gest as-so we rede -  
For þritten pouer men & 3ete mo  
For hir lordes loue sche loued so,  
Ich day sche gan fede  
Wiþ þan God & our leuedi  
Schuld saue hir lord sir Gij  
& help him at his nede.  
Sche no stint noiþer day no ni3t,  
For him sche bisou3t God almi3t  
Wiþ bedes & almos dede.<sup>102</sup>

This is greatly expanded from the Anglo-Norman, which reads:

La contesse Felice i esteit,  
Chascun jur tresze freres pesseit  
En la sale par devant lui,  
Que Deus guarist sun seignur Gui,  
De tel beivre, de tel manger,  
Cum ele meimes soleit user.<sup>103</sup>

Because the Anglo-Norman text already mentioned Felice's list of pious works in the section introducing the interlaced Reinbroun material, this description of Felice is localized to the moment the text is depicting. However, the Auchinleck text moves beyond the current moment, presenting an expanded description clearly based on ideas taken from the Reinbroun material that was extracted from an earlier part of the text, albeit in abridged form. The Auchinleck text calls attention here to Felice's goodness compared to every other woman in the world, found in line 8977 of the interlaced Anglo-Norman Reinbroun material. The list of specific pious works found in the interlaced Anglo-Norman Reinbroun material is abridged but summarized in lines 10270-71, and Auchinleck line 10269 adopts the specific description of the unceasing nature of Felice's pious actions, found in line 8980 of the interlaced Anglo-Norman Reinbroun material.

It is clear that the Reinbroun material was "unlaced" from *Gui de Warewic* with extreme care and complex consideration. Material about Felice that surrounded the Reinbroun material was removed so as not to disrupt the Auchinleck Guy material, but because it was germane to the characterization of Felice, it was moved to a moment in the

---

<sup>102</sup> Auchinleck *Guy* II, ll. 10260-71. We cannot compare this to the text in Gonville and Caius College, MS 107/176, since there are two leaves missing at the point where this material would appear, if it were there. The text in Cambridge University Library, MS Ff.2.38 reads exactly like *Gui*, ll. 10487-92. This part of the text is not preserved in the early fourteenth-century fragments.

<sup>103</sup> *Gui*, ll. 11387-92.

text that was more fitting. The editorial skill involved in unlacing the Reinbroun material from its interlace structure within the Auchinleck Guy material and “relacing” one part of it into a more fitting place within the Guy text and one part of it into the independent romance of *Reinbroun* is utterly inexplicable if one subscribes to the argument that the stanzaic section of the Auchinleck Guy text and the romance of *Reinbroun* were composed in different places and were circulating independently before making their way into the Auchinleck Manuscript. Likewise, the presence of the stanzaic prologue in the midst of the Auchinleck Guy material is not satisfactorily explained by the theory of an independently circulating stanzaic portion of the romance, given the textual and codicological evidence discussed above.

In fact, there are further significant connections between all three parts of the Auchinleck Guy and Reinbroun material along with another Auchinleck text, *Amis and Amiloun*. Combined with the Anglo-Norman and Middle English manuscript evidence, these connections suggest that the translation of all three parts was undertaken either by the same person or as a collaborative effort, and was produced specifically for the Auchinleck Manuscript.

Although Rhiannon Purdie accepts without further exploration Wiggins’s conclusions regarding the composition of the Auchinleck Guy and Reinbroun material,<sup>104</sup> she extensively examines the relationship Loomis proposed between the Auchinleck stanzaic Guy material and the Auchinleck *Amis and Amiloun*. Purdie rejects Loomis’s bookshop theory but recognizes that there is a “price to pay” for its loss, namely that it reopens “the problem it was designed to solve: how did there come to be so many intertextual connections within this manuscript?”<sup>105</sup>

To recap briefly, Loomis suggested that the Auchinleck *Amis and Amiloun* must have borrowed from the Auchinleck stanzaic Guy material. The stanzaic Guy material is rather faithful to its Anglo-Norman source, but *Amis and Amiloun* includes many moments which closely parallel the Auchinleck stanzaic Guy material but which do not exist in the Anglo-Norman *Amys e Amillyoun*. These lines appear in all extant *Amis and Amiloun* manuscripts, which shows that they must have been part of the original translation. Loomis does not suggest that the Auchinleck copy is the original translation because it repeats a line in one instance and transposes a line in another instance, and these mistakes do not appear in other manuscripts; however, she proposes that the Auchinleck copy must have been the earliest copy of the original translation since its similarities to the stanzaic Guy material in the same manuscript are the most consistent in this copy. Because she believes she has already shown that the stanzaic Guy material was composed for the Auchinleck Manuscript, and because the above indicates that *Amis and Amiloun* was composed after the stanzaic Guy material, she next suggests (and this is merely a conjecture) that Writer 1 composed *Amis and Amiloun* and was copying one of his own translations for the Auchinleck Manuscript.<sup>106</sup>

---

<sup>104</sup> However, Purdie disagrees with all of the dialect evidence Wiggins presents, and this evidence provides the main support for the conclusions Wiggins draws. See above for a discussion of Wiggins’s assessment of the dialects of *Reinbroun* and the stanzaic portion of the Auchinleck *Guy of Warwick*, and Purdie’s revised assessment of it.

<sup>105</sup> Purdie 2008, p. 107.

<sup>106</sup> See Loomis 1942 for the full argument that is summarized above.

With respect to Loomis's reasoning regarding the relationship between the stanzaic Guy material and the Auchinleck *Amis and Amiloun*, Purdie calls the argument "watertight" but points out that others have questioned it because of "extremely good" reasons for believing that the Middle English *Amis and Amiloun* is older than the Middle English *Guy of Warwick*.<sup>107</sup> However, while Purdie admittedly would like to believe that *Amis and Amiloun* was the older text, after close scrutiny of the arguments on both sides, she ultimately agrees with Loomis that it must have borrowed from *Guy of Warwick*. In the course of her examination, she notes that in his edition of *Horn Childe*, Maldwyn Mills suggests that *Horn Childe* may have borrowed some lines from *Amis and Amiloun* but that it is hard to tell which work borrowed from which. Purdie adds new evidence that she believes lends strength to Mills's proposal that it was *Horn Childe* that borrowed from *Amis and Amiloun*.<sup>108</sup>

After careful scrutiny of the arguments on all sides, Purdie convincingly argues that the order of borrowing suggests that the stanzaic Guy material was written first, followed by *Amis and Amiloun* (which borrows from the stanzaic *Guy*), followed by *Horn Childe* (which borrows from *Amis and Amiloun*). However, although she scrutinizes all of the previous arguments on the subject of the relationship between the stanzaic part of *Guy of Warwick* and the Auchinleck *Amis and Amiloun*, she does not do so with the arguments which have been made about the relationship between *Reinbroun* and the couplet and stanzaic parts of *Guy of Warwick*, and this affects the ultimate conclusion she comes to regarding *Amis and Amiloun* and Loomis's bookshop theory. Because Purdie presumes 1) that Wiggins's conclusions are correct, namely that *Reinbroun*, a couplet version of *Guy of Warwick*, and a stanzaic version of *Guy of Warwick* were all composed and circulated independently for years before being pieced together in the Auchinleck Manuscript, and 2) that *Horn Childe* was an old and "bedraggled" text before reaching the Auchinleck Manuscript,<sup>109</sup> she is compelled to conclude that:

the *Guy—Amis* relationship cannot be used to support any theory of collaborative or bespoke translation in direct association with the Auchinleck Manuscript. *Amis* is older than *Horn Childe*, which itself was clearly not a new text by the time a bedraggled copy of it reached the Auchinleck compiler's hands; the stanzaic *Guy* used by the author of *Amis* must therefore be older still. By 'older' we could be talking of as

---

<sup>107</sup> Purdie 2008, p. 108. See Mills 1991, pp. 222-29 for an argument that the borrowing goes in the other direction.

<sup>108</sup> Purdie 2008, p. 110.

<sup>109</sup> See Mills 1988 for an introduction to and edition of the text. Mills presents a balanced consideration of whether or not *Horn Childe* could have been composed specifically for the Auchinleck Manuscript and in relation to the composition of other Auchinleck texts. Although he does not seem to commit himself to an argument either way, he does conclude with a series of reasonable objections to the notion that it could have been composed in relation to some other Auchinleck texts, including some discrepancies between the spellings and the phonetic values of the words in rhyme, and the breakdowns in the rhyme pattern of its stanza, which indicate to Mills that the text may have already been in disarray before it reached the Auchinleck Manuscript (80). Earlier, he does recognize that without an earlier text, it is difficult to determine what is a scribal "mistake" and what is original to the composition (28).

little as a decade, of course, but we cannot now be talking of translations executed in London more or less simultaneously. . . . Nor can we posit . . . The triumphant arrival of tail-rhyme romance in London from the north, something which might otherwise have seemed likely from the apparent age of *Horn Childe* and the *Amis* and *Guy*-poets' apparent imitation of some more Northern poem with their *-are* rhymes. Instead, we must reckon with a London-area stanzaic *Guy* influencing a Midland (at least in terms of its dialect) *Amis* which greatly extends *Guy's* sporadic use of more northerly rhymes. *Amis* itself then influences the genuinely North Midland *Horn Childe* before copies of all three romances are procured by the London-based Scribe 1 of the Auchinleck Manuscript. Even if one supposed all three poems to be the work of immigrants to London this does not make for a tidy history; especially since the detailed Yorkshire allusions in *Horn Childe* make it unlikely that this last text was composed very far from there.<sup>110</sup>

As Purdie herself notes, however, the transmission history she proposes, with such exact influence over such a short period of time across different localities is not exactly tidy or easy to reckon with, and given what we know about the cosmopolitan nature of the London literary climate (which Purdie also notes elsewhere to support her argument that the northern forms found in many tail-rhyme romances do not actually indicate a northerly provenance), it is just as likely that all three poems may have been the work of immigrants to London. In fact, in his edition of *Horn Childe*, Mills notes more southerly dialect forms that could be indicative of a more southern living environment for the northern author of the work.<sup>111</sup> Purdie acknowledges this possibility above, but she rejects it based on the singular fact that there are detailed allusions to Yorkshire in *Horn Childe*, which she believes make it more likely that it was actually produced there. However, one cannot acknowledge a cosmopolitan literary milieu with respect to the composition of works but deny such a milieu with respect to the consumption of them. (Just as one cannot presume such a rigid divide between multilingual composers of works and presumed monolingual consumers of them.) Although it is possible that detailed allusions to Yorkshire could indicate such a provenance, it is not unthinkable that an author from Yorkshire composing in London for a cosmopolitan audience might also include such allusions. Insisting that this one fact means that *Horn Childe* was composed in Yorkshire requires us to imagine an excruciatingly complicated transmission history among these three texts, and the bulk of Purdie's rejection of Loomis's theory boils down to this one supposition. However, conceding the possibility that it, like many London texts, was composed in London by an author from Yorkshire goes a long way towards explaining how these texts could have borrowed exact lines from one another over such a short period of time.

The period of time with which Purdie is dealing is indeed quite short, and the dates she proposes are rather more precise than the evidence warrants. She proposes a date of 1300-1310 for the stanzaic *Guy* material, 1310-1320 for *Amis and Amiloun*, and

---

<sup>110</sup> Purdie 2008, p. 114.

<sup>111</sup> Mills 1988, p. 43.

the second or third decade of the fourteenth-century for *Horn Childe*. While most scholars agree that all three of these texts should be dated to the early fourteenth century, the more precise dating provided by Purdie is merely based on the order in which she believes they were written and on the presumption that *Horn Childe* and the stanzaic part of *Guy of Warwick* must have been written many years before the compilation of the Auchinleck Manuscript. But there is no serious evidence for the rather arbitrary spacing of a decade between each text, and the borrowing order for which Purdie argues might just as easily have occurred within the space of five years or five months. Although it is not her intention, Purdie's work confirms the textual connections which Loomis uses to suggest collaboration on the composition of the Auchinleck Guy and Amis material.

The assumption that unique features of the translations presented in the Auchinleck Manuscript must represent mistakes and accidents has driven scholars to search for the practical circumstances which would explain them. As we have seen above, the evidence presented does not necessitate the conclusions that have been made about the composition of *Reinbroun* and the couplet and stanzaic portions of the Auchinleck *Guy of Warwick*. In fact, there is much more evidence to suggest that they are original translations than that they are not. Thus far, all of the textual and codicological evidence I have presented points to the strong possibility that the composition of the Auchinleck Guy and Reinbroun material was related and was carried out in association with the Auchinleck project. There are numerous additional connections between the Auchinleck Guy and Reinbroun material which suggest that there is indeed a compositional relationship between *Reinbroun* and the Auchinleck couplet and stanzaic *Guy of Warwick*.

The medieval title given to the Reinbroun material in the Auchinleck Manuscript, *Reinbrun, Gij sone of Warwike*, highlights that this text is concerned with painting a particular kind of picture of Reinbroun as Guy's heir, a concern unique to the Auchinleck Manuscript, and one that uniquely links Reinbroun to the character of Guy that is presented in the Auchinleck couplet Guy material alone. Although for the sake of clarity I have been referring to the part of the Anglo-Norman romance of *Gui de Warewic* that takes place after Guy's death as the "final Reinbroun material," apart from the Auchinleck Manuscript, no other manuscript in Anglo-Norman or in Middle English suggests that this material is more about Reinbroun than it is about Heraud, his tutor. The Anglo-Norman text presents the material in interlace structure; after concluding the Guy material the text states:

Ore dirra de Heralt, le bon barun,  
 Ki en Alfrike gist en prison;  
 Poi i beit, meins i mangue,  
 A peine est sa vie sustenue.<sup>112</sup>

Although Reinbroun will certainly play a large role in this section, the character that is emphasized by the narrator is actually Heraud. Even the Middle English text in Cambridge University Library, MS Ff.2.38, which separates the material from the main narrative about Guy, presents the section as if it is more about Heraud than Reinbroun:

---

<sup>112</sup> *Gui*, ll. 11657-60.

Lystenyth now, y schalle yow telle,  
As y fynde in parchement spelle,  
Of syr Harrowde, þe gode baron,  
That lyeth in Awfryke in prison.<sup>113</sup>

The Auchinleck Manuscript alone makes a concerted effort to put all of the material concerning Reinbroun in one place and to emphasize, through the title and the new prologue, the character of Reinbroun and his status as the son of Guy of Warwick. Furthermore, Reinbroun is associated specifically with the character of Guy as he is presented in the couplet section of the Auchinleck *Guy of Warwick* (the pre-reform, romance-warrior father) and not with the post-reform, crusading figure Guy becomes in the stanzaic portion.

The new prologue in the Auchinleck *Reinbroun* specifically leaves out all references which would connect the Reinbroun material with the part of the *Guy of Warwick* legend that depicts Guy as a spiritual or “crusading” knight, which is also the part from which the Reinbroun material is extracted:

Ihesu þat ert of mi3te most,  
Fader & sone & holy gost,  
Ich bidde þe a bone,  
Ase þow ert lord of our ginning  
& madest heuene and alle þing,  
Se and sonne and mone,  
3eue hem grace wel to spede  
þat herkneþ what y schel rede,  
Ihesu, God in trone.  
Of a kni3t was to batayle boun,  
Sire Gij is sone þat hi3te Rey[n]broun,  
Of him y make my mone.  
His fader Gij þat him get,  
He was a werrour swiþe gret;  
þar nas nowhar his per  
In Fraunce, in Pycardy,  
In Spayne, in Lombardy,  
Neyþer fer ne ner.  
Mani batayle he began  
For þe loue of o wimman  
þat was him lef & dere.  
Siþe Rey[n]broun on hire he wan  
þat was a swiþe dou3ti man,  
Ase 3e may forþward here.<sup>114</sup>

---

<sup>113</sup> CUL *Guy*, ll. 10787-90.

While the stanzaic “medial prologue” clearly picks up the romance where the couplet part of *Guy of Warwick* leaves off, providing a sense of continuity between the two parts, the *Reinbroun* prologue shows a careful plan to divorce the romance from the part of the *Guy of Warwick* legend in which it is traditionally contained. Reinbroun’s father “was a werrouw swiþe gret,”<sup>115</sup> and “Mani batayle he began / For þe loue of o wimman / Þat was him lef & dere.”<sup>116</sup> Unique to the Auchinleck copy, Reinbroun’s father is clearly depicted as the secular romance knight of the couplet section of the Auchinleck *Guy* material, who accomplished great deeds because he loved Felice so much. Following this prologue, the Auchinleck text summarizes Guy’s marriage to Felice, introduces the birth of Reinbroun, and goes on to discuss his kidnapping and all of the adventures that ensue:

þay were togedre fifti ni3t  
 After a spusede þat swete wi3t  
 Wiþ meche melody.  
 Þanne was be3ete þat baroun,  
 His sone þat was cleped Rey[n]broun,  
 Of þat kni3t sire Gij.  
 Fourti wikes wiþ child 3he was  
 & dilyured þour3 [Godes] gras  
 And is moder Mari.  
 Cristned hit was werschipliche,  
 Reinbroun men calde him sikerliche,  
 For soþe and nou3t ne lye.  
 Heraud hadde þat child to lore  
 Seue winter and wel more;  
 Ful wel he gan him lere.<sup>117</sup>

This text happily follows a trajectory which includes describing Guy as a great warrior who fought for the love of Felice, followed by his marriage to her, followed by the joyous birth of their son. It omits all information about Guy’s decision to repent for the misdeeds he committed while fighting for his love of Felice and about his departure on a spiritual journey to do so, and, following this description of bravery, love, and marriage, it presents the Reinbroun material that is, in every other extant text in Anglo-Norman and Middle English, presented in interlace structure amidst Guy’s journey of spiritual repentance. Heraud is presented as Reinbroun’s tutor, but uniquely, the Auchinleck copy does not mention Guy’s “exile” or remorse here, something that is mentioned in the introduction to this material in the Anglo-Norman texts as well as in both other complete Middle English manuscript versions. Normally, one might argue that the audience should be expected to know the story already, and especially since *Reinbroun* comes just after *Guy* in the manuscript, the audience can make the connection to the “spiritual and

---

<sup>114</sup> Auchinleck *Reinbroun*, ll. 1-24.

<sup>115</sup> *Ibid.*, l. 14.

<sup>116</sup> *Ibid.*, ll. 19-21.

<sup>117</sup> *Ibid.*, ll. 25-39.

crusader” Guy. However, while it is logical to compare in this way two separate romances that are joined together in one manuscript, the fact that the Reinbroun legend is extracted from the previous romance already shows a clear attempt to distance it from that part of the romance. Indeed, the audience would be familiar with the *Guy of Warwick* story, and the language of the introduction to *Reinbroun* highlights moments from it. Guy is called a “werrour,”<sup>118</sup> verbally echoing Guy’s own reflection on his life as a “strong werrour,”<sup>119</sup> uniquely expressed in this way in the Auchinleck Manuscript.<sup>120</sup> The line “For þe loue of o wimman”<sup>121</sup> reminds us of the moment in which Guy laments that he has done everything for love of Felice and nothing for love of God. But is the audience being asked to “fill in” the rest (“but not for love of God”), or to notice that the rest is conspicuously not mentioned? Evidence from the remainder of *Reinbroun* suggests that it is the latter.

Reinbroun’s association with the pre-reform, romance-warrior Guy is introduced with the new prologue, and it is continuously emphasized throughout the text through subtle changes to the Anglo-Norman Reinbroun material that specifically highlight this association and de-emphasize any association with the pious figure of the second part of the romance. Guy is compared to a “lyoun” many times throughout the Auchinleck couplet part of Guy, but never again in the stanzaic part, where that description is reserved only for his enemy, Amoraunt.<sup>122</sup> Although the Anglo-Norman text occasionally compares Guy to a lion in this first part of the romance, these comparisons are proliferated in the couplet Auchinleck Guy translation, and they are not present at all in the Cambridge University Library, MS Ff.2.38 translation and are only rarely present in the Gonville and Caius College, MS 107/176 translation. In the Auchinleck *Reinbroun*, Guy’s son is verbally linked to the warrior Guy who fights like a lion through two lines describing him (using the same words): “Ase sterne else eni lyoun.”<sup>123</sup> Not only does the general lion simile compare Reinbroun to the Auchinleck couplet Guy, but the particular diction is echoed from the Auchinleck couplet Guy material as well: “Gij of Warwike his name it is, / Sterner þan eni lyoun, ywis.”<sup>124</sup> The two similes comparing Reinbroun to a lion are not present in the Anglo-Norman text or in the Cambridge University Library, MS Ff.2.38 translation (recall that the text in Gonville and Caius College, MS 107/176 does not include this material), and Auchinleck’s association of Reinbroun with the lion-like warrior characteristics of his father is unique to that manuscript version. Furthermore, when Reinbroun crosses the treacherous body of water to rescue Amis from the Otherworld, he blesses himself and commands himself to

<sup>118</sup> Auchinleck *Reinbroun*, l. 14.

<sup>119</sup> Auchinleck *Guy* II, l. 7170.

<sup>120</sup> In the Anglo-Norman, Guy reflects on his life: “Unc a chevalier ne fist greignur” (*Gui*, l. 7576). The Auchinleck copy uniquely emphasizes the “fighting” nature of a “chevalier” with its choice of “warrior” as a translation, and with its harkening back to this choice in the description of Guy in *Reinbroun*. The translation in Cambridge University Library, MS Ff.2.38 does not include this line, and the translation in Gonville and Caius College, MS 107/176 chooses the word “knyghte” (*Caius Guy*, l. 7402), with its multiple connotations which move beyond the notion of a “fighter.”

<sup>121</sup> Auchinleck *Reinbroun*, l. 20.

<sup>122</sup> This is fitting because, as I will argue in the next chapter, Guy’s successful fight with Amoraunt seems to be symbolic of his triumph over his old ways of prioritizing his love of a woman over his love for God.

<sup>123</sup> Auchinleck *Reinbroun*, ll. 1055 & 1478.

<sup>124</sup> Auchinleck *Guy* I, ll. 2772-73.

“Dieu”<sup>125</sup> in the Anglo-Norman text. In the Auchinleck text, “He þou3te on is fader.”<sup>126</sup> Although this could refer to God, in light of the other references in this text to Reinbroun thinking of Guy for inspiration, it more likely refers to his father, Guy, who had to cross a similar body of water in the couplet Guy material. The water Reinbroun crosses is described: “Þe water was so sterne & grim,”<sup>127</sup> which verbally echoes the description of the water Guy crosses over in the Auchinleck couplet translation: “a water sterne,”<sup>128</sup> which his enemies do not dare to cross after him for fear of their lives. Through verbal echoes, this scene uniquely links Reinbroun to the pre-reform “couplet” Guy (conceptually and textually) in the Auchinleck Manuscript,<sup>129</sup> and the link is solidified through a significant addition: Although the Anglo-Norman romance does not name the fairy knight who holds Amis captive, the Auchinleck translator calls him “Gayer,” which is the name of the first knight Guy fights in his first courtly tournament and also the name of Duke Loyer’s nephew whom Guy also fights in the couplet Guy material. Reinbroun gains the strength to fight Gayer by thinking of his father, and it is in the name of Guy that the fairy knight surrenders.<sup>130</sup>

The above additions link Reinbroun to the pre-reform Guy, and the one detail that specifically connects his feats to his more spiritual, post-reform father in the Anglo-Norman text is removed in the Auchinleck texts. In both the English and the Anglo-Norman Reinbroun stories, the adventure in the Otherworld takes place in the forest of the Great Arderne, probably Ardenne, in Northeastern France. In the Anglo-Norman text, a connection is drawn between this Otherworld and the forest in which Guy dies, called “Arderne,” or the Forest of Arden in England. This connection is removed in the Auchinleck Guy material, which removes the name of the forest to which Guy retreats, making the space anonymous.<sup>131</sup>

---

<sup>125</sup> *Gui*, l. 12349.

<sup>126</sup> Auchinleck *Reinbroun*, l. 976. The Cambridge University Library, MS Ff.2.38 text translates the Anglo-Norman more closely than Auchinleck here: “He blessyd hym with hys right honed” (CUL *Guy*, l. 11427).

<sup>127</sup> Auchinleck *Reinbroun*, l. 970.

<sup>128</sup> Auchinleck *Guy* I, l. 5460.

<sup>129</sup> Note, however, that the Cambridge University Library, MS Ff.2.38 translation does call both waters “brode” (CUL *Guy*, ll. 5561 & 11389). In the absence of a clear reference to Guy’s father in the Reinbroun section, however, this is probably simply the common word chosen by this particular translator to describe a great body of water. Yet, even if one were to apply the same argument to the Auchinleck texts (rather than accepting my argument for a more significant content connection), we may still add this to the list of evidence which links these two translations (arguing against the notion that they were composed at different times and places by different people). The Anglo-Norman text simply calls the water Guy crosses an “eve grant” (*Gui*, l. 5936) and provides no verbal echoes in the Reinbroun section.

<sup>130</sup> In the Cambridge University Library, MS Ff.2.38 translation and in the Anglo-Norman text, the fairy knight also recognizes Guy when he surrenders to Reinbroun (and Reinbroun also thinks of Guy while gathering the strength to fight the knight); however he is not named “Gayer” in these texts, and therefore he is not necessarily linked to the pre-reform, warrior Guy as he is in the Auchinleck.

<sup>131</sup> The interpretive implications of some of the above textual connections will be discussed further in the next chapter. It has been my goal here to show that the textual connections between the Auchinleck couplet and stanzaic Guy and Reinbroun material, combined with the codicological history of the material, argue strongly for their connections to each other and to the Auchinleck Manuscript.

### *Reviewing the Connections*

I would like to review in brief the evidence I have presented for the connections between the three parts of the Auchinleck translation of *Gui de Warewic*, and to provide a few more salient points here.<sup>132</sup> The most recent scholarship on the language of the texts suggests that the couplet Guy material, the stanzaic Guy material, and the romance of Reinbroun were likely all composed in the general area of London. Each was probably composed in the early fourteenth century, not far from the date offered for the compilation of the Auchinleck Manuscript, and it is likely that there was only a short time frame among the compositions of each. Although she does not subscribe to Loomis's bookshop theory, Purdie's most recent research supports Loomis's argument that the Auchinleck *Amis and Amiloun* borrowed from the Auchinleck stanzaic Guy material, indicating that the composition of the Auchinleck Guy material was also associated with the composition of at least one other text in the same manuscript.

The texts in question were written by Writer 1 and Writer 5, and codicological evidence shows that the work of these two writers uniquely overlaps. Writer 5 shares a folio side with Writer 1 in two places. Writer 5 begins writing *Reinbroun* on f. 167rb, directly after Writer 1's *Guy II* ends, also on f. 167rb; later, Writer 5 ends *Beves* on f. 201ra, and Writer 1 begins *Of Arthour and of Merlin* on f. 201rb. Writers do not share a side of a folio anywhere else in the manuscript. Elsewhere in transitions between writers, there are full columns and even virtually full sides of folios left blank. However, blanks are never left between works when the same writer wrote both texts. The transitions between the work of Writer 1 and that of Writer 5 therefore resemble the transitions among texts written by the same writer throughout the manuscript. One might argue that this was done to preserve parchment, as in both of these cases, there is good reason to believe that the decision made practical sense. However, short filler texts are always used to fill the same gaps elsewhere in the manuscript, and a unique decision was made in both of these places, which might suggest a different relationship between Writer 1 and Writer 5, or at least different circumstances from those surrounding the writing of the other texts in the manuscript.

This codicological connection is reinforced by the textual connections discussed in detail above and summarized briefly here: The couplet Guy material (Writer 1) is connected to the stanzaic Guy material (Writer 1) via the exact dovetailing between the texts. The couplet Guy material (Writer 1) is also connected to the romance of *Reinbroun* (Writer 5) via exact linguistic echoes and strategic similarities in content only present in the Auchinleck copies of this material. In addition, the stanzaic Guy material (Writer 1) is connected to the romance of *Reinbroun* (Writer 5) through the carefully considered method with which material about Reinbroun was unlaced from the stanzaic Guy material (Writer 1) and re-laced partially into a different section of the stanzaic Guy material (Writer 1) and partially into the romance of *Reinbroun* (Writer 5). These two sets of material are further linked through the clear verbal indebtedness of the prologue to the romance of *Reinbroun* (Writer 5) to lines from the stanzaic Guy material (Writer 1).

Although we can rarely be certain when discussing the circumstances surrounding the composition of medieval texts, all evidence we have for the Auchinleck

---

<sup>132</sup> Evidence from the textual history of the legend, which points to the uniqueness of the Auchinleck presentation, was summarized earlier in this chapter.

Guy and Reinbroun material points to the great likelihood that all of this material was composed (translated) under the same circumstances and connected in some way with the compilation of the Auchinleck Manuscript. The evidence suggests that the state of the Guy and Reinbroun texts in the Auchinleck Manuscript represents a purposeful set of translative revisions, not a set of sloppy accidents due to the limitations of practical circumstances, and the potential rhetorical significance of these revisions deserves serious consideration. The evidence presented in this chapter alters the current state of scholarship on the subject of the production of the Auchinleck Manuscript, returning us to the argument proposed by Loomis years ago. The likelihood is that at least some of the translations in this manuscript were composed as part of a single project and destined for the Auchinleck Manuscript. What characterized this “project,” and what were the rhetorical motivations that drove the translative revisions the texts exhibit?

### Chapter 3

## Reorientation of Text and Reader in *Guy of Warwick* and *Reinbroun*

In chapter two, I presented codicological and textual evidence that strongly suggests that in the Auchinleck Manuscript, the translation of the Anglo-Norman *Gui de Warewic* into Middle English—which takes the form of two texts, the couplet and stanzaic parts of *Guy of Warwick* and *Reinbroun*—was undertaken either by the same person or as a collaborative effort, and was associated with the production of the Auchinleck Manuscript. The argument that these texts represent an original Middle English translation of the Anglo-Norman *Gui de Warewic* opens the door to new questions, posed in this chapter, about the rhetorical motivations that might lie behind some of their unique features. In chapter one, I discussed the expectation of authors, translators, and readers alike that Middle English texts, even translations, should be in dialogue with French language texts, even “originals,” that circulated in the same literary milieu. Given this expectation, this chapter examines the intertextual dialogue between the Anglo-Norman *Gui de Warewic* and the Middle English *Guy of Warwick* and *Reinbroun*. What decisions did the translator make, and what kind of response would the translative revisions have provoked in an audience that was familiar with the Anglo-Norman text? If we view the unusual structural features examined in chapter two as rhetorically motivated translative revisions, what sort of discourse do they generate, and are there other translative revisions that contribute to the same discourse, revealing a unified and consciously enacted rhetorical translation project?

My reading of this material suggests that knowledge of the Anglo-Norman pre-text is a prerequisite to understanding the Middle English translation, and that the revision of the text in the form of translation is itself a rhetorical strategy. The translative revisions are painted in both broad strokes (such as the structural anomalies discussed in the previous chapter) and very localized revisions, creating a set of texts that, for the reader familiar with the Anglo-Norman pre-text, subtly ebbs and flows between similarity and innovation. A metaphor that might be offered for the type of reading that this translation demands is found in the *laissez similaires* of the *chansons de geste*.<sup>1</sup> Here, a *laisse* is retold in what we might view as a form of French-to-French translation, but with small variations which, when read together, offer the reader a richer perspective on the same scene and slight progression of the narrative. The information offered in the first of a series of *laissez similaires* is not displaced by the information in the subsequent *laissez*. But the progression of the narrative is slowed, and the reader is forced to go back in time, to linger on the multiple perspectives presented. The reader must frequently adjust expectations and finally synthesize the accumulation of revised details in the formulation of a more complex appreciation of the moment.

When read through the lens of *Gui de Warewic*, the translative revisions in the narrative of the Auchinleck *Guy of Warwick* and *Reinbroun* create a consistent interrogative pattern, revealing a textual project to reorient the cultural values of the

---

<sup>1</sup> *Chansons de geste* are Old French and Anglo-Norman epic poems, such as the *Song of Roland*. They are composed in stanzas called *laissez* that are united by an assonance or rhyme shared by all the lines of that *laisse*.

reader. The disjunction between the received message of the Anglo-Norman text and the issues posed by the Middle English translative revisions puts productive pressure on conventional ideas, creating a disruptive tension which troubles the reader's cultural assumptions about absolute boundaries, for instance between secular warrior and spiritual crusader, sinner and saint, Christian and Saracen, right and wrong.

The Anglo-Norman *Gui de Warweic* was composed in the very early thirteenth century, right on the heels of the Fourth Crusade.<sup>2</sup> As I discussed in chapter one, the atrocities committed during the Fourth Crusade, especially those against fellow Christians, were condemned by the pope and by many righteous Christians, and the behavior exhibited by the crusaders on this expedition was considered, at the time, a unique aberration. Because of its Eastern setting and Saracen enemies, parts of *Gui de Warewic* evoke contemplation about the crusades in general, and through its major episodes in Constantinople, at the time of its composition it should have evoked contemplation about the Fourth Crusade in particular. During Guy's first adventure in Constantinople, he is supposed to help defend the city from Saracens led by the Sultan of Coyne. Rebecca Wilcox notes that, just as in the Fourth Crusade, Guy's enemy abruptly shifts from Saracen to Greek, and he is "prepared to defect to the infidel camp and attack Constantinople, the very city for which he had recently sacrificed the lives of many of his companions."<sup>3</sup> However, differently from the events of the Fourth Crusade, Guy ultimately fights to save the Greeks, and he rejects the Emperor Ernis's gracious offer of his daughter's hand in marriage. For Wilcox, the Emperor's offer provides for Western Christians a palliative suggestion that Constantinople desires to be given to Westerners, symbolizing a revised and less troublesome view of their actual takeover of Constantinople.<sup>4</sup> Guy's rejection of the offer moreover revises the outcome and provides a happier ending than the historical one.<sup>5</sup> On the contrary, Robert Allen Rouse does not view the text as apologetic at all; instead he argues that "*Guy of Warwick* reads as a reaffirmation of Western military and cultural superiority over the Christians of the East, and Guy's personal rejection of the city acts to condemn further its hybridized cultural status."<sup>6</sup>

Both Wilcox and Rouse are discussing the Middle English *Guy of Warwick* in particular, but all of the textual evidence they present is also found in the Anglo-Norman text, and because of the proximity of that text's date of composition to the Fourth Crusade, their arguments seem equally germane—if not more so—to the Anglo-Norman text.<sup>7</sup> Whether one sees the tone of the Anglo-Norman text vis-à-vis the Fourth Crusade as apologetic, as Wilcox does, or as reaffirming, as Rouse does, both of their arguments suggest that the text presents Guy as an unquestionably exemplary Christian hero.

---

<sup>2</sup> In his edition, Ewert suggests that the Anglo-Norman poem was composed between 1232 and 1242 (Ewert 1933, p. vii). More recent research by Jeanne Wathelet-Willem, Emma Mason, and Judith Weiss dates the poem to before 1215 and possibly even as early as 1204. (See Wathelet-Willem 1975, pp. 512-514; Mason 1984; and Weiss 2007.)

<sup>3</sup> Wilcox 2004, p. 224.

<sup>4</sup> Ibid., pp. 225-6.

<sup>5</sup> Ibid., p. 227.

<sup>6</sup> Rouse 2007, p. 99.

<sup>7</sup> The Middle English translative revisions I discuss below impact Wilcox's argument and suggest that the Middle English text expresses a different view.

Indeed, this is how one would expect to see the hero of an Anglo-Norman *chanson de geste*.<sup>8</sup> However, in chapter one I described the impact on and the reaction of the English to the fact that, as the thirteenth century progressed, the aberration of Christian crusading and violence against fellow Christians in the Fourth Crusade became increasingly matters of concern. After a century of the papacy's sacralization of secular warfare, and with the English barons, at times, on the receiving end of the pope's crusades, literary crusading heroes like Guy take on a different hue. As we shall see below, the translative revisions in the Auchinleck Middle English *Guy of Warwick* and *Reinbroun* put pressure on the notion of the exemplary Christian crusader and trouble the readers' expectations, as the conventional boundaries delineated in the Anglo-Norman text become much more ambiguous and complex.

### **Textual Revisions: Guy of Warwick**

It is frequently recognized that the Middle English translations of *Gui de Warewic* do not diverge significantly from Anglo-Norman examples of the text with respect to plot. Alfred Ewert, editor of the Anglo-Norman *Gui de Warewic*, writes: "les poètes anglais . . . se sont contentés en premier lieu de traduire à peu près littéralement le poème français."<sup>9</sup> Indeed, the language reveals a very close translation, and as Ivana Djordjević has shown, even in areas where the translation seems divergent in comparison to the text presented in Ewert's edition, one may find it to be a close translation of the Anglo-Norman text as it is presented in a different Anglo-Norman manuscript version.<sup>10</sup> Despite the fact that the plot remains largely untouched, however, there are remarkable structural changes represented uniquely in the Auchinleck Manuscript. As I discussed in chapter two, *Guy of Warwick* changes verse form from rhyming couplets to tail-rhyme stanzas part way through the romance, and at that point the hand appears to be different, larger, despite the fact that paleographers agree that the hand does not actually change here, and the text uniquely includes what I have called a bizarre "medial prologue." Additionally, all material about Guy's son, Reinbroun, that is presented in interlace structure in *Gui de Warewic* is "unlaced" from that text, and some of it is "re-laced" into a different area of the Middle English *Guy of Warwick*, while most of it is gathered together to form a separate text, *Reinbroun*. These major revisions combine with more subtle revisions that are also unique to the Auchinleck translation, constructing for the reader an interesting interrogative pattern of revision.<sup>11</sup>

---

<sup>8</sup> Traditionally many of the Anglo-Norman texts in this study are called "romances;" however they seem to have more in common with *chansons de geste*. For example, see Ailes 2008 for a compelling argument that the Anglo-Norman *Boeve de Hauttone* should be considered a *chanson de geste*.

<sup>9</sup> Ewert 1932, p. viii.

<sup>10</sup> See Djordjević 2007. I cite Djordjević's point with caution since, as I explained in chapter one, the trajectory of influence cannot be assumed definitively to be from Anglo-Norman to Middle English when one is comparing the Middle English translation to a roughly contemporaneous Anglo-Norman manuscript version, as Djordjević does.

<sup>11</sup> By "interrogative pattern of revision," I mean here and elsewhere that the translative revisions work together to "interrogate" the ideas and ideals expressed in the source texts. This speaks against the view that the writers of this set of texts were "unoriginal and ungifted" (Loomis 1942, p. 608) or "men of generally humble literary attainments, of no literary ambition" (ibid., p. 607). Only a small handful of other scholars have ascribed intent to the structural revisions of these texts. For instance, Derek Pearsall writes that the divisions show the "intention of making a very long poem more readily digestible" (Pearsall

As I discussed above, the Eastern adventures and Saracen enemies in *Gui de Warewic*—like many Anglo-Norman romances or *chansons de geste*, especially those translated into English in the Auchinleck Manuscript—evoke contemplation about the crusades, about the aesthetics of conversion and Christian piety, and about what characterizes “the enemy.” But whereas the Anglo-Norman text certainly invites contemplation about these issues, the Auchinleck Middle English translation of this material is deeply concerned with them, and its concern is made most explicit through the very method of translation. The Middle English text lingers excessively on the most problematic moments and makes significant translative revisions that reveal that the text is operating in a discursive mode that requires cross-reading. It is in reading the Middle English text through the lens of the Anglo-Norman text that the reader encounters serious questions about these subjects.

The Anglo-Norman reader of the couplet section of the Auchinleck *Guy of Warwick* engages in a very familiar reading experience. Like *Gui de Warewic*, the story is told in rhyming couplets, and the translation seems to be almost a literal rendering of the Anglo-Norman text into English. It is when the reader approaches the abrupt shift to tail-rhyme stanzas, the altered appearance of the hand, and the strange medial prologue that the experience of familiarity quickly turns to disorientation and uncertainty. The formal change near the moment of Guy’s “conversion”<sup>12</sup> disrupts the text and forces the reader to ask productive questions, most notably—both symbolically and practically—“are there two Guys/*Guys* or one?” As we saw in chapter two, the trend in recent scholarship is to view the stanzaic section, with its own unique introduction, as a second *Guy* text that circulated independently and was attached here. The counter-evidence I presented in that chapter strongly argues against this view, but it is admittedly a natural assumption for both a medieval and a modern audience to make. Probably more natural for a medieval audience to consider, however, is the equal possibility that the formal, visual, and textual oddities here signal a crucial symbolic moment for our reading of the translated *Guy* material.<sup>13</sup> These differences require the reader to scrutinize the second

---

1977, p. ix). Proposals like this one seem grounded in the persistent assumption that the audience for Middle English translations of popular literature was an unsophisticated and relatively uneducated one, with the need to have things broken down to a more “manageable” level in translation.

<sup>12</sup> Fewster uses the term “conversion” to discuss Guy’s “conversion to a new awareness of Christianity” (1987, p. 83). Although she provides a nicely nuanced exploration of Guy’s “conversion,” I am using the term in a broader sense than she is, which should become clear as the present discussion progresses.

<sup>13</sup> The proposition that manuscript *mise-en-page* was used as a rhetorical move should not be a wild idea. In his seminal work *From Memory to Written Record*, Clanchy discusses the importance of the visual program and manuscript layout for imparting meaning to medieval readers. See Clanchy 1993, especially pp. 194-195. As a case in point, scholars of medieval English literature are familiar with the graphic tail-rhyme used in manuscripts of Chaucer’s *Sir Thopas*, which generates a joke on tail rhyme romance. “Graphic tail-rhyme” is Purdie’s term. Purdie discusses the tradition of graphic tail-rhyme in manuscripts that pre-date Chaucer and points out that the graphic representation of Chaucer’s *Sir Thopas* is in fact not unique, but that the existence of this tradition makes Chaucer’s joke a “bookish” one (2008, p. 77). Although Purdie argues that this bookish joke is “entirely consistent with the distance that the learned Chaucer tries to put between himself and “Traditional Middle English romance itself” (2008, p. 77), I would counter that the mere fact that this joke is only recognizable by *readers* of Chaucer’s manuscript who also have experience as *readers* of Middle English tail-rhyme romances implies that both Chaucer and his readers are fully engaged with this textual tradition; they do not stand apart from it. Purdie also argues that the fact that graphic tail-rhyme exists in other manuscripts but not in the Auchinleck Manuscript argues

part of the text in relation to the first and in relation to the Anglo-Norman pre-text. We are prompted to ask what else is different, and why. Within a manuscript full of texts which seem to pose questions about the intentions of the crusades, the truthfulness of religious conversion, and the identity of the “other,”<sup>14</sup> the presentation of the Auchinleck Guy and Reinbroun material seems to be a rhetorical strategy that invites some of the same interesting questions.

In the first part of *Guy of Warwick*, Guy travels the West and the East, fighting in tournaments and saving empires from harm. He does all of this to gain the reputation as the best knight in the world so that Felice will marry him, a mere steward’s son. However, after he marries Felice, he confesses that he has done everything for her but nothing at all for God, and he leaves her, on foot, to undertake a penitential pilgrimage, during which he continues to fight, but this time for God. The penitential pilgrimage—during which Guy becomes what I call “pious-crusader Guy” (in contrast to “romance-warrior Guy”)—takes place entirely in the stanzaic part of the Auchinleck *Guy of Warwick*. Most scholars therefore view the stanzaic part as the “pious half.” However, it does not begin with Guy’s repentance and pilgrimage; it begins with Felice’s declaration of love, the crowning achievement of the goal of the activities of the “romance-warrior Guy.” The medial prologue that is added to introduce this part gives no indication that we are entering the text of the pious-crusader Guy. In fact, it merely highlights the strength and fame that Guy spent the first half trying to achieve to impress Felice:

God graunt hem heuen-blis to mede  
 Pat herken to mi romaunce rede  
 Al of a gentil kni3t;  
 Þe best bodi he was at nede  
 Pat euer mi3t bistriden stede  
 & freest founde in fi3t.  
 Þe word of him ful wide it ran  
 Ouer al þis world þe priis he wan,  
 As man most of mi3t.  
 Balder bern was non in bi,  
 His name was hoten sir Gij  
 Of Warwike wise & wi3t.  
 Wi3t he was for soþe to say  
 & holden for priis in eueri play  
 As kni3t of gret bounde.  
 Out of þis lond he went his way  
 Þurth mani diuers cuntray  
 Pat was bi3ond þe see.

---

against the theory that Chaucer may have owned the Auchinleck Manuscript (2008, pp. 77-78). Although I do not think it is necessary to argue that Chaucer owned the Auchinleck Manuscript, it is equally unnecessary to argue that the lack of graphic tail-rhyme in the Auchinleck Manuscript indicates that Chaucer did not own it. Naturally, he could have owned the Auchinleck Manuscript and also been familiar with other manuscripts which include graphic tail-rhyme.

<sup>14</sup> See chapters one and five for further exploration of these issues in the Auchinleck Manuscript.

Seþþen he com into Jnglond  
 & Aþelston þe king he fond  
 Þat was boþe hende & fre.  
 For his loue ich vnderstond  
 He slou3 a dragoun in Norþhumberlond  
 Ful fer in þe norþ cuntre.<sup>15</sup>

The final lines of this prologue remind the reader that this mighty knight's deeds have been motivated by love in an ambiguous line which could be taken to mean that he killed the dragon for the love of King Athelstan, but which more likely refers to his love of Felice. "For his loue" is a key phrase that changes its signification as the romance progresses. In the couplet half, it always signifies Guy's love of Felice, and in the stanzaic half, it appears several times to signify Guy's love of God.<sup>16</sup> Here, in the medial prologue, it is not entirely clear if the phrase refers to Guy's love of King Athelstan or of Felice, but there is no question that it does not yet signify his love of God. Despite the formal revisions that signify a transition in the text, we are not yet presented with the pious and repentant version of Guy which is frequently associated with this part of the romance, an association that is often used to distinguish this section as a text that circulated independently, telling the story of the "pious Guy."

Rather, the reader is presented with 240 lines of stanzaic verse celebrating the union of Guy and Felice—the culmination of the deeds of the knight "most of mi3t" in the couplet half—before Guy ever thinks of God. In this way, the formal revision straddles—and therefore complicates—a boundary between the pre- and post-reform Guy. In the Anglo-Norman text, the boundary is clear: Guy's marriage celebration marks the culmination of his secular heroism, and his oral confession of his sins marks his reformed state, which is followed by a renewed set of adventures fighting Saracens *outramer*. In fact, depending on when in the early thirteenth century the Anglo-Norman text was composed, this structure could be a reflection of formal crusade procedures set forth in the bull *Quia Maior* of 1213 and the decree *Ad Liberandam* of the Fourth Lateran Council in 1213, which officially stated that anyone who confessed sins orally and campaigned in person would have his or her sins forgiven.<sup>17</sup> Using a formal textual marker (the change in verse form), the Middle English translative revisions move the Anglo-Norman text's tidy boundary back. The Middle English translation begins a clearly delineated second "half" of the text with the marriage celebration and introduces it with a newly composed prologue, cited above, which celebrates Guy's adventures for secular fame and love. The character of Guy described in this prologue is not at all consistent with the repentant, pious crusader that he is expected to become, and these translative revisions make the boundary between the pre- and post-reform Guy rather ambiguous and troublesome. As I discussed in detail in chapter one, after a century of the sacralization of secular warfare, by the early fourteenth century, England was particularly affected by a crisis surrounding the motivations behind both the crusades in general and the motivations of individual crusaders specifically. The ambiguity that this

<sup>15</sup> Auchinleck *Guy* II, ll. 6924-48.

<sup>16</sup> See for example *ibid.*, ll. 7219, 7227, and 9319.

<sup>17</sup> Tyerman 2009, p. 481.

Middle English revision emphasizes causes the reader to entertain questions which were pertinent to a fourteenth-century English audience. The unique visual presentation of this “pious” material seems to ask the reader to consider what it looks like to fight for God. Does fighting for the love of God actually look any different from fighting for the love of a woman or love of fame? This is a question concerning the aesthetics of conversion and the motivations behind the crusades. What does Guy’s life look like when he fights in the name of a different ideology? If we tell the same story in a different “form”—that is, a different language, a different verse form, and a different-looking hand—does it become a different story, or is it the same one in a disguise as thinly veiled as (G)Youn’s?<sup>18</sup> The Auchinleck translation formally, visually, and audibly straddles these boundaries. Beginning the “new” *Guy* (the tail-rhyme text) 240 lines before we are introduced to the new Guy (the character), the text retains just enough continuity with the first half of the romance as to suggest that the line between the quest for Felice and the quest for God is not terribly rigid, and the translative revisions presented in the stanzaic section of this text reinforce these questions, creating an intertextual dialogue between the Anglo-Norman and Middle English texts that generates serious questions about the morals and values espoused in the Anglo-Norman text and about fourteenth-century concerns about crusades in general, discussed in chapter one.

As a translation, the entire text operates through a system of multiple associations, and it is especially here—where the formal change and medial prologue suddenly confront the reader with the question of whether or not this is the text with which s/he is familiar—that the only slightly less familiar language and content require the reader to consider carefully the textual nuances. In this second part of the romance, uncertainty and ambiguity are continuously inscribed not only in broad strokes (such as through the formal and structural shifts in the narrative) but also in minute details of articulation, which the formal and structural shift encourages the cross-reader to look for. For example, the Middle English translation ruminates on Guy’s “pryde” and the multiple connotations of that word in English, planting seeds of doubt that Guy’s character in the Middle English translation should be read and understood the same way as his character in the Anglo-Norman text.<sup>19</sup> Carol Fewster examines several puns in *Guy of Warwick* and argues that in this text there is “the possibility of a double reading of any event, sometimes in two opposite directions of signification.”<sup>20</sup> In her discussion of the pun on “pryde,” she quotes the description of Guy in the Cambridge University Library, MS Ff.2.38 text: “That Gye had moche pryde,”<sup>21</sup> and writes that this line suggests a “double value judgement—of prowess and of sin.”<sup>22</sup> Although this pun could potentially be recognized by the most discerning readers in both of the later Middle English manuscript versions, it is there so far removed from the context that it could be merely left over from

---

<sup>18</sup> As I will discuss later, Guy goes by the name “Youn” in the second half, which is merely his own name without the first sound, since he is often called “Guyoun” in the couplet part of the text, from the oblique form of his name in Anglo-Norman.

<sup>19</sup> Interestingly, “pryde” is a very early borrowing into Old English from French, but the pun cannot exist on this word in French.

<sup>20</sup> Fewster 1987, p. 87.

<sup>21</sup> CUL *Guy*, l. 7120. The text in Gonville and Caius College, MS 107/176 states similarly: “Guy was at Warrewik in moche pride” (Caius *Guy*, l. 7390).

<sup>22</sup> Fewster 1987, p. 87.

a translation tradition more akin to that represented by the Auchinleck translation. The Auchinleck translation carries out this pun in an explicit, deliberate, and complex manner. Guy has just been hunting and has had much success and a merry time. In this hunting context, “pryde” clearly connotes prowess. But it is just after this moment that Guy begins to “think ri3t” and contemplate his sins. Fewster’s point is that retrospectively, considering Guy’s later “confession” (that he has done much for love of Felice but nothing for God), “pryde” takes on a different significance. However, in the Auchinleck translation the double reading is unavoidable as soon as the word is encountered. The text first sets up the reader to draw a parallel between Guy and Felice’s past suitors. Not long before the passage in question, Felice’s father asks her: “Why wiltow haue non husband / Þat mi3t þe spouse wiþ pride?”<sup>23</sup> She replies that she will marry Guy, who is described just a few lines down:

Pan was sir Gij of gret renown  
& holden lord of mani a toun  
As prince proude in pride.<sup>24</sup>

The term here links Guy to the past suitors of Felice, where “pride” was unquestionably a positive term, and the description of his great renown clearly provides a positive context for the word here as well. However, the strong alliteration of plosives in the line “As prince proude in pride” invites the reader to take special note of this line and of the connections between the alliterated words. The line ruminates on Guy’s “pride,” as he is described with both its adjectival and its noun form. Doubly “proud,” the immediate context has the disorienting effect of referring to two opposite significations. The comparison to the “prince of pride” is unmistakable here, even though it is unclear at this point why such a comparison would be made. In proposing this obvious double reading before providing an explanation for it, the translation invites readers to scrutinize this version of a familiar text, which proves to be just different enough from the Anglo-Norman text to destabilize readers’ assumptions.

Similarly, the Auchinleck text articulates Guy’s exile in the stanzaic section with a term that highlights the ambiguous nature of his “conversion” to a pious wanderer in the same way that the formal change does. Guy goes into “exile” in the Anglo-Norman text<sup>25</sup> and in the Middle English texts preserved in Cambridge University Library, MS Ff.2.38 and Gonville and Caius College, MS 107/176,<sup>26</sup> but in the Auchinleck translation he uniquely goes on “pilgrimage,” a term which is frequently repeated in this text alone.<sup>27</sup>

---

<sup>23</sup> Auchinleck *Guy* II, ll. 7012-13.

<sup>24</sup> *Ibid.*, ll. 7052-54.

<sup>25</sup> *Gui*, l. 7779. This and all statements about the Anglo-Norman texts and manuscripts are based on Ewert’s edition and variants and on my own examination of the following Anglo-Norman manuscripts: London, British Library, Royal MS 8.F.ix; London, British Library, Additional MS 38662; London, British Library, Harley MS 3775 [frag]; London, College of Arms, Arundel MS 27; and Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, MS français 1669.

<sup>26</sup> CUL *Guy*, l. 7315; Caius *Guy*, l. 7498.

<sup>27</sup> Auchinleck *Guy* II, l. 7349. The Auchinleck text reiterates over and over again that Guy is on “pilgrimage.” (See for example Auchinleck *Guy* II, ll. 7442, 7452, and 8619.) The other Middle English texts and the Anglo-Norman text allude to a pilgrimage by stating in some of these moments that Guy saw

It is well known that the roles “pilgrim” and “crusader” were frequently interchanged, and yet there are obvious and documented problems with associating a peaceful spiritual journey with the ostentatious rampage often associated with crusading,<sup>28</sup> especially by the time of the fourteenth century, when there were serious concerns about the application of crusades to secular warfare against Christians.<sup>29</sup> The choice to call Guy’s journey—in which he engages in the same fighting as in the first half of the text—a “pilgrimage” is suggestive of these problems.

The Anglo-Norman text presents Gui’s exile as a journey in repentance, and some scholars, writing about either the Anglo-Norman or the Middle English versions (which are typically not treated as if they are significantly different), have noted parallels between this text and Chrétien de Troyes’s *Yvain*, arguing for a similar plot structure in addition to several borrowed scenes.<sup>30</sup> Guy’s “confession” does make it tempting to read the second half of this romance like the second half of *Yvain*, where the knight’s adventures become less and less selfishly motivated, and it seems that the audience is meant to recall Yvain’s story while reading Guy’s.<sup>31</sup> The narrator explains Guy’s sorrow: “Mani man he hadde slayn wiþ wrong,”<sup>32</sup> and Guy himself confesses:

Bot wer & wo ichaue don wrou3t  
 & mani a man to grounde ybrou3t,  
 .....  
 Pi loue me haþ so ybounde  
 þat neuer seþþen no dede y gode  
 Bot in wer schadde mannes blode  
 Wiþ mani a griseli wounde.<sup>33</sup>

We certainly expect to see Guy perform deeds of a different nature during his repentance, but in fact, they look just like the adventures he sought in the first half. In both halves Guy sheds men’s blood, fighting giants, Saracens, and other wrongdoers. Indeed in the stanzaic portion, Guy often does these things to help somebody in need, but unlike in *Yvain*, this is also true in the first half. Unlike the knight Yvain, the “honorable” Guy of the second part does not contrast strongly with a notionally “dishonorable” Guy of the first. In fact, if it were not for Guy’s own lament, it might never occur to the reader that

---

holy sites along his journey. In these texts, the meaning is absolutely clear. However, uniquely in the Auchinleck text, the repeated use of the word “pilgrimage” (replacing the explicit information that Guy visited holy sites) adds a level of ambiguity to the work (because of the problems associated with the term, discussed below), which is consistent with other translative revisions in this version as well.

<sup>28</sup> Tyerman discusses these issues in *England and the Crusades* and summarizes: “as some preachers were aware, there was an evident contradiction between the mores of the pilgrim and the knight” (1988, p. 62).

<sup>29</sup> See chapter one for more on this subject.

<sup>30</sup> See especially Richmond 1996, pp. 30-36.

<sup>31</sup> For the original suggestion that Yvain’s adventures progress from selfishly motivated exploits to more altruistic ones, see Duggan 1969, especially pp. 112-123. See Hanna 2005, pp. 109-116 for a discussion of Guy’s intertextual use of *Yvain*, including the interesting point that the audience for the Middle English *Guy* must have been a sophisticated one, familiar with French literary traditions, in order to “get” the use of Chrétien’s work.

<sup>32</sup> Auchinleck *Guy* II, l. 7173.

<sup>33</sup> *Ibid.*, ll. 7182-83, 7205-08.

Guy has acted dishonorably before this moment. Paul Price calls Guy in the first half an “ethical fighter” who is even occasionally a peacemaker, such as when he encouraged a truce between Duke Segyn and Emperor Rayner, and Price also points out several instances that indicate divine approval of Guy’s works in the first section,<sup>34</sup> which makes the reader wonder why his actions must be corrected in the second. The intertextual reference to Chrétien’s text invites the reader to be particularly aware of the differences, or lack thereof, in the nature of Guy’s deeds in both halves of this text.

Because Guy confesses that the particular actions he took were wrong, we expect the nature of his actions to change in the second half. The parallel structure in lines 7269-70 below suggests such a course of action:

For mani a bern & kni3t hardi  
 Ich haue ysleyn sikerly  
 & strued cites fale  
 & for ich haue destrued mankin  
 Y schal walk for mi sinne  
 Barfot bi doun & dale.  
*Pat ich haue wiþ mi bodi wrou3t*  
*Wiþ mi bodi it schal be bou3t*  
 To bote me of þat bale.<sup>35</sup>

Since “*Pat ich haue wiþ mi bodi wrou3t*” refers to the slaying of men and the destruction of cities, we expect that Guy will not slay men while doing penance for that very sin. Yet, he performs again destructive actions like those he claims he is repenting.

It has been suggested that Guy’s odd repentance is merely an excuse for the adventure to continue,<sup>36</sup> and this seems to be a reasonable suggestion for the Anglo-Norman text. However, the formal change presented in the Auchinleck translation invites readers to consider carefully the problems associated with viewing these acts of destruction as acts of repentance for similar deeds. Indeed, the Auchinleck translation alone rewrites Guy’s first fight in the stanzaic section of the romance in such a way as to invite readers to consider this issue carefully.

Only the Auchinleck translation retains an odd connection presented in the Anglo-Norman text, in that it is in his first adventure of Christian repentance—Guy’s fight against the Saracen giant Amoraunt—that Guy adopts the same name that he used in the first part of the text when he disguised himself as a Saracen. There, he dyes his hair and face black in order to break Tirri out of Duke Otoun’s prison. He “performs the Saracen” not only in action and appearance but also in his strategy, using trickery and deception—typically associated with the dishonorable tactics of the Saracens—to accomplish his goal. Before his first fight in the stanzaic section, when the duke asks his name, Guy uses

---

<sup>34</sup> Price 2000, p. 104.

<sup>35</sup> Auchinleck *Guy* II, ll. 7265-71, emphasis mine.

<sup>36</sup> See for example Price 2000, p. 107.

the same one he used in the prison scene: “Yon, men clepet me in mi cuntre.”<sup>37</sup> Both of the later Middle English translations remove this connection either by omitting the name in the prison scene or by omitting it here.<sup>38</sup> The Auchinleck translation instead highlights the problem through its revision of the remainder of the scene, in which ambiguity and uncertainty are inscribed in every detail.

Like the Saracens he has killed and in whose guise he has fought, Guy is guilty of idol-worship. The parallel structure of Guy’s lament to Felice (“Ac for þi loue ich haue al wrou3t / For his loue dede y neuer nou3t”<sup>39</sup>) suggests that Guy’s “sin” has nothing to do with what he did, but rather with why he did it. The lines compare Guy’s love for Felice to his love for God, not in such a way as to highlight its spiritual quality but rather to suggest a heretical type of worship, courtly love as idol-worship. This first battle with Amoraunt (the obvious significance of his name, highlighted in English translation, cannot possibly be ignored) can be seen as a symbolic rejection of fighting “for his love” (of Felice) in favor of fighting “for his love” (that is, God’s love). Once Guy slays the larger-than-life representation of courtly love, Amoraunt, many Christian prisoners are freed.

The Auchinleck text alone presents an odd revision of this scene. Here, Guy not only adopts the same name he used when he disguised himself as a Saracen, but he also fights Amoraunt in the armor of a Saracen. Unlike the scene in the couplet section, Guy does not claim to be a Saracen in his first fight of the second half. However, as in the prison scene, there is nevertheless a disjunction between the representation of his person and his “true” Christian identity, and the Saracen armor in which he fights prompts readers to recall the last time Guy dressed as a Saracen. Although this fight is frequently seen as a clash “characterized not so much as a territorial dispute, but as an ideological battle between right and wrong, between Christian and Muslim,”<sup>40</sup> in the Auchinleck translation these boundaries are profoundly troubled.

Arming scenes in medieval literature are typically fraught with significance and symbolism with respect to building the hero’s identity, and this one is no exception, despite its troubling qualities.<sup>41</sup> For the fight with Amoraunt, Guy is given an assortment of armor worn by famous fighters of the past. In the Anglo-Norman text, the mixture simply places Guy in a long tradition of both pre-Christian and Christian heroes. The first piece belonged to Charlemagne, the next to Alexander, the third to Hector, and the

---

<sup>37</sup> Auchinleck *Guy* II, l. 5798. I take this to be simply a minor spelling variation, as the combination of names is clearly linked in the Anglo-Norman as well (Guiun—Yun—Jun), and had the writers wanted to remove the link, they could have done so more definitively by changing the name entirely.

<sup>38</sup> In the Middle English Cambridge University Library, MS Ff.2.38, the text is corrupt here (though the rhyme and number of syllables missing suggests a vague response, such as “a name, but not the right,” as suggested by Zupitza 1875, p. 168), and elsewhere, when Guy is fighting Amoraunt, the text similarly expresses that the name was not the right one, but does not actually give the name used. In Gonville and Caius College, MS 107/176, there is no name given in this prison scene, and the name given in the fight with Amoraunt is ‘Iohn.’

<sup>39</sup> Auchinleck *Guy* II, ll. 7218-19.

<sup>40</sup> Wilcox 2004, p. 231.

<sup>41</sup> For a discussion of the significance of arming scenes, see Brewer 1997. Brewer mentions that arming scenes typically occur “at the crucial moment in the development of a story,” and the armor takes a symbolic function in the construction of the identity of the hero (p. 179).

last to Darius.<sup>42</sup> However, the Auchinleck writer makes a curious change to this list. The armor of the great Christian hero, Charlemagne, is not represented in the Auchinleck text, and instead Guy fights in the armor of Charlemagne's Saracen enemy, King Clarel, of the Auchinleck text *Otuel*.<sup>43</sup> Judith Weiss has argued that the scene in the Anglo-Norman text is meant to place Guy in the tradition of the Nine Worthies and specifically to compare him with Charlemagne and implicitly with Arthur.<sup>44</sup> Subsequent scholars have viewed the replacement of Charlemagne by Clarel in the Auchinleck translation as a "dilution" of this scene. In the notes to her edition of the stanzaic section of the Auchinleck text, Wiggins notes Weiss's argument and states that the portrayal "has been somewhat weakened in the stanzaic *Guy*"<sup>45</sup> because fewer of the actual Nine Worthies are mentioned. Her only comment about the particular choice to replace Charlemagne with Clarel is to note: "The replacement may suggest an interest in representing warriors from the East or it may represent a particular knowledge of *Otuel* on the part of the redactor or scribe."<sup>46</sup> Rouse has recently added "scribal error" to the possibilities and concludes: "whatever the cause for the dilution of the arming scene, its purpose remains clear: to present Guy as taking on—in a most literal fashion—the mantle and arms of his culture-hero predecessors."<sup>47</sup>

Yet, the choice to represent the Saracen enemy of Charlemagne in place of Charlemagne himself seems far too significant to be an error. On the one hand, one might read this moment, in which Guy fights using his former "Saracen" name and in the armor of a Saracen, as a symbolic moment of "conversion." If the giant Amoraunt represents the notion of courtly love as idol-worship, as I suggest above, then here Guy assumes the image of the idol worshipper smashing his own idols in an act of conversion, thereby freeing Christians, and continuing on a Crusade-like journey of repentance.

On the other hand, reading the translated scene through the Anglo-Norman text reveals that Clarel is not merely an interesting Eastern ruler, but becomes, here, a ruler who dangerously displaces and replaces Charlemagne. This act of replacement is a deeply troubling moment which not only invites the reader to consider whether or not a Saracen is "worthy," but also whether or not he may succeed his enemy, the great Christian Charlemagne whom he replaces in this catalogue of worthies. Further, if

---

<sup>42</sup> *Guy*, ll. 8390, 8405, 8408, 8417. It seems that not every Anglo-Norman manuscript mentions all four of these names (likewise for the other Middle English manuscripts), but since Auchinleck does list all four, with the distinct replacement of Charlemagne by Clarel, the Auchinleck text must be translating from an Anglo-Norman tradition that does include all four names, or the translator is recalling all four from his own prior reading experience.

<sup>43</sup> The translations in Cambridge University Library Ff. 2.38 and Gonville and Caius College, MS 107/176 both retain the names of Alexander and Hector but take out the references to Charlemagne and Darius, simply describing the arms that belonged to them in the Anglo-Norman as great, well-made pieces without offering a genealogy of ownership.

<sup>44</sup> Weiss 2002, pp. 101-02. Weiss does not address the fact that Darius, the enemy of Alexander and not one of the Nine Worthies himself, is also listed here. What is different from the situation with Charlemagne and Clarel, however, is that Darius does not replace his enemy. Further, since tradition has it that Darius granted succession to Alexander at his death, his enduring status as "other" or "enemy" is greatly mitigated.

<sup>45</sup> Wiggins 2004b, p. 139.

<sup>46</sup> Wiggins 2004b, p. 139.

<sup>47</sup> Rouse 2007, p. 106.

originally Guy is meant to be compared most directly with Charlemagne, as Weiss argues, this striking replacement asks the reader familiar with this scene in the Anglo-Norman text to consider here in what ways Guy might be compared more aptly with the Saracen King Clarel than with Charlemagne, on the one hand, or on the other hand, in what ways Charlemagne and King Clarel resemble one another.<sup>48</sup>

In a fight which literary history and the particular history of this text tell us should represent, as Wilcox reads it, “an ideological battle between right and wrong, between Christian and Muslim,”<sup>49</sup> the replacement of Charlemagne’s armor by that of Clarel in fact troubles the boundaries between Christian and Saracen, right and wrong, that were more clearly delineated in the Anglo-Norman text. This rhetorically rich move puts productive pressure on the boundaries of these categories and asks the reader to reconsider these absolutes. While Guy’s first fight of Christian redemption is fought in the armor of a Saracen, the Saracens in this scene who should represent the “non-English, non-Christian Eastern ‘race,’”<sup>50</sup> as Wilcox describes Amoraunt in particular, in fact gain, in the Auchinleck translation, some Western features which further weaken the boundaries we expect to see. In both the Auchinleck translation and the Anglo-Norman text, the fight takes place not in an Eastern landscape, but in a liminal space which is described in terms similar to representations of the Otherworld in the Celtic literature of the British Isles, a distinctly Western tradition.<sup>51</sup> While the familiar landscape of the scene already suggests questions about who and where the “other” is in the Anglo-Norman text, these questions are accentuated in the Auchinleck translation in two additional ways. First, the name of the Saracen King Triamour acquires further Celtic associations because it is also the name of the Welsh king in the unique Auchinleck text *Sir Tristrem*, where, not unlike in *Guy*, King Triamour’s realm is threatened by a giant

---

<sup>48</sup> In the Auchinleck *Otuel*, Charlemagne’s men spare Clarel’s life. Later, Clarel sees one of Charlemagne’s men (Ogger) in trouble and about to die. He tells him that because he, Ogger, spared his life earlier, he will return the favor and send him to his lady to be healed. In the meantime, Clarel comes “in fourme of pees” and tries to convince another of Charlemagne’s men (Otuel, a former Muslim who converted to Christianity) to convert back to Islam. This does not work, so they fight to see whose god is stronger. Otuel kills Clarel. We later learn that Ogger had been imprisoned. Clarel’s motivations and intentions are frequently ambiguous in this text, and his outward appearance is not consistent with his “Saracen” identity. He seems to have the genuine intention to help Ogger in return for the fact that Ogger saved his life, but we learn at the end of the romance that Ogger was imprisoned. Other versions tell us that the imprisonment happened *because* Clarel was killed, while he was well cared for before that point, but because the Auchinleck translation does not include those details, Clarel is painted as a less trustworthy figure in the Auchinleck text. The discrepancy between Guy’s outward appearance or stated intentions and his actual actions is frequently also ambiguous in the Auchinleck texts.

<sup>49</sup> Wilcox 2004, p. 231.

<sup>50</sup> Ibid.

<sup>51</sup> The Anglo-Norman text describes the space:

En un isle, dedenz un pré  
Que fu desuz la cité  
Enclos ert d’une rivere (*Gui*, ll. 8449-51)

The Auchinleck text follows suit, describing the water surrounding this “launde vnder þe cite” (Auchinleck *Guy* II, l. 8071). The translation in Gonville and Caius College, MS 107/176 eliminates the significantly Celtic elements by not mentioning the water at all and by choosing the preposition “with-owte” rather than “under”: “In a feld with-owte the Cyte” (Caius *Guy*, l. 8159). The translation in Cambridge University Library, MS Ff.2.38 retains the island but removes the concept of an Otherworld field.

whom Tristan kills for him.<sup>52</sup> These “foreign enemies,” then, are not only associated with a familiar landscape, but they also speak a familiar language. Until this point in the Auchinleck translation, French lines are reserved only for Felice and her father; however, unique to the Auchinleck translation, these Saracens speak French as well.<sup>53</sup>

The symbolism of this first fight of the “pious” part of the text is troubling in the Auchinleck translation: the Christian wears the armor of a Saracen, the foreign lands resemble territories close to home, and the foreign enemies speak the same language as readers of this very text. Rewriting this scene so as to disrupt the reader’s expectations and disallow clear delineation between traditionally bifurcated categories reaffirms the questions suggested by the formal and structural shift and ambiguous language that open the stanzaic section of the text, and establishes a method for reading the remainder.

Guy sets off for the purpose of a sort of “conversion,” changing his name to “Youn,” a reflection of the thinly veiled nature of his disguise, as it is of course his own name, “Gyoun,” without the “G.” However, “Youn” truly is never able to lose the “G,” and there is constant confusion in the stanzaic section surrounding “Whennes & who was pat man.”<sup>54</sup> The change in verse form, the addition of a medial prologue, and numerous detailed translative revisions cast doubt on Guy’s conversion from a vainglorious warrior fighting for secular gains to a pious crusader fighting for God, and they invite the reader to question the differences between fighting for secular and spiritual gains. The Auchinleck *Guy of Warwick* engages in a cross-lingual, intertextual dialogue with the Anglo-Norman *Gui de Warewic*, troubling the clearly delineated categories that are presented in that text and engaging the audience in an extratextual discourse that resonates with fourteenth-century English malaise about the secular motivations behind the crusades and about finding themselves, at times, in the position of the enemy of the papacy’s crusades.<sup>55</sup> Moreover, the subtle criticism of crusading that is implied by these

---

<sup>52</sup> Triamour also happens to be the name of the Otherworld lady in Marie de France’s *Lanval*, and in turn, Marie de France’s Triamour is given distinctly Saracen characteristics.

<sup>53</sup> The unfortunate situation with Amoraunt occurs when the sultan’s son, Sadok, calls Fabour, King Triamour’s son, names. Uniquely in the Auchinleck translation, this name-calling takes place in French. Sadok calls Fabour a “fiz a putayn” (Auchinleck *Guy* II, l. 7605). Fabour then kills Sadok. The sultan is angry and tells King Triamour that he must fight the giant, Amoraunt. King Triamour has the Christian Earl Jonas and his sons imprisoned as the result of an earlier incident, and he tells Jonas that if he can find somebody to fight the giant Amoraunt for him, he will free him and his sons. Although it later becomes common in Middle English texts to ‘swear’ in French, this tradition must have developed from texts like *Guy*, and it is unlikely that it was already a codified tradition by the time this text was composed.

<sup>54</sup> Auchinleck *Guy* II, l. 8046. As Guy sets off on his journey of repentance, he claims that he will no longer seek renown and will now live unseen by others: “pat whoreso y lye ani3t / Y schal neuer be seyn wiþ si3t / Bi way no bi strete” (Auchinleck *Guy* II, ll. 7230-32). Yet, there is constant confusion in the stanzaic half surrounding “Whennes & who was pat man” (Auchinleck *Guy* II, l. 8046), and onlookers frequently swear that this “Youn” is actually Guy: “On Gij y þenke when ichim se / So douhti he was in fi3t” (Auchinleck *Guy* II, ll. 9211-12). The text draws on the typical “hidden name motif” found in many romances, but usually the hero’s name is not revealed until he has actually rebuilt his identity. On the contrary, Guy is always quick to reveal his name whenever anyone asks for his “real” name. He does not even accomplish his first battle before he reveals his real name to his enemy, Amoraunt (Auchinleck *Guy* II, l. 8415), a detail which would not go unnoticed by a reader familiar with the tradition as it is found in Anglo-Norman and Continental French romances.

<sup>55</sup> On England and the crusades see further chapter one.

interrogative translative revisions prefigures the more overt criticism that a number of later fourteenth-century texts famously express.<sup>56</sup>

### **Textual Revisions: Reinbroun**

As I discussed in detail in chapter two, the text that follows *Guy of Warwick* in the Auchinleck Manuscript was produced by unlacing from the Anglo-Norman *Gui de Warewic* all of the interlaced material concerning Guy's son, Reinbroun, and re-lacing some of it into a different location in *Guy of Warwick* while gathering most of it together to create a separate romance, *Reinbroun*. The translative revisions in this text continue to engage with the questions discussed above.<sup>57</sup> In chapter two, I discussed multiple translative revisions which show how the Auchinleck *Reinbroun* uniquely links Reinbroun to the romance-warrior Guy, as he is characterized in the first half of the Guy material, and effaces any link between him and the more pious-crusader Guy, as he is represented in the stanzaic material (which is the part of the text from which the Reinbroun material is removed). The choice to divorce the Reinbroun material from its association with the "pious" Guy material in the Auchinleck translation emphasizes already-latent commonalities between the "pre-reform" Guy and his son and suggests further complex questions concerning the issues raised in this chapter.

In addition to the numerous details I presented in the last chapter, the Auchinleck translation links Reinbroun to his pre-reform father by giving them and their female companions similar qualities. In the Auchinleck translation, King Argus's daughter resembles Felice in her courtliness, something that is not described in the Anglo-Norman text or in Cambridge University Library, MS Ff.2.38. Reinbroun is also described with the same significant pun discussed earlier with respect to Guy. Like Guy, Reinbroun is called a young knight "wiþ wel meche pride," and this ambiguous description, suggesting both sin and prowess, is unique to the Auchinleck translation.<sup>58</sup> This verbal echo, along

---

<sup>56</sup> As I discuss in chapter one, Gower and Langland provide two later examples of authors who explicitly express such criticism.

<sup>57</sup> As in the case of the stanzaic Guy material, few have considered a rhetorical agenda in the way the Reinbroun material is "unlaced" from the interlace structure in which it is presented in the Anglo-Norman text. Julie Burton is the only person of whom I am aware who has suggested an agenda for this extraction. Arguing for a fairytale structure in *Guy*, she considers the removal of the Reinbroun material a removal of the "clutter," to use her word, of interlace: "The interlace of the other versions is rejected in the Auchinleck in favour of a fairytale, linear structure" (1992, p. 110). However, removing the Reinbroun material from the Guy material does not remove the interlace structure of the romance, which is full of interlace with or without it.

<sup>58</sup> This description appears in a "tag line," and admittedly, the line could either describe the way in which Reinbroun was riding through the woods (if the two lines before form an aside, which they well could), or it could describe the pride with which the king dubbed Reinbroun a knight. The punctuation in the online edition suggests the latter, but the punctuation could easily be changed to suggest the former. Here is the full quotation for reference:

Whan Heraud parseued is  
Be his armes a knew him, iwis,  
And after him he gan ride.  
Ne3 he hadde him ouercome,  
Slawe oþer in þe feld ynome  
In þat ilche tide.  
Panne se3 he come a 3ingling -

with others discussed in chapter two, emphasizes that Reinbroun carries on the legacy of the pre-reform Guy. Yet, as part of the intricate translation and reworking of the material, Reinbroun's story is both divorced from the post-reform Guy material with respect to content and at the same time intimately related to it with respect to form. Just as the formal change in the middle of the Guy material straddles the boundary between pre- and post-reform Guy with respect to content, the Reinbroun material straddles the boundary by sharing the form (tail-rhyme stanzas) of the post-reform Guy material while continuously emphasizing Reinbroun's similarity to his pre-reform father through the content. The ambiguity of Reinbroun's description as a knight full of "pride" provides an apt commentary on this moment of the text, where Reinbroun finds himself fighting *for* the Saracen King Argus (who has sworn to kill all Christians), *against* his own kin, his tutor Heraud.<sup>59</sup> Like the moment in which Guy fights in the armor of a Saracen, this fight and the complex commentary made through the pun encourages the reader again to question received absolutes. Although it is not unheard of for Christians to fight in Saracen armies, this is rarely portrayed in Middle English literature.<sup>60</sup> It is rather frequently portrayed, however, in translations in the Auchinleck Manuscript, in texts which seem to cross and question boundaries and received absolutes.<sup>61</sup> Reinbroun's troublesome identification with the enemy is further explored when he unknowingly fights another of his kin, Heraud's son, who wonders if he is "of fendes come."<sup>62</sup> This troublesome representation harkens to Reinbroun's time fighting for the Saracen king and additionally casts an oddly troubling light on his actual lineage as the son of Guy, who, recall, was linked to the "prince of pride" in the stanzaic section of the Auchinleck *Guy*, just before his "conversion."<sup>63</sup>

Moments like these resonate with fourteenth-century anxieties about the motivations of the crusaders and about the identity of their enemies; these enemies were, by the early fourteenth-century, all too frequently fellow Christians.<sup>64</sup> As I discussed above, Rebecca Wilcox has argued that the Middle English *Guy of Warwick* works to mitigate England's guilt about crusade atrocities, specifically those of the Fourth Crusade. She argues that the text "transforms these culpabilities into redeeming

---

Ouer al þe oþer a mi3te be king -  
 Out of þe wodes side.  
 Þe king him hadde dobbed kni3t,  
 3eue him hors & armes bri3t  
 Wiþ wel meche pride. (Auchinleck *Reinbroun*, ll. 625-36)

<sup>59</sup> The aptness of this description of Reinbroun at this point in the text is what leads me to prefer to read it as a description of the way in which Reinbroun rides through the forest rather than of the way in which he was dubbed a knight.

<sup>60</sup> Wilcox 2004, p. 225.

<sup>61</sup> See chapter five for other examples.

<sup>62</sup> Auchinleck *Reinbroun*, l. 1363.

<sup>63</sup> Note that Reinbroun's association with the devil is also present in the Anglo Norman text (*Guy*, l. 12745). However, it takes on greater significance here because of the particular questions that are lingered on in the Auchinleck translation, and because of Guy's comparison with the "prince of pride" in the stanzaic section of the Auchinleck version.

<sup>64</sup> See chapter one for a discussion about crusades against Christians and the ways in which England was particularly affected by them.

alternative possibilities for remembering the past and for performing the future,”<sup>65</sup> allowing the audience to “come to terms with its difficult past and to imagine a future of Crusading that will not repeat history’s mistakes.”<sup>66</sup> These arguments seem very germane to the Anglo-Norman text, composed right on the heels of the Fourth Crusade. However, the earliest Middle English texts that translate *Gui de Warewic*, the Auchinleck *Guy of Warwick* and *Reinbroun*, were composed after a century of secular crusades against Christians, some against English barons themselves, and they appear in a manuscript that specifically references this context.<sup>67</sup> The translative revisions in these texts reveal an agenda that does not so easily redeem or provide definitive alternative possibilities for the past and the future. Instead, they interrogate the conventional ideas and easy “categories” delineated in the Anglo-Norman text, systematically creating moments of uncertainty and ambiguity. These revisions invite reflection on serious questions about ethnic, cultural, political, and individual identity, the motivations behind the crusades, and the aesthetics of conversion and piety. One absolute (actual history) is not replaced by another (proposed history / future), as is arguably the case in the Anglo-Norman text, but received absolutes are questioned by constantly straddling perceived boundaries.

The new romance of *Reinbroun* formally resembles the post-reform Guy material, but the multilingual cross-reader would notice that it is intricately unlaced and divorced from that material and given its own independent context, while at the same time translative revisions show a concerted effort to turn Reinbroun into a legacy of his pre-reform father. Instead of imagining a future which does not repeat history’s mistakes, this strategy casts doubt on the ability to correct the mistakes of the past and provides a less optimistic view of the future. However, the text does not provide a definitively dismal commentary; Reinbroun is celebrated in the Auchinleck translation and heads back to England, presumably to be received with honor and jubilation as he is in all other extant versions, though we are missing the final leaf in the Auchinleck text.<sup>68</sup> Yet, the explicit choice to link his character to his pre-reform “prince of pride” father in the Auchinleck translation leaves the reader slightly uneasy at the end, a feeling somewhat similar to the mild malaise we feel when the sinful Gawain is received with jubilation at Arthur’s court at the end of *Sir Gawain and the Green Knight*.

## **Conclusion**

As the discussion of late thirteenth-century translation in chapter four will show, the rather literal rendering of a secular Anglo-Norman narrative into Middle English

---

<sup>65</sup> Wilcox 2004, p. 217.

<sup>66</sup> Ibid., p. 223.

<sup>67</sup> See chapter one for further details about this argument.

<sup>68</sup> It is particularly regrettable that this last leaf is missing, as the epilogue would surely be different from what is found in all other extant versions, since it typically focuses on Guy (discussed in chapter two) and would be quite inappropriate as an ending to an independent romance about Reinbroun. The fact that the traditional epilogue was already used to end the stanzaic portion of the Guy material which comes before *Reinbroun* in the manuscript combined with the fact that a new prologue was composed in order to present the Reinbroun material as an independent romance makes it very likely that a new, more fitting epilogue was composed as well, one which may have provided fascinating insight into how the writer(s) may have viewed the changed text.

might have been a literary novelty in the early fourteenth century. The Anglo-Norman reader approaching this Middle English text might have felt a combination of familiarity and uncertainty. It begins in a familiar French verse form (rhyming couplets), a formal resemblance with the Anglo-Norman version of the text, and it seems almost a literal rendition of the familiar text in a different language. Both the medieval reader and the modern scholar are forced to pause, however, when the text shifts in form to tail-rhyme stanzas, still largely recounting the same story but in an unsettlingly different form. Next the reader finds that a portion of the story is missing, but it is not merely abridged, as might have been the case in earlier French-to-English translation (discussed in chapter four); rather it is intricately unlaced and re-laced into different parts of the narrative, and largely retold in a separate text following the one from which it was removed. These broad translative revisions, together with other more localized revisions discussed in this chapter, put the text in an ambiguous and uncertain space which invites—indeed requires—the reader to ask questions.

The infrequent but significant translative revisions create an interrogative mode of cross-lingual discourse between the Anglo-Norman original and the Middle English translation. Translation is inherently a mode which destabilizes norm-governed cultural and linguistic structures; it disrupts, disorients, and reorients. Through the use of this rhetorical mode that itself straddles boundaries and resides in an uncertain space between cultures and times, the Auchinleck translation of *Gui de Warewic* troubles assumptions about the absolute boundaries between “Anglo-Norman” and “English” at the same time that it works to trouble other ideological boundaries presented in the original text. Where the Anglo-Norman *chanson de geste* presents clear and uncomplicated boundaries between the pre-reform and post-reform Guy, secular and spiritual warfare, enemy and ally (heathen Saracen and Christian Crusader), and right and wrong (fighting for God vs. fighting for a woman), the Middle English translative revisions complicate each of these ideas. Guy and Reinbrun progress from uncomplicated Christian heroes in the Anglo-Norman text to complex and ambiguous figures in the Middle English, and the texts become rich sites for the interrogation of ideals that were pertinent to a fourteenth-century English audience, for whom the simpler crusade ideology reflected in the early thirteenth-century *chanson de geste* had developed, after a century that normalized crusades against fellow Christians, into an exceedingly complex, multifaceted, and ambiguous ideology.<sup>69</sup>

Additionally, there is a metonymic relationship between the Anglo-Norman text and the Anglo-Norman reader of the text, in that through its content the Middle English translation proposes a revision of the cultural values presented in the source text at the same time that it—as a translation—performs such a revision on the Anglo-Norman text and requires a revision of the cultural values of the Anglo-Norman readers of the text. The acts of writing and of reading the translation enact the very reorientation of cultural values that is proposed in the narrative itself, compelling the reorientation of the writer and the reader from one cultural and linguistic value system (Anglo-Norman) to another (Middle English).<sup>70</sup>

---

<sup>69</sup> See further chapter one on this context.

<sup>70</sup> This reorientation only happens if the reader is clear that the text is indeed revising something, suggesting that the Anglo-Norman pre-text is integral to the reading of its Middle English translation and

---

that the Anglo-Norman reader is in fact the target audience for the Middle English translation: s/he is the only reader who can recognize the changes.

## Chapter 4

### French-to-English Translation Before the Auchinleck Manuscript

Chapters two and three discussed the method by which the Anglo-Norman *Gui de Warewic* was translated into Middle English and rendered into two romances in the Auchinleck Manuscript, *Guy of Warwick* and *Reinbroun*. When comparing the texts line-by-line, the translation often seems rather literal. However, I have argued that the major structural revisions work together with some minor revisions to create an interrogative pattern that comments on the original text and generates, for the Anglo-Norman cross-reader, a new sense of ambiguity surrounding traditionally bifurcated categories. Although the translative revisions are infrequent, they are significant in that they interrogate some of the values celebrated in the original text and encourage the reader to entertain serious questions that were pertinent to early fourteenth-century political and social concerns.

Is the method and objective of translation in *Guy of Warwick* and *Reinbroun* unique, or did it persist from an earlier tradition? In chapter one I discussed the fact that, before the late thirteenth- and early fourteenth-century proliferation of Middle English translations from popular French language texts, translation was largely reserved for academic and spiritual texts, and usually the translations were from Latin into French or English. The early to mid fourteenth-century Auchinleck Manuscript preserves many of the earliest or sole surviving translations from French language texts into Middle English, and only a very small handful of translations, which are the subject of this chapter, appear in manuscripts that pre-date the Auchinleck Manuscript.

The earliest extant translation into Middle English from a French language text is La3amon's *Brut*, a translation of Wace's *Roman de Brut*. La3amon's text is traditionally dated to the first quarter of the thirteenth century, an anomalous example of French-to-English translation at this point in English literary history. It would be another seventy-five to one hundred years before English would again translate French. The only two manuscripts in which La3amon's *Brut* survives are dated to the late thirteenth century,<sup>1</sup> precisely when the seeds seem to have been sown for the fourteenth-century mass proliferation of Middle English translations of French romances and *chansons de geste*, showcased most prominently in the Auchinleck Manuscript. Besides La3amon's *Brut*, the only French-to-English translations that we can assign to a period before the fourteenth century with a reasonable amount of certainty—because they are preserved in manuscripts dated to the cusp of the fourteenth century—are *King Horn*, *Havelok*, and *Floris and Blancheflour*.

These translations were developed and circulated in the exceedingly multilingual literary milieu I described in chapter one, as their manuscript histories indicate. In chapter one I discussed the example of *King Horn*, a translation of the Anglo-Norman *Roman de Horn*, which was likely composed in the last quarter of the thirteenth century.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> London, British Library, Cotton Otho MS C. xiii and London, British Library, Cotton Caligula MS A. ix.

<sup>2</sup> *King Horn* was once dated to c. 1225, but newer dialect analysis and other evidence proposed by Rosamund Allen, together with the newer dating of Cambridge University Library MS Ff.II.38 to c. 1300 (as opposed to the previously accepted date of c. 1260), puts the composition of the text in the late thirteenth century. See Allen 1998.

It is preserved in London, British Library, Harley MS 2253, the trilingual miscellany from the first half of the fourteenth century discussed extensively in chapter one. It is also preserved, along with *Havelok* (another Middle English translation of Anglo-Norman texts which will be discussed in this chapter), in Oxford, Bodleian Library, Laud Misc. MS 108, which dates to the late thirteenth or the very early fourteenth century. Gisela Guddat-Figge notes French rubrics and other ‘scraps’ of French in the margins of this manuscript and suggests that the English versions of both of these poems were copied in it for a circle of French speakers.<sup>3</sup> The third manuscript that preserves *King Horn* is Cambridge University Library, MS Gg.4.27.2, which dates to the cusp of the fourteenth century. The manuscripts that preserve the Anglo-Norman text, *Roman de Horn*, all date to the thirteenth century, including one set of fragments that dates to the end of the century and possibly overlaps, then, not only with the composition of the Middle English translation but also with two of the three manuscripts that preserve the Middle English text.<sup>4</sup>

*Havelok* is traditionally dated between 1280 and 1290, and G.V. Smithers examines evidence that dates it more specifically to the last decade of the thirteenth century, possibly even later.<sup>5</sup> As mentioned above, *Havelok* is extant, with *King Horn*, in Oxford, Bodleian Library, Laud Misc. MS 108, a manuscript that Guddat-Figge suggests was produced for French speakers.<sup>6</sup> Parts of it are also preserved in Cambridge University Library, Additional MS 4407, a batch of four fragmentary leaves that are dated on palaeographic grounds to the second half of the fourteenth century.<sup>7</sup> Like most of the French language originals of Middle English translations, the anonymous *Lai d’Haveloc* and the story of Havelok in Geoffrey Gaimar’s *Estoire des Engleis* continued to be copied at the same time that the Middle English translation was produced and circulated. The Anglo-Norman *Lai d’Haveloc* is extant in two manuscripts. Coligny-Geneva, Bibliothèque Bodmeriana, MS 82 dates to the late thirteenth or early fourteenth century, and London, College of Arms, Arundel MS XIV dates to the first quarter of the fourteenth century<sup>8</sup> and is one of four copies of Gaimar’s *Estoire des Engleis*, where here Gaimar’s story of Haveloc has been replaced with the *Lai d’Haveloc*. The other three copies of Gaimar’s *Estoire des Engleis*, which include the story of Havelok but not in the

---

<sup>3</sup> Guddat-Figge 1976, p. 11.

<sup>4</sup> The Anglo-Norman *Roman de Horn* is preserved in three manuscripts and two sets of fragments, all dating to the thirteenth century: Oxford, Bodleian Library, Douce MS 132 (mid thirteenth century), Cambridge University Library, MS Ff.6.17 (first half of the thirteenth century), London, British Library Harley MS 527 (mid thirteenth century). The fragments include Cambridge University Library, Additional MS 4407 (late thirteenth century), preserving 21 lines from one leaf and pieces of another, and Cambridge University Library Additional MS 4470 (first half of the thirteenth century), preserving two leaves (discontinuous) with 237 lines and a colophon.

<sup>5</sup> Smithers 1987, pp. lxiv-lxxiii.

<sup>6</sup> See note four above.

<sup>7</sup> For a description of the fragments, see Smithers pp. xiv-xvi.

<sup>8</sup> Dean reports that Arundel XIV dates to the first quarter of the fourteenth century (Dean and Boulton 1999, p. 89), but Bell’s earlier work dated it to the later fourteenth century (Bell 1925, pp. 79-90).

form of a *lai*, are preserved in two late thirteenth-century manuscripts and one early thirteenth-century manuscript.<sup>9</sup>

*Floris and Blauncheflour* is traditionally dated to c. 1250, but nobody has proposed extensive evidence for such a date. Rosamund Allen speculates that this early date was assigned mainly because one of the manuscripts that preserves it (along with *King Horn*), Cambridge University Library, MS Gg.IV.27.2, was once assigned a date as early as 1260; however, it is now generally agreed upon that it dates to c. 1300.<sup>10</sup> Given the fact that translations of French language romances and *chansons de geste* generally did not appear until the end of the thirteenth century, it is more likely that *Floris and Blauncheflour* also dates to this period.

*Floris and Blauncheflour* is preserved in four manuscripts dating from the late thirteenth to the early fifteenth centuries. In addition to the Auchinleck Manuscript and Cambridge University Library, MS Gg.IV.27.2, mentioned above, parts of it are preserved in London, British Library, Cotton Vitellius MS D.iii, also dated to the latter half of the thirteenth century. Only about two hundred lines of *Floris and Blauncheflour* survive in this manuscript since it was badly damaged in a fire in the early eighteenth century; however, it is clear that it was a trilingual codex that preserved texts in English, French, and Latin. Guddat-Figge notes that there are indications that it once also preserved a French language copy of *Amis e Amilun*.<sup>11</sup> The damage to the manuscript makes it impossible to be certain whether these two texts were originally preserved together or were brought together after the medieval period; however, if they were originally preserved together, it would provide more evidence that both French language romances and Middle English translations were produced for and read by the same group. The youngest manuscript that preserves *Floris and Blauncheflour* is London, British Library, Egerton MS 2862, a collection of popular Middle English romances dated to the first half of the fifteenth century, and the only manuscript that preserves the first 366 lines. The French language version of *Floire et Blancheflor* from which the Middle English text was translated is preserved in three complete manuscripts plus one Anglo-Norman fragment which covers approximately half of the story. The Anglo-Norman fragment is dated to the first half of the thirteenth century, and one of the complete manuscripts is dated to the fifteenth century, but two of them date from the late thirteenth century and the fourteenth century, also indicating this text continued to be copied anew during the period that it was translated into Middle English.<sup>12</sup>

Because they are the earliest extant examples of Middle English translation from French language texts—apart from La3amon's anomalous *Brut*—these three translations are potential signals of an emerging *genre* of French-to-English translation, one which grew and developed and became virtually synonymous with Middle English romance. In

---

<sup>9</sup> The two late thirteenth-century manuscripts are Lincoln Cathedral, MS A. 4. 12 and London, British Library, Royal MS 13. A. xxi. The early thirteenth-century manuscript is Durham Cathedral, MS C. iv. 27. They are described in Bell 1925, pp. 79-90.

<sup>10</sup> Allen 1988, pp. 102-103.

<sup>11</sup> Guddat-Figge 1976, p. 180.

<sup>12</sup> The complete manuscripts include Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, MS fr. 375, dated to the end of the thirteenth century; Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, MS fr. 1447, dated to the fourteenth century, and Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, MS fr. 12562, dated to the fifteenth century. The thirteenth-century Anglo-Norman fragment is preserved in Vatican, palat. lat. MS 1971.

this capacity they have much to tell us about what characterizes the earliest stages of the genre, and how later examples of it developed in interesting ways.<sup>13</sup>

*King Horn* and *Havelok* are often discussed together not only because the only manuscript that preserves a complete text of *Havelok* also preserves a copy of *King Horn*, but also because they share similar themes relating to kingship and inheritance. With respect to their translation styles, however, they are very different. *King Horn*, like *Floris and Blancheflour*, abridges the original text significantly, whereas *Havelok* augments the original dramatically. Whether because of significant abridgment or amplification, all of these translations seem more like “retellings” in English, and their method of moving the original texts into Middle English differs significantly from the method exhibited by most of the Auchinleck translations discussed in chapters two, three, and five.

The Anglo-Norman *Roman de Horn*, which might be the earliest romance to celebrate an English hero, was composed c. 1170 by a clerk called “Thomas,”<sup>14</sup> and it may have been based on an English source. Because of the large number of Germanic forms preserved in this Anglo-Norman text, Mildred Pope writes: “It seems . . . highly probable that Thomas made use of a poem written in English.”<sup>15</sup> It is composed of monorhymed alexandrine *laissez* of divergent lengths, and it is 5240 lines long in Pope and Reid’s edition.<sup>16</sup> The Middle English *King Horn* is told in rhyming couplets and can only very loosely be called a “translation,” as it is less than 1/3 the length of the Anglo-Norman text and represents what we might call a “translation-abridgement.” Despite its shorter length, scholars agree that some form of the Anglo-Norman *Roman de Horn* is the source that generated *King Horn*.

The ‘skeleton’ of the story remains virtually identical in both versions. Horn is the strikingly beautiful child of the king of Suddene, whose lands are seized by Saracens. Rather than killing Horn and some of his companions, the Saracen leader puts them on a boat to drift away, hoping they will drown, but they arrive safely in another land where they are well cared for. There, the king’s daughter falls in love with Horn. A traitor tells the king that Horn has been lying with his daughter, and the king banishes him. Horn goes to Ireland, where he assumes a new name and serves another king. When Saracens attack Ireland as well, Horn defeats them and kills the very Saracen who is responsible

---

<sup>13</sup> However, inasmuch as the dating of medieval texts and manuscripts is an inexact science, it must be acknowledged that the appearance of these texts so close to the cusp of the fourteenth century does not make them definitively earlier than some examples of the genre that appear in the Auchinleck Manuscript, where the next earliest of such translations are extant. Additionally, it should be acknowledged that the fragments of *Guy of Warwick* might predate the Auchinleck Manuscript. See chapter two for more information on these fragments.

<sup>14</sup> Susan Crane makes this point in Crane 1986, p. 25. The Anglo-Norman *Roman de Horn* is preserved in three manuscripts and two sets of fragments, all dating to the thirteenth century: Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Douce 132 (mid thirteenth century), Cambridge University Library, MS Ff.6.17 (first half of the thirteenth century), London, British Library MS Harley 527 (mid thirteenth century). The fragments include Cambridge University Library MS Additional 4407 (late thirteenth century), preserving 21 lines from one leaf and pieces of another, and Cambridge University Library MS Additional 4470 (first half of the thirteenth century), preserving two leaves (discontinuous) with 237 lines and a colophon.

<sup>15</sup> Pope 1956, p. 167.

<sup>16</sup> Pope and Reid, ed., 1955. All references from the *Roman de Horn* will be taken from this edition and will be cited by line number as *Roman de Horn*.

for his father's death. Meanwhile, his lover is about to marry another man against her will, and a messenger comes to tell him. Horn arrives at the wedding festivities dressed as a beggar, makes himself known to his lover, and ultimately rescues her. He returns to Suddene, where he wins his father's land from the Saracens and is reunited with his mother. While he is in Suddene, the same traitor who informed the king of Horn's relationship with his daughter takes her against her will and marries her. Horn has a dream which indicates that she is in danger, so he returns to her land and attends the marriage festivities disguised as a minstrel. He rescues her once again, and they end their days together in Suddene.

This short summary could almost serve as a detailed description of the plot of *King Horn*, whereas to provide a detailed description of the *Roman de Horn* would require much more space. The overall impression of the translation strategy in *King Horn* is that details that do not serve to move the plot forward are left out. In fact, the movement into English suggests that it is possible that the translator was merely 'retelling' in English a story he might have known well.

To provide a detailed list of plot elements from the *Roman de Horn* that are left out of *King Horn* would not serve any significant purpose, but a few examples will illustrate the method of translation-abridgement. In a few cases, long sections describing feasts or 'idle time' are left out. The most significant example of this is a scene in the *Roman de Horn* that describes Horn's life at the Irish court. The Irish king's daughter makes several attempts to court him (attempts that resemble those made earlier by Horn's lover), and there is much description of the games and music played (including a *lai* they all knew about Horn's lover). The text describes how Horn is the most excellent at all of the games but that he rarely engages in them since he does not want to show off.<sup>17</sup> Another method of abridgement involves leaving out smaller details from a scene. For example, in the *Roman de Horn*, the king insists he will believe Horn's claim that he did not sleep with his daughter if he will simply take an oath; however, Horn believes it is more honorable to fight than to take an oath, and since the king knows that nobody can beat Horn, he is banished.<sup>18</sup> The text discusses this dilemma at length, emphasizing both the king's desire to believe and retain Horn and Horn's great sense of honor. These kinds of details, however, are not necessary to drive the plot forward, and they are left out of *King Horn*, where the king immediately banishes Horn.

In other cases, details are slightly nuanced so as to move the story along more quickly. For example, in the *Roman de Horn*, when Horn and his companions first arrive in Brittany ("Westernesse" in *King Horn*) they are greeted by the king's seneschal, Herland. They tell Herland who they are and what has happened to them, and he brings them to the king, where they recount their lineage and give more details about their journey. The king distributes the children to his men to raise and protect (Horn goes with Herland).<sup>19</sup> In *King Horn*, the children go directly to the king, Horn briefly tells who he is and what has happened to them, and the king distributes them to his men to raise and

---

<sup>17</sup> *Roman de Horn*, ll. 2399-2904b.

<sup>18</sup> *Ibid.*, ll. 1920-79.

<sup>19</sup> *Ibid.*, ll. 157-368.

protect.<sup>20</sup> Here, in addition to more briefly summarizing the details, *King Horn* changes the person who meets the children, thereby removing the intermediary (Herland) and moving the story along much more quickly, without changing any details that significantly affect the plot.

In a couple of cases there are details in *King Horn* that seem to have been repositioned or added for the purpose of shortening the narrative. For example, whereas we do not find out until the end of the *Roman de Horn* that Horn's mother has survived and has been living in a cave in Suddene,<sup>21</sup> *King Horn* mentions this detail in the beginning of the poem.<sup>22</sup> A longer detail that is added is a speech that Horn gives to his boat once he lands, in which he tells the boat to return to Suddene and inform the pagan king that he is alive and well and will seek revenge.<sup>23</sup> These rare additions do not typically add new information; they merely mention earlier details that are saved for later in the *Roman de Horn*, where they are more thoroughly developed.

Some changes that are more significant still appear to serve the purpose of helping the translator to abridge the material. For example, in *King Horn*, Rimmild requests that the king's steward, Athelbrus, come to her room with Horn because she is ill.<sup>24</sup> The detail that she is ill is added to *King Horn*, but it provides a motive for requesting the seneschal's presence that allows the translator to leave out numerous details from the *Roman de Horn* in which Rimmild flatters the seneschal (Herland, in that text), with gifts and praise in order to convince him to bring Horn to see her.<sup>25</sup> Another change with greater impact is that in *King Horn*, the man Rimmild is supposed to marry in Horn's absence, is explicitly his enemy,<sup>26</sup> whereas in the *Roman de Horn*, he is a distant relative. While this does change the dynamics, it also conveniently serves to eliminate the need for excessive explanation of details regarding the lineage of the two men and regarding how Horn chooses to deal with him after he saves Rimmild from him.

As a result of abridging the *Roman de Horn*, the text of *King Horn* is slightly less nuanced, and the lack of details does occasionally have the effect of oversimplification, making complex issues and characters from the *Roman de Horn* seem more black-and-white in the Middle English text. In fact, these changes most significantly impact the character of Horn himself, whose great warrior qualities are emphasized in *King Horn* much more than the complimentary qualities of modesty, morality, and honor that the *Roman de Horn* emphasizes through many of the details that are removed from *King Horn*. For example, removing the long scene in Ireland described above does not allow the text of *King Horn* to place emphasis on these personal qualities, which seems to be the sole purpose of this scene in the *Roman de Horn*. Similarly, Horn's sense of honor is de-emphasized by abridging the scene with Rimmild's father where in the *Roman de*

---

<sup>20</sup> All references to *King Horn* are from Allen, ed., 1984, and will be cited by line number as *King Horn*. This edition is based on Cambridge University Library, MS Gg.4.27.2. I have, however, compared all three of the extant texts of *King Horn*. Editions of the texts in Oxford, Bodleian Library, Laud Misc, MS 108 and London, British Library, Harleian MS 2253 can be read in Hall 1901. *King Horn*, ll. 159-243.

<sup>21</sup> *Roman de Horn*, ll. 4865-4913.

<sup>22</sup> *King Horn*, ll. 73-82.

<sup>23</sup> *Ibid.*, ll. 140-58.

<sup>24</sup> *Ibid.*, ll. 269-78.

<sup>25</sup> *Roman de Horn*, ll. 484-650.

<sup>26</sup> *King Horn*, l. 972.

*Horn*, he is acting deeply honorably by choosing to be banished rather than swearing an oath, an unfit course of action for the son of a king. Most significantly, in *King Horn*, in order to effect his immediate banishment, Horn seems to have been genuinely caught in Rimmild's arms,<sup>27</sup> despite the somewhat inconsistent fact that at the end of the romance he is able to swear to the king that he has never lain with his daughter (whereas in the *Roman de Horn* it is clear that he is exceedingly chaste). The de-emphasis of Horn's moral character also happens through his much more hasty acceptance of Rimmild's love and gifts in *King Horn* and by the fact that he requests that she use her status to help him become a knight.<sup>28</sup> In the *Roman de Horn*, he does not become a knight through a special request, but because he offers to defend the land from invading Saracens if he is knighted, thus earning the position through his honorable proposal.<sup>29</sup>

The overall sense is that this Middle English text provides the "short version" of a well-known story. Dieter Mehl writes: "[the author] tells practically the same story as Thomas, the author of the Anglo-Norman poem, in only about a quarter of the time. This remarkable abridgement is not achieved by the omission of complete episodes or a drastic simplification of the plot, but by a striking swiftness of narration, a lack of lengthy description or reflection and a very sketchy indication of localities."<sup>30</sup> Susan Crane similarly notes that despite the dramatically different narrative styles, the Anglo-Norman *Roman de Horn* and the Middle English *King Horn* ultimately express the same thing: "That *King Horn* takes on the stances of the *Roman de Horn* is remarkable in view of the two works' vastly different verbal resources."<sup>31</sup> In fact, we might even presume that the audience—a multilingual crowd, as suggested by the manuscript evidence discussed above—could fill in the details.

*King Horn* and *Havelok* not only share one manuscript, but they also share similar themes and are frequently discussed together for those reasons. For example, Crane writes that the Anglo-Norman and Middle English versions of Horn's story "draw on baronial ideals in their exaltation of landed stability, their conservative faith in custom, and their presentation of these values as beneficial to the nation as a whole,"<sup>32</sup> and she writes that *Havelok* and the *Lai d'Haveloc* share the same themes, since they "develop the expulsion-and-return pattern in terms of the wrongful usurpation of inherited rights."<sup>33</sup> The most likely sources of the Middle English *Havelok* are the story about Haveloc found in Geoffrey Gaimar's *Estoire des Engleis* and the anonymous *Lai d'Haveloc*. Gaimar's chronicle has been dated by Ian Short to "the fourteen-month period between March 1136 and April 1137."<sup>34</sup> It opens with an 816-line story about Haveloc, told in octosyllabic lines of rhyming couplets. The *Lai d'Haveloc* is told in the

---

<sup>27</sup> Ibid., ll. 715-16.

<sup>28</sup> Ibid., ll. 439-44.

<sup>29</sup> *Roman de Horn*, ll. 1376-85. The one change here that does not seem necessary for the purpose of abridgement is that the Saracen battle becomes, in *King Horn*, a private event in which Horn stumbles upon the Saracens and defeats them single-handedly, and brings the Saracen king's head to the king (*King Horn*, ll. 601-50).

<sup>30</sup> Mehl 1969, p. 49.

<sup>31</sup> Crane 1986, p. 27.

<sup>32</sup> Ibid., p. 39.

<sup>33</sup> Ibid., pp. 40-50.

<sup>34</sup> Short 1994, p. 340.

same form, in 1112 lines. It was composed between c. 1190 and c. 1220,<sup>35</sup> and it appears to be based directly on Gaimar's text, though some minor details are altered in such a way that the *Lai* feels slightly more 'courtly.'

The Middle English *Havelok* includes details that come from both of these Anglo-Norman sources, and unlike *King Horn* which seems to be a 'translation-abridgement,' *Havelok* is three times the length of either of the Anglo-Norman sources and might be described as a 'translation-amplification.' A generic plot summary that could apply to all three texts follows (though not all texts present the material in the same order): A ruler in England, about to die, entrusts his daughter (AN Argentille; ME Goldeboru, both names having a precious metal as root) and his land to another man until the daughter is old enough to marry. A ruler in Denmark, also about to die, does the same thing since his son, Havelok, is also too young to rule. The person to whom Havelok was entrusted turns out to be a traitor with no intention of giving the land back to him, and he is taken to England and fostered there, where he serves a cook in the household of the man to whom the daughter of the English king was entrusted. When Argentille/Goldeboru is old enough to marry, the English ruler also does not want to give up his land and power. So he marries her to Havelok (who everyone thinks is a common servant) and gives her nothing. Ultimately, she and Havelok return to Denmark and win back his land, and then they return to England and win back her land.

The Middle English translation is an impressively well-crafted story.<sup>36</sup> The text alters the details and the structure of the Anglo-Norman texts so as to emphasize better (in some cases) or newly create (in others) parallelism and symmetry. For example, Mehl observes: "In contrast to the French versions, where Havelok's story is presented on its own and Goldeboru's similar fate is only briefly summarized later, the English poet emphasizes the resemblances by devoting practically the same amount of space to both strands of the narrative. This contributes to the symmetrical structure of the poem: first we are told about Athelwold's death and Godrich's treason, then, in very similar words, about Birkabeyn's death and Godard's crime."<sup>37</sup> Additionally, whereas both Anglo-Norman texts include two different kings in England, one of whom is entrusted with the land and daughter of the other who dies, the Middle English text presents just one king of all of England, who entrusts his land and daughter to a man who becomes a traitor. This new situation directly parallels the situation in Denmark, which is also slightly adjusted from the Anglo-Norman and now presents a king who entrusts his land and son to a man who becomes a traitor. Although in the Anglo-Norman texts, Havelok knows nothing of his royal birth until after he marries Argentille and sets off to find his birthplace, in the Middle English text he is aware all along (which is probably also why the Middle English text uniquely does not give him a second name, Cuaran, by which he goes in the Anglo-Norman texts when he is living as a servant in England). This detail provides a more direct parallel between Goldeboru's experience and Havelok's. The Middle English text also adds a second marker of Havelok's royal birth. In the Anglo-Norman texts as in the Middle English, a light comes from Havelok's mouth when he sleeps. The Middle

---

<sup>35</sup> Ibid., p. 25.

<sup>36</sup> This is frequently noted. For example, Mehl writes that "the whole structure of the poem reveals careful planning and conscious artistry" (Mehl 1969, p. 168).

<sup>37</sup> Ibid., p. 169.

English text adds a unique birthmark to Havelok's shoulder, and the dual markers seem to indicate that he will be king of two realms.<sup>38</sup> Finally, in the Middle English text both traitors are judged and executed at the end,<sup>39</sup> whereas neither one is judged or executed in the two Anglo-Norman texts, where their outcomes are in no way parallel.<sup>40</sup>

Other details in the Middle English translation create dramatic irony, for example when the ruler of her father's lands tells Goldeboru she will marry Havelok, and Goldeboru swears that she will marry only a king or a king's heir.<sup>41</sup> The audience is, of course, aware that Havelok is indeed a king's heir. Some details add pathos and suspense to the story. For example, unique to the Middle English text is the detail that Havelok's caretaker slices the throats of Havelok's two sisters right in front of him, and this information is repeated throughout the romance whenever Havelok tells the story of his childhood.<sup>42</sup> As a small child, Havelok himself is bound and nearly murdered (at the request of the usurper) by the person who decides instead, when he realizes that Havelok is actually the rightful heir of Denmark, to leave Denmark and foster him in England.<sup>43</sup>

It has been suggested that the combination of details taken from Gaimar's version and the *Lai* indicates that there was likely an Anglo-Norman story which already combined those details and was used as a source for the Middle English text: "The only warrantable conclusion from all this is that the author of *Hav.* used a version of the story that was at many points identical with both the AN ones, was very close to them as a whole (if we make due allowance for the substantial and numerous changes that he made), and may well have been written in AN."<sup>44</sup> However, it is also possible, as the same critic notes, that "Gaimar and the *Lai* were his main sources."<sup>45</sup> One reason critics may hypothesize a lost Anglo-Norman source is that when Middle English translations diverge significantly from their source texts, it is usually in the ways discussed above with respect to *King Horn* or below with respect to *Floris and Blancheflour*. Mehl generalizes: "We often find that Middle English romances are considerably shorter than their 'sources' and that this abridgement is not due to the omission of complete episodes or parts of the plot, but to a more concise mode of narration, a much sparser use of description and less reflection. Even in the very long verse novels the increase in size is not achieved by a more leisurely pace or by lengthy description, but simply by an aggregation of more episodes regardless of repetition."<sup>46</sup> *Havelok*, with its beautiful

---

<sup>38</sup> All references to the Middle English *Havelok* are from Smithers, ed., 1987, and will be cited by line number as *Havelok*. An angel interprets these two signs as indicators that he will be king of two realms. *Havelok*, ll. 1270-73.

<sup>39</sup> Godard, the usurper of Havelok's land, is judged and executed in *ibid.*, ll. 2431-2512, as is Godrich, the usurper of Rimmild's land, in *ibid.*, ll. 2783-2838.

<sup>40</sup> However, Havelok kills the Danish traitor in combat in the *Lai d'Havelok*.

<sup>41</sup> *Havelok*, l. 1116.

<sup>42</sup> *Ibid.*, ll. 467-77.

<sup>43</sup> *Ibid.*, ll. 478-586.

<sup>44</sup> Smithers 1987, p. liv. See *ibid.*, pp. liii-lvi for a summary of the details that are drawn from each text and a general discussion of the sources for *Havelok*.

<sup>45</sup> *Ibid.* Smithers continues with yet another possibility: "There is some evidence to show that there was an antecedent ME version" (*Ibid.*). However, Smithers places much more emphasis on the idea of a lost Anglo-Norman antecedent by calling it "the only warrantable conclusion."

<sup>46</sup> Mehl 1969, p. 22.

narrative symmetry and added details that not only describe “daily life”<sup>47</sup> but also increase drama and pathos, does not fit these expectations.

Rather than being concerned with whether or not there is a lost Anglo-Norman or Middle English text between the extant French Havelok stories and the Middle English *Havelok*, Scott Kleinman writes that the wide variation in the many extant versions of the Havelok story suggests that we should view “all the extant versions as participants in a textual community—a body of historiographical materials, many of which were in written form—in which the Havelok story circulated.”<sup>48</sup> Indeed, it is important to note that the story about Havelok was probably a legend that circulated in England even before the time of the Norman Conquest.<sup>49</sup> In fact, Gaimar’s *Estoire des Engleis*, in which the earliest extant version is told, was translated from the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle.<sup>50</sup> As I mentioned earlier, it is also probable that the Anglo-Norman *Roman de Horn*, the earliest extant romance about an English hero, was based on an English source.<sup>51</sup> Although the style of translation differs dramatically between *King Horn* and *Havelok*, both translations take such liberty with their sources that they might be described more accurately as “re-tellings” in English than as “translations.” These methods of rendering a previously circulating Anglo-Norman story into Middle English differ significantly from the method of translation exhibited in most of the Auchinleck translations discussed in chapters two, three, and five. They more clearly translate line-by-line, despite the fact that the translations cannot be described as “slavish,” and they show interesting translative revisions. It is possible that the native English quality of the Horn and Havelok stories explains this difference. Although some of the other Anglo-Norman romances that were translated in the Auchinleck Manuscript are also about English heroes, such as Beves of Hampton and Guy of Warwick, there is no evidence, as far as we know, that these stories circulated in English before they were composed in Anglo-Norman. Perhaps it is the native English quality of the tales about Horn and Havelok that permitted the authors rendering them (back) into English to take control of the narrative in the ways they did. In fact, a similar phenomenon is seen in medieval Welsh translation. In chapter six I discuss the fact that Welsh translations of Old French texts that were themselves based on native Celtic legends exhibit a very free style of translation and could be described, like *King Horn* and *Havelok*, as “re-tellings.” However, when the Welsh translate material that is not based on native Celtic legends, they do so much more literally.<sup>52</sup>

---

<sup>47</sup> Smithers notes that the author of the Middle English text reveals “a relish for the details of daily life within the administrative framework of a community” (Smithers 1987, p. L).

<sup>48</sup> Kleinman 2003, pp. 249-50. Kleinman’s article focuses on the vast range of mainly historiographical materials in which the Havelok story appears.

<sup>49</sup> Kleinman discusses evidence that suggests the pre-Conquest origin of the story in Kleinman 2003, p. 246.

<sup>50</sup> Ian Short writes that Gaimar “follows the annalistic model of a possibly Northern recension of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*” but introduces “a number of narrative interludes from more popular sources” (2009b, p. ix).

<sup>51</sup> See above; see also Pope 1956, p. 167.

<sup>52</sup> As I discuss in chapter six, Annalee Rejhon has proposed that one reason for this difference is that the translations of French texts based on native Celtic material might have been based on oral sources, whereas the Welsh were translating from manuscript exemplars when they worked with the non-native material

Even though both *King Horn* and *Havelok* differ significantly from their Anglo-Norman sources, however, unlike the translations of *Gui de Warewic* discussed in the previous chapters, and also unlike the other Auchinleck translations discussed in chapter five, the translative revisions do not seem to engage with the Anglo-Norman texts in ways that interrogate the ideals expressed in them. Crane's remark about *King Horn* that I quoted above is worth restating here: "That *King Horn* takes on the stances of the *Roman de Horn* is remarkable in view of the two works' vastly different verbal resources."<sup>53</sup> Similarly, although Crane argues that *Havelok* updates some social and legal issues, she sees "nascent suggestions" of the same ideas in the *Lai d'Haveloc*.<sup>54</sup> Despite the aesthetic differences, the Middle English texts reinforce the same messages about law and order and kingship expressed in the Anglo-Norman texts.

*Floris and Blaunche flour* is the only other Middle English translation of a French romance or *chanson de geste*—and the only one not based on a native English legend—that is preserved in manuscripts that pre-date the Auchinleck Manuscript, though it is preserved there as well. In some ways, it exhibits characteristics both of the other Auchinleck translations discussed in this study and of the two discussed above, especially *King Horn*. Like *King Horn*, *Floris and Blaunche flour* abridges its source significantly. However, like many of the other Auchinleck translations, the parts that are included appear to be reworked directly from the French lines of *Floire et Blanchefleur*.

The Old French *Floire et Blanchefleur*, thought to have been composed between 1155 and 1170, is a romance of over 3,000 lines of octosyllabic rhyming couplets. It tells the story of the love between the remarkably beautiful Floire and Blanchefleur, who were conceived and born on the same day and resembled one another very much. Floire was the son of a pagan king from Spain, and Blanchefleur was the daughter of a widowed French Christian girl whom the Spanish king captured from her father on a raid. The girl was pregnant at the time, and the Spanish king gave her to his wife as a servant. As the queen's servant, she raised her child and the queen's as her own. The children did everything together and eventually fell in love. The king, not wanting his son to marry beneath his rank, wanted to have the girl killed. The queen suggested that they send Floire away to be educated instead. Floire was so distraught without Blanchefleur that he refused to eat. So his parents erected a tomb for Blanchefleur and sold her to merchants, then brought Floire home and told him that she had died. He was so distraught that he attempted suicide, so his parents gave in and told him that Blanchefleur was alive and that they had sold her. Floire dressed as a merchant and brought along many goods while he searched for her. He learned that she had been sold to the emir of Babylon and was kept in a tower with a lot of other maidens to serve the emir. Each year, the emir kills his current wife and chooses a new one from among the maidens, and rumor had it that Blanchefleur would be his next choice. Floire befriended the porter who guarded the tower and eventually got him to hide Floire in a basket of flowers so that he could be with Blanchefleur. They were happily reunited and lived hidden in the tower until the emir discovered them. The emir was going to kill them both, but their great beauty and

---

discussed in chapter six. See chapter six and Rejhon 1990. This idea may also apply to the Middle English translations of the Horn and Havelok stories.

<sup>53</sup> Crane 1986, p. 27.

<sup>54</sup> *Ibid.*, 49.

sadness inspired such pity in everyone that he spared their lives and allowed them to marry. All lived happily until Floire got news that his father had died, and he was asked to come home to rule his kingdom. The emir begged him to stay, but Floire returned home, converted to Christianity, forced his whole land to convert as well, and lived out his days together with Blanchefleur there.

The Middle English *Floris and Blaunche flour* is told in rhyming couplets with three or four stresses per line, and it is roughly one third the length of the Old French version it translates (even accounting for the fact that the beginning is lost in all four extant manuscripts).<sup>55</sup> As I mentioned earlier, it is clear that the translator was ‘translating’ in a more traditional sense than is evident in *King Horn* and *Havelok*, since many lines represent direct translation from the French and some even retain the Old French rhyme words. Here is just one example, from a description of the tower where Blanchefleur is being held, that is typical of the translation style. The Old French text reads:

Une escharboucle qui resplent,  
Assis i est par grant conseil;  
La nuit reluit comme soleill.  
N’estuet par nuit a nul garçon  
Porter chandelle ne brandon.<sup>56</sup>

The Middle English text translates:

Þe Pomel þat aboue is leide,  
It is made with mucche pride;  
þat man ne þar in þe Tour berne  
Nouther torcher ne lantern;  
Suche a pommel was þer bygone,  
Hit shyned a nyȝt so doþ þe soone.<sup>57</sup>

The translation is not “slavish,” and the order of the lines is even adjusted, but it is clear that the translator is working directly with the Old French lines. There are no

---

<sup>55</sup> The texts in the four extant manuscripts do not diverge significantly from one another. However, in the introduction to his edition of the romance, Erik Kooper argues that common readings show that the translation in the Auchinleck Manuscript; London, British Library, Cotton Vitellius MS D.iii; and London, British Library, Egerton MS 2862 form a group against Cambridge University Library, MS Gg.iv.27.2. In this manuscript, the plot details are the same, but the vocabulary and phrasing diverge from the others (Kooper 2006).

<sup>56</sup> All citations from the Old French *Floire et Blancheflor* are from Pelan, ed., 1937 and will be cited by line number as *Floire et Blancheflor*. *Floire et Blancheflor*, ll. 1634-38.

<sup>57</sup> All citations from the Middle English *Floris and Blaunche flour* are from Lumby, ed., 1866, from the edition of the text that is preserved in London, British Library, Egerton MS 2862 (also known as the Trentham MS or the Sutherland MS), and will be cited by line number as *Floris and Blaunche flour*. I have compared the texts preserved in all four Middle English manuscript versions. Lumby 1866 includes editions from Cambridge University Library, MS Gg.IV.27.2 and London, British Library, Cotton Vitellius MS D.iii in addition to Egerton MS 2862. The Auchinleck text may be read in Burnley and Wiggins 2003, *Floris and Blaunche flour*. *Floris and Blaunche flour*, ll. 577-82.

interpolations, and as in *King Horn*, the method of abridgement involves simply leaving out moments that are not necessary to move the plot forward. However, the end result indeed gives the Middle English text a different feel.

The Old French text spends many lines describing the details of Blanchefleur's tomb, great feasts, gardens, and other things of this sort, but the Middle English text glosses over these descriptions in just a few lines. Whereas the Old French text consistently reveals the inner turmoil and thoughts of the characters which lead to their subsequent actions, the Middle English text leaves out the thoughts and jumps directly to the actions. Because of the lack of detailed descriptions, some of the symbolism of the story is lost in Middle English. For example, the Old French text weaves rich flower and color symbolism throughout the story, associating Floire with the red rose and Blanchefleur with the white lily; these details are lacking in the Middle English text. Rarely, details are not merely left out but are reworked for the purpose of abridging the text. For example, the Old French text provides numerous details about Floire's interaction with a shipman whose ship he boards to search for Blanchefleur. This whole interaction is glossed over in the Middle English text, but it does include one important aspect of the plot. The Old French text elaborately weaves together Floire's disguise as a merchant with his desire to go to the emir's feast, where he hopes to sell his merchandise and make a profit from the many kings who will be there.<sup>58</sup> The Middle English text reworks this moment so as to include the important details without delving into Floris's long interaction with the shipman by providing instead an omniscient narrative reflection on the fact that Floris had heard about the emir's feast and that in his heart he really wanted to be there in hopes he might see Blanchefleur.<sup>59</sup> Another example of a similar reworking involves conflating two minor characters from the Old French text into one. In the Old French text Floire lodges with a merchant, and following that he meets with a ferryman who tells him that his friend, the toll keeper of a bridge, will be able to advise him about the best way to get to Blanchefleur. He gives him a ring to take to the toll keeper so that he knows that Floire was sent to him by the ferryman.<sup>60</sup> The Middle English text leaves out the ferryman and gives his speech and actions to the merchant instead.<sup>61</sup>

Some critics have argued that the Middle English text reveals a particular agenda through its translative revisions. For example, Kathleen Kelly argues that it places a much greater emphasis on the commoditization of Blanchefleur: "The poet's many references and allusions to literal and metaphorical trades, gifts, rewards, thefts, and merchandise repeatedly point to Blanchefleur's value as a commodity."<sup>62</sup> Indeed the commoditization of Blanchefleur is at stake in both the Old French and the Middle English texts, but it seems to stand out more in the Middle English text because of its lack of emphasis on her corresponding sentimental and symbolic value, which provides a balance

---

<sup>58</sup> *Floire et Blanchefleur*, ll. 1181-91.

<sup>59</sup> *Floris and Blanchefleur*, ll. 439-42.

<sup>60</sup> *Floire et Blanchefleur*, ll. 1362-1412.

<sup>61</sup> *Floris and Blanchefleur*, ll. 499-508.

<sup>62</sup> Kelly 1994, p. 104. Kelly argues that these references are unique to the Middle English translation: "And in practically every instance, these mercantile references are apparently original with the Middle English poet, for they are not found in his French source" (ibid.). My findings differ from hers; more often than not, the references she cites also appear in the Old French text.

to the multiple references to her commercial value in the Old French text. Geraldine Barnes analyzes the Middle English text's emphasis on 'engin' and 'conseil.' She compares the number of times these words appear in the Old French and Middle English texts and also compares the appearance of such words as 'amour' and others which might normally balance out 'engin.' Her numerical analysis supports her argument that there is a greater than proportionally necessary emphasis on 'engin' and 'conseil' in the Middle English text, but she recognizes that this is partially due to the decrease in emphasis on love and sentiment. She concludes, however, that the emphasis on 'engin' and 'conseil' suggests a "distinct structural pattern which points to conscious selectivity rather than lack of sensitivity in [the Middle English poet's] approach to the French. It is clear that what the adaptor has done is to focus his narrative upon certain scenes in his original, notably those consisting of direct speech and concerned with the providing of *conseil* . . . and the exercise of *engin*."<sup>63</sup> Barnes's analysis is convincing, but it is indeed difficult to determine whether the author had the explicit intention of turning the sentimental love story into one that is more about trickery and deception (as Barnes argues), or whether this increased emphasis is merely the unintended result of abridgment. Indeed a majority of the scenes which emphasize 'engin' and 'conseil' are those which propel the action of the plot forward, so it is natural that an abridger who is removing excessive description and sentimentality while retaining the main action of the story would wind up creating a greater emphasis on trickery and plotting. At the same time, enough sentimentality remains in the Middle English text that it does not appear as if it is driven almost exclusively by deception and scheming rather than by the love which drives the Old French text. Regardless of the intention, the translative revisions in *Floris and Blancheflour* do not seem to require cross-reading to understand them, nor do they appear to interrogate and comment upon the ideals expressed in the original text.

In Susan Crane's book, *Insular Romance*, she argues that the Anglo-Norman romances and their Middle English translations were read by the same baronial class, but that the Middle English texts were developed because so many baronial households "were turning from Anglo-Norman bilingualism to English."<sup>64</sup> The linguistic climate I described in chapter one and the particular manuscript evidence for *King Horn*, *Havelok*, and *Floris and Blancheflour*, discussed above, challenge this view. Certainly, English was becoming more common as a mode of communication by the end of the thirteenth century, but as the manuscript evidence indicates, these early translations circulated among French speakers. It is interesting that the earliest extant "translations" are of Anglo-Norman texts that express native English legends. Perhaps it was some sense of English "ownership" over these tales that inspired their translation at a time when English was becoming a more common mode of communication. The diversity of the style of translation exhibited in them suggests that the authors were experimenting with various ways of moving these legends back into English. Appearing back-to-back in the only manuscript that preserves a complete copy of the Middle English *Havelok*, *King Horn* and *Havelok* showcase two native English stories and the rich variety and texture that could characterize their tales in the English language. *Floris and Blancheflour* exhibits yet another method of moving French into English that bridges the gap, in some ways,

---

<sup>63</sup> Barnes 1984, p. 13.

<sup>64</sup> Crane 1986, p. 10.

between the method of abridgement that characterizes *King Horn* and the method of close translation that characterizes many of the other Auchinleck translations.

All three of these early translations are told in rhyming couplets, a form that would eventually come to be used in the composition of roughly a third of the extant corpus of Middle English verse romances.<sup>65</sup> Unlike the later Auchinleck translations, however, these texts really do not evoke their source texts in any significant ways. They do not reflect on their relationship to their sources, something that later becomes common in Middle English translation. They do not announce themselves as translations, which we also see in many later translations. And they cannot in any way be taken for the same text in a different language. Other texts considered in this study—such as *Guy of Warwick* and *Reinbroun*, discussed in the previous chapters, and *Lay le Freine* and *Beves of Hamptoun*, discussed in the next chapter—are so similar to their source texts that modern critics frequently discuss them interchangeably, a strategy nobody would use to discuss these three late thirteenth-century translations.

Despite the many innovations, these texts do not appear to operate in the same discursive mode that the Auchinleck translations discussed in chapters two, three, and five do. There is no indication that knowledge of the French language pre-texts, or familiarity with the topoi used in French romances and *chansons de geste*, is a prerequisite for understanding the nuances of these translations. Comparing them to their pre-texts does not reveal the kind of interrogative translative pattern I identified in the Auchinleck texts that translate *Gui de Warewic*, and the translative revisions do not seem to point to an ideological argument.

The translative revisions in the Auchinleck *Guy of Warwick* and *Reinbroun* indicate that these texts are operating in a discursive mode that speaks through the pre-text and interrogates the ideas and ideals expressed in it. Understanding the interpretive agenda of these translations is a textual endeavor in cross-reading and cross-referencing. The audience for the three texts discussed in this chapter is not necessarily any less capable of this kind of reading, but it does not seem to be required of them. Are the Auchinleck translations of *Gui de Warewic* unique, or do they represent a development in the function of French-to-English translation? The chapter that follows considers this question through a study of four additional translations that appear for the first time in the Auchinleck Manuscript.

---

<sup>65</sup> Purdie notes: “The thirty-six romances written wholly or partially in tail-rhyme account for just over a third of all known Middle English verse romances. Roughly another third are in rhyming couplets of some description, and the final third comprises those in all other verse forms, including alliterative long lines and rhymed or rhymed-alliterative stanzas” (Purdie 2008, p. 1).

## Chapter 5

### Translation in the Auchinleck Manuscript

Chapter four considered the only French-to-English translations that clearly predate those in the Auchinleck Manuscript. The manuscript evidence showed that they circulated in a multilingual reading context, but they did not seem to operate in a discursive mode that requires multilingual cross-reading, nor did the nature of the revisions suggest an ideological argument. Chapters two and three showed that the translative revisions in the Auchinleck *Guy of Warwick* and *Reinbroun* gave rise to an intertextual dialogue with *Gui de Warewic* that places in question the ideas and ideals expressed in that text, and that this dialogue was particularly relevant to early fourteenth-century ideological concerns in England. This chapter explores other translations that appear for the first time in the Auchinleck Manuscript to determine if the discursive mode in *Guy of Warwick* and *Reinbroun* is unique, or if it characterizes translation in this manuscript.

In chapter one, I outlined in detail the multilingual reading milieu in which the Auchinleck Manuscript circulated, despite the fact that it is most famous for being the first virtually monolingual anthology of English texts. Another feature of the manuscript that I discussed there is the large number of the earliest or sole surviving examples of English translations of French language texts. Some of these texts, and all of those discussed in this study, may have been translated in conjunction with the production of the Auchinleck Manuscript. In chapter two, I presented evidence that suggests that the Auchinleck *Guy of Warwick* and *Reinbroun* are original translations. There I also discussed evidence to the effect that *Amis and Amiloun* borrowed lines from the Auchinleck *Guy of Warwick* and that *Horn Childe and Maiden Rimnild* borrowed lines from *Amis and Amiloun*. Below I discuss the sharing of lines between the Auchinleck *Beves* and *Amis and Amiloun*, while *Lay le Freine* shares lines with both of the other lays in the Auchinleck Manuscript.

The act of translation may have been a principal part of the production of the Auchinleck Manuscript, and the proliferation of translations that appear in it for the first time suggests an interest in the symbolic value of translation itself. As I discuss in chapter one, other scholars have identified key issues that appear throughout the texts of the Auchinleck Manuscript, such as the English language and ethnic identity, Christian and Saracen identities, and cultural differentiation. To these concerns, I also added problems related to the sacralization of secular warfare and the papacy's frequent promotion of crusades against Christians, which prompted a serious crisis in cultural, moral, and spiritual values in England and blurred boundaries between traditionally bifurcated categories such as Christian and Saracen, wrong and right, and enemy and ally. Below, I show how an extratextual dialogue about the concerns I discuss in chapter one is generated through translative revisions that put the Middle English texts in conversation with their originals.<sup>1</sup> Translation in the Auchinleck Manuscript is shown to be a

---

<sup>1</sup> Because a dialogue is generated only through reading across different linguistic versions of the text, it should be called also an "intertextual dialogue." I frequently refer to it as an "extratextual dialogue," however, because the ideas that are generated through this intertextual reading are often, in fact, "extratextual" in nature. That is, the intertextual reading generates a commentary about subjects that are

subversive and interrogative mode of discourse that operates between texts and across languages. Mimetically, while the texts interrogate and revise ideological issues depicted in the originals, as translations themselves they participate in an interrogation and revision of the literary landscape of England. It is frequently noted that the period in which the Auchinleck Manuscript was produced “marks the post-Conquest reemergence of English as a prestigious language of literature and historical record.”<sup>2</sup> The translations do not merely reflect this movement; they *produce* it, since the act of reading translations requires the reorientation of the reader from an Anglo-Norman cultural and linguistic value system to a Middle English one. In fact, this is the very subject of the extratextual dialogue produced by the translative revisions in the Middle English *Lay le Freine*, to which I will now turn.

### Lay le Freine

*Lay le Freine* is a short-couplet translation of Marie de France’s twelfth-century *Lai le Fraisne*, and it is extant only in the Auchinleck Manuscript, where the text is incomplete. The lay tells the story of a woman who slanders another woman for giving birth to twins, claiming that in order to have twins she must have slept with two different men. When the slanderer herself gives birth to twins some time later, she decides to save face by sending one of them away. The baby is left in an ash tree near an abbey, so when she is found she is given the name “Freine,” meaning “ash tree” in Old French. Freine is raised by the abbess, and she falls in love with a wealthy man named Guroun, with whom she lives, unwedded, for some time. Guroun’s people want him to marry a woman of known lineage so that he will produce a legitimate heir, so they find a beautiful noblewoman named Le Codre (hazel tree), and Guroun reluctantly agrees to marry her. The incomplete Middle English text ends here, but Marie de France’s text provides the end: While preparing for the wedding, Le Codre’s mother spots a piece of fine cloth that she had wrapped around Freine as a baby. Everyone then realizes that the girls are sisters. Guroun’s marriage to Le Codre is annulled, another husband is found for her, and Freine and Guroun are married.

The *lai* is a genre much more frequently associated with the medieval French literary canon than with the English one, which preserves approximately eight lays, almost half as many as survive in French. However, the earliest extant written examples of the genre, those attributed Marie de France (and which make up roughly half of the surviving *lais* in French), were most likely written in England. In fact, Marie de France’s *oeuvre* as a whole, and the peritextual<sup>3</sup> elements of her *lais* in particular, indicate her

---

not always of primary concern to the plot of the texts themselves, but are of concern, rather, to the cultural and historical milieu in which they circulated.

<sup>2</sup> Calkin 2005, p. 9.

<sup>3</sup> Gérard Genette defines *peritext* as a subcategory of the *paratext*, which itself refers to all elements that surround the main text (e.g., interviews with authors, book covers, prefaces, acknowledgements, dedications, titles, etc.). The *peritext*, according to Genette, refers to those elements of the *paratext* that accompany the text, such as titles, prefaces, chapter titles, etc. (The other subcategory is the *epitext*, which includes paratextual elements that do not accompany the text, such as interviews, conversations, etc.). These terms are explored in depth in Genette 1987, and a reprint of the English translation of the introduction to this work, which defines each of these terms, may be read in Genette and Maclean 1991. In the context of medieval manuscripts, commentary, glosses, manuscript *mise-en-page*, illuminations, etc.

association with the multilingual literary milieu that characterized post-Conquest Britain. The three works for which Marie is known represent four of the principal languages of post-Conquest Britain, since she translated the *Espugatoire* into French from Latin, the *Fables* from English, and the *Lais* from Breton.<sup>4</sup> The prologue to the *lais* situates Marie's project within the context of translation from Latin:

Custume fu as anciëns,  
Ceo testimoine Preciëns,  
Es livres que jadis faiseient  
Assez oscurement diseient  
Pur cels ki a venire esteient  
E ki aprendre les deveient,  
Que peüssent gloser la letre  
E de lur sen le surplus metre.  
Li philesophe le saveient,  
Par els meïsmes l'entendeient,  
Cum plus trespasereit li tens,  
Plus serreient sutil de sens  
E plus se savreient garder  
De ceo qu'i ert, a trespasrer.  
Ki de vice se vult defender,  
Studier deit e entendre  
E grevose oevre comencier;  
Par ceo s'en puet plus esloignier  
E de grant dolur delivrer.  
Pur ceo començai a penser  
D'alkune bon estoire faire  
E de Latin en Romanz traire;  
Mais ne me fust guaires de pris:  
Itant s'en sunt altre entremis.  
Des lais pensai qu'oïz aveie.  
Ne dutai pas, bien le saveie,  
Que pur remembrance les firent  
Des aventures qu'il oïrent  
Cil ki primes les comencierent

---

might be viewed as peritextual elements, and some peritextual elements which are, today, visually separated from the main body of the text (such as titles, dedications, prefaces, notes, translations etc.) were written within the main body of the text in the Middle Ages, usually in prologues and epilogues but sometimes as interjections in the midst of the narrative. Nevertheless, they may be considered peritextual elements, and it is to this sort of apparatus that I refer when I discuss the "peritextual" elements of the lays.

<sup>4</sup> Medieval Breton and Welsh were still mutually intelligible in the twelfth century; on the ease of communications between the Bretons at that time not only with their Welsh-speaking compatriots but their Cornish ones as well see Bromwich 1991, p. 290. Moreover, a large number of Breton lords came to England with William during the Norman Conquest, and after they were rewarded with lands, more Bretons joined them and settled there. Breton families formed part of every English community, and in many, their presence was rather influential. See Loomis 1958, p. 5.

A ki avant les enveierent.<sup>5</sup>

Here she describes translation as a form of *accessus*, an art in which the author may “gloser la letre / e de lur sen le surplus metre.”<sup>6</sup> It makes one virtuous to “estudiër” and “entendre” a “grevose oevre.”<sup>7</sup> This discussion naturally leads Marie to her first idea, to take a story “e de Latin en Romanz traire.”<sup>8</sup> Yet this, she informs us, has been done too many times and will gain her “guaires de pris.”<sup>9</sup> From there, Marie presents the rather avant-garde idea to translate Breton *lais* and subtly implies that the same virtues attributed to translation from Latin may also apply to translation from another vernacular.<sup>10</sup>

As the prologue cited above indicates, Marie is as interested in preserving the past as she is in innovating through vernacular-to-vernacular translation. Likewise, at the same time that she frequently gestures towards the past in her texts by offering an indication of the origin of the *lais*, she also directs the reader’s attention to the present by indicating the ways her French language *lais* might be received in Britain’s multilingual literary milieu. At the beginning of *Aüstic*, she writes:

Une aventure vus dirai,  
dunt li Bretun firent un lai.  
L’Aüstic a nun, ceo m’est vis,  
si l’apelent en lur païs;  
ceo est russignol en Franceis  
e nihtengale en dreit Engleis.<sup>11</sup>

She similarly comments at the end of *Chievrefueil*:

Asez briefment le numerai:  
‘Gotelef’ l’apelent Engleis,  
‘Chievrefueil’ le nument Franceis.<sup>12</sup>

These passages call attention to the ways that the works might be named, discussed, perhaps even translated in three of the living languages of twelfth-century Britain. Together with the general prologue, they imagine and address an audience of Latin,

---

<sup>5</sup> All citations from Marie de France’s *lais* are taken from Harf-Lancner’s reprinting of Karl Warnke’s edition (Harf-Lancner and Warnke 1990) and will be cited by the title of the text and the line numbers from this edition. *Prologue*, ll. 9-38.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*, 15-16.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*, 24-25.

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.*, 30.

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.*, 31.

<sup>10</sup> Similarly, she claims to have translated the *Fables* from English to French: “Pur amur le cunte Willame, / Le plus vaillant de nul realme, / M’entremis de cest livre feire / E de l’engleis en roman z treire.” (Brucker 1991, *Epilogue*, ll. 9-12.) Some scholars question this claim since there is no extant copy of an Old English translation of Aesop’s *Fables*, but it is certainly possible that they were translated under Alfred’s direction, as so many other important Latin works were.

<sup>11</sup> *Aüstic*, ll. 1-6.

<sup>12</sup> *Chievrefueil*, ll. 114-116.

French, Breton, and English readers and speakers, and this inclusiveness suggests that Marie is carefully situating her texts within the literary traditions of Britain, wishing to be viewed not merely as the author from France, but the author from France who can skillfully interact with all of the literary traditions of England.

Marie de France was writing in England in the late twelfth century, during a period that saw a mass proliferation of writing in French (for example the *Roman de Thèbes*, the *Roman d'Enéas*, the *Roman de Troie*, and the *Roman d'Alexandre*) at the same time that Old English texts continued to be disseminated, and new writing in Middle English was just beginning to appear.<sup>13</sup> The references above suggest that part of Marie's imagined audience included English speakers and readers, and indeed, as chapter one described, English speakers and readers increasingly read French texts as the thirteenth century progressed. The virtually monolingual English Auchinleck Manuscript appears at the cusp of a fourteenth-century movement towards the opposite trajectory, in which English writing would become much more common and French speakers and readers would eventually read texts in English rather frequently.

The Auchinleck *Lay le Freine* explicitly interacts with Marie's *oeuvre* of *lais* in order to generate an extratextual dialogue about the subject of multilingualism, and who is reading what, in medieval Britain. Because only readers who are familiar with Marie's *lais* can recognize the dialogue that the translative revisions generate, the Middle English text inscribes in its translation a reflection of a fourteenth-century multilingual, multidirectional reading community that both resembles and revises the twelfth-century community described in Marie de France's texts.

There are very few lays in Middle English, and like tail-rhyme romances, the Auchinleck Manuscript preserves the earliest, or in some cases, the only surviving examples of the genre. Of the eight lays in Middle English, three are preserved in the Auchinleck Manuscript, and the others are preserved in manuscripts that are considerably later.<sup>14</sup> Interestingly, although the Auchinleck Manuscript preserves the earliest extant tail-rhyme romances, all three of the lays that appear in it are written in octosyllabic couplets, whereas most of the lays preserved in much later manuscripts are written in tail-rhyme, such as *Erle of Tolous*, *Sir Launfal*, *Emare*, and *Sir Gowther*. Of these four tail-rhyme lays, three are not thought to have been composed until the fifteenth century.<sup>15</sup> All three couplet lays in the Auchinleck Manuscript may have been translated from French sources, but only the source for *Lay le Freine* survives, and a large number of similar phrases in all three texts suggests that they all may have been composed or translated by the same person.<sup>16</sup>

---

<sup>13</sup> See chapter one for more on this subject. Some Middle English texts that date to the late twelfth century include *Canute Song*, verses of St Godric, *Poema Morale*, *Proverbs of Alfred*, and *The Owl and the Nightingale*.

<sup>14</sup> John Finlayson constructs the corpus with the following eight lays: The Auchinleck Manuscript preserves three: *Lay le Freine* (unique copy), *Sir Degare* (unique copy), and *Sir Orfeo*. The others are Chaucer's *Franklin's Tale*; *The Erl of Tolous*, *Sir Launfal*, *Emare*, and *Sir Gowther*. See Finlayson 1985.

<sup>15</sup> *Sir Launfal* may have been composed earlier.

<sup>16</sup> In his edition of *Sir Orfeo*, A.J. Bliss shows shared lines between *Sir Orfeo* and *Lay le Freine*. See Bliss 1966, pp. xlvi-xlvii. John Finlayson shows shared lines between *Sir Degare* and *Lay le Freine*. See Finlayson 1985, pp. 359-361.

Aside from the newly composed prologue, *Lay le Freine* provides a more-or-less literal rendering of its source.<sup>17</sup> Mainly because the author tells us that “Frain” means “ash” in English, the text is often discussed in the context of a presumed monolingual readership, and in fact the monolingualism of its readership is itself a common subject of scholarship on the text. Comments like the following are frequent: “The translator certainly does not seem to think his audience will be conversant with French,”<sup>18</sup> or “The anonymous poet of *Lay le Freine* does not presume that his audience knows the heroine’s French name means “asche” in English, but rather explicitly defines it.”<sup>19</sup> Scholars also point to the fact that a play on the two sisters’ names in Marie’s text (Fresne, meaning Ash, and Codre, meaning Hazel) does not appear in the Middle English translation.<sup>20</sup> However, a close look at the peritextual elements of *Lay le Freine* shows that the translation addresses a specifically multilingual crowd, and these details actually produce a dialogue *about* multilingualism and multiculturalism in Britain.

The English translation retains the French title, *Lay le Freine*, and including the title itself, it repeats this French phrase three times in the first twenty-four lines and again mid-way through.<sup>21</sup> This self-conscious reflection on the text’s status as a translation draws the reader’s attention back to its original source and turns his awareness outward, away from the apparent monolingualism of the Auchinleck Manuscript and towards the cosmopolitan literary environment in which it operates. The prologue to *Lay le Freine* was newly composed for this translation,<sup>22</sup> and it has already been recognized that it represents a “mosaic” of phrases borrowed from Marie de France’s many prologues and epilogues to her lays.<sup>23</sup> The intricately woven mosaic of intertextual references that span the corpus of Marie’s peritexts puts the Middle English *Lay le Freine* in dialogue with the extratextual literary and cultural matters that Marie presents in her own prologues and epilogues, discussed above.

In the general prologue to her *lais*, Marie presents herself in the privileged position of being able to do something others have not done by writing down (in French or any other language) the Breton lays that make up her collection: “Des lays pensai

---

<sup>17</sup> In addition to the features I will discuss below, there are a number of very minor alterations which seem motivated by literary craft and do not appear to affect the significance of the story. See McCreesh 1999 for a detailed account of them.

<sup>18</sup> McCreesh 1999, p. 388.

<sup>19</sup> Laskaya and Salisbury 1995, p. 8.

<sup>20</sup> See for example McCreesh 1999, p. 388, where she uses this negative evidence to support the claim quoted above, and Rikhardsdottir 2008, p. 160. Rikhardsdottir also writes that the Middle English translator replaces Marie’s play on names with “a comment clarifying the French names: ‘Better than Ash is Hazle y ween! / (For in Romaunce *Le Frain* “ash” is, / And *Le Codre* “hazle,” y-wis)”” (ibid.). However, these lines were actually added hundreds of years later as an amendment to the text by editor Henry William Weber, in an attempt to recreate its missing parts; they do not tell us anything about the medieval readers of the text. See Laskaya and Salisbury 1995, p. 65.

<sup>21</sup> All citations from the Middle English *Lay le Freine* are from Burnley and Wiggins, ed., 2003, *Lay le Freine*, and will be cited by line number as “Auchinleck *Freine*.” After the title position, the name of the lay is repeated at Auchinleck *Freine*, ll. 22, 24, and 235.

<sup>22</sup> In some manuscripts, the same prologue introduces *Sir Orfeo* (though it does not introduce the text preserved in the Auchinleck Manuscript). It was once thought that *Lay le Freine* borrowed the prologue from *Sir Orfeo*, but it is now generally agreed that it was more likely written originally for *Lay le Freine*. See Guillaume 1921 for an early summary of this debate.

<sup>23</sup> Guillaume 1921, pp. 460 and 462.

qu'oïz aveie. / . . . Plusurs en ai oïz conter, / nes vueil laissier ne obliër."<sup>24</sup> The emphasis here is on what she has *heard* told, on the importance of writing down these oral tales so they will not be forgotten, and on the unique position she is in, as she uses the first person to explain twice that she has heard the lays, with the implication that perhaps her imagined audience has not. Marie's place of privilege contrasts with the position of the narrator in the Middle English prologue to *Lay le Freine*, who includes himself in an already established community of *readers* of *lais* with the grand "We" that opens the text:

We redeþ oft & findeþ [ywri]te  
 & þis clerkes wele it wite  
 Layes þat ben in harping<sup>25</sup>

As Marie translated oral Breton tales into written French ones with Britain's multilingual readership in mind, the Middle English *Lay le Freine*, one of the earliest Middle English lays, if not the earliest, indeed addresses that very readership by referring, in English, to the "We" who "oft" find these stories written—in all likelihood in French, since the three Auchinleck lays are the earliest known in Middle English—followed by an intricately woven tapestry of recognizable ideas from Marie's various prologues and epilogues. This "We" to whom the Middle English lay is addressed is not only multilingual ("we" are reading a text in English and are being reminded of the French *lais* we often read), but is also a highly educated and intellectual crowd: 'clerkes' are especially familiar with *lais*, the text tells us. Indeed the Middle English prologue seems to describe the type of crowd Marie anticipated would read her *lais*, since she implies in the prologue cited above that her audience should apply the same rigorous interpretation to them that they would to Latin literature. This simple reference to the familiarity of clerks with written *lais* is yet another invocation of Marie's peritexts.

The Middle English prologue establishes not only a multilingual audience for the translation, but specifically a multilingual cross-reading audience, intimately familiar with the French language source of the text they are about to read. In the final line of this carefully constructed prologue, the text translates the first line of Marie de France's *Lai le Fraisne*: "Le lai del Fraisne vus dirai"<sup>26</sup> becomes "Ichil you telle Lay le Frayn."<sup>27</sup> However, just as soon as the translator delves into the main text, he again departs from it, adopting a strategy from the peritexts of Marie's other *lais*:

Bifel a cas in Breteyne  
 Whereof was made Lay le Frain.  
 In Ingliche for to tellen, ywis,  
 Of an asche for soþe it is.<sup>28</sup>

In a similar reflection, the text later describes the naming of the baby:

<sup>24</sup> *Prologue*, ll. 33, 39-40.

<sup>25</sup> Auchinleck *Freine*, ll. 1-3.

<sup>26</sup> *Le Fraisne*, l. 1.

<sup>27</sup> Auchinleck *Freine*, ll. 22.

<sup>28</sup> *Ibid.*, ll. 23-26.

& for it was in an asche yfounde  
Sche cleped it Frain in þat stounde.  
þe Freyns of þe asche is a freyn  
After þe language of Breteyn;  
Forþe Le Frein men clepeþ þis lay  
More þan asche in ich cuntray.<sup>29</sup>

These lines, as I discussed earlier, are generally interpreted as evidence that the author envisioned an audience that did not know enough French to understand the meaning of “Freine.” I have argued, however, that the prologue describes a specifically multilingual readership. Certainly one simple answer to the conundrum generated by these opposing interpretations is that the argument for a multilingual readership does not rule out the possibility that some of the people who would have encountered this text were not proficient in French. Indeed the linguistic explanations could serve the purpose of instructing a monolingual audience. However, these moments also signal to the multilingual ‘we’ who ‘oft’ read French lays to look, once again, to Marie’s peritextual discourse for an explanation. Above, I discussed the moments in which Marie provides the names of her *lais* in several languages, and I argued that they reflect the multilingual literary milieu in which she imagined her texts would circulate. The Middle English translation of the name *freyn* perfectly imitates Marie’s discourse, and in her texts, this strategy simply cannot be interpreted as an attempt to instruct monolingual readers. In a French language translation of an oral Breton text, there is no practical need to provide the audience with the English word for the title. As part of the Middle English text’s carefully crafted engagement with the discourse of Marie’s peritexts, these translations of Freine’s name signify the text’s role as a contributor to Britain’s multilingual reading milieu, and at the same time, they reverse the conditions of the situation described by Marie de France. That is, whereas Marie seems to reference English speaking readers who will engage with her French language texts, the mimetic linguistic reflections in the Middle English translation seem to reference, rather, French speaking readers (already referenced, as we saw, in the first lines of the prologue) who will engage with this English text. In fact, perhaps it is the French speaking reader who needs to be informed that *freyn* means ‘ash,’ since it is the only word that is not translated as part of the main text.

Through this complex engagement with Marie’s peritextual discourse, the Middle English translation explicitly opens a dialogue with Marie’s texts about translation and multilingualism. Since these are issues that Marie presents throughout her collection, but interestingly, specifically *not* in *Lai le Fraisne*, the Middle English translator’s engagement with them is all the more indicative of a deliberate endeavor to produce a dialogue with her texts, through readers familiar with them, which actively redefines the literary landscape of multilingual Britain that is presented in Marie’s peritexts.

Moreover, the linguistic explanations of the word ‘freine’ may be seen as explicit and self-reflexive demonstrations of translation, mimetic of the entire translative enterprise. Both the text as a whole, and these moments in particular, are easily mistaken

---

<sup>29</sup> Ibid., ll. 229-34.

for means of access to French language and culture for the relatively uneducated. However, many Auchinleck translations hark back to their source texts—for instance by indicating that they are translating them, by transcribing or recomposing lines in French, or by other more subtle indications, which are the subject of this chapter—so as to encourage a dialogue between them. Here, moments of demonstrative translation not only evoke Marie’s collection of *lais*, but they specifically evoke similar moments of demonstrative translation from Marie’s texts that, as I mentioned earlier, cannot be interpreted as tools of access for the relatively uneducated. Through these sophisticated references, the text both reflects and participates in the generation of the fourteenth-century movement towards English language literature discussed in chapter one; it explicitly reverses the terms of multilingual literary engagement in England, effecting the reorientation of the Anglo-Norman reader towards a cultural and linguistic value system that includes Middle English.

This peritextual reflection on multilingualism, multiculturalism, and translation prepares the reader to consider other aspects of the lay within this context. As the linguistic explanations suggest, the Middle English text indicates intimate familiarity with Marie de France’s narrative style. One other discursive practice for which Marie is known, and which is somewhat related to her naming and renaming of the *lais* in several languages, is the multivalence of her language. Howard Bloch discusses the importance of geography and of the multiple significations suggested by some of the place names in Marie’s *lais*. For example, he points out that *Lai le Fraisne* takes place in Dol, signifying in part the sorrow of the situation.<sup>30</sup> The Middle English translation appears to be cognizant of this feature of Marie’s discourse, and in turn it imbues the name “Bretagne” with multiple significations, a strategy that relates to the issues discussed above.

Scholars have noted that the Middle English translation seems to move the setting from Brittany to England. Whereas Marie’s *lai* takes place in “Bretaigne,” and there is no reason to question that this signifies “Brittany,” the Middle English translation ambiguously states: “In þe west cuntre woned tvay kni3tes,”<sup>31</sup> and later it states: “In al Jnglond þer nas non / A fairer maiden þan hye was on.”<sup>32</sup> These two references have led scholars to assume that the setting was moved to England, and that all of the references to “Breteyne” in the Middle English text must therefore signify Britain rather than Brittany.<sup>33</sup> McCreesh goes so far as to state that these two references show that “there is no doubt whatsoever as to the location of the English story or to what the translator means by *Bretayne*.”<sup>34</sup>

Although it might seem like a tidy revision to relocate the text, in English translation, to the land where English is spoken, the signification of “Breteyne” appears to be ambiguous, and its association with both France and England brings a richly

<sup>30</sup> Bloch 2003, p. 53.

<sup>31</sup> Auchinleck *Freine*, ll. 29.

<sup>32</sup> *Ibid.*, ll. 239-40.

<sup>33</sup> See for example McCreesh 1999 and Rikhardsdottir 2008. Both the Anglo-Norman “Bretaigne” and the Middle English “Bretayne” can refer to either Little Britain (i.e., Brittany) or Great Britain. For the Anglo-Norman definition, see the *Anglo-Norman Dictionary*, s.v. “Bretagne,” accessed 29 April 2012: <http://www.anglo-norman.net/> For the Middle English definition, see the *Middle English Dictionary*, s.v. “Britaine,” accessed 29 April 2012: <http://quod.lib.umich.edu/m/med/>

<sup>34</sup> McCreesh 1999, p. 387.

textured perspective to the text's discourse about multiculturalism and multilingualism. The two references cited above indeed suggest that the term might signify Britain in the Middle English translation, but there are several other moments that suggest that it signifies Brittany. One of the most obvious is a line that draws from Marie de France's peritexts to explain that long ago lays were made in Brittany.<sup>35</sup> Nobody familiar with Marie's *lais* (and the Middle English prologue suggests that "we" are indeed familiar with them) would question that the "Breteyne" in which *lais* were produced is indeed what is today called Brittany. After this statement, the Middle English text begins the story: Bifel a cas in Breteyne / Whereof was made Lay le Frain.<sup>36</sup> This is followed closely by the moment in which that same place is called "west cuntre." Certainly Brittany could be considered "west cuntre" in relation to the rest of France, or the text could refer logically to the western part of Brittany itself, where Breton was spoken (as opposed to eastern Brittany, where Gallo was spoken), so this moment does not need to cause any confusion with respect to the signification of "Breteyne." It is the moment in which England is cited specifically that gives scholars reason to question its signification.<sup>37</sup> This reference, "In al Jnglond þer nas non / A fairer maiden þan hye was on,"<sup>38</sup> specifically replaces "Bretaigne" in Marie de France's text: "en Bretaigne ne fu si bele,"<sup>39</sup> and it comes right on the heels of the second instance of demonstrative translation discussed above, where the Middle English text also states that *freyn* is a word from "the language of Breteyn."<sup>40</sup>

Here is where the semiotic slippage that makes the signification of "Breteyne" ambiguous becomes important to the text's discourse on multilingualism and multiculturalism. It is not until the reader encounters the word "Jnglond" that he or she must ask what the text has meant by "Breteyne" all along. The linguistic explanation of *freyn* just a few lines above becomes more complex, since it becomes unclear whether the text means that French is the language of Brittany or of England, and this puts the translation in dialogue with issues pertaining to the interaction between the French language and the "native" literature of two related territories. In the late thirteenth and early fourteenth century, French is only the language of administration and the upper echelons in both Brittany and England, with Breton and English sharing a similar status, perhaps, as the native languages of the populace in each place, whose oral (in the case of Brittany, and perhaps also in the case of England) and written (in the case of England) literary traditions provided a formative influence on the development of literature in the French language, which dominated the written vernacular literary landscape in both places. It is therefore not any more logical to call French "*the* language" of either

---

<sup>35</sup> Auchinleck *Freine*, ll. 13-14. Marie de France also informs her readers that *lais* were made in Brittany. See for instance *Guigemar*, ll. 19-20.

<sup>36</sup> Auchinleck *Freine*, ll. 23-24.

<sup>37</sup> And, if we were to place the setting in England, then "west cuntre" could refer to the borderlands between England and Wales. I thank Joe Duggan for this suggestion (personal communication).

<sup>38</sup> *Ibid.*, ll. 239-40.

<sup>39</sup> *Le Fraisne*, ll. 243.

<sup>40</sup> Auchinleck *Freine*, ll. 232.

Brittany or Britain.<sup>41</sup> This semiotic slippage provides a particularly loaded commentary on the status of French “in ich cuntray.” (In fact, the very mention of “ich cuntray” is suggestive of the dual signification of “Breteyne” here.) At the same time, the translation reorients the reader towards a different cultural and linguistic value system by suggesting a new appellation for the tale, “asche.” The multivalence of “Bretaigne” in the Middle English text reflects the cultural hybridity of translated texts themselves as well as the actual cultural hybridity of the English, whose literary traditions, like many of the people themselves, represented a hybrid mix of English, Celtic, and French.

Howard Bloch writes that *Lai le Fraisne* is “about breaking apart and coming together, about a speech act that rebounds and comes to haunt, about a child who is cast out and returns, about a sister who is cast out and later displaced.”<sup>42</sup> Mimetically, as a translation, the Middle English text departs from Marie’s by transforming it into a different language, but at the same time it repeatedly returns to it, requiring the reader to reference it to generate meaning. In some respects, the re-translation of *Lai le Fraisne*, this time into Middle English, produces exactly the kind of multilingual dialogue about Marie’s texts that she envisioned. It completes the circle of texts from Breton to French to English—the three languages in which Marie names her works—in a sense achieving the “impulse toward wholeness” which Bloch argues is an important feature of her texts.<sup>43</sup>

Whereas Marie’s texts reflect a late twelfth-century multilingual reading milieu, characterized in part by English speakers reading French language texts more often than English ones, the Middle English *Lay le Freine* both reflects and helps to generate a burgeoning fourteenth-century revision of this milieu, in which French speakers will begin to read English texts more frequently than before. The dialogue generated by the translative revisions is as much about multilingualism as it is about multiple cultures and hybrid cultures in Britain and the interactions among them. In chapter one I discuss the fact that scholars have pointed to “English identity” as a unifying theme in many Auchinleck texts, and *Lay le Freine* shows one way in which this theme is explored through the vehicle of translation.

### **Horn Childe and Maiden Rinnild**

Although most of the Auchinleck translations are from French language texts, the position of Celtic cultures in the politics of English identity receives some attention through translative revisions, and this is showcased most prominently in *Horn Childe and Maiden Rinnild*. Like *King Horn*, the Auchinleck *Horn Childe and Maiden Rinnild* presents a significantly abridged version of the Anglo-Norman *Roman de Horn*, but it represents an independent translation that does not derive from *King Horn*.<sup>44</sup> *King Horn*,

---

<sup>41</sup> Note also that in other English lays, including *Sir Degaree*—which as I mentioned above may have been written by the same person who translated *Lay le Freine*—slippage is expressly avoided by calling Brittany “Litel Bretaygne.”

<sup>42</sup> Bloch 2003, p. 79.

<sup>43</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 51. I cannot help but think that Marie would have been deeply satisfied by the complex dialogue between the Middle English text and her own.

<sup>44</sup> See Mills 1988, pp. 44-51. Dieter Mehl notes that at times *Horn Childe and Maiden Rinnild* seems closer to the *Roman de Horn* than *King Horn* does, despite the significant interpolations and other revisions I will discuss below (Mehl 1969, p. 52). See chapter four for a list of the manuscripts in which the *Roman*

discussed in chapter four, abridges the *Roman de Horn* through swift narration and a focus on the events that move the plot forward. *Horn Childe and Maiden Rinnild* abridges the text at times by combining events or by combining the actions and characteristics of several characters into a single character.<sup>45</sup> Along with these carefully considered revisions, there are several significant interpolations and other revisions that invite questions about the cultural identity of the English, Irish, Welsh, and Scots.

Although *King Horn* receives a lot of critical attention, *Horn Childe and Maiden Rinnild* is often seen as an “inferior analogue to *King Horn*,” and consequently, it is “one of the most neglected of all Middle English romances.”<sup>46</sup> However, it is particularly interesting in the context of this study because it represents a second and dramatically different attempt at translating the *Roman de Horn* into Middle English. It aligns itself with the other Auchinleck translations and departs from the earlier translations discussed in chapter four in that it appears to use the technique of translation to generate a dialogue with the original text that comments upon ideological issues of concern to an early fourteenth-century audience.

One of the political backdrops Siobhain Calkin identified as important to the issue of English identity in the Auchinleck Manuscript is England’s frequent efforts to subject Wales and Scotland to English rule. She reminds us that “Edward I campaigned against the Welsh in 1276-77 and 1282-83, and Welsh uprisings were put down by English forces in 1287, 1294-95, and 1316. Similarly, English relations with Scotland consisted of protracted wars from 1296-1328, and from 1333-57.”<sup>47</sup> Calkin argues that these efforts “posed questions about the desirability and possibility of integrating different peoples”<sup>48</sup> around the time of the Auchinleck’s compilation, and she suggests that one issue that was at stake was “whether the Welsh and Scots could, in some way, be made ‘English’ by their subjugation to an English king.”<sup>49</sup> Calkin does not study *Horn Childe and Maiden Rinnild* in particular, but Matthew Holford has identified Edward I’s conquests, and the collapse of English power in Britain in the 1310’s, as important issues to which this text responds, and he argues that the text works in a similar fashion to the Auchinleck Manuscript’s only chronicle, the *Liber Regum Anglie*, which “gives particular attention to the historic basis for Edward I’s conquests. . . . English dominance in Britain can be justified because it extends back to the very foundation of the English kingdom.”<sup>50</sup>

There is no question that the subject of the unification of Britain, and England’s historical and contemporary position in that conception, is explored through the translative revisions in *Horn Childe and Maiden Rinnild*. One of the most significant revisions is that the text turns the ambiguous and meandering landscape of the *Roman de Horn* into a decidedly and entirely British landscape, and it even adds an interpolation that involves Horn’s journey into Wales to complete the picture. Calkin argues that the

---

*de Horn* is extant. As noted above, *Horn Childe and Maiden Rinnild* is extant only in the Auchinleck Manuscript, where 1136 lines are preserved, and the final folio is missing.

<sup>45</sup> Maldwyn Mills gives several detailed examples of this strategy in the introduction to his edition of the text. See Mills 1988, pp. 44-68.

<sup>46</sup> Holford 2006, p. 149.

<sup>47</sup> Calkin 2005, p. 101.

<sup>48</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 97.

<sup>49</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 9.

<sup>50</sup> Holford 2006, p. 159.

Auchinleck Manuscript considers how Celtic people can be “made English,” and Holford argues that this particular text represents an idealized picture of a unified Britain under English rule.<sup>51</sup> But from what perspective are these issues explored in *Horn Childe and Maiden Rimnild*? Both Holford and Calkin view the issue from the perspective of the English wishing to conquer Wales, Scotland, and Ireland.<sup>52</sup> In addition to these political endeavors, it is important to remember the cultural hybridity that characterized the “English” people, especially on the borders with their Celtic neighbors. The intermingling of Celtic and English cultures, sometimes even in military efforts both for and against the English Crown, also plays an important role in the treatment of this translation, which I will discuss in greater detail below.<sup>53</sup> The translative revisions in *Horn Childe and Maiden Rimnild* reflect the complications involved in the political and cultural relations between England and its Celtic neighbors and suggest an interesting sense of cultural unity that does not neatly reflect attempts to make the Celts “English,” but rather refigures a conception of “English” that incorporates “Celtic.” Moreover, the complexity of this hybrid formulation of “Englishness” is reflected by the fact that in order to effect an extratextual conversation on this subject, the Middle English translation requires a reader who is able to triangulate knowledge of English, Celtic, and Anglo-Norman literary traditions.

As I mentioned above, one of the most significant revisions in *Horn Childe and Maiden Rimnild* is that it transforms the ambiguous landscape of the *Roman de Horn* into a specifically and comprehensively British one. The text begins with the familiar idea of a vague, ill-defined landscape, since the first sentence of the newly composed prologue presents the setting in inexact terms:

Mi leue frende dere,  
Herken & 3e may here  
& 3e wil vnderstonde,  
Stories 3e may lere  
Of our elders þat were  
Whilom in þis lond.<sup>54</sup>

The vague reference to “þis lond” evokes the ambiguous landscape of the source text, but the reader’s expectations are challenged as the landscape is immediately given what appears to be a precise definition in the following sentence, ‘Ingelond’:

---

<sup>51</sup> Because Horn not only reacquires his rightful inheritance but also acquires new lands in Ireland and England, and because he successively proves his knightly superiority in England, Wales, and Ireland, Holford associates the romance with English imperial ambitions and sees the reshaping of the narrative as an idealized response to the crisis of Edward II’s rule. See Holford 2006.

<sup>52</sup> Ireland plays a significant role in this text, and as Holford notes, “Edward [I] could—and did—claim, by the beginning of the fourteenth century, lordship of England, Ireland, Wales, and Scotland” (Holford 2006, p. 160).

<sup>53</sup> See below and also chapters one and six for more on English-Welsh relations.

<sup>54</sup> All citations from the Middle English *Horn Childe and Maiden Rimnild* will be taken from Burnley and Wiggins, ed., 2003, *Horn Childe and Maiden Rimnild*, and will be cited by line number as “*Horn Childe*.” *Horn Childe*, ll. 1-6.

Y wil 3ou telle of kinges tvo –  
 Hende Hapeolf was on of þo –  
 Þat weld al Ingelond;  
 Fram Humber norþ þan walt he,  
 Þat was into þe Wan See,  
 Into his owhen hond.<sup>55</sup>

How is the territory of England defined here, and why is this important? The translation adds great specificity to the text and names all of the territories of the British Isles—England, Ireland, and Wales—except Scotland, and this lack poses a problem for the argument that the text engages with issues of English sovereignty in the British Isles, since the incorporation of Scotland was a significant aspect of England’s efforts to subject its Celtic neighbors to its rule.<sup>56</sup> “Wan See” is typically interpreted as the Firth of Forth because it could be a translation of the Scandinavian name for the place, “Myrcforth.”<sup>57</sup> Indeed in the tenth century, when “England” was first moving towards a model of a single kingship which controlled all of Britain, the Firth of Forth was the northern limit of the territory of Northumbria. However, this identification still poses a problem, since Scotland is still missing from the otherwise comprehensive British landscape depicted by the translative revisions. If we presume instead that “wan see” does not need to be decoded through the translation of a Scandinavian name, but rather means just what it says, “dark sea,” this would extend Hapeolf’s kingdom throughout all of Scotland. In fact, this line’s intertextual reference to La3amon’s *Brut* supports this interpretation. La3amon describes the lands held by Brenne as extending from the Humber north into the sea (i.e., incorporating all of Scotland):

Belin 3ef his leue broþer    anne dal of his londe  
 bi3ende þer Humbre    mid monscipe to halden,  
 norð into þare sae,    sel þat heo iworðe.<sup>58</sup>

Beginning *Horn Childe and Maiden Rimnild* with a description of an “Ingelond” divided into two territories, shared by two kings, that resemble the territories of Britain ruled by Brenne and Belin is significant because it contextualizes the Middle English translation in the mythological history of Britain as a united realm. Through its telling and retellings in many of the languages of Britain, this is an historical myth that is culturally rich and

---

<sup>55</sup> *Horn Childe*, ll. 7-12.

<sup>56</sup> Holford suggests that this lack could be a reflection of Scottish rebellion against England in the early fourteenth century, ultimately leading to the loss of the territory (Holford 2006, p. 162). However, he also sees the text as an idealized vision of efforts to create a unified Britain under English rule, so a realistic reflection of the loss of Scotland doesn’t seem to fit with the program of the text. Moreover, one cannot argue that Wales and Ireland were completely content and complacent under English rule, yet their lands are incorporated into the unified vision the text presents.

<sup>57</sup> William Henry Schofield proposed this identification in Schofield 1903, p 69, and it has been accepted since then.

<sup>58</sup> This quotation is taken from the text edited by Barron and Weinberg 1995, ll. 2143-45. See Mills 1988, p. 188 for other references to La3amon’s text that he identifies. Mills notes this reference to La3amon but nevertheless identifies the ‘Wan See’ in his glossary as referring to the Firth of Forth.

evokes in its very reference the blend of cultures that make up the British Isles. (Here, specifically, the Britain held by Brenne and Belin is collapsed with “al Ingelond.”) Yet, at the same time that *Horn Childe and Maiden Rimnild* seems concerned with defining various territories that were ambiguous in the source text and seems to calque “Ingelond” onto a territory describing much of Britain, it also presents a sense of unity among those territories that seems more communal than political, as I will describe below. Certainly, the translative revisions suggest that this text is concerned with British and English identity and relations in a way that the *Roman de Horn* and *King Horn* are not.

*Horn Childe and Maiden Rimnild* includes a major interpolation that adds to Horn’s adventures through the British Isles a journey into Wales. This is an interpolation that would have stood out, since it is quite uncommon for Wales to appear as a setting in Middle English texts.<sup>59</sup> One function of this episode is that it serves the textual program to define and categorize, in an all-British context, the ambiguous landscape of the *Roman de Horn*.<sup>60</sup> It also serves to bring to the fore challenging questions about the political and cultural position of Wales in the context of English imperialism. Meecham-Jones has argued that the absence of Wales in most Middle English literature represents a “semiconscious policy of cultural erasure, through which challenging questions about the legality and legitimacy of English intervention in Wales were evaded by the inability of English writers to acknowledge the cultural separateness and independence of Welsh cultural and political structures without seeming to challenge the political discourses of authority and racial inferiority.”<sup>61</sup> Conversely, the revision of the landscape of the *Roman de Horn* to include Wales challenges the dominant discourse of English authority and superiority over the region and its people, and as we shall see, other translative revisions support the text’s program to draw attention to the political and cultural challenges of English and Celtic relations as well as to incorporate Celtic cultures in the discourse of “Englishness.”

The desire to incorporate Celtic lands into the English polity brought with it competing ideas. On the one hand, it was useful to consider the historical unity of Britain, as *Horn Childe and Maiden Rimnild* arguably does by adding a prologue that contextualizes it in the mythological history of the land. This strategy focuses on the shared history of the English and their Celtic neighbors. On the other hand, despite a shared history and, in some aspects, a shared culture, incorporating Celtic lands officially into the English polity also requires the English to make war on the Celtic peoples and consider them “the enemy.” Calkin notes: “Descriptions of the Scots in the early 1300s . . . slipped rhetorically between claims that they were recalcitrant members of the English polity and appeals to make war on them because they were so culturally different from the English.”<sup>62</sup> A similar situation is seen in English-Welsh relations, arguably a

---

<sup>59</sup> Davenport (2008) discusses the rarity of Wales as a setting in Middle English texts. I would add to Davenport’s points that most of the Middle English texts that do include Wales as a setting are translated from French language texts that already featured Wales. The fact that the Middle English *Horn Childe and Maiden Rimnild* departs from its French source to include Wales makes it strikingly unique.

<sup>60</sup> *Horn Childe and Maiden Rimnild* also alters names from the *Roman de Horn* in order to accomplish this goal. Note that the landscape of *King Horn* similarly contains mythic elements.

<sup>61</sup> Meecham-Jones 2008a, p. 5. *Sir Gawain and the Green Knight*, which includes Gawain’s journey into Wales, is of course one striking exception, which Meecham-Jones notes (p. 33).

<sup>62</sup> Calkin 2005, p. 101.

focus of *Horn Childe and Maiden Rimnild* because of its unique interpolation involving Horn's adventures in Wales. The English and the Welsh were so assimilated in some respects that campaigns against the Welsh involved as many Welshmen fighting one another as it did Englishmen fighting Welshmen. R. R. Davies writes that "over half of the foot-soldiers who served Edward I on his first campaign in Wales were themselves Welshmen, most of them from the March and frequently led by Welshmen who had been drawn into Marcher service in earlier generations."<sup>63</sup> Despite years of political conflict, the English and the Welsh lived, worked, and fought together, and by the fourteenth century, the cultural divide between Englishmen and Welshmen was far less distinct than one might imagine. Davies writes: "behind the façade of an institutionalized racial distinction, Welshmen and Englishmen within Wales were reaching accommodation with each other, as indeed they had done for generations," especially in the Marches, where "English settlers and native Welsh lived cheek by jowl with each other for a long time."<sup>64</sup> The fourteenth-century *Polichronicon Ranulfi Higden* states: "So they semeth now in mynde, More Engliche men than Walsche kind."<sup>65</sup> However, it was not just that the Welsh were assimilating English cultural customs; English families enjoyed Welsh culture as well, often acting as patrons to Welsh bards.<sup>66</sup>

The complexity of this political and cultural situation is reflected in *Horn Childe and Maiden Rimnild* through translative revisions that create clear differentiation among the various "lands" of the British Isles while suggesting a sense of cultural similarity among the people by not distinguishing among them except in discussion of the enemy. British territories—Ireland, Ingelond, Wales—are named and distinguished. However, Horn is never actually called "English," though the land he is from is called "Ingelond." Likewise, he travels to the land of Wales, which is named several times, but the people he befriends there are never distinguished as Welsh; when he travels to Ireland, the people he befriends are similarly not distinguished, despite the fact that the text refers to the land of "Ireland." This might not at first seem like a deliberate strategy, but it becomes clear that it is a significant choice when one contrasts it with the text's manner of depicting people who are considered enemies. In the scenes that describe Hafeolf's wars, the people who make up the enemy troops are distinguished as culturally different from those they are fighting. They are not merely "Out of Danmark" but are specifically "Danis men" in the first war, and the enemy is the "Yrise folk" in the next.

Despite the fact that the text names the enemy and presents this distinction for the reader, it also reflects the complex cultural situation described above by highlighting an uncomfortable lack of distinction between friend and foe through the physical depiction of the "Irise ost." These Irish troops have been calqued onto the Saracen enemies from the *Roman de Horn*, a translative revision that recasts the clearly defined "other" of the original text as a group that looks a lot like "us." In fact, the text makes this point clear by using the same adjective to describe Horn and the Irish troops. Horn is famously described as "fair," a characteristic that is frequently recognized as an external indicator of his goodness and worth. The Irish enemy is uniquely described the same way:

---

<sup>63</sup> Davies 1987, p. 284.

<sup>64</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 421.

<sup>65</sup> This English text is taken from Trevisa's Middle English translation, printed in Higden 1865, p. 411.

<sup>66</sup> Davies 1987, p. 424.

To Yrlond he com o3ain  
& left her fair folk al slain  
Lieand on þe grene.<sup>67</sup>

Not only is this group calqued onto the original Saracen enemies of the *Roman de Horn*, but the picture painted in this scene is a familiar one from Anglo-Norman *chansons de geste*, where the battlefield would be strewn with the bodies of the more easily identifiable dark-skinned Saracens. The emphasis on the ‘fairness’ of the bodies here would surely strike any reader familiar with such scenes.<sup>68</sup> A similar translative revision replaces the Saracen king who seized the land in the *Roman de Horn* with an earl from within Northumberland, who becomes, in *Horn Childe and Maiden Rimmild*, the ultimate enemy who seizes Hafeolf’s land.

Along with the geographical revisions, the ‘translation’ of the enemy from the easily identifiable and evil Saracens to internal dissenters whose appearance does not differ from that of the ‘fair’ and good English suggests a discomfiting inability to categorize, define, and identify *people* in a text which clearly goes out of its way to try to do just that in its description of *territory*. This strategy reflects the complex cultural situation of late thirteenth- and early fourteenth-century England, which saw Celtic people intermingling with the English through marriage, friendships, administrative work, and more, and, at the same time, being engaged in great strife with them on a political level. Moreover, the translative revisions generate a dialogue with the original text that specifically compares these familiar looking enemies to Saracens, a strategy that reflects another problem relevant to late thirteenth- and early fourteenth-century England. As I discussed in detail in chapter one, England was particularly affected by the papacy’s abuse of the crusades to create war against fellow Christians rather than against Saracens, which created an unsettling situation in which the “enemy of God” looked very much like the English themselves. In fact, as I discuss in that chapter, the English barons and their Welsh allies were at times targeted by the papacy. This situation was also particularly relevant to England’s wars with its Celtic neighbors, since they were often seen as ‘holy wars,’ and England’s Celtic enemies were likened to the heathens that were the traditional enemies of God.<sup>69</sup>

---

<sup>67</sup> *Horn Childe*, ll. 235-7.

<sup>68</sup> Interestingly, the Irish are at times considered to be a Saracen tribe in the *chansons de geste*, for example in the Châteauroux Venice 7 version of the *Chanson de Roland*, l. 5075 (see Duggan, ed., 2005). I thank Joseph Duggan for drawing this to my attention (personal communication). As we shall see below, *Horn Childe and Maiden Rimmild* shows a concerted effort to replace all Saracen enemies from the original text with enemies from within the Isles of Britain.

<sup>69</sup> For instance, Tyerman writes: “One description of Edward I of England’s 1300 campaign against the Scots to Annandale and Carlaverock talked of him signing himself and his troops ‘with the Lord’s Cross’, an unmistakable gesture in a war that observers on both sides equated with a holy war” (Tyerman 2006, p. 909). In another study he writes: “In the 1280s and 1290s Edward I’s campaigns against the Welsh and the Scots were presented by church and state as struggles for the church and orthodoxy as much as for royal rights and the protection of the realm. Archbishop Pecham excommunicated the Welsh for rumoured atrocities and condemned them for their unorthodox religious observations. . . . the causes of religious faith and secular loyalty were deliberately combined in royal propaganda” (Tyerman 1988, p. 330). The “unorthodox religious observations” to which Tyerman alludes included such acts as clerical marriage and

Although *Horn Childe and Maiden Rinnild* does seem to be in conversation with England's imperial desires to take over Celtic lands, the image of the British Isles that it presents is not one that would be expected from the "monocultural," English-only perspective from which it is typically analyzed. In this text, Wales and Ireland remain sovereign territories whose kings engage in an amicable relationship with Horn, who ultimately becomes King of England. Although Horn is granted the part of Ireland that belonged to a menacing king that he defeated, he shares the territory harmoniously with King Finlak. Rather than presenting Celtic kings as victims of English imperial desires, they seem to acknowledge England (represented by Horn) as a powerful but friendly ally; this suggests an idealized relationship among the territories of the British Isles, but it is not the kind of relationship that would seem ideal from the perspective of those who desire English domination over Celtic lands.

In fact, there are other indications that *Horn Childe and Maiden Rinnild* represents Celtic interests and was in conversation with Celtic cultures in addition to English and Anglo-Norman cultures. Maldwyn Mills summarizes the Celtic historical sources upon which parts of the text seem to be based,<sup>70</sup> additionally, the translation revises elements of the *Roman de Horn* in ways that seem inexplicable unless one considers them from a Celtic mythological perspective. Mills notes that the gifts Rinnild gives in the *Roman de Horn* are oddly redistributed in *Horn Childe and Maiden Rinnild*.<sup>71</sup> In the *Roman de Horn*, Rinnild gives Herland a majority of the gifts in exchange for helping her get close to Horn. He gets a ring, a cup, a horse, two hounds, and a falcon.<sup>72</sup> In the same text, Haderof, Horn's substitute, does not get anything. In fact, when Rinnild learns that he is not Horn, she wants nothing to do with him and is incensed that Herland would treat her as if she were 'cummunal.'<sup>73</sup> (Here, this probably means available sexually to any and all.) When the genuine Horn arrives, he refuses all gifts from Rinnild, explaining that he must first prove himself a worthy knight; when he does prove his worth, he accepts a pennon and a ring.<sup>74</sup> In *Horn Childe and Maiden Rinnild*, the scene is significantly revised. Herland does not receive any gifts from Rinnild; instead, they are redistributed between Haperof (the substitute) and Horn. Among other gifts, those that are redistributed from the *Roman de Horn* include the hawk and hounds, given to Haperof, and the white horse, given to Horn.<sup>75</sup> In this text, Rinnild

---

hereditary succession to benefices (Price 2003, p. 414). Huw Price notes further on this subject that the thirteenth-century criticism of Welsh clergy "belonged to a rhetoric developed by twelfth-century Anglo-Norman churchmen that stigmatized the Welsh as barbarians, a rhetoric which can be seen as giving ideological legitimacy to Anglo-Norman and English conquest and colonization in Wales" (2003, p. 413).

<sup>70</sup> Mills 1988, pp. 56-68.

<sup>71</sup> Ibid., pp. 52-53. Mills calls this redistribution the "most interesting and complex" of the reattribution of details in this text, but he makes no conjecture about what purpose it might serve. The other examples of reattribution of details (combining of events and characters) might be explained by the fact that they serve to abridge the text; however, it is difficult to explain the redistribution of gifts the same way.

<sup>72</sup> All citations from the *Roman de Horn* will be taken from Pope and Reid, ed., 1955, and will be cited by line number as "*Roman de Horn*." *Roman de Horn*, ll. 559-638.

<sup>73</sup> *Roman de Horn*, l. 879.

<sup>74</sup> *Roman de Horn*, ll. 1580-3, 1790. In *King Horn* it is also only the steward who receives gifts from Rinnild (a cup and a ring). The number of gifts is reduced, in keeping with that translation's abridgement strategy.

<sup>75</sup> *Horn Childe*, ll. 337-51, 376-84.

does present herself as a little bit ‘cummunal.’ After attempting to seduce Harperof with her gifts, he admits to her that he is not Horn. Rather than being incensed as in the *Roman de Horn*, she allows him to keep her love tokens and responds casually:

‘Whateuer þi name it be  
þou schalt haue þis houndes þre  
þat wele can take a dere.<sup>76</sup>

When Harlaund returns the next day with Horn, the scene is presented as a sensual meeting among all three of them, not just between Horn and Rimmild:

Sche sett hir hem bitvene;  
þe maiden was bri3t & schene  
& comen of kinges kinne.  
Anon hirselve hadde hem ledde  
To sitten opon her owen bedde,  
Arlaund & Horn wiþ him.

Hendeliche sche to hem spac,  
A poumgarnet þer sche brak<sup>77</sup>

Sitting seductively between the two men whom she had led to her bed, breaking open a pomegranate, Rimmild is presented in this text as a sensuous and somewhat ‘loose’ woman who resembles very much the Celtic sovereignty figure who has the ability to bestow power and kingship.<sup>78</sup> This figure is frequently associated with promiscuity and with apples or pomegranates, both details that are explicitly added to this scene in *Horn Childe and Maiden Rimmild* and which directly contrast with the scene as it is presented in the *Roman de Horn*, where the mere idea that Rimmild could be ‘friendly’ with anybody other than Horn incenses her, and where Herland is explicitly sent to sit with the other maidens while Rimmild sits alone with Horn. The white horse also has strong associations with the Celtic sovereignty figure, and the one that Rimmild gives to Herland in the *Roman de Horn* (and that is rather haphazardly passed around among several men throughout the romance) is specifically redistributed to Horn in *Horn Childe and Maiden Rimmild*. Here, it is also associated with the revelation that it is Rimmild who is responsible for the knighting of Horn, the first step in the process of his acquisition of power and land:

Sche lete fet forþ a stede blac,  
Was couered al wiþ palle.

---

<sup>76</sup> Ibid. 349-51. The differences between this scene and the same one in the *Roman de Horn* have been seen as evidence that “the author had not quite understood why Arlaund has brought Horn’s brother with him at first instead of Horn himself” (Mehl 1968, p. 54). As we shall see, however, they make sense in the context of the other revisions to this part of the romance.

<sup>77</sup> *Horn Childe*, ll. 367-74.

<sup>78</sup> On the Celtic Sovereignty goddess see Mac Cana 1983, p. 92.

þe stiropes were of silke wite,  
 Bridel & sadel al was slike,  
 & seyd ‘Horn hende in halle,  
 It was me told þou schust be kni3t;  
 Y þe 3if here a stede li3t  
 & a queyntise of palle.’<sup>79</sup>

It is also significant that the gift of this horse (as opposed to any other gift), becomes the real indicator to Rimmild’s father that she has given herself to Horn: “Forþi 3af sche him þe stede, / Lesing it is nou3t.”<sup>80</sup>

In keeping with this new characterization of Rimmild as a Celtic sovereignty figure, *Horn Childe and Maiden Rimmild* revises the timing of the consummation of her relationship with Horn. In *King Horn*, he does not want to consummate their relationship until he has won back his father’s land. As before, when he refuses to accept Rimmild’s gifts until he has independently proven himself, he explicitly states that he wants to become a worthy king *before* he sleeps with her. (Unfortunately the part of the text where this scene would be located is missing in the *Roman de Horn* manuscripts, but it is not characteristic of the text of *King Horn* to add details of this kind that were not in the source text.) In *Horn Childe and Maiden Rimmild*, not only are Rimmild and her gifts explicitly associated with the power Horn gains earlier on (his knighting), but also care is taken to move the consummation of their relationship to a moment in the text that associates that act with Horn’s kingship, and a key characteristic of the Celtic sovereignty figure is that she bestows the power of kingship upon her lover by sleeping with him:

Horn brou3t hir to his bedde;  
 Houlac king gan say  
 ‘Half mi lond ichil þe 3iue  
 Wiþ mi dou3ter while y liue  
 & al after mi day.’  
 Fiue days sat her fest  
 Wiþ mete & drink riche & onest,  
 In boke as we rede.  
 Forþ, as we telle in gest,  
 Horn lete sende est & west  
 His folk to batayle bede,  
 Into Norþhumberland for to fare  
 To winne þat his fader ware  
 Wiþ kni3tes stiþe on stede.<sup>81</sup>

Here, directly after Horn sleeps with Rimmild, Houlac grants him half of his land now and the remainder upon his death, and then Horn leaves to conquer his father’s land.

---

<sup>79</sup> Ibid., ll. 377-84.

<sup>80</sup> Ibid., ll. 494-95.

<sup>81</sup> Ibid., ll. 1112-1125.

These scenes do not just present a few Celtic details for “flavor” or appeal. They systematically transform the source text by redistributing some details and adding others so as to represent Rinnild clearly as a Celtic sovereignty figure, and this transformation of her character and her relationship with Horn resonates with other major translativ revisions, such as the geographical revisions that include Celtic lands, the placement of the text in the context of British legendary history, and the depiction of sovereign Celtic kings in an amicable relationship with England. Often, when Celtic culture appears in Middle English literature, it is associated with the past, with the ‘unreal,’ or with depictions of the ‘other’ (hence the ‘otherness’ of Saracen lands is frequently depicted in Celtic terms, as we saw for example in Guy’s fight with the giant Amoraunt, discussed in chapter three). The translativ revisions in *Horn Childe and Maiden Rinnild* bring Celtic culture into the *real* present by redesigning the mythic landscape of the *Roman de Horn* in such a way as to bring Celtic lands and people into a present reality rather than depicting them merely as relics from the past or sources of mythological stories. They are presented here as friendly participants in the affairs of ‘England.’ At the same time, through its revision of Rinnild’s character, the text seems to understand and embrace a Celtic concept of mythic history and even applies it to the kingship of ‘England.’

This integration of Celtic and English, and the calquing of both Celtic (Irish) and English (Northumbrian) enemies onto the Saracen enemies of the *Roman de Horn* bring to the fore complex issues surrounding the multicultural politics of Britain discussed above. It also redefines a reader’s expectations by presenting a sense of cultural unity that preserves the idea of Celtic sovereignty and legitimacy at the same time that it redefines the concept of “English” that realistically incorporates, even embraces, “Celtic.” Notably, recognizing the translativ revisions that generate this dialogue about multiculturalism in Britain requires a reader to be steeped in English, Celtic, and Anglo-Norman cultures. It requires a reader of English texts who is familiar both with the Anglo-Norman *Roman de Horn* and with the serious historical and political application of Celtic mythology, not just the literary appropriation of it.

As we have seen, the translativ revisions in *Guy of Warwick*, *Reinbroun*, and *Lay le Freine* comment specifically on cultural and ideological issues that are presented in their source texts. We will see that this is also true of *Beves of Hampton* and *Amis and Amiloun*. However, although *Horn Childe and Maiden Rinnild* also relies on its readers’ knowledge of the source text to generate part of the dialogue it develops,<sup>82</sup> the issue of English-Celtic relations is developed anew in the Middle English translation, and it does not comment on a perspective presented in the *Roman de Horn*. In this respect, it differs from the other Auchinleck translations discussed in this study and presents a more radical transformation of its source. One other aspect that makes this text unique is that, as I discussed in relation to *King Horn* in chapter four, it is translating an Anglo-Norman text that was, itself, based on a native English source, and this seems to be a common thread that characterizes translations that take more liberties with their sources, both in England and in Wales.<sup>83</sup> Nevertheless, the text uses translation as a vehicle to generate a

---

<sup>82</sup> For instance, it is important for the reader to know that the Celtic enemies in *Horn Childe and Maiden Rinnild* were Saracens in the *Roman de Horn*.

<sup>83</sup> See chapter six for a discussion of Welsh translation and the fact that the Welsh also innovate more freely when the text they are translating was itself based on a native Welsh tale.

multilingual and multicultural dialogue that engages challenging ideological questions and revises cultural values, and in this respect, it operates in the same discursive mode as the other Auchinleck translations discussed in this study.

### **Amis and Amiloun**

*Lay le Freine* and *Horn Childe and Maiden Rimmild* show how translation, a fundamentally multilingual and multicultural enterprise, may have been used in the Auchinleck Manuscript as a rhetorical tool to generate a serious dialogue about multilingualism and multiculturalism itself. The particular space that a translation occupies, a liminal space on the borders among cultures, times, and ideas, provides a unique environment for testing controversial ideas that put pressure on conventional ones. As we saw in chapter three, the Auchinleck *Guy of Warwick* and *Reinbroun* put pressure on traditionally bifurcated categories that are depicted in *Gui de Warewic*, such as Christian and Muslim, right and wrong, and spiritual and personal. Some of these ideas are explored through translation in other Auchinleck texts as well, such as *Amis and Amiloun* and *Beves of Hampton*, and this suggests that the act of reading across languages—of reconsidering a conventional idea in a fresh context—was a rhetorically rich process that effected the cultural reorientation of the reader on a number of levels.

The thirteenth-century Anglo-Norman *Amis e Amilun* is written in octosyllabic rhymed couplets and is extant in three manuscripts, the earliest of which dates from the second half of the thirteenth century and the latest from the second half of the fourteenth century, putting its circulation in England during the same period that it was translated and circulated in Middle English.<sup>84</sup> The Middle English translation was probably composed in the first quarter of the fourteenth century and was written in twelve-line tail-rhyme stanzas rhyming aabaabccbddb in all four extant manuscripts, which date from the first quarter of the fourteenth century to the second half of the fifteenth century.<sup>85</sup>

The story was enormously popular and appeared in a number medieval languages, including Latin, Anglo-Norman and Continental French dialects, Welsh, Old Norse, German, and more. Scholars have grouped the extant versions into two distinct traditions: the romantic tradition, and the hagiographic tradition. MacEdward Leach describes the two groups:

The romantic group presents the extraordinary friendship of Amis and Amiloun, true knights of romance, and the testing of that friendship to the point of child sacrifice. The hagiographic group uses the same story skeleton, but adds new incidents; it changes the story theme from the testing of romantic friendship to an exposition of the virtues

---

<sup>84</sup> Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, MS 50 (second half of the thirteenth century); Karlsruhe, Badische Landesbibliothek, MS 345 (Durlac 38) (second half of the fourteenth century); London, British Library, MS Royal 12 C.XII (first half of the fourteenth century).

<sup>85</sup> Edinburgh, National Library of Scotland, Advocates MS 19.2.1; London, British Library, Egerton MS 2862; Oxford, Bodleian Library, Douce MS 326 (Bodleian 21900); London, British Library, Harley MS 2386.

of two friends, so beloved of God and the Blessed Virgin that miracles are worked in their behalf, and so zealous in the cause of right and the Church that they are rewarded with martyrdom.<sup>86</sup>

Both the Anglo-Norman and the Middle English versions of *Amis and Amiloun* have been classified as part of the secular, romantic tradition of the story, and the following short plot summary applies to both:

Amis and Amiloun, identical in appearance, swear eternal friendship while youths in service to a count (duke in Middle English). When the count's daughter Florie (Belisaunt in Middle English) seduces Amis, a seneschal betrays the lovers. Amiloun takes Amis's place in swearing to no fault against the count and thus by deception wins a judicial combat and the hand of Florie. Just before marrying her in Amis's stead, Amiloun hears a voice warning him that if he goes through with the ceremony he will be stricken with leprosy (this warning precedes the judicial combat in Middle English). He continues to hide his name and marries Florie for Amis, assuring his friend's happiness. Amiloun returns home but is soon cast out by his own wife when he becomes leprous. Helped only by Owein, a faithful young relative, Amiloun eventually arrives to beg at Amis's door. The friends are reunited by Owein's faithfulness and by recognition tokens, identical cups they exchanged at parting. Soon Amis hears from a voice in a dream that the blood of his two children would restore Amiloun to health. He kills the children, cures Amiloun, and finds the children miraculously restored. Amiloun takes vengeance on his wife and gives his land to Owein, then returns to live the rest of his life with Amis. The two lie buried together in Lombardy.<sup>87</sup>

The Anglo-Norman text was likely the source for the Middle English translation, but it more than doubles the length of its source, which makes the translation style seem very free.<sup>88</sup> This will be clear from the citations below, which show the differences in the way the Anglo-Norman and Middle English texts treat some of the same scenes. Mehl argues that almost every innovation and expansion is included in order to highlight clearly "the conflict between loyalty and selfishness which runs through the poem."<sup>89</sup> One example Mehl gives that is characteristic is the treatment of a scene in which the wicked seneschal offers his friendship to Amis after Amiloun has left. Amis rejects the friendship in both texts, but the Middle English translation expands this scene to make it clear that the seneschal wants to replace Amiloun by swearing brotherhood, and Amis must therefore reject him in order to remain faithful to Amiloun. Here and elsewhere, the Middle

---

<sup>86</sup> Leach 1960, p. ix.

<sup>87</sup> I have taken this summary from Crane 1986, p. 119.

<sup>88</sup> Leach discusses the ultimate folkloric origins of the story (Leach 1937, pp. xxxii-lxxxix). The undoubtedly oral circulation of this well-known tale might have contributed to the freer translation style than that exhibited in many other Auchinleck translations. In this respect, it reflects the translation style of the native English tales about Horn and Havelok, which may have also circulated orally.

<sup>89</sup> Mehl 1969, p. 110.

English text expands scenes in order to highlight and ruminate on moral dilemmas that are not given attention in the source text. Below I will discuss several significant details that are thoughtfully expanded and reworked so as to generate a multilingual dialogue among a number of extant versions of the story.

The Anglo-Norman text presents a much less complex worldview than the one presented in the Middle English translation. It is a story that exalts friendship and loyalty above all else, and any element of the story—such as perjury or murder—that might seem morally questionable is glossed over either by generic expectations or by the invocation of prayer, which suggests that the hero has God’s blessing to do what he needs to uphold the primary value of loyalty to his friend. Susan Crane discusses the latter point and concludes that all potential moral issues in the Anglo-Norman text are deflected by “perfunctory invocations of piety” and that “the deity is a passive force at the disposal of the poet, to be invoked as necessary in support of friendship’s demands.”<sup>90</sup> She contrasts this strategy to some extent with the one in the Middle English *Amis and Amiloun*, which she suggests “introduces complexities that make moral judgments more difficult for both characters and critics.”<sup>91</sup> One revision that accomplishes this is the increase in religious references (voices from angels, prayers, and Biblical references) in the Middle English translation, and Crane writes: “These Christian intrusions, acting in the relatively detailed, rationalized world of *Amis and Amiloun*, produce moments of reflective doubt not found in the Anglo-Norman version.”<sup>92</sup> Although Crane recognizes the new moral texture that the Middle English revisions give to the story, ultimately she concludes that divine assurance justifies rather than condemns the deeds of the friends<sup>93</sup> and “the Middle English poet is scrupulously true to the sense of the Anglo-Norman version.”<sup>94</sup> On the other hand, Carol Fewster argues that the moral dilemmas the Middle English revisions present are more significant. While acknowledging that generic expectations give the romance heroes some immunity from moral guilt, she concludes that “*Amis* suggests that this purely literary justification [for morally questionable deeds] is inadequate.”<sup>95</sup>

---

<sup>90</sup> Crane 1986, p. 121.

<sup>91</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 122.

<sup>92</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>93</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 125. Here, Crane discusses specifically the murder scene. She comes to a similar conclusion, however, in her discussion of the equivocal oath: “the issues of crime and punishment that seem to be introduced in this heightened Christian context are suppressed by retaining the Anglo-Norman exaltation of friendship above all other values” (*ibid.*, p. 123).

<sup>94</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 121.

<sup>95</sup> Fewster 1987, p. 76. Fewster’s study touches on some of the same moral problems that I will discuss below. Although she argues that some scenes become clearly problematic in the Middle English text, she argues that these problems are somewhat balanced by the demands of the narrative. For instance, the Christmas setting of the murder scene might (problematically) create an analogy between Christ’s sacrifice for mankind and the friends’ sacrifices for each other, but, she argues, “the practical devices of story work very firmly against signification: everyone going to church at Christmas is just the occasion for Amis to be alone with the nursery keys, and structurally this echoes the first ‘riche douke’ going hunting and leaving his daughter Belisaunt alone with Amis” (*ibid.*, p. 78). Ultimately it is outside the scope of her study, which is on the narrative style of Middle English romance, to pursue the moral problems further. Her main argument about these questionable moments, which is not incompatible with the argument I will present below, is that they make “the existence of this self-justifying literary language [what she calls “romance language”] apparent” (*ibid.*, p. 80).

The intensified religious context that the translative revisions add to the Middle English *Amis and Amiloun* causes Crane to discuss the text within a generic category she calls “pious romances,” a group of texts that she argues presents “a devotion to God that is compatible with pursuing earthly and secular well-being.”<sup>96</sup> Indeed, as Crane argues in her study, there was an increased focus in fourteenth-century England on making some aspects of secular life more compatible with religious devotion. At the same time, however, there was significant anxiety about the moral dilemmas posed by some aspects of the sacralization of secular matters, particularly with respect to the crusades. In chapter one I discussed the ways in which England was particularly affected by the increasing frequency of Rome’s crusades against Christians, sometimes against the English barons themselves, for the purpose of secular political interests. There was significant disapproval of the fact that crusade taxes, resources, and rhetoric were being used to harm and kill fellow Christians to serve worldly, rather than religious, interests, and this disapproval is registered in a number of Auchinleck texts, both explicitly, as I discussed in chapter one, and implicitly, as many of the translative revisions discussed in this study show. Although *Amis and Amiloun* is not set in a crusading context that includes Saracen enemies and adventures through Eastern lands, its setting in Lombardy evokes the particular context of the papacy’s crusades against Christians, since this was a major site of the mid thirteenth-century papal wars against Frederick, which were vociferously decried by the English who were appalled by the fact that the pope was using the crusades for a cause that was not pious.<sup>97</sup> In fact, in 1238, England entered the fray and fought for Frederick, against the papacy-backed Lombard cities.<sup>98</sup>

The translative revisions in *Amis and Amiloun* put this text in conversation with these issues. The intensified religious context produced by the revisions interrogates the value system depicted in the Anglo-Norman text and suggests that it is one thing to pursue secular ideals in a Christian context, but it is another matter entirely to excuse acts as extreme as perjury and murder in the pursuit of secular ideals; there should be limits, the revisions suggest, to the acceptable use of God’s name to justify acts carried out for worldly gain. In fact, as I will show below, one method by which this text revises the Anglo-Norman “romantic version” of the story and interrogates the values depicted in it is to use details that appear to be derived from the “hagiographic version” in order to suggest divine inspiration for morally questionable acts undertaken to uphold secular values. This mixing of secular and religious sources makes the method of translation mimetic of the message produced by the revisions, and it puts the translation in dialogue with other versions of the story that circulated in England.

Three significant translative revisions establish early in the Middle English text a new critical framework for evaluating the actions of the friends. The first is the translation of the name “Amis” from the context of a Latinate (specifically French) linguistic system of signification to a primarily Germanic (specifically English) one. In the French language text, the name Amis is clearly a meaningful reference to the character’s quality as a “friend.” When the name is used in Middle English, its meaning

---

<sup>96</sup> Crane 1986, p. 97.

<sup>97</sup> Tyerman 1996, p. 121.

<sup>98</sup> Ibid., pp. 89-90. However, as English kings frequently enjoyed Rome’s support in their own secular wars, Henry III backed the papacy in 1254 (ibid., pp. 113, 118).

changes, since “amis” in Middle English derives from Old English “missan” and refers rather to a person’s wrong or sinful behavior.<sup>99</sup> However, above I described the linguistic system of signification in the Middle English translation as “primarily” Germanic because, as a translation from a French language text, it is actually in dialogue with that language as well. In the Middle English text, the name “Amis” becomes a bilingual pun that suggests both “sin” and “friendship,” reflecting the more complex moral value system depicted in the translation.<sup>100</sup>

The second early translative revision that signals the interrogative critical framework of the Middle English text is the treatment of the pledge of “trouthe” between the two friends. In this text they uniquely pledge loyalty “In wele & wo, in wrong & ri3t.”<sup>101</sup> This simple revision encourages readers to consider the moral virtues of the actions the characters carry out to uphold their pledge. Moreover, the use of the conjunction “and,” as opposed to “or,” suggests that the dividing line between “wrong & ri3t” will not always be clear, and this ambiguity is also expressed in the third early translative revision that redefines the text’s critical framework. Just a few lines after the pledge, the friends are described: “As princes prout in pride.”<sup>102</sup> This phrase, as I discussed in chapter three, is used in an ambiguous way in two other Auchinleck texts, *Guy of Warwick* and *Reinbroun*, where it functions to interrogate the characterization of Guy and Reinbroun as they are presented in the Anglo-Norman *Gui de Warewic*.<sup>103</sup> *Amis and Amiloun*, as I discuss in chapter two, is known to have borrowed lines from the

---

<sup>99</sup> The etymology is taken from *Online Etymology Dictionary*, s.v. “amiss,” accessed 12 April 2012: <http://www.etymonline.com/>. The definition is from *Middle English Dictionary*, s.v. “amis,” accessed 12 April 2012: <http://quod.lib.umich.edu/m/med/> Françoise Le Saux also discusses this issue. She points out: “to the English ear, the name Amys might suggest sin rather than friendship, a character who goes amiss, rather than a friend” (Le Saux 1993, p. 4). Le Saux argues that this is the only possible reading for the audience of a Middle English translation, for whom the name “must have posed problems, since his name no longer fulfilled the emblematic function it had for the original French audience” (ibid.). However, she argues further that its meaning must have been overlooked because “the English romance presents an extremely simplified world-view,” and the hero “is ensured of the audience’s sympathy whatever he does” (ibid., p. 11). My argument differs, as we shall see below, in that I contend that the audience for the Middle English text understood both the French and the Middle English meanings and that this bilingual understanding was significant to the reception of the translation.

<sup>100</sup> This pun appears to be deliberate rather than an unfortunate accident, not only because it works with a series of other translative revisions to generate a particular dialogue with the original text, but also because, had the translator wished to avoid the negative associations of the name in Middle English, he could have chosen to substitute the Latin name. In fact, when discussing the leprous Amiloun’s loyal companion, the translator uses two names, Owain and Amoraunt, which appear in various versions of the story. This strategy reminds the reader that the Middle English text is in dialogue with other versions, and it also indicates that the translator did not feel obligated to use only the names from the Anglo-Norman texts (which say that Owain is the correct name).

<sup>101</sup> All citations from the Auchinleck *Amis and Amiloun* will be taken from Burnley and Wiggins, ed., 2003, *Amis and Amiloun*, and will be cited by line number as “Auchinleck *Amis*.” Auchinleck *Amis*, l. 97.

<sup>102</sup> Auchinleck *Amis*, l. 116. According to Leach’s variants, note that two manuscripts, London, British Library, Egerton MS 2862, and Oxford, Bodleian Library, Douce MS 326, change “princes” to “lordinges.” London, British Library, Harley MS 2386 retains “princys” and also uses “princys” earlier, where Auchinleck and the others use “lordinges.” See Auchinleck *Amis*, l. 68.

<sup>103</sup> As a reminder, in Middle English “pride” may connote either honorable prowess or sin.

Auchinleck *Guy of Warwick*, and here a virtually identical phrase,<sup>104</sup> which comes right on the heels of the friends' morally ambiguous pledge to one another, works in a similar way to cast doubt on the morality of the friends as they are presented in the Anglo-Norman text.<sup>105</sup> Before we encounter the adventures of these friends, their description is peppered with an unusual sense of ambiguity that contrasts with the absolute "rightness" that characterizes them in the Anglo-Norman text, and this provides a framework that suggests a method for considering the adventures that follow.

The story is organized around two main acts of loyalty that will be the focus of the following discussion: Amiloun's fight in the guise of Amis, and Amis's killing of his children to restore the leprous Amiloun to health. Both of the scenes depicting these events include significant translative revisions that interrogate the moral integrity of the acts the friends commit and that put these acts in conversation with fourteenth-century anxieties about the use of God's name to justify morally questionable acts committed for secular gain, discussed briefly above and in greater detail in chapter one. The main revisions to the first act (the combat), which will be discussed in greater detail below, include: 1) rearranging the position of Amiloun's warning that he will become a leper, 2) adding several references to God (whereas there are none here in the Anglo-Norman text), 3) adding an allusion to the hagiographic tradition of the story, and 4) including a complex reference to the equivocal oath scene in Bérout's *Tristan et Iseut*, which the text contrasts with Christ's own trial, to provide a rich commentary on the combat scene in *Amis and Amiloun*.

In the Anglo-Norman text, if there is a problem with this combat at all, it is with Amilun's bigamous marriage to Florie (Belisaunt in the Middle English text) that is bound to ensue after he wins the battle. After the combat, an unidentified voice warns him that if he marries Florie, he will become a leper after three years:

Est vus, une voiz li diseit,  
Ke nul ne l'oi si li noun:  
"Lessez, lessez, sir Amilun!  
Jeo vus di certeine novele  
Ke, si vus prenez la damoisele,  
Ainz ke seient treis ans passé  
Apert leprus vus series,  
Avant mes unc si led ne fud!"<sup>106</sup>

The Middle English translation moves this warning to just before the combat, implying that the act of perjury that results in killing an innocent man is the more problematic aspect of the scene, and it is further revised in interesting ways:

---

<sup>104</sup> Guy is described "As prince proude in pride" (Auchinleck *Guy* II, l. 7054). Reinbroun is described "wiþ wel meche pride" (Auchinleck *Reinbroun*, l. 636).

<sup>105</sup> Although some may consider this suggestion a stretch, I will show later the fact that there is, in fact, a little-known medieval precedent for doubting the morality of these famously virtuous friends.

<sup>106</sup> All quotations from the Anglo-Norman *Amis e Amilun* will be taken from the Kölbing edition, 1884, and will be cited by line number as "AN *Amis*." AN *Amis*, ll. 710-17.

As he com prikand out of toun,  
 Com a voice fram heuen adoun,  
 Þat noman herd bot he,  
 Say ‘þou kni3t, sir Amiloun,  
 God þat suffred passioun,  
 Sent þe bode bi me;  
 3if þou þis bataile vnderfong  
 Pou schalt haue an euentour strong  
 Wiþin þis 3eres þre;  
 & or þis þre 3ere ben al gon  
 Fouler mesel nas neuer non  
 In þe world þan þou schal be.  
 Ac for þou art so hende & fre  
 Ihesu sent þe bode bi me  
 To warn þe anon;  
 So foule a wreche þou schalt be,  
 Wiþ sorwe & care & pouerte  
 Nas neuer non wers bigon.  
 Ouer al þis world, fer & hende,  
 Þo þat be þine best frende  
 Schal be þi most fon  
 & þi wiif & alle þi kinne  
 Schul fle þe stede þatow art inne  
 & forsake þe ichon.<sup>107</sup>

The mysterious voice in the Anglo-Norman text comes directly “fram heuen” in the Middle English revision, which might have been inspired by the angelic messengers that appear throughout the hagiographic texts; the revised position of the warning further puts the text in dialogue with the hagiographic version of the story. None of the hagiographic texts connects either the ordeal or the marriage with the leprosy (which is frequently considered, there, to be God’s trial of an especially beloved person). However, the placement of the warning in the Middle English text corresponds with Amiloun’s moment of moral hesitation in some of the hagiographic texts, where Amicus reflects on the fact that to kill the steward would be to kill an innocent man and attempts to get his opponent to reconcile with him.<sup>108</sup> Although the hagiographic texts include this moment of moral reflection, they, like the Anglo-Norman text, gloss over the problem and rely in part on generic expectations to ensure the “rightness” of the character’s actions. The Middle English translation gestures towards the hagiographic tradition by adjusting the placement of the leprosy warning and indicating that it comes from heaven, and it exposes the problematic nature of this part of the story in both traditions. After the clear

<sup>107</sup> Auchinleck *Amis*, ll. 1197-1220.

<sup>108</sup> For example, in the Latin prose *Amici et Amelii Carissimorum*, Amis (who plays the part of Amiloun in the hagiographic group) muses: “Tunc Amicus coepit rogare intra se dicens. “heu mihi, qui mortem hujus comitis tam fraudulenter cupio. Scio namque, quod si illum interfecero, reus ero ante supernum iudicem, si vero vitam meam tulerit, de me semper opprobrium narrabitur perpetuum” (Mone 1836, p. 152).

warning that suggests God's disapproval of what Amiloun is about to do, Amiloun deliberates for a moment (another reflection of the hagiographic tradition) and then actively chooses to ignore the warning, uphold his secular oath to his friend, and endure God's punishment:

He nist what him was best to don,  
To flen oþer to fizting gon,  
In hert him liked ille.  
He þouzt 'ʒif y beknowe mi name  
þan schal mi broþer go to schame,  
Wiþ sorwe þai schul him spille.'  
'Certes' he seyde 'for drede of care  
To hold mi treuþe schal y nouzt spare,  
Lete God don alle his wille.'<sup>109</sup>

Amiloun's reflection and hesitation before acting encourages the reader to consider the complexity of the intersection between spiritual and secular values and the grey areas that lie between them. Here, Amiloun chooses to uphold his secular oath despite clear spiritual disapproval. The Middle English text explores this theme further through additional translative revisions to the scene. As Carol Fewster has noted, connecting the leprosy warning to the equivocal oath puts the Middle English text in dialogue with the Tristan story.<sup>110</sup> In Bérout's *Tristan et Iseut*, Iseut's lover, Tristan, disguises himself as a leper and carries her on his back, allowing her to swear an oath that no man has been between her legs except her husband and the leper. In that text, the scene is meant to be entertaining and comical. *Amis and Amiloun* distorts this motif, however, in that here leprosy does not provide disguise and entertainment; it provides rather a serious consequence, a real disease sent by God as a punishment for Amiloun's equivocal oath. Further, *Amis and Amiloun* exposes the sinfulness of equivocal oaths (which the text reminds us, through its allusion to *Tristan and Iseut*, are all too often taken lightly) by adding language that contrasts Amiloun's trial with Christ's trial. The voice from heaven states that it was sent by "God, þat suffred passion" to warn Amiloun of the consequences of falsely fighting in Amis's trial. This pointed reference to Christ's Passion contrasts Christ's own trial—in which he truthfully admitted his claim to be the King of the Jews and the Son of God and suffered death for it—with Amis's trial, in which he falsely asks Amiloun to swear in his place, and Amiloun pledges to do so in Christ's name. The warning from "God, þat suffred passion" also recalls the moment in which Amiloun promises Amis that he will engage in the false trial by combat "bi him þat Judas sold / & died oþon þe rode,"<sup>111</sup> which suggests a real disharmony between that which Amiloun swears to do in God's name and that which God, speaking through an envoy from heaven, actually wants Amiloun to do.

---

<sup>109</sup> Auchinleck *Amis*, ll. 1224-32.

<sup>110</sup> Fewster points out: "leprosy as a disguise and an occasion for an equivocal oath is a motif in the Tristan story" (Fewster 1987, p. 70). Her point is to suggest that this motif is used in *Amis and Amiloun* to "recall those secular texts which privilege social statement over internal guilt" (ibid.).

<sup>111</sup> Auchinleck *Amis*, ll. 1057-58.

These complex revisions interrogate the values that are traditionally upheld in both the romantic and the hagiographic traditions of the story, which privilege worldly friendship above all else.<sup>112</sup> Because Amiloun swears in the name of Christ's Passion to commit perjury (which results in murder), and he is later warned that Christ who suffered the Passion does not approve, the revisions also engage with fourteenth-century concerns about the actions we take in God's name. Is it "right" to claim to act in God's name, when the true motivations behind one's (sometimes morally questionable) actions involve secular and personal gains?

The Middle English text indicated in the beginning that the friends would act "in wrong & ri3t," and like the nature of an equivocal oath itself, Amiloun's action is both "wrong" and "right." The revisions to the trial scene encourage the reader to consider this problem seriously, and the text drives home the message through the language used by Amiloun's wife, who Fewster argues provides "a moral gloss on the poem,"<sup>113</sup> since she, a villain, problematically takes the moral high ground, whereas the heroes do not.<sup>114</sup> Amiloun's "wicked & schrewed"<sup>115</sup> wife upbraids him using language that reflects the oath of loyalty the friends took: "wiþ wrong & michel vnri3t/ Pou slou3 þer a gentil kni3t."<sup>116</sup> This reprimand reminds the reader of the problematic nature of the friends' oath to one another before we begin to read the second half of the story, which culminates in a second troublesome act of loyalty.

When Amis recognizes that the leprous beggar at his door is Amiloun, he takes him in and cares for him. A voice in a dream tells him that if he were to kill his children, their blood would heal Amiloun; since he is loyal to his friend above all else, he murders his children to save his friend. The Middle English text revises this scene to include an array of interesting details that make it much more complex than the corresponding scene in the Anglo-Norman text. As I will discuss in greater detail below, this scene is also put in dialogue with the hagiographic tradition by turning the mysterious voice from the Anglo-Norman text into an angelic messenger from God, and it complicates the action by setting it on Christmas night and by adding descriptions of Amis's doubt and deliberation.

Like the voice in the Anglo-Norman combat scene, the one that tells Amis to kill his children for Amiloun is not expressly from God in that text:

Tant passa le tens issi  
Ke li coens une nuit dormi;  
Une voiz oit, ke li diseit

---

<sup>112</sup> While I argue that the Middle English text requires readers to question traditionally held ideals, critics typically gloss over God's apparent disapproval of the oath in the Middle English text, since it does not align with the ideals that are traditionally presented in romances. For instance, Susan Crane argues that in epics and romances, judicial ordeals only verify sworn statements, not the entire situation, and "in the case of a literally true though functionally deceptive oath, it is not God and Justice who are being tricked, but simply the human onlookers" (Crane 1986, p. 123). Traditionally, this is true, but *Amis and Amiloun* includes a series of revisions that suggest that it is not operating within this tradition. In fact, although equivocal oaths and ideals are common in medieval romance and folklore, ordeals in reality were condemned by the papacy from the eleventh century on (Leach 1960, p. LXXXI).

<sup>113</sup> Fewster 1987, p. 73.

<sup>114</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 71-73.

<sup>115</sup> Auchinleck *Amis*, l. 1509.

<sup>116</sup> *Ibid.*, ll. 1440-41.

Ke Amilun bien le garreit,  
 Si il vousist i mettre cure.  
 Dou fiz aveit de s'engendrure:  
 Si il les dous enfanz tuast  
 E Amilun el sanc baignast,  
 Si sein devendreit com pessun.  
 Kant veu aveit la vision  
 E de cel soinge repairi:  
 "A, Deu," dist il, "ke ne menti,  
 Doint ke veirs seit mon sunge.  
 Mes ore seit voir ou mensunge,  
 Al meins la voiz voil esprover,  
 Por mes enfanz ne voil lesser.  
 Mult avroie fait bone jornee,  
 Si par lur sank fust sane!"<sup>117</sup>

Here, Amilun has no idea whether or not the voice is speaking the truth. He superficially pleads with God for aid in determining it, but ultimately, without assurance, he chooses to give the plan a try for the sake of his friend. The text creates a suspenseful scenario in which the reader is unsure whether or not the plan will work. It is presented as a romance adventure and a hero's test of sorts, as Amiloun himself states in the language of romance: "Al meins la voiz voil esprover." But the question of whether or not murdering his children is the "right" thing to do is not entertained. In this version, it is clear that saving Amiloun takes precedence above all else; Amis takes decisive action and has no pity on his children when he kills them: "Le piere des fiz n'out nule pite."<sup>118</sup> Even his wife is joyful when she finds out that her husband killed the children to save Amiloun, for she reasons that God can always give them more children, but they could never get another Amiloun.<sup>119</sup>

The Middle English translation complicates this scene, in part by turning the mysterious voice of the Anglo-Norman romance into that of an angel:

So it bifel opon a ni3t,  
 As sir Amis þat gentil kni3t  
 In slepe þou3t as he lay,  
 An angel com fram heuen bri3t  
 & stode biforn his bed ful ri3t  
 & to him þus gan say:  
 3if he wald rise on Cristes morn,  
 Swiche time as Ihesu Crist was born,  
 & slen his children tvay  
 & alien his broþer wiþ þe blode,

<sup>117</sup> AN *Amis*, ll. 1075-92.

<sup>118</sup> *Ibid.*, l. 1103.

<sup>119</sup> *Ibid.*, ll. 1126-30. The Middle English text is similar here, but there the comment is preceded by an expression of sorrow for the loss of her children.

Purth Godes grace þat is so gode  
 His wo schuld wende oway.  
 Þus him þou3t al þo þre ni3t  
 An angel out of heuen bri3t  
 Warned him euer more  
 3if he wald do as he him hi3t,  
 His broþer schuld ben as fair a kni3t  
 As euer he was biforn.  
 Ful bliþe was sir Amis þo,  
 Ac for his childer him was ful wo,  
 For fairer ner non born.  
 Wel loþ him was his childer to slo  
 & wele loþer his broþer forgo  
 Þat is so kinde ycorn.<sup>120</sup>

The fact that the voice that commands him comes from an angel seems to suggest a clear spiritual endorsement of the act, at least as clear as the disapproval of Amiloun's combat that was expressed by the heavenly voice in that scene.<sup>121</sup> This seems to be adopted from the hagiographic version of the story, where it is also clear that the command comes from an angel. There, it is not a test with an uncertain outcome, as it is in the Anglo-Norman romance. Because it is a hagiographic tale, the reader is expected to trust that God has a plan, despite the anguish that plan produces. But moving this angelic command to kill Amis's children into the genre of romance produces much greater discomfort around the act. The infusion of hagiographic details into this translation of a more "worldly" romance creates a sense of having "tacked on" religious references and encourages the reader to consider the extent to which one should be able to justify all acts that satisfy one's personal and secular interests merely by claiming that they are undertaken in God's name.

An additional revision to this scene highlights the problematic nature of the murder and of accepting that it is sanctioned by God merely because the translator turned the voice into an angelic one. The voice in the Middle English text commands that the children be killed on Christmas night, drawing a parallel between the murder of Amis's children to save Amiloun and "swiche time as Ihesu ful of mi3t / Was born to saue mankunne."<sup>122</sup> Most often, it is argued that the Christmas setting suggests the sacrifice of Christ and its typological precursor, Abraham's sacrifice of Isaac, which is seen to parallel Amis's sacrifice of his own children.<sup>123</sup> Indeed, the story of Abraham's sacrifice of Isaac comes to mind in this scene. However, despite the fact that the act was commanded by an angel, the text frequently repeats that Amis kills his children not for God, but for his "broþer," and it points out that "to slen his childer so 3ing, / It were a

<sup>120</sup> Auchinleck *Amis*, ll. 2133-56.

<sup>121</sup> In fact, the Middle English text gives us double assurance that the plan will work because the voice expresses the same thing to Amiloun.

<sup>122</sup> Auchinleck *Amis*, ll. 2188-89.

<sup>123</sup> See for example Dannenbaum [Crane] 1983, p. 621, and Hume 1973, p. 29.

dedli sinne,”<sup>124</sup> which problematically signals the apparent authorization by God of a clearly sinful act done for a reason that is more secular than spiritual. On an extratextual level, it is clear to the reader that the translator has intervened to insert the notion of God’s approval here (and to remind the reader that the act is sinful), a theoretical reflection, perhaps, of the liberty taken by Rome to ascribe God’s approval to the killing of Christians for secular reasons throughout the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries.

Moreover, the actual events do not properly correspond with respect to the typological significance that critics have pointed out. It is Christ’s death, not his birth, that is the typological descendant of the sacrifice of Isaac, but the setting in the Middle English *Amis and Amiloun* is Christmas, not Good Friday. The Christmas setting is suggestive of a different biblical story involving the killing of children, the Massacre of the Innocents. The young children killed shortly after the birth of Christ were murdered in order to preserve a worldly relationship (the secular kingship over the Jews), as Amis’s children are murdered to preserve the friends’ worldly relationship. Yet, the apparent association of the killing of Amis’s children with the Massacre of the Innocents is also problematic because of the fact that it is an angel from heaven that commands it, not a secular king as in the biblical story. This fact contributes further to the general sense of discomfort about the extent to which we can make any action seem “right” if we do it in God’s name.

The translative revisions in the Middle English text generate a dialogue with other versions of the tale that were circulating in Anglo-Norman and Latin, and the unique mix of romantic and hagiographic material troubles generic boundaries, creating a disruptive tension around the most problematic moments in the text. The translation revises the values depicted in other versions of the story and asks readers to think critically about the morality of the heroes’ actions. In this way, the translative revisions move the reader away from the simplistic “ideal” with which we most commonly associate the romance genre and reflect instead a much more real uncertainty and ambiguity around what it is right to do in the name of God.

There is, in fact, a medieval precedent for questioning the absolute “rightness” of these friends’ actions in the earliest known written account of the tale. The eleventh-century poet Rodulfus Tortarius told the story in a Latin epistle, “ad Bernardum.” In the *cauda*, he suggests that there are values that are greater than friendship, and upholding them would give one good reason to spurn friendship.<sup>125</sup> Because of this *cauda*, and because of the fact that earlier in his version he expresses doubt about the veracity of some elements of the tale, Françoise Le Saux suggests that he tells the story “as a counter-example to illustrate excessive friendship, rather than to serve as a model.”<sup>126</sup> Rodulfus Tortarius gives “justice” as an example of a value greater than friendship and is therefore musing on various secular values, so the complex interaction between secular and spiritual values that I described above is unique to the Middle English text. However,

---

<sup>124</sup> Auchinleck *Amis*, ll. 2182-83.

<sup>125</sup> Haec retuli tibi, care mihi, studeas u tamari,

Pro sola spernas id modo iustitia:

Iusticiae zelo licet irasci tibi caro,

Maior amicitia denique iusticia (Rudolphus Tortarius, edited by Ogle and Schullian 1933, ll. 321-4).

<sup>126</sup> Le Saux 1993, p. 2.

this Latin version shows that the friends' story was sometimes treated critically, and the acts they committed to uphold their oath were considered excessive, at least once, even before the Middle English version was written. The Middle English revisions suggest not only that the friends' behavior is excessive, but also that there should be limits to the acceptable use of God's name to justify acts carried out for worldly gain, a message that resonates with other texts in the Auchinleck Manuscript and with fourteenth-century English concerns about the motivations of individual crusaders and the widespread sacralization of secular wars.

### **Beves of Hampton**

Beves of Hampton, like Guy of Warwick, has been considered a model of "Christian chivalry" that fourteenth-century people are called to emulate.<sup>127</sup> The translative revisions in the Middle English *Beves of Hampton*, however, transform his character so that he is far less perfect than his Anglo-Norman counterpart, and they put the text in conversation with some of the problems—such as an inability to distinguish between enemy and ally and Christian and Saracen—generated by Rome's sacralization of secular warfare and the pope's involvement in the thirteenth-century Barons' Wars in particular, which I will discuss in greater detail below.

The Anglo-Norman *Boeve de Haumtone* tells the story of Boeve, whose mother asks her lover to kill her husband (Boeve's father), which he does. She then asks Boeve's tutor, Sabot, to kill her son as well, but he chooses to hide him from her instead. Boeve refuses to remain hidden and tries to kill his mother's new husband, which prompts her to sell him to Saracen merchants. He ends up serving King Hermine of Egypt and falls in love with his daughter, Josiane. Boeve is slandered and sent to Bradmund, king of Damascus, who imprisons him for seven years. Meanwhile Josiane is in a chaste marriage to Yvori, king of Monbrant. Boeve escapes and rescues her, and they head for England with a Saracen giant, Escopart, as their servant. The English King Edgar gives Boeve his rightful inheritance, but when his horse kills the king's son (who tried to steal him), Boeve is banished. Their former servant, Escopart, betrays them and kidnaps Josiane after she gives birth to twin sons. Boeve's tutor, Sabot, rescues Josiane and returns her to him. Josiane's former husband, Yvori, has been attacking her father, Hermine. Boeve, his two sons, and Terri (Sabot's son) kill Yvori and take his land, Monbrant. They then return to England to attempt to get King Edgar to restore Sabot's son's inheritance. One of Boeve's sons (Miles) marries Edgar's daughter. The other (Gui), inherits Hermine's kingdom. Boeve returns to his land, Monbrant, and after he and Josiane die, their son Gui inherits that land.

The Anglo-Norman *Boeve* is preserved in manuscripts that date from the thirteenth through the early fourteenth centuries, and it was probably composed in the very late twelfth century; Dominica Legge suggests that it may have been written for the family of Aubigny (or Albini), earls of Arundel.<sup>128</sup> Inconsistencies in plot details and the

---

<sup>127</sup> Turville-Petre 1996, p. 134.

<sup>128</sup> For the date, see Weiss 1986. On the issue of patronage, see Legge 1963, p. 159. The Anglo-Norman *Boeve de Haumtone* is extant in one manuscript and two sets of short fragments, and it was also preserved in a manuscript that was burned in 1940. The only manuscript that survives today is Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, MS nouv. acqu. fr. 4532. It is dated to the early fourteenth century, and it is incomplete,

fact that the first part is written in rhyme while the second part is assonance has led most scholars to believe that the part from *laisse* CLXVI to the end represents a continuation.<sup>129</sup> The Auchinleck Manuscript preserves the earliest extant translation into Middle English,<sup>130</sup> and the method of translation involves both close translation and major interpolations that put the text in dialogue with its original, with the conventions of Anglo-Norman *chansons de geste* in general, with the other texts in the Auchinleck Manuscript, and with the particular historical concerns that have been discussed throughout this study. The original translation could date as late as the first quarter of the fourteenth century, but a fight which takes place in the streets of London, an interpolation which Judith Weiss's work suggests is a feature of the original Middle English translation, seems to resonate with the political climate of England in the 1260's or 70's.<sup>131</sup>

This interpolation is one of the features of the Middle English *Beves* that explicitly puts the text in conversation with the historical issues I present in chapter one and that I have argued are relevant to the translative revisions in several Auchinleck texts. In this scene, Beves, the powerful vassal of the weak King Edgar, fights Londoners who are defending the King. Judith Weiss has noted clear parallels between this literary fight, emphasizing the closed gates and chained streets of London, and the incident between Simon de Montfort and Henry III, when in 1263 Simon arrived outside the walls of London, and Henry ordered the royalist faction to shut the gates of the city and bar them with chains. Ultimately, Simon de Montfort was aided by London citizens, and he and the king made a truce, as did King Edgar and Beves in the story (of course this did not last in the case of Simon de Montfort and King Henry).<sup>132</sup> This scene indicates that the English text was not only translated during or sometime after the Barons' War in England

---

breaking off at line 1268 of Stimming's edition. Leuven, Univ. Bibl., MS G.170 (The Firmin Didot MS) is dated to the second half of the thirteenth-century. Unfortunately this manuscript was burned in 1940, but Stimming used it after line 1268 for his edition. The two sets of fragments include London, Lambeth Palace, 1237, Nos. 1, 2, dated to the second half of the thirteenth century. This set of fragments preserves lines corresponding to lines 1641-63 and 1672-96 of Stimming's edition. Finally, University of Glasgow, Hunterian Library, MS 466, is a 62-line fragment corresponding to lines 1003-65 of Stimming's edition, which was discovered on a pastedown in the Hunterian Library. Judith Weiss suggests that they date to the early thirteenth century (Weiss 2000).

<sup>129</sup> See Stimming 1899, pp. xlv-l and Weiss 1986, p. 240.

<sup>130</sup> The Middle English translation is extant in six manuscripts in addition to the Auchinleck Manuscript (seven total): Cambridge, Gonville and Caius College, MS 175 (third quarter of the fourteenth century); London, British Library, MS Egerton 2862 (the Sutherland MS) (fifteenth or late fourteenth century); Naples, Biblioteca Nazionale, MS XIII.B.29 (mid fifteenth century); Cambridge, Trinity College, MS 0.2.13 (mid to late fifteenth-century fragment); Manchester, Chetham's Library, MS Mum.A.6.31 (1470-1480); Cambridge, University Library, MS Ff.2.38 (sixteenth century); Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Eng. Poet. D.208 (mid to late fifteenth-century fragment).

<sup>131</sup> See Weiss 1979. However, there are indications that this text was translated in conjunction with the production of the Auchinleck Manuscript, in the early fourteenth century. See the introduction to this chapter and the discussion of the dragon interpolation below. Literary texts about Simon de Montfort and the Barons' Wars continued to be produced after the wars took place, so references to them do not necessarily indicate that texts were produced at the time of the conflict. A majority of the medieval texts about Simon de Montfort were produced in the last three decades of the thirteenth century (Valente 1995, pp. 43 and 47).

<sup>132</sup> Weiss 1979, p. 74.

but that the events of this war are intimately connected with the details of the translative revisions.

One important aspect of the Barons' War was the involvement of the papacy. As I discuss in greater detail in chapter one, Rome was on the side of the king, and crusades were formally authorized and preached against the barons and their allies, Christians who were treated as infidels. Simon de Montfort, himself a crusader, fought the papacy-backed royalists with a sort of unauthorized counter-crusade, and he and his allies were even promised remission of their sins by the bishop of Worcester.<sup>133</sup> They wore white crosses—which were later countered by the royalist's red crosses—and they even had themselves tonsured before one battle.<sup>134</sup> This was a holy war on British soil, with the English fighting the English, Christians fighting Christians, crusaders fighting crusaders, and Rome authorizing the use of crusades against fellow Christians for non-spiritual gains.

The interpolation that evokes this context explicitly brings the text into conversation with problems caused by Rome's sacralization of secular warfare, particularly the blurred boundaries between wrong and right, Saracen and Christian, and enemy and ally. In fact, Rome is clearly condemned in this text through another translative revision that could be explained by the historical context that is evoked by the London interpolation discussed above. When Beves and Josiane are in Cologne, the Middle English text inserts a story about two dragons that represent the souls of the evil kings of Apulia and Calabria. Beves kills one of them, and this part of the story, to which I will return below, is the subject of much scholarship on the Middle English *Beves*. Little attention is given to the second dragon, described here:

þat oþer dragoun is fli3t nome  
To seinte Peter is brige of Rome;  
þar he schel leggen ay,  
Til hit come domes dai.  
And eueri seue 3er ones,  
Whan þe dragoun moweþ is bones,  
þan comeþ a roke & a stink  
Out of þe water vnder þe brink  
þat men þerof takeþ þe feuere  
þat neuer after mai he keuere;  
And who þat nel nou3t leue me,  
Wite at pilgrimes þat þer haþ be  
For þai can telle 3ow, iwis,  
Of þat dragoun how it is.<sup>135</sup>

---

<sup>133</sup> On the remission of sins, see Lloyd 1985, p. 116.

<sup>134</sup> The above information about the barons' revolts is from Tyerman 1988, especially pp. 144-151 and pp. 328-330. See also chapter one for more details on this subject.

<sup>135</sup> All quotations from the Middle English *Beves of Hampton* will be taken from Burnley and Wiggins, ed., 2003, and will be cited by line number as "*Beves*." *Beves*, ll. 2465-78.

The dragon is commonly associated with the devil, and here it creates such a stink under Saint Peter's Bridge in Rome that it plagues men with a "fever" from which they will never recover (verifiable by any pilgrim who has ventured into Rome). This interpolation clearly implicates Rome in some sort of moral disease.<sup>136</sup> Together with the inclusion of the fight in London, this scene places the text in the context of serious social, spiritual, and political concerns about Rome's abuse of its spiritual power for secular gains, which prompted a critical discourse in England about the ideology behind the crusades.<sup>137</sup> The same interpolation in fact alludes to the Middle English *Guy of Warwick*, which explores similar issues. When Beves kills the first dragon, he is compared with a number of significant heroes:

Swich bataile dede neuer non  
 Cristene man of flesch ne bon  
 Of a dragoun þer beside  
 Þat Beues slou3 þer in þat tide  
 Saue sire Launcelet de Lake;  
 He fau3t wiþ a fur drake,  
 And Wade dede also,  
 & neuer kni3tes boutte þai to.  
 Gij a Warwik, ich vnderstonde,  
 Slou3 a dragoun in Norphomberlonde.  
 How þat ilche dragoun com þer  
 Ich wile 3ow telle in what maner.<sup>138</sup>

It is unclear to what dragon fight the reference to "Wade" refers, but it seems the text refers specifically to the English version of *Guy of Warwick*, since it names him in English, whereas it uses the French name for "Lancelot de Lake."<sup>139</sup> Moreover, Beves's dragon fight recalls the one described in the Auchinleck *Guy of Warwick* through similar descriptions and through some lines that are actually identical,<sup>140</sup> which suggests that both of these texts formed part of a larger project of translative revision designed to generate an extratextual dialogue among Auchinleck texts and their originals about ideological issues that were pertinent to fourteenth-century England.<sup>141</sup> This scene further evokes the crusades, and therefore the problems they posed in England, by comparing Beves to St. George, commonly called upon by crusaders: "A nemenede sein Gorge, our

---

<sup>136</sup> For a different reason, Judith Weiss also notes that this interpolation creates "a disturbing picture of the heart of Christendom" (Weiss 1979, p. 72).

<sup>137</sup> For more on England's particular response to Rome's sacralization of secular warfare, see chapter one.

<sup>138</sup> *Beves*, ll. 2423-34.

<sup>139</sup> Weiss points out that Wade's dragon fight is unknown and that there is no known translation of a story about Lancelot into English that predates *Beves* (Weiss 1979, p. 75, n. 7).

<sup>140</sup> Weiss 1979, p. 75, n. 7.

<sup>141</sup> In chapter two, I showed that *Guy of Warwick* and *Reinbroun* are likely original translations that were created in conjunction with the Auchinleck Manuscript. The fact that *Guy of Warwick* shares lines with this major interpolation in the Auchinleck *Beves* indicates that it, too, may have been an original translation, like several other Auchinleck translations. See chapter two and the introduction to this chapter.

leuedi kniȝt, / And sete on his helm þat was briȝt.”<sup>142</sup>

The above revisions place the text in a particular historical context through major interpolations, but like other Auchinleck translations, *Beves* includes minor translative revisions as well that work with the major interpolations to generate an interrogative dialogue about the values depicted in the source text. One significant example of this strategy is the increase in religious language, such as prayers and other references to God. We saw in *Amis and Amiloun*—which, like *Beves*, also shares lines with *Guy of Warwick* and therefore seems also to have been revised in conjunction with the Auchinleck Manuscript—that the increase in religious language does not merely locate the text in a more pious context; rather it serves a significant interpretive purpose that requires readers to consider the disjunction between what it is “right” to do in God’s name and the acts that are actually committed in his name. In *Beves*, these minor prayers and invocations of God are added to the beginning of most battles, which are no more pious than they were in the original text. In fact, because *Beves* is fighting for a Saracen king, many of them are fought for the purpose of expanding or protecting Hermine’s Saracen kingdom. The additions therefore provide an outward appearance of Christian honor despite the fact that *Beves*’s actions—fighting for the preservation of a Saracen kingdom—are somewhat problematic.

These minor revisions use the empty, formulaic language of Christianity while depicting acts that are morally questionable since they show a Christian acting more like a Saracen, a point to which I will return later. They form part of a larger program of revisions to the Anglo-Norman text that serve to blur the boundary between Christian and Saracen, wrong and right that are taken for granted in the original, which was written at a time when these categories were more clearly delineated both in literature and in reality.<sup>143</sup> In this way, they interrogate the reader’s assumptions about these categories and bring the text out of the ideal world of the *chanson de geste*<sup>144</sup> and into the real context of fourteenth-century England.

The Anglo-Norman *Boeve*, like most *chansons de geste*, relies on generic expectations to assure the reader that *Boeve* is a good Christian despite the circumstances that forced him to live among Saracens. In *chansons de geste*, it is not uncommon for Christians and Saracens to resemble one another in prowess or even to respect one another for their great strength. Religious difference is usually clear, however, and unquestionably distinguishes them. In the context of the *chanson de geste*, unless we are

---

<sup>142</sup> *Beves*, ll. 2641-2. It is commonly argued that this reference emphasizes *Beves*’s “Englishness.” See for example Weiss 1979, p. 72, Calkin 2004, p. 145, and Rouse 2008, p. 115. However, around the time that *Beves* was translated, the saint might not yet have had such a strong association with England, but he did have a strong association with crusaders in general. Calkin reports that the only known association of St. George with England before *Beves* was translated is the fact that in 1277 St. George was used to identify English troops campaigning in Wales (Calkin 2004, p. 152, n. 17). However, at this time, it is likely that St. George served as a symbol to invoke the crusades rather than as a national symbol of England, since this was a common strategy in late thirteenth-century English wars. See chapter one for more on this subject.

<sup>143</sup> See chapter one for a discussion that contrasts the crusades in the early twelfth century and the attitudes surrounding them with the crusades and attitudes surrounding them in the late thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries.

<sup>144</sup> The Anglo-Norman *Boeve* is usually called a “romance,” but it has more in common with *chansons de geste* than with romances. Marianne Ailes argues that it should be considered a *chanson de geste* in Ailes 2008; I agree and will refer to it as a *chanson de geste*.

dealing with a traitor, the reader is usually expected to assume, regardless of the circumstances, the famous notion expressed in the *Chanson de Roland*, “Païen unt tort e chrestïens unt dreit.”<sup>145</sup> However, translative revisions in the Middle English *Beves* introduce new moral dilemmas that blur this boundary even in a spiritual sense, a dangerous reflection of the ideological problems inherent in crusading against Christians.

The Middle English translation begins in a way that challenges the reader’s generic expectations and suggests that s/he should be critical of the text and should not assume that it operates in the same discursive mode as the original. Ivana Djordjevic has shown that the Middle English text leaves out an important detail in the way it characterizes Beves’s father. The Anglo-Norman text alludes to the pressure he received from his people to marry in old age, a common motif in medieval literature. Djordjevic argues that since the Middle English translation leaves out this detail as regards the pressure on the father to marry, he simply becomes, in that text, a *senex amans*, or an old man who suddenly decides he wants a wife. This character type is typically found in medieval *fabliaux*, and the omission in the Middle English text, then, invites one to laugh at his deception, despite the fact that such a reaction would be inappropriate in the context of *Beves*. Furthermore, Djordjevic argues, this makes Beves’s mother a *malmariée* in the Middle English translation, and the text is further revised to give her a miniature *chanson de malmariée* that invites the reader’s sympathy for her miserable situation.<sup>146</sup>

Djordjevic argues that this translative revision is not deliberate and that it represents a misunderstanding on the part of the translator.<sup>147</sup> However, it might be as deliberate as many of the other translative revisions, and it does seem to serve a similar purpose. The generic expectations triggered by the “fabliau-esque” quality of the opening scene generate for the Anglo-Norman cross-reader—the only type of reader who could understand it, since there is no *fabliau* tradition in Middle English at the time of this translation<sup>148</sup>—a sense of generic disorientation that forces him or her to reconsider who is right, who is wrong, and where his or her sympathies should lie. Beves’s father, an innocent victim in the Anglo-Norman text, becomes a laughable fool, and his mother,

---

<sup>145</sup> Short, ed., 2005, l. 1015.

<sup>146</sup> The summarized argument above may be read in detail in Djordjevic 2005a, p. 20. The miniature *chanson de malmariée* that Djordjevic points out is found in *Beves*, ll. 58-69.

<sup>147</sup> Djordjevic 2005a, p. 20. Djordjevic argues that although the translator was “trying hard to be faithful to his original” (ibid., p. 11), he must have misunderstood the reference to the motif of the old ruler whose subjects ask him to marry: “Working a hundred years later, the Middle English translator could have no access to the socio-historical context in which such allusions were made and inevitably missed them” (ibid., p. 25). However, although the translator lived in a different time, a great number of surviving literary texts that include the motif should have given the translator plenty of literary context that would allow him to recognize it, since it continues to appear in Middle English translations well into the late medieval period (Chaucer’s *Griselda* story comes to mind). In fact, although there are one hundred years between the composition of the Anglo-Norman and Middle English stories about Beves, the motif is retained in the only surviving Anglo-Norman manuscript of *Boeve*, which dates to the same period as the Middle English translation. If the passage of time should cause this comprehension problem in Middle English, one would expect it to be a problem in later Anglo-Norman manuscript versions as well, but it is not.

<sup>148</sup> *Dame Sirith* is thought to have been composed sometime in the thirteenth century, but it is clearly inspired by the French tradition, and the survival of a single Middle English fabliau before Chaucer does not indicate a Middle English fabliau tradition. For more on the absence of a Middle English fabliau tradition before Chaucer, see Furrow 1989.

who should be despised for her treatment of her husband, becomes a recognizable character-type with whom the reader should sympathize. This expectation, too, is thwarted when she tries to kill her own son, an act that goes far beyond the forgivable moral foibles of the traditional *malmariée*. The revision interrogates the clear moral categories depicted in the original text, and it calls attention early on to the fact that the reader should not rely on generic expectations; this translation violates expectations and should be read with a critical eye. As we shall see below, a number of other translative revisions operate through a manipulation of the reader's generic expectations, as traditional topoi from *chansons de geste* are revised in interesting ways.

All of the early insular versions of this story—Anglo-Norman, Middle English, and Middle Welsh—include interesting formal innovations in the beginning of the text.<sup>149</sup> To my knowledge, such formal innovation is unique to the medieval insular versions, yet it is manifested differently in each language.<sup>150</sup> The Anglo-Norman text begins with a series of short *laissez* that are mostly six lines long, with occasional variation. After 66 short *laissez*, the work continues with *laissez* of divergent lengths. Ivana Djordjevic has noted that this is the only example of a long series of short *laissez* among Old French *chansons de geste*, which makes this presentation of *Boeve* rather remarkable.<sup>151</sup> It seems significant that the shift into *laissez* of divergent lengths occurs at the moment of Boeve's coming of age. In the series of short *laissez*, King Hermine consistently addresses Boeve by calling him "child" ("emfes"). In the final two *laissez* of the short series, he tells the "child" he will knight him when he comes of age, and the king's love for him and the jealousy of the other knights are described briefly. The formal transition happens precisely "Quaunt li emfes ou quinze aunz ou cesse acomplis."<sup>152</sup> No longer an "emfes," and no longer addressed as such, Boeve is described in the following three lines: "mult estoit beaus, fort et bien forniz; / en la court ne out chevaler si hardis / ke a li oseit turner, taunt fut il forcis."<sup>153</sup> Marking this transition, Boeve kills a boar, symbolically indicating his status as a great warrior.

The Anglo-Norman text marks a significant development in content with this formal transition. The wild divergence of the lengths of the *laissez* that follow may reflect the diverse nature of Boeve's following adventures, but since such divergence is quite the norm in Anglo-Norman texts, it is only remarkable because of the simple regularity of the *laissez* of Boeve's *enfance* which come before. The only significant irregularity amidst the series of short *laissez* occurs in *laisse* 21 (comprised of twelve lines), where Boeve's mother deceitfully sends her husband into the forest after a wild boar that she says will cure her feigned illness, only to have her lover kill him there. Doubling the length of the monorhymed *laisse* builds a crescendo that emphasizes

<sup>149</sup> There is also a later Irish version, translated from the English, which will not be considered in this study.

<sup>150</sup> See chapter six for an exploration of the formal innovations of the Middle Welsh text. The discussion here explores only the Middle English and Anglo-Norman texts.

<sup>151</sup> Djordjević 2005b.

<sup>152</sup> All quotations from the Anglo-Norman *Boeve de Haumtone* will be taken from Stimming's 1899 edition and will be cited by line number as "*Boeve*." *Boeve*, l. 416. This line occurs in *laisse* 67, which is nine lines long. This *laisse* may be counted among the short series, or it may mark the beginning of the series of *laissez* of divergent lengths. Either way, it marks a significant point in the text both with respect to structure and with respect to content.

<sup>153</sup> *Boeve*, ll. 417-19.

Boeve's mother's treachery and deceit in sending her husband after the boar. The content of this renegade 12-line *laisse* is linked with the content at the transition to *laisse*s of divergent lengths, as a significant boar hunt is introduced in both places. Through this link the text emphasizes structurally the two highly symbolic functions of the boar in Celtic mythology. The first boar hunt is carefully orchestrated by Boeve's mother on the first of May, the day on the Celtic calendar when the Otherworld is considered to be particularly accessible, and on this day, the boar ushers Boeve's father to his death, one common function of this richly symbolic hunt. The second boar hunt, which is introduced at the next significant structural shift, not only symbolizes Boeve's prowess, but also, since the boar is killed, symbolically associates him with his mother and her treachery and prefigures his later triumph over her. It seems that this unique *laisse* structure serves a specific function to highlight formally and draw parallels between significant moments in the content of the story.

Similarly, the Middle English *Beves* begins with a rather remarkable formal innovation, and this signals the translation's revision of the clearly delineated categories presented in the original. In three Middle English manuscripts, *Beves* begins in 6-line tail-rhyme stanzas but abandons this form after line 474 in favor of rhyming couplets.<sup>154</sup> In two others, the tail-rhyme stanzas are continued to line 527 before they are abandoned for couplets.<sup>155</sup> The points of departure do not match up between the Anglo-Norman and the Middle English texts. However, they do each place emphasis on different aspects of the text that seem foregrounded in their respective linguistic versions. As discussed above, the structure of the Anglo-Norman text seems to highlight very clearly Boeve's superior qualities. The parallel boar hunts at structurally significant moments show that he is a great warrior who will rightfully triumph over his evil mother and stepfather. It is clear that he is "good," and although he serves a Saracen king, it is because of his evil mother; the tone of the text throughout suggests a pervasive confidence in Boeve's Christian "rightness."

The structure of the Middle English text serves to present another perspective, one that is frequently also emphasized by the other translative revisions. The point at which the Middle English text switches from tail-rhyme to couplets places the emphasis on the actions Beves took to ensure his own banishment—his confrontation with his mother's lover. The moment in which Saber tells Beves that he, Beves, is to blame for the shame

---

<sup>154</sup> The three manuscripts include Edinburgh, National Library of Scotland, MS Advocates' 19.2.1; Cambridge, Gonville and Caius College MS 175; and Cambridge University Library, MS Ff.2.38.

<sup>155</sup> The two manuscripts include London, British Library, MS Egerton 2862 (AKA Sutherland or Trenthan MS), and Naples, Biblioteca Nazionale, MS XIII.B.29. Six-line tail-rhyme stanzas are rare in Middle English literature, and *Beves* is the earliest example. In fact, *Beves* may be the first tail-rhyme romance in Middle English (Djordjević 2005b, p. 51). Djordjević has argued that the Anglo-Norman short *laisse*s may have been the inspiration for the unique 6-line tail-rhyme stanzas that begin the Middle English *Beves*, an idea first proposed by Albert Baugh (Baugh 1959, p. 431). However, it is possible that the trajectory of influence could have gone in the other direction. The sole surviving copy of the beginning of the Anglo-Norman *Boeve* is preserved in a manuscript roughly contemporaneous with, possibly even later than, the first translation into Middle English. Given the relative frequency with which the earliest surviving copies of Middle English translations from Anglo-Norman texts present deliberate changes in verse form part way through the texts, and given the uniqueness of the change from "regular" short *laisse*s to *laisse*s of irregular lengths in the Anglo-Norman *Boeve*, it is certainly possible that it was the Middle English 6-line stanza that influenced the unique Anglo-Norman presentation in this late manuscript, rather than the other way around.

and woe that will ensue marks the end of the tail-rhyme section. Through the shift in verse form, the English text lingers on this moment where the categories of “right and wrong” are problematized. Had Beves followed Saber’s plan to have him raised elsewhere, in secret, until he was old enough to return and fight his stepfather for his rightful inheritance, he never would have had to “forsake” England. This is the case in the Anglo-Norman text as well, but the structural emphases there highlight Beves’s future triumph, not the rash choice he made that Saber reminds him ensured his banishment.

In the couplet section that follows, Beves is banished *outré-mer* by his mother. The metrical change creates for the reader an auditory and visual boundary that separates Beves’s life in England from his departure into *hethenese*, a formal textual marker of the permanence of his departure from England, which in the end he must “forswere.”<sup>156</sup> As in the Auchinleck *Guy of Warwick*, this formal shift straddles the boundary between the hero’s life in England and his life in exile, and it asks the reader to consider the aesthetics of boundary crossing: if we change the verse form of the story does it become a different story, or is it the same one in a different guise? If we send an Englishman on Crusade in the East, is it possible for him to return to England unaffected by life *outré-mer*? (In Beves’s case, it is not, neither was it the case for many *crucesignati* returning home.) If a Christian fights in the service of a Saracen king, to what extent is he still a Christian?

The latter two questions have already been identified as key concerns of the Middle English *Beves*. For instance, Calkin notes in this text “a clear anxiety about Christian characters too closely resembling Saracen characters who evoke aspects of medieval Muslim society.”<sup>157</sup> She reminds us that this was a genuine concern in thirteenth- and fourteenth-century England: “Historically, one of the concerns prompted by crusade and settlement in the East was the fear that western Christians involved in these activities might lose their sense of proper mores and become too similar to their Muslim opponents.”<sup>158</sup> In fact, given the additional historical context I have outlined in this study, Christians did not even need to go to the East in order to take on Saracen characteristics, since they were frequently demonized as heathens and excommunicated from the church, if such actions suited the political desires of the pope and his allies.

This blurring of boundaries between Christian and Saracen, right and wrong is explored in the first major interpolation in *Beves*. The Middle English translation adds a Christmas Day battle, and it is placed precisely at the point at which the Anglo-Norman text ends its series of short *laissez*. It, rather than the boar hunt (which is retained, but comes just after the interpolation), becomes Beves’s first fight. In the Anglo-Norman text, Boeve’s first fight paints him as a great warrior and prefigures his future triumph over his mother. Just as the revised structural shift in the Middle English text blurs the boundaries between “right and wrong” by emphasizing the harm caused by Beves’s rash

---

<sup>156</sup> *Beves*, l. 3402. This new emphasis may also reflect a contemporary concern about English leaders choosing to leave England for the East: “Since the beginning of the movement, voices had been raised against the departure of rulers and other leading members of society. The obligation to fight for the cross conflicted with the responsibility to protect and support family, vassals, subjects, or lords” (Tyerman 1988, p. 166).

<sup>157</sup> Calkin 2005, p. 54. See also Calkin 2004 and Rouse 2008.

<sup>158</sup> Calkin 2005, p. 54.

decision to confront his stepfather, this first battle also depicts a rash and irresponsible Beves, through a complex reworking of a familiar *chanson de geste* topos.

Just before the interpolation, Beves becomes a knight in the service of a Saracen king, enthusiastically willing to wave the Saracen flag in battle. The Middle English text adds that the king loves Beves as his “broþer,”<sup>159</sup> a small but significant revision that is repeated later in the text as well,<sup>160</sup> and a familial simile that links him strongly with his new life with the Saracens. This scene that comes right before the Christmas Day battle invites the reader to consider what kinds of battles he might fight in such an army. Might he, a Christian, end up fighting other Christians?

Shortly after he is officially in the service of Saracens, Beves is asked by a group of them what day it is, and, having been away from Christian lands since he was seven years old, he does not know that it is Christmas:

A Sarasin began to say  
And askede him what het þat day.  
Beues seide ‘For soþ, ywis,  
I not neuer what dai it is,  
For I nas bouste seue winter old,  
Fro Cristendome ich was isold;  
Parfore I no can telle nou3t þe  
What dai þat hit mi3te be.’<sup>161</sup>

However, the Saracens, who have never lived in Christian lands, do know, and they inform Beves that he should honor his God on this day:

þe Sarasin beheld and lou3  
‘þis dai’ a seide ‘I knowe wel inou3;  
þis is þe ferste dai of 3oul,  
þe God was boren wiþouten doul;  
Forþi men maken þer mor blisse  
þan men do her in heþenese.  
Anoure þe God so I schel myn,  
Boþe Mahoun and Apolyn.’<sup>162</sup>

Instead of honoring God, Beves responds by becoming angry at the Saracens and retorts that, for his love of God, he would fight every one of them if he were as strong as his father, a response which, in turn, angers the Saracens and causes a gratuitous fight to ensue.

This scene revises a common literary topos in Old French and Anglo-Norman *chansons de geste* which involves a Christian crusader informing a Saracen about Christianity and giving him the choice to either honor the Christian God (convert) or fight.

---

<sup>159</sup> *Beves*, l. 578.

<sup>160</sup> *Ibid.*, l. 1332.

<sup>161</sup> *Ibid.*, ll. 591-98.

<sup>162</sup> *Ibid.*, l. 599-606.

Here, the reader is presented with an oddly reverse scenario. We have Saracens informing Beves, a Christian, about the Christian faith, telling him to honor the Christian God. Rather than choosing to honor God peacefully, he, like most of the literary Saracens who are asked to honor God, chooses to fight instead. In fact, this choice violates the most important Christian feast day by inciting an unnecessary battle. Visually, the text depicts an appropriate and familiar *tableau* that portrays a Christian valiantly fighting (and beating) Saracens. But the scenario leading up to that image is deeply problematic. In this way it is reminiscent of the revisions discussed above—in which Christian prayers are added before battles depicting a Christian fighting on behalf of Saracens—in that the empty, formulaic language of Christianity (here, in the form of a recognizable Christian crusade *tableau*) is “tacked on” to episodes that, upon further contemplation, seem morally problematic.

The scene theorizes questions pertaining to the crusades and the motivations behind them. Is battling Saracens in and of itself a way of honoring God? Is fighting itself a “Christian” act, even if the purpose is for political or personal gain, rather than for the spread of Christianity?<sup>163</sup> It theorizes questions pertaining to boundaries and religious difference, where Beves is placed in the typical position of the Saracens but does not make the more honorable spiritual choice. Moreover, it paints a picture of a Christian who looks morally and spiritually like a Saracen, and this is different from the more commonly depicted similarities with respect to manners and bravery.

In fact, Beves’s spiritual devotion to Christianity is questioned through another translative revision that also complicates a topos found in *chansons de geste*. Typically, in *chansons de geste* and historiography, when a Christian blesses a Saracen by the Saracen gods, it is meant in a very tongue-and-cheek way, usually as a malediction of sorts. In both the Anglo-Norman and the Middle English texts, Beves, thinking he is making an innocent delivery for King Ermin, brings a letter to Brademond bearing instructions for his own death. In the Anglo-Norman text, he threatens to cut off Brademond’s head if he doesn’t read the letter quickly enough:

“Par mun chef!” dist Boefs, “jeo vus frai bien saver,  
lisez moi ceo bref toust saunz demorrer,  
ou jeo vus couperai la teste o mun espeie de ascer.”<sup>164</sup>

The Auchinleck *Beves* revises this scene by removing the threat and inserting instead a blessing:

‘God þat made þis world a[l] ronde  
þe saue, sire king Brademond,  
And ek alle þine fere  
þat I se now here,  
And 3if þat ilche blessing

<sup>163</sup> In fact, Calkin notes that Beves often asserts his Christianity through battle. She cites this scene and the one in which he destroys Saracen idols as major examples. Calkin 2005, p. 57. I agree, but I wonder if the context of these scenes suggests that the text is critical of this method of asserting Christianity.

<sup>164</sup> *Boeve*, ll. 898-900.

Likeþ þe riſt noþing,  
Mahoun, þat is god þin,  
Teruagaunt & Apolin  
þe blessi and di3te  
Be alle here mi3te.<sup>165</sup>

Here, rather than a malediction, Beves's blessing in the name of Mahoun, Tervagaunt, and Apolin seems sincere because it is casually parallel to his first blessing, in the name of the Christian God. This challenges readers' expectations and suggests a dangerous acceptance of the notion that the Saracen gods might actually have the power to protect the Saracens, a radical suggestion, since the absolute rule in *chansons de geste* is that regardless of how admirable the Saracens may be as warriors, the Saracen gods fail to protect them. This is one of several revisions speckled throughout the text that invite serious questions about religious identity and difference and that suggest an uncomfortable inability to categorize and delineate clear boundaries between "us" and "them."<sup>166</sup>

The translative revisions in the Middle English *Beves* seem to test the limits of Christianity and reveal a general uncertainty about who the "enemy" is and what that means and who "Christians" are and what that category means. Like *Guy of Warwick*, a text with which *Beves* shares some identical lines, the translative revisions in *Beves* interrogate some of the cultural values of the source text both through features of form and of content. And like *Guy of Warwick*, *Beves* questions what it "looks like" to be Christian or Saracen, who is fighting whom, and who can cross what boundaries—spiritual, ethnic, linguistic, literary, and rhetorical.

### **Conclusion**

As I suggested in chapter one, it was something of a cultural revolution to reproduce French texts in Middle English in the early to mid fourteenth century, as much as interrogating the ideas espoused in the original texts represents a cultural revolution of another sort. All of the Auchinleck translations discussed in this study use translative revision to destabilize norms and reflect various aspects of fourteenth-century English concerns pertaining to an inability to define clearly various cultural, linguistic, and spiritual categories that were more easily distinguished at the time the original texts were produced. The Auchinleck Manuscript itself violates the expectations of early fourteenth-century readers through its virtually monolingual English collection of texts, of which the most prominent are romances and *chansons de geste*, a type of text that a fourteenth-century reader would have expected see only in French. The texts themselves

---

<sup>165</sup> *Beves*, ll. 1373-82.

<sup>166</sup> This and the other revisions I have discussed put the text in dialogue with other Auchinleck translations that seem to engage with similar issues and suggest similar problems. The fact that these were issues with which the Auchinleck Manuscript was particularly concerned is indicated by the fact that some of the revisions that generate this dialogue were, in turn, revised in later Middle English renditions of the texts. For example, this blessing is unique to the Auchinleck *Beves*, and some later renditions turn it into a malediction, such as Cambridge, University Library, MS Ff.2.38. In Manchester, Chetham's Library, MS Mum.A.6.31, Beves asks the Saracen gods to give Brademond a short life and an evil end. See Calkin 2008, p.137. Calkin reads this moment in Auchinleck as an indication of Beves's diplomacy (ibid., p. 198).

violate expectations, in that they interrogate and revise traditional ideas and ideals, many of which are espoused by the original French language texts.

It is significant that it is through the method of translation that this interrogation takes place. Different from a redaction in the same language, a translation announces itself—through its visual and audible distinction—as a “different” text, despite its similarity with the original. It resides on the border where cultures, languages, ideas, and times bleed into one another, a sort of “liminal” space that is at once familiar and quite different. A recent description of the limen in literature calls it “a fertile place for creativity and change, if not the very seat of such activity,” the significance of which lies in its “disruptive forces and generating power.”<sup>167</sup> In the Auchinleck translations, new and sometimes controversial ideas are generated through the very method of translation, suggesting that here, it is developing into a rhetorically rich mode of discourse that signals to readers the expectation of serious questions that put productive pressure on traditional ideals. This is accomplished through the reader’s critical evaluation of the significance of translative revisions, which requires reading and thinking across languages. In this way, the Auchinleck Manuscript demonstrates yet another innovation (which can be added to its long list) in the way information is communicated and significance is inscribed, and it dramatically changes the way we think about the transmission of ideas and the use of the English language in medieval Britain.

---

<sup>167</sup> Bredendick 2004, p. 1.

## Chapter 6

### Welsh Translation in the Context of British Multilingualism

With respect to new literary productions in the thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries, English was a secondary or even tertiary language. As I discussed in chapter one, during this period English appeared alone in manuscripts much less frequently than it appeared alongside Latin or Anglo-Norman texts. It most frequently had to share space with one or both of the dominant written languages, whereas Anglo-Norman and Latin more frequently than not stood alone. Despite the fact that Anglo-Norman did not as frequently share physical manuscript space with other languages, we know that it nevertheless actively shared a literary environment with English, Latin, and Welsh. Since Ian Short's influential article eloquently brought into view a most obvious and yet heretofore largely unrecognized fact—that written French vernacular literary tradition actually began in England, and that prior to that, the prestigious and the only written vernacular literary tradition was in English—scholars have increasingly recognized the debt that the development of French literature owes to the existence of an Old English literary tradition.<sup>1</sup> Twelfth-century writers such as Marie de France and Wace make the multilingual—English, French, Latin, and Welsh or Breton—environment in which they wrote very clear.<sup>2</sup> Even as late as the thirteenth century, the author of the Anglo-Norman *Waldef* justifies his translation of the story by discussing the history of translation from English to French, culminating in his final 'truth' claim, "Pus esguardai tuz les escriz, / L'estoire englesche regardai, / En franceis la translatai."<sup>3</sup>

Chapter one outlined the multilingual character of medieval England's literary milieu, including evidence that the trilingual English, French, and Latin manuscript London, British Library, Harley MS 2253 was produced in an environment that was familiar with Welsh literary traditions. However, despite the proliferation of well-known Celtic themes in Anglo-Norman, Old French, and Middle English literature, Welsh is frequently not considered in relation to other vernacular literary traditions. This lack is in part due to a general want of attention paid to Welsh literature by scholars of non-Celtic literatures, and in part to the relative lack of manuscript evidence indicating that Welsh literature rubbed shoulders in any significant way with Anglo-Norman or English literature. Like early French literature written in England, which was not, until recently, put in meaningful dialogue with Old and Early Middle English texts, the manuscript context of Welsh literature gives the impression that it existed in an isolated vacuum of

---

<sup>1</sup> Short 1991. On the subject of Old English literature as a context for the development of French vernacular literature, see Tyler 2009.

<sup>2</sup> See chapter five for more on Marie de France and the multilingual literary milieu in which she wrote. Wace is famous for his linguistic and onomastic emphases in the *Roman de Brut*, where he frequently muses over the linguistic histories of place names. Often, however, he discusses the various names of places not in the context of historical evolution but rather in the context of contemporary multilingualism. Here is one brief example: "Urb est latins, citez romanz, / Cestre est engleis, kaer bretanz" (Weiss, ed., 1999, *Roman de Brut*, ll. 1231-2).

<sup>3</sup> Holden, ed., 1984, *Le Roman de Waldef*, ll. 84-86.

‘Welshness,’ which might be one reason scholars do not generally consider it in the context of Anglo-Norman and English literature.<sup>4</sup>

Moreover, the paucity of medieval Welsh manuscripts that survive today—less than 250 in total (not including post-1200 fragments), and only about 160 of those written in the Welsh vernacular<sup>5</sup>—makes it difficult to provide an accurate picture of written Welsh literary tradition. And the general lack of information about what was contained in Welsh libraries even makes it difficult to ascertain the extent to which texts in English and Anglo-Norman might have shared shelf space, if not manuscript space, with Welsh texts. After making this point, Ceridwen Lloyd-Morgan indicates, however, that the little documentary evidence we have does suggest that at least by the fourteenth century French and Welsh books appeared together in some Welsh libraries, and there is no question that English books were in Welsh libraries by at least the sixteenth century.<sup>6</sup>

These late dates are fairly consistent with the few instances we find of Welsh sharing manuscript space with Anglo-Norman and English. The earliest instance of Anglo-Norman appearing with Welsh (and in this case Latin as well) as a planned manuscript design is in the late fourteenth-century Cardiff, Central Library, MS 3.42 (olim Hafod MS 16).<sup>7</sup> Before that, Aberystwyth, National Library of Wales Peniarth MS 7, dating to approximately 1300 and containing several Welsh texts derived from French sources (e.g. *Peredur* and Welsh prose versions of the *Chanson de Roland* and the *Pèlerinage de Charlemagne*), may have originally had bound in it three folios of a thirteenth-century Anglo-Norman romance, *Berinus*.<sup>8</sup> Although this fragment is not thought to be of Welsh origin, its inclusion in a compilation of texts derived from Anglo-Norman and French sources counters the impression given by primarily monolingual manuscripts that Welsh texts circulated in an isolated literary vacuum.<sup>9</sup> English did not appear in Welsh manuscripts, however, until the fifteenth century.

The earliest trilingual manuscript that includes English is Aberystwyth, National Library of Wales, Peniarth MS 50, commonly called *Y Cwta Cyfarwydd o Forganwg* [The Short Guide of Glamorgan]. This manuscript dates to approximately 1445 and was compiled in Glamorgan, and the majority of the texts in it are prophetic prose and verse texts in Welsh, Latin, and English.<sup>10</sup> The relationship between English and Welsh in this manuscript is very interesting. The preface to the Welsh *Darogan yr Olew Bendigaidd* [The Prophecy of the Blessed Oil], concerning the oil that was given to Thomas Becket, explains that some of the text was translated into Welsh from Latin, French, and English,

---

<sup>4</sup> Notable exceptions include the work of Annalee Rejhon, Ceridwen Lloyd-Morgan, Erich Poppe and Regina Reck, whose work frequently focuses on the interaction between medieval Welsh and Anglo-Norman or Continental French texts. Jennifer Miller and Ann Matonis are the only scholars I am aware of who work seriously on the interaction between medieval Welsh and English texts.

<sup>5</sup> Huws 2000a, p. 3.

<sup>6</sup> Lloyd-Morgan 2008, especially p. 163 and p. 167.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 166.

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 166-167. Daniel Huws indicates that it is possible that the three-folio fragment may have not been part of the original binding of MS Peniarth 7, but rather added in at a second binding in London some time after 1564. See Huws 2000b, p. 4.

<sup>9</sup> Even if the fragment was added much later, as Huws suggests (see note above), the collection of Welsh texts derived from French sources still speaks against the notion that Welsh literature circulated in a homogenous Welsh cultural environment.

<sup>10</sup> Lloyd-Morgan 2008, p. 168.

which might indicate a project of appropriation. The compiler who wrote the preface also laments “the servitude of the Welsh under English domination and says that he suffered great despair because of this.”<sup>11</sup> Yet, there are twenty-three additional items in the manuscript that are written in English, not translated, including many prophecies. As William Marx points out, this sharing of space with English language texts, in a manuscript that condemns the English as oppressors of the Welsh, nevertheless suggests an easy relationship with the English language; it indicates that English is “not regarded as a foreign language. The English may be seen as the oppressors, but the English language is not regarded as a symbol of the foreigners.”<sup>12</sup>

Marx views English in this manuscript as an example of native Welsh writing, not foreign writing, exemplifying English as a comfortable secondary language in Wales.<sup>13</sup> Although it is true that the number of untranslated English texts sharing space with Welsh texts does indicate this easy relationship, there are other indications that at least some of the English texts may have been foreign imports, and this is a rather significant point, given the content. Marx discusses an example from one of the English prophecies:

A remembrance of termys of diuerse prophecyes that Wallyshmen fyndyth in her bokys. On of hem is that ther is a tyme of foxyes the whiche Merlyn spekyth of, how a foxe schall aryse and schall be take for a kyng, but nought by law, and schall gendyr whelpys that schall do moche steryng & moche woo make . . .<sup>14</sup>

Marx deliberates about whether the first sentence marks the author as an Englishman providing a list of the “prophecies that Welshmen—as the ‘Other’—‘compose’ or ‘produce’ in their books,” or as a Welshman recording “the prophecies that *we* Welshmen compose in *our* books.”<sup>15</sup> He finds the line ambiguous, but because of the large number of English texts in the manuscript, he ultimately argues for the probability that “this English material is considered to be native writing.”<sup>16</sup> Although it is not impossible that the author could be speaking *as* a Welshman *about* Welshmen in the third person, this would be a highly unusual construction. The use of the third person plural possessive pronoun *her* argues for the greater possibility that the author is speaking as an outsider who does not identify as Welsh, likely an Englishman writing in and about Wales. Whether this potential Englishman wrote in Wales or in England is impossible to know, but it would indicate that Englishmen were reading—and translating—Welsh books. (Of course we do not know whether the author refers to Welsh books in Latin or in Welsh.) In the absence of very much concrete evidence for English engagement with Welsh literary culture, this statement about the reading of Welsh books by an Englishman suggests at a minimum engagement with Latin literary culture in Wales and provides equally possible—yet much more tantalizing—evidence for English engagement with

---

<sup>11</sup> Marx 2008, p. 18. Unless otherwise noted, the description of this manuscript is taken from this article, especially pp. 17-19.

<sup>12</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 19.

<sup>13</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 18.

<sup>14</sup> Marx 1999, pp. 33-34.

<sup>15</sup> Marx 2008, p. 18.

<sup>16</sup> *Ibid.*

Welsh-language books. My analysis does not weaken Marx's point about the status of English in this manuscript and what it suggests about English in Wales in the mid fifteenth century, but it does add a dimension which considers also the status of Welsh culture from the vantage point of the English.

While Peniarth 50 indicates multilingual reading in general, Aberystwyth, National Library of Wales, Peniarth MS 12 preserves a clear example of multilingual cross-reading of translated texts. It is a trilingual (Welsh, English, Latin) manuscript, written by four scribes, with texts dating between 1400 and 1580.<sup>17</sup> It was compiled in the late sixteenth century, probably in Denbighshire, by Hugh Evans, who is also the main scribe. The texts are mostly devotional, and in addition to six works in Welsh, there is one entirely in English, one entirely in Latin and one in both Latin and English. It is well known for its early fifteenth-century Welsh version of the *Elucidarium*, which the compiler restored from a fragmentary copy. The *Elucidarium* explains various theological issues in a question and answer dialogue format. It was originally composed in Latin at the end of the eleventh century and is attributed to Honorius of Autun. The original hand of the Welsh version in Peniarth 12 is that of Hywel Fychan, who worked around 1400 and is also responsible for works in the more famous *Llyfr Coch Hergest* [Red Book of Hergest]. The fifteenth-century quires are on vellum and contain only the middle section of the *Elucidarium*, and Evans supplied the beginning and the end of the text on paper. O'Rourke argues that comparison with other Welsh versions indicates that he probably used another Welsh exemplar rather than translating from another language to complete his text.

What is most interesting about this trilingual manuscript is that the text which comes right before the Welsh *Elucidarium* is an incomplete copy of the same text, in English. This English *Elucidarium* is dated to the end of the fifteenth century. William Marx has determined that it is probably once or twice removed from the original, and that the original was translated from Latin with substantial alterations and abbreviations. The language might belong to Archenfield (Welsh Erging).<sup>18</sup>

Interestingly, on folio 55r, which is near the end of Hywel Fychan's Welsh text, Evans has written a Latin note in the margin: 'finis angli.' This note indicates the precise point in the Welsh *Elucidarium* where the incomplete English version ends. O'Rourke observes: "The note suggests not only that the compiler was able to understand and write in three languages, but also that he was interested in preserving different versions of this interesting text."<sup>19</sup> I would add that the note indicates that it is not simply a matter of preserving different versions; in fact it indicates careful cross-reading and comparison of different versions, in this case in different languages. Although O'Rourke believes this manuscript was primarily for private use, he also acknowledges that it may have been put to other uses, and he offers: "The fact that the manuscript was assembled after the Reformation means that it might have been circulated in a milieu where texts such as the *Elucidarium* in two languages answered to the spiritual needs of a diverse community."<sup>20</sup>

---

<sup>17</sup> The following description of MS Peniarth 12 is taken from O'Rourke 2003.

<sup>18</sup> Some of this information on the English *Elucidarium* is printed in Marx 2000, and some is reported by O'Rourke from personal communication with Marx (O'Rourke 2003).

<sup>19</sup> O'Rourke 2003, p. 58.

<sup>20</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 61.

It is common to suggest that multilingual manuscripts were read by people with diverse linguistic abilities (i.e., that they catered to various monolingual groups, rather than to a specifically multilingual audience). Although it is true that relatively monolingual individuals could and probably did pick and choose what they read in multilingual manuscripts, there is extraordinary evidence that multilingual individuals were reading and even cross-reading versions of texts in various languages, and Peniarth 12 provides a clear example of serious cross-reading and comparison of an English and a Welsh translation of the same Latin text.

Another interesting trilingual Welsh manuscript is Aberystwyth, National Library of Wales, Peniarth MS 215.<sup>21</sup> This manuscript contains historical and prophetic texts, mainly in Welsh but some also in English and Latin. It was compiled by John Jones of Gellilyfdy between 1604 and 1612. Interestingly, in the midst of a Welsh language historical chronicle, Jones inserted “a long passage of Middle English covering pages 164-76. This is made up of three separate passages that have been derived from John Trevisa’s translation of the *Polychronicon*.”<sup>22</sup> Marx reports that Jones prefaces the English passage with a note in Welsh that reads:

Sef a gefais i hyn o storia am gafadedigaeth angladd yr ardderchawg frenin arthvr yn y chweched gabidwl or pvmmed llyfr o lyfr kronikl saesonaeg or eiddo harri Jones o lwyn y kosyn yn ysgeifiog fal hynn. [I discovered this story concerning the finding of the burial place of the honorable king Arthur in the sixth chapter of the fifth book of an English chronicle book owned by Harri Jones of Llwyn-y-cosyn in Ysgeifiog, thus.]<sup>23</sup>

The same compiler, according to Marx, prefaces English and Latin texts with similar notes in Welsh in another manuscript as well (Aberystwyth, National Library of Wales, MS 3041).<sup>24</sup> Marx concludes: “These instances are evidence of the circulation and use of a Middle English text [*Polychronicon*] that was well respected in Flintshire in north Wales, and was regarded as authoritative enough to use to interrupt a Welsh language narrative in order to provide some additional information.”<sup>25</sup> This, I would add, is also evidence that the normal expectation for the reader of these manuscripts is multilingual reading, rather than picking and choosing texts in the language with which one is most comfortable.

To the three multilingual manuscripts that have been the focus of the discussion above can be added two more: Aberystwyth, National Library of Wales, Peniarth MS 26, a near contemporary of Peniarth 50 that combines Welsh, English and Latin texts and is from the Oswestry area, and Peniarth MS 53 (post-1484) which also is trilingual.<sup>26</sup>

---

<sup>21</sup> The following description of MS Peniarth 215 is from Marx 2008, pp. 19-21.

<sup>22</sup> Ibid., p. 19.

<sup>23</sup> Ibid., p. 20.

<sup>24</sup> Ibid.

<sup>25</sup> Ibid.

<sup>26</sup> My thanks to Daniel Huws for this information (personal communication between Mr. Huws and Annalee Rejhon). For descriptions of these two manuscripts see Evans 1898, pp. 351-58 and pp. 403-09, respectively. For an edition of the latter, see Roberts et. al. 1927.

The conundrum presented by this discussion of Welsh manuscripts is that it paints a picture that suggests that Anglo-Norman did not interact with Welsh until the fourteenth century, and English did not interact with Welsh until the fifteenth century. However, as Jennifer Miller points out, although Old Welsh glosses in the *Liber Commonei* (in Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Auct F.4.32) indicate that Welsh was a book-language at least from the ninth century, the earliest manuscripts written in Welsh date to the thirteenth century.<sup>27</sup> We simply do not have enough manuscripts—either with respect to number or to historical breadth—to allow manuscript evidence alone to paint that picture. Moreover, a similar situation in England shows that there, although Anglo-Norman and English texts do not begin to appear together in manuscripts until the last quarter of the thirteenth century, we know from authors such as Marie de France and Wace, and from a couple of exceptional twelfth-century manuscripts with multilingual glosses (most notably the famous Eadwine Psalter of 1155-60, discussed in chapter one), that the two languages nevertheless interacted in a multilingual literary environment before that time.<sup>28</sup>

There is no question that, like England, Wales was characterized by multilingualism from a much earlier date than multilingual manuscripts indicate. As Constance Bullock-Davies has shown, Norman presence in Wales led to many professional interpreters fluent in Welsh, French, and English, and ultimately Welsh lords and their officials also became fluent in three languages.<sup>29</sup> Ceridwen Lloyd-Morgan has pointed out that by the late twelfth century Gerald of Wales reports that Prince Owain Cyfeiliog conversed fluently with Henry II, and “by the thirteenth century there is little doubt that French was spoken at the court of the princes of the house of Gwynedd.”<sup>30</sup> Literary adaptation of French material is evident in the Welsh romances of *Gereint*, *Owein*, and *Peredur*, which seem to draw from material in Chrétien de Troyes’ *Erec*, *Yvain*, and *Perceval*, respectively. The earliest extant manuscripts preserving these Welsh tales date from the late thirteenth or early fourteenth centuries, but it is difficult to determine how much earlier the tales may have been written down. Marie Surridge has shown lexical borrowings from both French and English in the Welsh *Ystorya Bown o Hamtwn*, dating from the second half of the thirteenth century.<sup>31</sup>

Despite work, such as that cited above, which indicates that Wales had a multilingual culture before surviving manuscripts reflect it, scholars generally do not compare English and Welsh literary texts. Along with the lack of early manuscript evidence, the political and cultural enmity that most scholars think of when considering English-Welsh relations also contributes to the assumption that there should be no significant literary exchange between the two cultures. Indeed, Wales and England have a long history of political strife, and their perceived cultural separateness is reflected in our academic system: the study of Welsh literature is marginalized with only two

---

<sup>27</sup> Miller forthcoming, “La3amon’s Welsh.” On Welsh manuscripts see Huws 2000a, p. 7.

<sup>28</sup> I thank Ian Short (personal communication) for informing me that it would be surprising to see Anglo-Norman and Middle English sharing manuscript space in the first half of the thirteenth century, it would be expected to see it at the end of the thirteenth century, and it would be relatively common in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. See also Thomson and Morgan 2008, pp. 367 ff.

<sup>29</sup> Bullock-Davies 1966.

<sup>30</sup> Lloyd-Morgan 2008, p. 162.

<sup>31</sup> See Surridge 1985.

universities (UC Berkeley and Harvard) offering degrees in Celtic Studies in this country, while English literature, of course, is studied in English departments countrywide with an occasional course offered in Anglo-Norman literature. The convenient structure of academia contributes to and perpetuates our perception of this cultural separateness, constructing disciplinary boundaries which fabricate a tidy separation between these cultures, whose interactions were, in fact, quite untidy.

Yet, there is ample evidence that medieval Welsh and English literary traditions were intertwined, and not just through the intermediary of Anglo-Norman. Jeffrey Huntsman has shown multiple influences from Celtic prosody that explain features of Middle English alliterative poetry for which, as he points out, "our English prosody lacks even names."<sup>32</sup> There are similarities between the English *Sir Perceval of Galles* and the Welsh *Peredur* that are not found in Chrétien's *Conte del graal*.<sup>33</sup> There are bilingual puns in Dafydd ap Gwilym's poetry that would only be intelligible to a bilingual audience.<sup>34</sup> Two of the great English heroes, Guy of Warwick and Beves of Hampton, appear in Welsh literature from the thirteenth through the fifteenth centuries, and Erich Poppe has indicated that the Welsh poets sometimes use a form of the name Beves that goes back to the English "Bevis" (Welsh *Befus*), and other times use a form that goes back to the Anglo-Norman oblique case "Bovoun" or "Boun" (Welsh *Bŵn*).<sup>35</sup> Such inconsistent use of Anglo-Norman and English forms in Welsh poetry reflects the complex cultural situation in Britain and indicates that Welsh knowledge of this hero might stem from English as well as Anglo-Norman sources. Since the references to Beves in Welsh poetry are largely casual comparisons of his valor to that of somebody else in the poem, the implication is that the audience would be familiar enough with the hero to comprehend the comparison, and it may indicate that the audience was familiar enough with the English tradition to recognize the English form of his name, which is quite different from the Welsh/Anglo-Norman form used in all of the extant Welsh redactions of the romance.

In regard to this manuscript I am most interested, however, not in a list of the textual evidence that shows influence from one culture on the other. I am wondering if, rather than just a smattering of influence, there was not, in fact, a larger cultural and literary project in which both the Welsh and the English participated. As I discussed in chapter one, there seems to have been a mass movement of works that exist in Anglo-Norman and Continental French dialects into both Welsh and English in the late thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries. Many of the same texts were translated into both languages: *The Song of Roland*, *The Tale of Vernagu*, *Otuel* or *Otinell*, *Beves of Hampton*, *Amis and Amiloun*, *The Seven Sages of Rome*, *Saint Patrick's Purgatory*, the *Brut chronicles* translating Geoffrey of Monmouth's *Historia Regum Britanniae*, and

---

<sup>32</sup> Huntsman 1986, p. 178.

<sup>33</sup> Minor textual similarities include the fact that there are only three knights in the woods in both the Welsh and the English texts, whereas there are five in Chrétien's text; likewise in only the Welsh and English texts Yvain is named as one of the knights; and in both the Welsh and English texts Perceval goes specifically to his *uncle's* house, whereas in Chrétien's text there is no relation mentioned between Perceval and the parallel figure, Gornement. There are also other aspects of the Middle English text that seem to locate it within a Welsh cultural context, but they are too numerous and complex to discuss in this note.

<sup>34</sup> Huntsman 1986, p. 178.

<sup>35</sup> Poppe 2002, pp. 53-54.

others. In fact, this was a unique time in both England and Wales, when “new literature” continued to be produced in Latin and Anglo-Norman, but despite an earlier tradition of composing “new literature” in both English and Welsh, a vast majority of secular literature (outside of short poems) produced in both of these languages during this time was in translation—and they were translating the same texts. At least some of the Welsh translations have a southeastern provenance and were therefore “produced in an area where Norman French as well as English was a second language to Welsh.”<sup>36</sup> Did the Welsh and English know of one another’s translations? Did they read and respond to one another’s translations? Peniarth 12, which shows cross-reading between English and Welsh *Elucidarium* texts, proves at least one instance in which this was happening, but it is much later than the translations with which we are concerned. Chapters three and five above show internal evidence that English translations were cross-read with Anglo-Norman originals; does such internal evidence exist which suggests also cross-reading between thirteenth- and fourteenth-century Middle English and Middle Welsh translations?

Jennifer Miller has pointed out that La3amon’s *Brut*, the first translation of a French text into English, was composed at the same time that this text was frequently being translated from the Latin version into the Welsh *Brut y Brenhinedd*, which she sees as an answer to Geoffrey of Monmouth’s call to replenish the archives with Welsh vernacular books of the kind from which he claims he translated his own text into Latin:

At precisely the moment when Welsh translators and scribes were answering Geoffrey of Monmouth’s call to replenish the archives with vernacular books, reinventing Welsh as a language on the page, La3amon was translating the British history into another ancient book-language, one which had, like Welsh, hardly been written since the Conquest.<sup>37</sup>

The sympathy towards the Britons and antipathy towards the Saxons in La3amon’s English-language text is well known, and Miller notes regarding the Welsh *Brut y Brenhinedd* and La3amon’s *Brut*, “certainly influence, one way or another, is discernible.”<sup>38</sup> These parallel translations in English and Welsh were composed right around a time of alliance between the Welsh and the rebel English barons during the first Barons’ Revolt of 1215-1217. After a falling out with King John, Llywelyn ap Iorwerth (who was married to John’s daughter Joan), supported the rebel English barons with his own Welsh troops.

Despite the fact that the frequent discord between the English and the Welsh tends to be the scholarly focus of their relationship, the first Barons’ Revolt is one of many historical moments in which some faction of English and Welsh troops were allied together. Davies notes that between 1280 and 1350 Welshmen “accounted for as much as half of the infantry in many English expeditionary armies to Scotland and France.”<sup>39</sup> It

---

<sup>36</sup> Lloyd-Morgan 1991, p. 53.

<sup>37</sup> Miller forthcoming, “La3amon’s Welsh.” I thank Professor Miller for allowing me to read a copy of this article before it was published.

<sup>38</sup> Ibid.

<sup>39</sup> Davies 1987, p. 398.

is not unreasonable to assume that with such close contact between the English and the Welsh, and not always in opposition, there would also be literary and cultural influence between them. Ann Matonis reminds us that Welsh culture was not only found in Wales and in the Marches, but Welsh poets and performers were also employed at the English court: “Both Edward I and Edward II employed Welsh trumpeters, minstrels, and musicians from areas of English infiltration as well as from the most Cymric parts of Wales. There were sufficient numbers of Welshmen at court, in the baronial households, and in the king’s army to allow us to suppose that at least upon occasion Welsh songs would have been performed and, possibly, Welsh poetry as well.”<sup>40</sup> Given the political and cultural climate of frequent political alliance and opposition, intermarriage, and border and land sharing, it would indeed be surprising not to see influence between English and Welsh literary traditions.

In fact, with respect to the composition and subsequent copying of La3amon’s *Brut*, Miller notes the significance not only of the original English baronial alliance with the Welsh, but also of a similar alliance during the second Barons’ War:

The association of La3amon’s *Brut* in particular with this political context of baronial and Welsh insurgency is recorded in its scribal rescription around the time of the (second) Barons’ War in Cotton MS Caligula A.ix: in this later political context, evocative of the political interests and affinities informing the revolt against King John, evocative in turn of those which led to civil war in Stephen’s reign, La3amon’s British history became once again resonant and meaningful. This moment of scribal rescription, as well as the nature of the work which prompted it, implicates La3amon and his *Brut*—Welsh-inflected, Englished, based on a book in French—in the alliance of Welsh and English and French in the cause against the English king, usurper of old English law and custom.<sup>41</sup>

As discussed in chapter five, this is also roughly the time in which there was a mass explosion of translations from other Anglo-Norman and Continental French dialect texts into Middle English, and it should not be surprising—nor should it be overlooked—that the same movement, with the same texts, was happening also in Wales at this time.

One significant Welsh manuscript that preserves many of these translations is Aberystwyth, National Library of Wales Peniarth MS 4-5, commonly known as *Llyfr Gwyn Rhydderch* [the White Book of Rhydderch]. According to Daniel Huws, it was probably written circa 1350 for Rhydderch ab Ieuan Llwyd, who was linked to the English crown and was no stranger to English circles, having once served with an English army, possibly as an interpreter.<sup>42</sup> While the manuscript was not the first carefully planned anthology in Welsh, it is, according to Daniel Huws, the first “bringing together of secular prose, of Welsh *belles-lettres*.”<sup>43</sup> It is also notable that these Welsh *belles-lettres* form a collection primarily of translations of texts that exist in Anglo-Norman and

---

<sup>40</sup> Matonis 1988, p. 4.

<sup>41</sup> Miller forthcoming, “La3amon’s Welsh.”

<sup>42</sup> Huws 2000a, p. 250.

<sup>43</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 246.

Continental French dialects, not unlike a roughly contemporary manuscript in England, the Auchinleck Manuscript. As discussed in chapters one and five, the Auchinleck Manuscript is traditionally dated between 1330 and 1340, and like the contemporary White Book of Rhydderch, it is a collection of many translations of texts that also exist in Anglo-Norman and Continental French dialects. Also like the Auchinleck Manuscript, *Llyfr Gwyn Rhydderch* was put together by multiple scribes (five), with at least a number of them (four) demonstrably working together towards a common project.<sup>44</sup> The manuscripts share three of the same translations, in fact: *Saint Patrick's Purgatory*, *Otuel* (*Otinell*), and *Beves* (the earliest extant translation in both languages). Catherine McKenna has pointed out further similarities in content between these two manuscripts: “There is even some overlap in the content of the White Book and the Auchinleck, which contains the Story of Adam and Eve, the Harrowing of Hell, the early life and miracles of Mary, the death and assumption into heaven of Mary, and the lives of Saints Catherine and Margaret, all among the texts in the first section of the White Book [written by scribe A]; and St. Patrick's Purgatory, Sir Beves of Hamtoun, and Otuel, found in Welsh versions in the gatherings of the White Book written by scribes B and C. . . .”<sup>45</sup> The historical and literary context, then, demands that we consider some of these Welsh and English translations side-by-side.

Not only does the earliest extant Middle Welsh *Ystoria Bown o Hamtwn* appear in a manuscript full of translations,<sup>46</sup> roughly contemporary with the earliest Middle English *Beves of Hampton*, but it also seems that the original impetus to translate this work from the Anglo-Norman was contemporary in Wales and in England. Morgan Watkin, the only editor of the full Welsh text (for selections see now Poppe and Reck 2009), has dated it to the second half of the thirteenth century.<sup>47</sup> The original Middle English text has been dated by various scholars as early as the beginning of the thirteenth century and as late as the first quarter of the fourteenth century, although the London episode—discussed in chapter four—seems according to Weiss's work to be an interpolation that is a feature of the original Middle English translation and appears to resonate with the political climate of England in the 1260's or 70's.<sup>48</sup>

Both translations were likely composed, then, during or after the time that the Welsh ruler Llywelyn ap Gruffudd joined with Simon de Montfort, leader of the second

---

<sup>44</sup> Ibid., p. 252.

<sup>45</sup> McKenna 2011, p. 228.

<sup>46</sup> The earliest text of *Ystoria Bown de Hamtwn* is preserved in Aberystwyth, National Library of Wales, Peniarth MS 4-5, the White Book of Rhydderch, discussed above. The only other medieval example is preserved in Oxford, Jesus College, MS 111 (*Llyfr Coch Hergest*, [the Red Book of Hergest]). All other texts, according to Erich Poppe and Regina Reck (2006, p. 142) are based directly or indirectly on the White Book or on a common source for the two medieval manuscripts. Three postmedieval texts are preserved in the late sixteenth-century Aberystwyth, National Library of Wales, MS 3043B (Mostyn 135), the sixteenth-century Aberystwyth, National Library of Wales, MS Peniarth 118 (*Llyfr Sion Dafydd Rhys*), and the early seventeenth-century Aberystwyth, National Library of Wales, MS Gwenogvryn Evans 1A. See also Poppe and Reck 2009, pp. xi-xii.

<sup>47</sup> Watkin 1958, p. lix.

<sup>48</sup> See Weiss 1979, especially p. 74. As I indicated in chapter five, however, I believe the Middle English translation may have been composed later than the 1260's or 70's. In any case, we do not have an exact date for either the Welsh or the Middle English texts, and the approximate dates for both indicate that they were translated around the same time.

Barons' Revolt in England. Welsh and English baronial forces were allied together against the English crown, and their joint action achieved multiple successes before the death of Simon de Montfort in 1265. After this point, Llywelyn was recognized by the English crown as Prince of Wales (in exchange for his own recognition of Henry III's overlordship). Together with the Welsh and English *Brut* translations, the *Beves/Bown* translations provide a second example of parallel literary developments in England and Wales related to a time of political alliance between the Welsh and English barons against the crown.

It should not be surprising that parallel literary developments might occur in England and Wales during a century which frequently saw Welsh and English troops fighting together against a common enemy. It should be surprising, however, that there does not seem to be cross-referencing between these two parallel projects, as Miller sees there is in the *Brut* translation projects. Both the Middle English and the Welsh translations preserve some of the more "Celtic" elements of the Anglo-Norman original, such as the frequent references to hunting boars, whereas the Continental translators and redactors find some of these details irrelevant or extractable, speaking of courtly stags rather than Celtic boars, for example. While this generally gives further indication of English awareness of Celtic literary tradition, it is virtually the only thing the translations have in common, notable only because it sets them apart from the Continental redactions.

The Welsh translation innovates formally—it turns the rhyming *laissez* of the Anglo-Norman *Boeve* into the more familiar prose style characteristic of native Welsh tales. However, it nearly completely preserves the content of the Anglo-Norman poem and shows no knowledge of the wild interpolations of the English. As discussed in chapter five, the English translation alters both form and content, writing in a combination of 6-line tail-rhyme stanzas and rhyming couplets, and innovating on the level of plot with its interpolations in addition to demonstrating a much freer style of translation, even in the places where there is not major content innovation. The innovations of the English translation are well known, and it is generally agreed that their function is to anglicize this Anglo-Norman poem, although I have shown in chapter five that there is more to them than that. As I discussed in chapter five, Judith Weiss has indicated what I agree to be clear parallels between the Auchinleck text's innovative literary fight in the city of London—with its closed gates and chained streets—in which Beves, the powerful vassal of the weak King Edgar, fights Londoners who are defending the king, and the incident between Simon de Montfort and Henry III, when in 1263 he arrived outside the walls of London, and Henry ordered the royalist faction to shut the gates of the city and bar them with chains. Ultimately, Simon de Montfort was aided by some London citizens, and he and the King made a truce, as did King Edgar and Beves in the story. Of course this did not last in the case of Simon de Montfort and King Henry.<sup>49</sup>

There are indications, then, that the English text was not only translated during or after the time of the Barons' War in England but that the events of this war, which included the participation of Welsh troops fighting right along with the English, are intimately connected with the details of the translation itself, perhaps even with the impetus for translation. Is it merely a coincidence that the English and the Welsh chose to translate this work at around the same time? Do the English and Welsh translations

---

<sup>49</sup> Weiss 1979, p. 74.

represent a similar cultural project, and if so, why undertake such a project? What is the nature of the literary, cultural, and political conversation that is initiated by such similar projects?

The Welsh and the English approaches to translation here (and in many of the texts that were translated into both Welsh and English during this period) are in some ways diametrically opposed. Given the lack of innovation on the level of content in the Welsh translation, one might call the Welsh project one of preservation. Yet, the Welsh arguably gave a Celtic flavor to this text and to others with their formal innovation.<sup>50</sup> The English, on the other hand, anglicized the translation on the level of content and also innovated formally, though the form probably ultimately came from French models.<sup>51</sup> Is the lack of content innovation in Welsh translation a response to English innovation in content? Is the Welsh translation of the Anglo-Norman poem about an English hero specifically “*not* English” in its approach? In fact, with regard to medieval vernacular to vernacular translation of secular works, the lack of innovation on the level of content in the Welsh translation is rather innovative in and of itself.<sup>52</sup> The norm is innovation. Does the lack of textual evidence of a relationship between the contemporary Middle Welsh and Middle English translations of *Boeve*, despite a cultural milieu which suggests that they should be aware of one another, suggest that they are in knowing opposition to one another? Are the Welsh claiming the text in some way, appropriating an English hero who does ultimately show up in Philemon Holland’s 1610 translation of Camden’s 1586 *Britannia* as a hero who fought against the Normans at Cardiff?

Or, on the other hand, with almost a century of political alliance against the king, are the Welsh and the English barons creating a cultural conversation together? Both the Welsh and the English started a mass movement of translating texts linked to baronial concerns and dealing with crusading themes and the conversion of Saracens during a century of political alliance against the English king, who consistently enjoyed the support of Rome against the barons. As discussed in chapters one and five of the present work, formal crusades were authorized and threatened against the barons and their allies. Pope Innocent III called the rebel barons and their allies no better than infidels during the first Barons’ Revolt, and during the second major revolt, the pope sent two legates to England to preach a Crusade against the rebels and their allies, who were excommunicated from the church. Yet, Simon de Montfort, himself a *crucesignatus* along with others in his forces, fought the royalists with a sort of unauthorized counter-

---

<sup>50</sup> For the most recent and detailed study of the formal innovations which show the translator meticulously transforming the narrative into a native Welsh prose style, see e.g., Poppe and Reck 2006, pp. 151-180 and 2008, pp. 130-142.

<sup>51</sup> Rhyming couplets are not a native English poetic form, and Rhiannon Purdie argues that Middle English tail-rhyme also derives, likely, from Anglo-Norman and Continental French verse forms. See Purdie 2008, especially pp. 23-25.

<sup>52</sup> As we shall see, this lack of content innovation is the norm in these types of mid to late thirteenth- and fourteenth-century Welsh translations of *chansons de geste*, which is not the case with the potentially earlier Welsh translations of Arthurian romances (which, incidentally, did not coincide with English ones, and which appear together in the same manuscripts with the *chansons de geste* translations). See Lloyd-Morgan 1991 for a discussion of what she sees as the progression of the style of medieval Welsh translation of French texts over time. See also Rejhon 1990, especially pp. 133-39, for a discussion of the differences between translations from orally transmitted texts (such as the Welsh romances) and those made from texts transmitted in manuscript form (such as the *chansons de geste*).

crusade, wearing white crosses, which were later countered by the royalists' red crosses, and even having themselves tonsured before one battle.<sup>53</sup> This was a holy war on British soil, with the English fighting the English, Christians fighting Christians, crusaders fighting crusaders, and Rome authorizing the use of crusades for non-spiritual gains.

It is not surprising that the texts chosen for translation—various parts of the Charlemagne legend, *Boeve*, *Gui de Warewic*, and others—were those dealing with crusades, conversion, boundary and border crossing, doubling, disguise and a general uncertainty about who the enemy is, what it looks like to “convert,” what it means to fight for God, and whether that looks any different from fighting for fame or secular love or any other reason. The English translators certainly seemed to read these texts in this way, and the choices they made in translation either support such a reading or develop it anew.<sup>54</sup> Chapter five discusses the translative revisions in the Auchinleck *Beves* that seem to grapple with these issues, including the formal innovation in the beginning of the text. As I discuss there, the Middle English text appears to be concerned with testing limits and boundaries, and blurring religious, ethical, and ethnic boundaries—issues that were of prime concern in late thirteenth- and early fourteenth-century Britain.

Does the Welsh text too appear to be interested in the same issues? If so, it is certainly not to the same degree. Translating an Anglo-Norman text about an English hero into Middle Welsh and formally giving it a Welsh flavor with its prose narration does axiomatically broach the subject. However, the conservatism with which the Welsh translation treats the content of the text speaks against the same kind of radical commentary that the English seem to be making.<sup>55</sup> Yet, like the Middle English and Anglo-Norman texts, in one manuscript the Welsh text presents us with a formal anomaly at the beginning with which we must come to terms as readers. The beginning is written twice in the White Book of Rhydderch. *Ystorya Bown* begins at the top of column a on folio 138 recto (medieval foliation) and about half way through column b, it ends, the rest of the column remaining blank. Then it begins again on the verso side (column c) of the same folio 138; this folio is, according to Huws, the beginning of the tenth quire of eight folios and in the hand of a new scribe C.<sup>56</sup> The first 21 lines of each beginning are virtually identical, but after that they differ. The first beginning glosses over the particulars of the Anglo-Norman text and seems to translate in “summary form,” whereas the second beginning includes most of the details and direct speech of the Anglo-Norman text. The first twenty-one lines of the two beginnings are close to one another, but they diverge from there. Both beginnings are reprinted below, and the point at which they diverge is indicated by bold text:

---

<sup>53</sup> The above information about the barons' revolts is from Tyerman 1988, especially pp. 144-151 and pp. 328-330.

<sup>54</sup> See further chapters three and five.

<sup>55</sup> As noted above, Rejhon attributes the conservatism of the Welsh translations of the *chansons de geste* to the fact that they were translating from manuscript (as opposed to oral) sources. This raises an interesting question regarding Middle English translations of the same texts, since it is clear that the Middle English translators were also working with manuscript sources, yet they were not at all conservative in translating the precise content of their manuscript sources.

<sup>56</sup> Huws 2000a, p. 231.

<i>First Beginning:</i>	<i>Second Beginning:</i>
<p>Yn hamtwn yd oed iarll  A elwid Giwn ac aruer awn=  aeth na vynhei wreic yny ieu=  eingtid. a gwedy hynny pann  ymdreiglawd parth a heneint y  gwregkahawd. Sef gwreic a vyn=  nawd gwreic ieuank tu draw y  vor. A honno a oyd yn karu gwr  ieuank arderchawc a oed amher=  awdyr yn yr almayn. Ac eissoes  yn y kyfamser hwnnw y kauas  hi veichogi o racdywededic giwn  y gwr priawd. A ffan rydyuu am=  ser mab a anet a elwid bown. Ar  mab hwnnw a rodet ar vaeth ar  varchawc kyuoethawc a elwit saba=  oth. A gwelet or ialles y iarll yn  llithraw y amdrymder heneint  y drymygu ay yscaylussyaw o ga=  ryat y racdywededic amherawdyr  ieuanc. <b>Ac ystrywyaw a wnaeth</b>  pa vod y gallei gwplau y serch=  awl damunedic ywyllus ymdanaw.  Sef y mod y ystryrawd dyuyn=  nu kennat at yr amherawdyr  ac erchi idaw dyuot yn oet dyd  teruynedic y fforest ynyal a oed  yny iarllaeth giwn yn gyuagos  yr kastell yd oedynt yn presswy=  lyaw yndaw a niuer mawr o varch=  ogyon aruawc gyt ac ef. Ac ym=  dirgelu yno a dywedut y parei  hitheu yr iarll vynet yn oet  y dyd hwnnw a niuer yskyuala <sup>57</sup>  gyt ac ef heb arueu megys y  gallei llad y iarll. Achyflenwi eu  damunedic serch o hynny allan.  Ac uuudhau a oruc yr amherawdyr  y hynny oll. Affan gogleu y iarllles</p>	<p>Yn hamtwn yd oed iarll  a elwit giwn ac aruer  awnaeth na uynnei  wreic yn y ieueigtit. A gue=  dy hynny pan ymdreiglawd  parth a heneint y gwreicka=  awd. Sef wreic a uynnawd  gwreic ieuanc tu draw y vor.  A honno a oed yn karu gwr  ieuanc arderchawc a oed am=  herawdyr yn yr almayn. Ac  eissoes yny kyfamser hwn=  nw y kauas hi ueichogi o rac=  dywededic giwn y gwr pri=  awt. A ffan dyfu amser mab  aanet a elwit bown. Ar mab  hwnnw a rodete ar uaeth ar  varchawc kyuoethawc a elwit  sabaoth. A gwelet or iarllles  y iarll yn llithraw parth ac  amdrwnder heneint y dre=  mygu ae yskaelussaw o gary=  at y racdywededic amheraw=  dyr ieuanc. <b>Ac anuon kennat</b>  a wnaeth at amheradyr yr  almaen ac adolwyn ydaw  yr y charyat hi y uot ef a ni=  uer o varchogyon aruawc  y gyt ac ef duw kalanmei  yn fforest y iarll yn ymgu=  dyaw yndi. A hitheu a barei  yr iarll ac achydic o niuer ys=  cyuala mynet yr fforest. Ac  ynna y gallei ynteu llad penn<sup>58</sup>  y iarll ae anuon idi hitheu  yn anrec ac o hynny allan y  gellynt hwynteu bot y gyt  yn dideruysc. Y gennat a ger=  dawd yr almaen ac o ouyn=</p>

<sup>57</sup> Column a ends here and the following line begins Column b.

<sup>58</sup> Column c of the verso side of the folio ends here and the following line begins column d.

hynny. sef a wnaeth hitheu kym=  
ryt arnei y bot yn glaf o orthrwm  
heint a dywedut na bydei vyw  
ony damweinei idi gaffel ychwant  
o gic baed koet a oed yny fforest  
racdywededic. Ac yn oet y dyd y  
gwydat hi vot yr amherawdyr  
yn ymdirgelu yny fforest honno  
annoc awnaeth hitheu yr iarll  
vynet y hela y baed keot.<sup>59</sup>

*In Hampton, there was an earl who was called Giwn, and he made a decision that he would not take a wife in his youth. And after that, when he was heading towards old age, he took a wife. Namely, the lady that he wished for was a young woman from over the sea. And that one loved a noble young man who was emperor in Germany. And nevertheless, at that time, she got pregnant from the aforesaid Giwn, her husband. And when the time came, a son was born who was called Bown. And that son was given in fosterage to the mighty knight called Sabaoeth. And the lady saw the earl lapsing into the heaviness of old age; she loathed and despised him from love of the aforesaid young emperor. **And she thought** how she could fulfil her desired amorous passion for him. This [is] the way she devised it, she summoned a messenger to her and sent him to the emperor and asked him to come on an appointed day to a secluded forest which was in Giwn's earldom close to the castle in which they were living, with a large host of armed knights with him, and to lie in ambush there, and she said that she would cause the earl to go on that appointed day with a defenceless host without harms with him, so that he could kill the earl and*

nawd yr amherawdyr. y mae  
yn llys idaw a elwit calys.  
tu ac yno y kerdawd y genat  
ac yr calys y doeth a dygwy=  
daw ar benn y lin rac bron  
yr amherawdyr a chyffarch  
guell idaw ac yn dirgeledic  
menegi y gennadwri idaw.  
a llawen fu yr amherawdyr  
wrth y gennat a rodi ammws  
idaw a chymeint ac auynnei  
o eur ac aryant yn yghwanec.  
ac erchi idaw mynet drache=  
fyn at y wreic vwyaf a garei.  
a dywedut idi y gwnaei ef  
pob peth or a archyassei hi idaw  
ef yn oet y dyd. Ar gennat  
a doeth dracheuyn hyt yn  
hamtwn at y iarll a mene=  
gi y gwnaei yr amherawdyr  
y hewyllus hi ym phob peth  
or a archyssid idaw. a llawen  
uu hitheu orawenus a rywyr  
genthi y doi oed y dyd. A  
nos clanmei y kymerth y  
iarll cleuyt arnei ac y dy=  
wawt wrth y iarll y bot yn  
claf. Ac yna y doluryawd yn  
uawr am cleuyt y iarll ac<sup>60</sup>  
y dywawt wrthi. A oes dim  
aallo gwaret it ac o byd na=  
chel yr a gosto : oes arglwyd  
heb hi pei kawn beth o gic  
baed coet yn ir mi a gawn  
iechyt. A wdost ti pa le y keit  
kyuot ar vaed coet. gwn ar=  
glwyd heb hi yn yn fforest ni  
vch penn y mor y mae baed  
coet medei y fforestwyr ymi.  
A minneu aaf auory yno yn  
vore. Sef a wnaeth hitheu

<sup>59</sup> Watkin, ed., 1958, ll. 1-49.

<sup>60</sup> Column d ends here and the next line begins column a on the recto side of the following folio 139.

*realize their desired passion from then on. And the emperor submitted to all this. And when the lady heard this, this she did, she pretended that she was ill with a grievous disease and said that she would not stay alive unless she could eat her fill of the meat of a boar that was in the aforementioned forest. And on the day on which she knew that the emperor was lying in ambush in that forest, she urged the earl to go to hunt the boar.<sup>61</sup>*

yna kyuodi ynyseuyll a dodi  
y dwylaw am y vynwgyl a ro=  
di kussan ydaw. A thrannoeth  
y gwiscawd y iarll ymdanaw ac  
y kymerth y daryan ay wayw  
ae gledyf heb arueu yn ang=  
chwanec ac ar y petwryd mar=  
chawc yd aethant tu ar fforest.<sup>62</sup>

*In Hampton, there was an earl who was called Giwn, and he made a decision that he would not take a wife in his youth. And after that, when he was heading towards old age, he took a wife. Namely, the lady that he wished for was a young woman from over the sea. And that one loved a noble young man who was emperor in Germany. And nevertheless, at that time, she got pregnant from the aforesaid Giwn, her husband. And when the time came, a son was born who was called Bown. And that son was given in fosterage to the mighty knight called Sabaoth. And the lady saw the earl lapsing into the heaviness of old age; she loathed and despised him from love of the aforesaid young emperor. **And she sent** a messenger to the emperor of Germany and asked him out of love for her to be on the first of May with a host of armed knights with him in the earl's forest lying in ambush in it, and she would cause the earl and a small defenceless host to go to the forest, and then he could cut off the earl's head and send it to her as a present, and from then onwards they could be together undisturbed. The messenger went to Germany and asked for the emperor. 'He is in a court of his which is called Calys.' The messenger went there and came to Calys and fell on his knees before the emperor and secretly told him his message. And the emperor was pleased with the messenger and gave him a stallion*

<sup>61</sup> Translation of ll 1-20 mine; translation of ll. 21-49 reprinted from Poppe and Reck 2006, p. 148.

<sup>62</sup> Watkin 1958, ll. 50-137.

	<p><i>and what he desired of gold and silver besides, and asked him to return to the woman he loved most and to tell her that he would do everything she had asked of him on the appointed day. And the messenger returned to Hamtwn to the lady and said that the emperor would fulfil her wish in everything she had asked of him. And she was joyous and joyful, and the appointed day approached too slow for her. And on the first of May the lady feigned an illness and said to the earl that she was ill. And then he was greatly distressed about the lady's illness and said to her, 'Is there anything that would bring you recovery? And if there is, do not conceal it, whatever it may cost.' 'There is, lord,' she said, 'if I might have a bit of the meat of a boar freshly made, I would recover.' 'Do you know where one can rouse a boar?' 'Yes, lord,' she said, 'in our forest above the sea there is a boar, the foresters tell me.' 'And I will go there tomorrow morning.' This she did then, she sat up and embraced him and kissed him. And the next morning the earl dressed and took his shield and his spear and his sword, without arms beyond this, and went with three other knights towards the forest.<sup>63</sup></i></p>
--	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Theories about the oddity of the double beginning typically relate to the practical circumstances of translation, and the phenomenon is most often viewed as a mistake.<sup>64</sup> However, in such an important and carefully put together anthology, it seems strange that the compilers would not have excised it. On the other hand, the first beginning starts and ends on the recto side of the first folio of a new quire, and it may have been too expensive to excise even the first folio of that quire, thereby wasting the verso side. The scribe did waste the second half of column b, however, choosing to start the second beginning on the verso side, and there are no notes or marks on the recto side to indicate that the first beginning is a mistake and should be ignored by the reader. Moreover, recopying the entire beginning from a new manuscript exemplar with only a slightly different translation (rather than continuing from where the first left off) seems wasteful as well if

<sup>63</sup> Translation of ll. 50-72 mine; translation of ll. 73-137 reprinted from Poppe and Reck 2006, pp. 146-147.

<sup>64</sup> For a brief summary of theories and opinions, including their own, see Poppe and Reck 2006, pp. 149-150 and most recently their 2009 edition, p. 43, n. 44-59.

one is concerned about losing even a single side of a folio. Although, there might have been a concern to keep the quaternion intact.<sup>65</sup> Mistakes do happen, but as with the Middle English formal anomalies discussed with respect to *Guy of Warwick* and the Middle English *Beves*, a rhetorical purpose may also have been intended here. Certainly the existence of the double beginning affects the reading experience.<sup>66</sup> Like the Middle English text's formal innovation, the Welsh text's double beginning has a relationship with the Anglo-Norman poem, in that the first beginning ends just after the same moment that is emphasized in the Anglo-Norman text with the renegade 12-line *laisse*, discussed in chapter five. For a Celtic audience, this moment would be of great significance, as it represents a well-known theme in Celtic literature. When a man enters a forest near a body of water to chase a wild boar, he is most certainly being led into the Otherworld. He dies to this world, but life in the Otherworld continues alongside life in ours. A medieval reader working with this manuscript would read the first beginning up until the moment the earl leaves to hunt the boar, and that would be the end of the text. It could easily be a self-contained story, a short text about a woman who was ready to give her land to a younger ruler and goaded her old husband into the Otherworld. The remainder of the folio is left blank, and we clearly have the impression that the earl is gone and the story is over. Then, we turn the folio, and we start to read a new story. However, we are, at first, reading almost exactly the same words that we just read. As we continue, we notice that it seems to be the same story, but there is slight variation, and there are more details. This reading experience effects in the audience the experience of traveling through the parallel other and over-worlds. As the Middle English text includes a formal innovation that marks the physical departure into an unknown territory, the Middle Welsh includes a formal innovation that marks a figurative departure into an unknown territory. It calls early attention to the series of doubles, disguises, interactions, and characters that are not quite what they seem in the romance. It certainly would not be the only time a story was begun twice, with a strong rhetorical effect, as the contemporary Auchinleck Manuscript in England stops *Guy of Warwick* half way through and adds a brand new introduction before continuing the story, with serious implications for how we are to re-read the translated romance.<sup>67</sup>

Also preserved in Oxford, Jesus College, MS 111 (*Llyfr Coch Hergest* [The Red Book of Hergest]) is a unique copy of the Welsh prose translation of the story of Amis and Amiloun, dated on linguistic grounds to the early fourteenth century and also written in prose. *Kymdeithas Amlyn ac Amic* [The Friendship of Amlyn and Amic] is unique among insular vernacular versions of the story. As discussed in chapter five, both the Anglo-Norman and the Middle English versions are considered part of what is called the "romantic group" of this story, whereas the Welsh text is considered part of the "hagiographic group." As a reminder, here is MacEdward Leach's description of the two groups:

---

<sup>65</sup> On the foliation of *Bown* in the White Book see Huws 2000a, p. 231.

<sup>66</sup> Poppe and Reck explain that they include the second part of the first beginning in their edition of selections because they are interested in comparing translation approaches. See Poppe and Reck 2009, p. xxiv, n. 11.

<sup>67</sup> See chapters two and three.

The romantic group presents the extraordinary friendship of Amis and Amiloun, true knights of romance, and the testing of that friendship to the point of child sacrifice. The hagiographic group uses the same story skeleton, but adds new incidents; it changes the story theme from the testing of romantic friendship to an exposition of the virtues of two friends, so beloved of God and the Blessed Virgin that miracles are worked in their behalf, and so zealous in the cause of right and the Church that they are rewarded with martyrdom.<sup>68</sup>

As I discussed in chapter five, the Middle English text strategically borrows details from the hagiographic group in order to generate a dialogue with other circulating versions of the story through a unique blend of elements from both traditions at key moments. Although the Welsh text draws occasionally and very generally on its author's familiarity with other literary traditions,<sup>69</sup> it remains a somewhat straightforward translation of the Latin prose hagiographic text.<sup>70</sup> Henri Gaidoz notes that among published versions, the Welsh text seems closest to the Latin *Amici et Amelii Carissimorum* from a thirteenth-century manuscript and the French prose translation, *Li Amitiez de Ami et Amile*; however, the forms of certain names in the Welsh text indicate that it was most likely translated from a Latin text rather than from a French translation.<sup>71</sup>

Vernacular translations and other stories based on the hagiographic tradition appear in various languages, including German, French, Welsh, Dutch, Old Norse—and finally English, but not until the fifteenth century.<sup>72</sup> It was common practice to translate the hagiographic version, as the Welsh text does, and minor details of the translation, whether added by the Welsh translator or taken from a source that is no longer extant, indicate Continental interests.<sup>73</sup> In the context of insular vernacular literary production, the Welsh text is unique, since there are no other insular vernacular versions of the hagiographic text at this time; in fact vernacular versions of the romantic group seem to be limited to England and France, since they only appear in Anglo-Norman, Continental French dialects, and Middle English. Within a larger European context, then, the Welsh translation is rather conservative, whereas the English translation is innovative both with respect to the version of the text chosen for translation and with respect to the method of translation, discussed in chapter five. This conservative choice is consistent with the preservative method of translation into Welsh described above as well.

---

<sup>68</sup> Leach 1960, p. ix.

<sup>69</sup> For example, the development of Amlyn's father's discourse on his deathbed into a sermon-like speech suggests some familiarity with sermon literature, and the Welsh text also expands its source with a longer description of the king's daughter's love for Amlyn, using the language of courtly love literature.

<sup>70</sup> In the introduction to her edition of *Kedymdeithyas Amlyn ac Amic*, Patricia Williams outlines some differences between the Latin and Middle Welsh versions, for example moments in which the Welsh slightly expands or slightly abridges, but overall these seem to be stylistic differences that do not significantly affect our understanding of the story. See Williams 1982, pp. xxvii-xxxii.

<sup>71</sup> Gaidoz 1879-1880, p. 202. The Latin text, *Vita Sanctorum Amici et Amelii Carissimorum*, published by Franz Joseph Mone was edited from St. Omer, MS St. Bertin 776 (see Mone 1836). The French prose version can be found in Moland and d'Hericault 1856.

<sup>72</sup> See Leach 1960.

<sup>73</sup> Specifically, some details of locale that are not present in the Old French or Latin versions closest to the Welsh translation include the monastery of Saint-Germain and lands in Normandy.

*Rhamant Otuel* [The Romance (or Tale) of Otuel] forms part of the Welsh Charlemagne cycle. No one, as far as I know, has proposed a precise date for the text, and the history of the Middle English translation(s) is ambiguous and complex as well, so it is difficult to contextualize the two translations in relation to each other. The editor of *Rhamant Otuel* suggests a wide date range, from sometime after the composition of *Cân Rolant* (which Rejhon places in the first half of the thirteenth-century) to 1336.<sup>74</sup> It is extant in three medieval manuscripts, Oxford, Jesus College, MS 111 (*Llyfr Coch Hergest*, [The Red Book of Hergeset]), Aberystwyth, National Library of Wales, Peniarth MS 4-5 (*Llyfr Gwyn Rhydderch*, [The White Book of Rhydderch]), and the fragmentary manuscript, Aberystwyth, National Library of Wales Peniarth MS 9.<sup>75</sup> *Otuel* is one of the texts that *Llyfr Gwyn Rhydderch* and the Auchinleck Manuscript have in common. In fact, it has been proposed that the story of Otuel was introduced into the Welsh Charlemagne cycle as a complement to the English Charlemagne texts, which include it, and it has also been recognized that the Welsh translation is closer to the French than the English one is, as I have noted below as well.<sup>76</sup> Both the Middle Welsh text and the Auchinleck *Otuel, a Knight* were most likely translated ultimately from the Old French *chanson de geste*, the *Chanson d'Otinel*.

The transmission and translation history of the Auchinleck *Otuel, a Knight*, including how it appeared in the Auchinleck Manuscript, is very complex and involves much disagreement among scholars. Because of this complexity, the treatment of which would be beyond the scope of this dissertation, I do not discuss the text in chapter five nor do I discuss it in depth here.<sup>77</sup> However, I have compared the Auchinleck translation with the Old French *Otinel*, as well as with the part of the Middle English *Otuel and Roland* that is also translated from the Old French *Otinel*. Both Middle English texts take a fair amount of liberty in their translations, and like the earlier Middle English translations discussed in chapter four, there does not seem to be, in either text, a consistent pattern of translative revisions that point to a particular interpretive agenda.

Like the other Middle Welsh translations discussed so far, *Rhamant Otuel* follows the text it is translating much more closely than the Middle English translations do. Whereas the Middle Welsh text translates almost word-for-word from the Old French, the Middle English texts frequently change or omit small details and almost seem to be telling the story “in their own words” rather than meticulously translating. One short example will show what I mean in my description of the different translation styles:<sup>78</sup>

---

<sup>74</sup> See Williams 1968, p. xxxiv; for Rejhon’s discussion of the dating of the *Cân Rolant*, see Rejhon 1984, pp. 75-88.

<sup>75</sup> It is interesting that it appears only in these three manuscripts and not in the other Welsh manuscripts that include the Charlemagne cycle. For more on this, see below. For a useful chart of Charlemagne texts in Welsh manuscripts, see Rejhon 1984, pp. 22-23.

<sup>76</sup> Annalee Rejhon illuminates this discussion about the Welsh and Middle English *Otuel* texts in Rejhon 1984, p. 24 and n. 87. For the original suggestions about the relationship between these texts, see Williams 1907, p. 75 and Williams 1968, p. xxxiv.

<sup>77</sup> For a recent survey and analysis of scholarship on the problem, see Purdie 2008, pp. 115-125.

<sup>78</sup> I include only the Middle English translation from the Auchinleck *Otuel* since the text is the same here in the Middle English *Otuel and Roland*.

### Old French

Li Sarazin en vient devant le rei.  
«Charles, fait il, ore entend envers mei :  
«Messenger sui, ço quid, al meillur rei  
«K'unques fëust en la paiene lei.  
«Ne te salu, k'à dreit faire nel dei,  
«Forfait en es vers Mahum et vers mei;  
«Cil te confunde en la ki lei jo crei,  
«E tuz ces altres qui sunt environ tei,  
«E ton nevu Rollant, que jo ci vei.  
«Si uncore un jor le truis en tornei,  
«Ke mun destrer puisse acurser vers lei,  
«De m'espée le quid faire un espei  
«Parmi le cors . . .<sup>79</sup>

The Saracen came before the king:  
"Charles," he said, "now listen to me: I  
am a messenger of the best king who  
was ever, I think, in the pagan religion.  
He does not greet you, for it is right that  
he should not; you do wrong to  
Mahomet and to me; may he in whose  
religion I believe defeat you and all  
these others who are around you, and  
your nephew Rolland, whom I see here.  
If one day I ever meet him in battle so  
that my horse could run towards him, I  
think I would spear him through his  
body with my sword. . .<sup>80</sup>

### Middle Welsh

Ac yna dyuot racdaw gyr  
bronn y brenhin a wnaeth  
ual kynt, a dywedut wrthaw  
ual hynn: "[Ch]yarlys",  
heb ef, "gwarandaw arnaf  
vi. Kenyat wyf vi y'r  
brenhin cadarnhaf a vu  
eiryoet yg kyfreith yr  
Yspæen, gwr nyt  
annerchwys di o dim, kanys  
nys dylvei, wrth y vlyghau  
ohonat, a llityaw Mahumet  
a minheu. Y gwr poet, ual  
y credaf vi yndaw ef, a'th  
ladho di—ti a'th holl  
gedymdeithas a'r niuer  
yssyd y'th gylch, ac yn  
enwedic Rolant dy nei, gwr  
pei ys caffwnn i ef ym  
brwydyr, neu y lle y gallei  
vy march rydec yn y erbyn,  
a'm cledyf mi a'e gwanwn  
yny vei yn ver trwydyaw.<sup>81</sup>

And then he came before  
the king, as before, and  
spoke to him like this:  
"Charles," he said, "listen  
to me. I am a messenger of  
the most powerful king  
who was ever in the law<sup>82</sup>  
of Spain, one who has  
given you no greeting at all,  
since he should not,  
because you have angered  
him and infuriated  
Mahomet and myself. May  
he, as I believe in him, be  
the one who kills you—you  
and all your companions  
and the retinue that is  
around you, and especially  
Roland your nephew,  
whom, if I should find him  
in battle or where my horse  
could run against him, I  
would pierce with my

### Middle English

Anon as Otuwel hadde a sizt  
Of Charles þat was king & kniȝt,  
For eye of no man he ne leet  
Bote wente to him þere he seet.  
Hit was þe boldeste Sarazin  
þat euere þorte drinke win,  
And þat was sene wiþoute lesing.  
þo he spak wiþ Charles þe king.  
He seide to him amydde his halle  
'Sire king, foule mote þe falle.  
þou art aboute for to greue  
Mahoun þat we onne byleue;  
þefore haue þou maugre.  
So þe greteþ Garsie bi me  
þat me haueþ in message sent  
To seggen his comaundement.<sup>84</sup>

<sup>79</sup> Guessard and Michelant, ed., 1858, ll. 63-75.

<sup>80</sup> My translation.

<sup>81</sup> Williams, ed., 1968, p. 45, ll. 5-17.

<sup>82</sup> Note that the Middle Welsh *kyfreith*, meaning "law," literally translates the Old French *lei*, which can mean either "law" or "religion." I thank Annalee Rejhon for this observation (personal communication).

sword until it be through  
him like a lance.<sup>83</sup>

The most dramatic difference between the Middle Welsh *Otuel* and the Old French text is that the Welsh translation is uncharacteristically abridged at the end. The Old French text ends with the death of Garsie in a Paris prison and the celebration of the marriage between Otuel and Belisaunt. The Middle Welsh text ends with Garsie in prison (and no mention of his death there), and there is no marriage celebration. Incidentally, this is similar to the Auchinleck *Otuel, a Knight*, which ends with Garsie's surrender to Charles but does not mention his death in prison and does not include a scene celebrating the marriage. Aside from this abridgement and a couple of minor differences in details, the Welsh translation is entirely faithful to the Old French source.<sup>85</sup>

Looking for textual influence between the Middle Welsh and Middle English texts discussed above is difficult since, except in the case of the Amis and Amiloun story, their sources are similar. Textual evidence that might indicate that the producers of these translations were reading one another's work could include, for example, slippage between the forms of proper names (e.g., finding a form of the English name "Beves" in the Welsh text, which uses a form of the name based on the Anglo-Norman "Boun"), finding indications that the Welsh translators were aware of the significant interpolations in the English texts, or finding other translative revisions in the Welsh texts that would indicate that they were generating dialogues with their source texts that are similar to those I argue the Middle English translations generate with their sources.

The chart at the end of this chapter gives an example of the kind of cross-reading that I did in comparing texts for this chapter and throughout the study. This chart serves as a short example, but whenever it was possible, I also compared multiple manuscript versions in each language. When that was not possible I checked the variants available to me in published editions.

The short examples in the chart are from the Anglo-Norman, Middle Welsh (White Book, second beginning), and Auchinleck Middle English versions of the Beves story.<sup>86</sup> What this chart shows is typical of my findings in this chapter and throughout this study. Neither the Welsh nor the Middle English is trying to imitate the poetic style of the Anglo-Norman text; even when preserving content, the translations are stylistically unique and generally unaffected by the source text. With respect to content, the near exactness of the Welsh translation in the second example of the chart is more typical of

---

<sup>84</sup> Burnley and Wiggins, ed., 2003, *Otuel a Kni3t*, ll. 99-114.

<sup>83</sup> My translation.

<sup>85</sup> There are some differences in the description of Otuel's baptism scene, where the Middle Welsh text includes the names of some people that are not included in the Old French text, and the description of the major battle seems to differ. Also, Belisaunt is not given a say about her marriage to Otuel (whereas her opinion is sought in the Old French text), but this is true in the Middle English texts as well. Finally, there is a short scene describing the arming of Clarel in the Middle Welsh text that is not in the Old French text; this scene also appears in the Middle English *Otuel and Roland*, but not in the Auchinleck *Otuel*. Because the differences are so minor and so few, in this case I am more inclined to suspect that they come from another French manuscript tradition of the story than that the Middle English translations influenced the Middle Welsh translation, though that is not impossible.

<sup>86</sup> For the Anglo-Norman edition, see Stimming, ed., 1899; for the Middle English edition, see Burnley and Wiggins, ed., 2003, *Sir Beues of Hamptoun*; for the Welsh edition, see Watkin, ed., 1958.

much of this translation than what we see in the first example, where the Welsh text seems to be summarizing rather than simply translating. In the second example on the chart, the Welsh text preserves even an idiomatic Anglo-Norman expression that does not occur in native Welsh literature. The Anglo-Norman *Par mun chef!* is very literally translated: *Myn vy phen* [By my head!]. Yet, as Poppe and Reck explain in their detailed study, these kinds of literal translations are not always adopted; there are other moments in which the Welsh translator uses an exclamation common to native Welsh literature as a substitute for the more foreign sounding Anglo-Norman exclamation.<sup>87</sup> Although the Welsh translator generally attempts to make the text adhere stylistically to Welsh native tradition while preserving the Anglo-Norman content, it makes sense that in such a long text, there would be some inconsistency. Poppe and Reck notice that in the part they identify as the second region of the Welsh *Bown*, there are fewer stylistic interventions than there are in what they call the first region.<sup>88</sup> The first example in the chart shows a much more significant reworking of the Anglo-Norman text, stylistically, since the direct speech of the Anglo-Norman text is replaced by indirect speech in the Welsh. Some small content details are left out, which seems to be a natural consequence of reporting speech rather than quoting it directly. Interestingly direct speech is more common in native Welsh prose than indirect speech,<sup>89</sup> but the section quoted shows where the Welsh text seems to have changed strategies, from one of providing a shortened summary of the Anglo-Norman text to one of providing a more detailed and exactly articulated translation.<sup>90</sup>

The Middle English translation preserves the direct speech and therefore many of the details of the Anglo-Norman text, but it is clearly not slavish. The tail-rhyme style is faster moving, and likewise the narrative proceeds a bit more quickly as well. The Middle English text leaves out some minor details such as the exact number of knights the emperor should have with him and the injunction to not allow anyone to prevent him from being ready. This is typical of many Middle English translations, which reproduce the content of the original, but in a rather free style. Yet, what is also typical is the type of radical textual innovation that we see in the second example in the chart. Whereas the

---

<sup>87</sup> Poppe and Reck 2008, pp. 139-140.

<sup>88</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 158-59. In their discussion of these stylistic differences, Poppe and Reck divide the two regions of *Bown* rather arbitrarily (as they note) at around l. 2725. They also note that this dividing line corresponds somewhat to where Weiss divides the Anglo-Norman *Boeve*. Weiss notes that starting at *laisse* clxvi, the Anglo-Norman *Boeve* seems less carefully put together, with discrepancies in the story and characters along with a more careless style in the construction of the *laissez* in the last part. See Weiss 1986, p. 240. However, since Poppe and Reck acknowledge that their dividing line is tentative and somewhat arbitrary and that the stylistic changes they note in what they call the two regions of *Bown* definitely do not occur abruptly, but rather gradually begin to occur more frequently, the note of rough correspondence to the change in the Anglo-Norman text seems interesting, but not exact enough to draw any conclusions. As they write, “The implications of this situation are not yet clear” (Poppe and Reck 2008, p. 159).

<sup>89</sup> Poppe and Reck 2006, p. 149.

<sup>90</sup> More details are therefore included in these lines than in the few lines that precede it, but the style remains in keeping with the shorter summary translation that comes just before. The text that comes before is provided in the body of this chapter, where I discuss the double beginning in the White Book of Rhydderch. Note that I am not contrasting the two beginnings here; I am discussing only the second beginning, and the apparent change in translation strategy within the text of the second beginning.

Welsh text is translating exactly, the Middle English translation alters the source text significantly, in one of many moments that change the narrative intent of the original entirely.<sup>91</sup>

What is evident in these short examples, which are demonstrative of the translative strategy throughout the texts studied here, is that there is no textual indication that the producers of the Welsh and English texts were aware of one another's work. The Welsh texts show no knowledge of the interpolations of the English, they are stylistically very different, no English names appear in the Welsh translations, and there is no evidence that the Welsh texts are innovating in other ways that generate an ideological commentary on the values depicted in the original texts, as the English translations do.<sup>92</sup> Of course, choosing not to reproduce one another's methods does not indicate that they were mutually unaware, and as Catherine McKenna has suggested, in putting together anthologies of secular texts for entertainment, it seems that the Welsh were participating in an "international vogue that originated in thirteenth-century France and spread into Britain in the fourteenth century."<sup>93</sup>

I chose the three Welsh texts examined above because of their contextual proximity (in genre, source text, date of composition, and manuscript context) to the Middle English texts I have already discussed. In all cases, the method of these late thirteenth- and early fourteenth-century translations differs from that of the English translations of the same texts. Interestingly, it also differs from the method Welsh translators themselves used to fashion Old French romances such as Chrétien de Troyes' texts—*Owain*, *Peredur*, and *Geraint*, mentioned above; these are all also preserved in both Aberystwyth, National Library of Wales, Peniarth MS 4-5 and Oxford, Jesus College, MS 111.<sup>94</sup> However, the composition of these texts is considered to have taken place somewhat earlier than the translation of the *chansons de geste*, that is in the later twelfth century for *Peredur* and *Owein*, and for *Gereint*, in the early thirteenth century (or possibly late twelfth century).<sup>95</sup> Although their status as "translations" of Chrétien's texts has been debated, many scholars agree that they are indeed very loose translations. Some scholars have noted word-for-word translation in some sections of these romances,<sup>96</sup> but on the whole they are quite different from Chrétien's texts with respect to the plot, and they have much more a "native Welsh" feel than a courtly French one, with respect to both form and content.<sup>97</sup>

---

<sup>91</sup> See chapter five for a discussion of the significance of this moment in the Middle English *Beves*.

<sup>92</sup> As I mention above, this style contrasts with that of the Welsh Arthurian romance translations, which show great innovation in both style and content.

<sup>93</sup> McKenna 2011, p. 229. My thanks to Catherine McKenna for allowing me to see the article in proofs.

<sup>94</sup> All three Welsh romances survive in additional medieval Welsh manuscripts, none of which is later than the fourteenth century. *Peredur* survives in Aberystwyth, National Library of Wales, Peniarth MS 7 (early fourteenth century), where it appears with *Cân Rolant*, translated in the early thirteenth century, and a fragment in Aberystwyth, National Library of Wales, Peniarth MS 14 (second quarter of the fourteenth century). *Owain* is found in Jesus College Oxford MS. XX (on which see Thomson 1975, p. x) and *Gereint* in Peniarth MSS 6, parts iv, and iii, respectively (on which see further Thomson 1997, p. x).

<sup>95</sup> For the dating see Bromwich et al. 1991, p. 171 (*Peredur*), pp. 148-49 (*Gereint*), and p. 159 (*Owain*).

<sup>96</sup> See for example Lloyd-Morgan 1991.

<sup>97</sup> For a useful discussion of the ways in which the Welsh translators re-incorporated native Welsh themes into their translations of Chrétien's romances, see Rejhon 1990, especially pp. 136-39.

These Arthurian romance texts suggest that the type of translation we see in the late thirteenth- and fourteenth-century translations of the *chansons de geste* discussed here, while seemingly characteristic either of this time period or of this genre, is not necessarily characteristic of Welsh translation practice in general. One significant difference between the earlier Arthurian translations and those discussed in this study is that the Arthurian texts, even if they were translated from Old French sources, derived originally from native Celtic tales. Perhaps translators felt more at liberty to make significant translative revisions when they were dealing with texts derived from native content, as opposed to the definitively ‘foreign’ content of *Bown*, *Amis*, and *Otuel*, for instance. Annalee Rejhon suggests that a significant difference between the translation styles has to do with the aural reception of the Arthurian romances, whereas the *chansons de geste* were translated from manuscript sources.<sup>98</sup>

Although we do not know anything about the patronage of the particular texts studied in this chapter, many late thirteenth- and early fourteenth-century translations are thought to have been commissioned by patrons from the *uchelwyr* class.<sup>99</sup> This was a gentry class that emerged after the conquest of 1282, and one which we might consider bicultural in many respects. They likely identified as Welsh with respect to their native language and many aspects of their cultural identity, and they frequently patronized Welsh poets and engaged with high Welsh culture. But because of their service to the English crown and frequent marriage into English ruling families, their political perspectives and even some aspects of their cultural identity were likely unmistakably English.<sup>100</sup> Perhaps, in addition to the various battle alliances discussed above, the influence of this bicultural class known for its literary patronage is one factor that accounts for the parallel vogue, in Wales and England, of literary translation as an almost exclusive form of secular literary composition—excepting short poems—in Welsh and English.

But what accounts for the very different execution of these translation projects, and why, despite the historical and contextual evidence which suggest that there ought to be a dialogue between these translations, do we not see any textual evidence of cross-referencing? Much later, Welsh translations clearly draw from sources in several languages. Ceridwen Lloyd-Morgan points out: “During the fifteenth century and into the sixteenth, there began to emerge in addition a new breed of redactor, the antiquarian collector-scribe, who, magpie-like, would pick up tit-bits of narrative here and there. Sometimes these odds and ends of material, derived from manuscripts in Latin, English, French and Welsh, were worked up into complete narratives.”<sup>101</sup>

---

<sup>98</sup> Rejhon 1990. As I mention above, this point raises an interesting question, since the Middle English translators were also translating the same texts from manuscripts, yet they innovated much more freely in translating the content. The Welsh Arthurian romances in question belong to the eleven Middle Welsh prose tales known collectively as the *Mabinogion*. Brynley F. Roberts discusses how the antecedents of all these tales “lie in traditional tales recited by oral storytellers” (see further Roberts 1984, pp. 211-30, quotation p. 229; see also Rejhon 1985-86, p. 119).

<sup>99</sup> Lloyd-Morgan 1991, p. 52.

<sup>100</sup> See Fulton 2008 for more information on the *uchelwyr* class and their complex relationship with Welsh and English culture, including their patronage specifically of Welsh poetry.

<sup>101</sup> Lloyd-Morgan 1991, p. 59.

With so much cultural contact between the English and the Welsh during the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, why do we not see any of the English interpolations and translative revisions appearing also in the Welsh translations, and why are the Welsh and English methods for translating the same texts, in the same period, in many ways diametrically opposed? Where the English adopted French poetic forms and narrative style but took the liberty to make significant innovations with respect to content revision, the Welsh seem staunchly devoted to preserving the plot and general narrative intention of the source text, but took great liberties in making the text conform as closely as possible to Welsh narrative style. When given a choice, the English most often chose to translate from a French as opposed to a Latin source, but the Welsh almost always chose a Latin source.<sup>102</sup>

The conservatism and biculturalism suggested by these Welsh translations might be a reflection of the cultural position of the *uchelwyr* class, who not only showed an interest in participating in French and English culture but also showed staunch support for preserving native Welsh traditions. Fulton writes: “The strategy they adopted, of participating in the dominant English culture while simultaneously supporting the Welsh ‘high’ culture, worked to define the *uchelwyr* as a class of noblemen.”<sup>103</sup> Known as supporters of native Welsh poetry, these at times conflicting interests are described by Fulton:

We know that the *uchelwyr* did participate in the courtly culture of the English and French nobilities as a way of asserting their own high status within Wales. But the poets make it very clear that one of the main roles of the *uchelwyr* is to support the native Welsh culture, particularly its music and poetry. There is a single poem, an *awdl*, attributed to a fourteenth-century poet, Iorwerth Beli (ca. 1300-25), that is addressed to an unnamed bishop of Bangor who, despite his Welsh origins, patronized English singers and musicians. These new rivals to Welsh culture were regarded as low grade and untrained compared to the Welsh poets who deeply resented their influence and the threat they posed to the traditional livelihoods of the Welsh bards. Iorwerth Beli expresses an unequivocal rebuke to the bishop on account of his patronage of such low-class players.<sup>104</sup>

Although Fulton is discussing the relationship between the *uchelwyr* class and Welsh poetry, as I mentioned above, this class also frequently patronized prose translations. Strict adherence to the original plot and narrative intent would seem to satisfy the desire

---

<sup>102</sup> I thank Annalee Rejhon for this observation (personal communication). Examples include the Welsh Brut chronicle, *Brut y Brenhinedd*, translated from Geoffrey of Monmouth’s *Historia Regum Britanniae* (while La3amon’s Middle English *Brut* was more likely translated from Wace’s *Roman de Brut*), the Welsh version of the tale of Vernagu, found in the *Chronicl Turpin*, is translated from the Latin *Pseudo-Turpin Chronicle* (while the Middle English *Roland and Vernagu* is translated from the French Johannes *Pseudo-Turpin*), and the Welsh *Kymdeithas Amlyn ac Amic* is translated from the prose Latin hagiographic text (while the Middle English *Amis and Amiloun* is translated from the Anglo-Norman *Amys e Amilun*).

<sup>103</sup> Fulton 2008, p. 198.

<sup>104</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 207.

to participate fully in French and Anglo-Norman high culture. In some cases, choosing a Latin source text over a French one puts the Welsh translations in the same position as the French translations, in that they are not derivative from the French; rather both vernacular texts derive directly from Latin. But translating texts into a Welsh style reminiscent of native Welsh prose would satisfy the need, at the same time, to support native Welsh culture. Most importantly, translating texts in this style allows Welsh participation in an English literary ‘vogue’ while doing it in a way that is specifically not English. In fact the Welsh style of translating these texts is uniquely Welsh, for the norm in vernacular-to-vernacular translation all over Europe is a much freer treatment of the narrative intent of the source text.

Earlier chapters of this study have suggested that the translative revisions in the English texts specifically blur ethnic, religious, moral and other boundaries in order to pose serious questions about cultural assumptions in those areas. On one level, as translations, and as participants in a parallel literary movement with one happening in England, the Welsh translations, written in Welsh narrative style, inherently blur some boundaries. At the same time, they staunchly adhere to other restrictions, in that they use native Welsh narrative style and preserve the narrative intent of the original remarkably faithfully. Such a method is, in many ways, mimetic of a strong Welsh desire, specifically among the members of the *uchelwyr* class, to preserve native traditions and simultaneously participate in a cosmopolitan literary environment.

When considering the other evidence presented in this chapter, the lack of discernable textual influence between medieval Welsh and English translations of the same texts in the late thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries brings to light several important ideas. The multilingual and multicultural political and cultural milieu in which these Welsh texts were produced, the simultaneity of the similar Welsh and English projects, and even the later fifteenth-century manuscripts that show Welsh-English cross-reading suggest that the lack of textual influence is, on the one hand, interesting and unexpected. On the other hand, the Welsh are known for their culture of preservation. This is precisely what we see in the tendency to preserve the “original” content, in the tendency to translate from the earliest linguistic version possible (choosing Latin over French sources where possible), and in the choice to preserve native Welsh literary and stylistic conventions even while translating foreign texts. But this culture of preservation also suggests that the multilingual reading inscribed in the fifteenth-century Welsh manuscripts discussed earlier might not represent a new fifteenth-century phenomenon; it is more likely that the Welsh are merely newly inscribing and documenting within manuscripts a multilingual reading tradition that is preserved from the past, a hypothesis that is consistent with the simultaneity of the Welsh and English translation projects. Despite indications that the producers of Welsh and English translations of the same texts likely knew of one another’s projects, the contrast between their methods of executing the same project of mass translation highlights not only the Welsh culture of conservatism and preservation but also the extent to which the discursive mode of the Auchinleck translations—which generate an interrogative and subversive dialogue with their source texts—is unique to the English milieu in which the texts were produced and is not a general characteristic of medieval insular translation.

**Anglo-Norman  
Example 1**

“Messenger,” dist ele, “en Alemaigne ore tost alez!  
En Alemaigne ja ne demorrez,  
a le riche emperor de la meii part dirrez,  
ke jeo lui envoie saluz e amistez;  
e dites lui, ke il ne lese pur homme ke seit nez  
ke le primer jur de may ne seit apresterz.

E di lui, ke il face ov lui aprester  
quater cent de chevaliers, se facent ben armer  
e veinient en ceste forest par desuz la mer;  
jeo lui envoie mon seigneur ausi com pur chacer  
e poi de gent od ly, ne ly estoit doter;  
e di lui, ke il ne let lui jamés eschaper  
que il ne lui coupe le chef o un branc de ascer.

Ore ly di, ke jeo ly maund pur la moy amisté,  
kaunt il verra mon seigneur, ke il seit tot aprester  
e lui coupe le chef a un braunc acéré;  
e kaunt il me avera le chef enveé,  
jeo en frai certes kan ke ly vent a greez.”<sup>105</sup>

*“Messenger,” she said, “go now immediately to*

**Middle Welsh  
Example 1**

. . . **Ac anuon kennat**  
a wnaeth at amheradyr yr  
almaen ac adolwyn ydaw  
yr y charyat hi y uot ef a ni=  
uer o varchogyon aruawc  
y gyt ac ef duw kalanmei  
yn fforest y iarll yn ymgu=  
dyaw yndi. A hitheu a barei  
yr iarll ac achydic o niuer ys=  
cyuala mynet yr fforest. Ac  
ynna y gallei ynteu llad penn  
y iarll ae anuon idi hitheu  
yn anrec ac o hynny allan y  
gellynt hwynteu bot y gyt  
yn dideruyse.<sup>106</sup>

*And she sent a messenger to  
the emperor of Germany and  
asked him out of love for her  
to be on the first of May with  
a host of armed knights with  
him in the earl’s forest lying  
in ambush in it, and she  
would cause the*

**Middle English (Auchinleck)  
Example 1**

‘Go’ 3he seide ‘into Almaine  
Out of me bour.  
Maseger, be 3ep and snel,  
And on min helf þow grete wel  
Pat emperur

And bid, in þe ferþe dai  
Pat comeþ in þe moneþ of May,  
For loue of me,  
Pat he be to fi3te prest  
Wiþ is ferde in hare forest  
Beside þe se.  
Me lord ich wile þeder sende  
For his loue, for to schende  
And for to sle.  
Bid him þat hit be nou3t beleued  
Pat he ne smite of his heued  
And sende hit me.  
And whan he haueþ so ydo  
Me loue he schel vnderfo  
Wiþouten delai.<sup>107</sup>

<sup>105</sup> Stimming, ed., 1899, ll. 51-68.

<sup>106</sup> Watkin, ed., 1958, ll. 73-87 (second beginning).

<sup>107</sup> Burnley and Wiggins, ed., 2003, *Beves*, ll. 86-105.

**Anglo-Norman  
Example 1**

*Germany! Do not linger in Germany; to the rich emperor you will say for me that I send him greetings and friendship. And tell him that he should not permit, for any man alive, that he not be ready on the first day of May.*

*And tell him that he should have ready with him four hundred well-armed knights, and they should come to this forest on the sea. I will send him my husband as if he is hunting and few men with him, he [the emperor] need not fear. And tell him that he should never let him escape without cutting off his head with a steel sword.*

*Now tell him that I order him, for love of me, to be ready when he sees my husband, and to cut off his head with a steel sword. And when he will have sent me his head, I will certainly do whatever would please him.<sup>107</sup>*

**Middle Welsh  
Example 1**

*earl and a small defenseless host to go to the forest, and then he could cut off the earl's head and send it to her as a present, and from then onwards they could be together undisturbed.<sup>108</sup>*

**Middle English  
(Auchinleck)  
Example 1**

---

<sup>107</sup> My translation.

<sup>108</sup> Translation reprinted from Poppe and Reck 2006, p. 146.

**Anglo-Norman****Example 2**

“Par mun chef!” dist Boefs, “jeo vus frai bien saver,  
lisez moi ceo bref toust saunz demorrer,  
ou jeo vus couperai la teste o mun espeie de  
ascer.”<sup>109</sup>

*“By my head,” said Boeve, “I will let you know,  
read me this letter quickly, without delay, or I will  
cut off your head with my steel sword.”*<sup>110</sup>

**Middle Welsh****Example 2**

. . . Myn  
vy phenn heb y bown mi awnaf  
yt y wybot. Darllein y llythyr  
hwn heb ohir<sup>111</sup> neu minneu a lado  
dy  
penn ar cledyf hwn.<sup>112</sup>

*By my head, said Bown, I will make  
you know it. Read this letter  
without delay or I will cut off your  
head with this sword.*<sup>113</sup>

**Middle English (Auchinleck)****Example 2**

‘God þat made þis world a[l] ronde  
þe saue, sire king Brademond,  
And ek alle þine fere  
þat I se now here,  
And 3if þat ilche blessing  
Likeþ þe ri3t noþing,  
Mahoun, þat is god þin,  
Teruagaunt & Apolin  
þe blessi and di3te  
Be alle here mi3te.  
Lo her þe king Ermin  
þe sente þis letter in parchemin,  
And ase þe letter þe telleþ to  
A bad þow scholdest swiþe do.’<sup>114</sup>

<sup>109</sup> Stimming, ed., 1899, ll. 898-900.

<sup>110</sup> My translation.

<sup>111</sup> The White Book reads “heb olud,” which is an error, so I have replaced it with the variant from the Red Book, which is indicated in Watkin’s edition.

<sup>112</sup> Watkin, ed., 1958, ll. 938-942.

<sup>113</sup> My translation.

<sup>114</sup> Burnley and Wiggins, ed., 2003, *Beves*, ll. 1371-86.

## Conclusion

We have come a long way since our discussion of the English translation of *Boeve de Haumtone* preserved in Paris, Bibliothèque nationale, MS nouv. acq. fr. 4532. This late inscription of a parallel text translation into a medieval manuscript illuminates the modern expectations about translation that we project backward onto medieval texts. We have seen, however, that literary translation in medieval Britain operated in a linguistic and cultural milieu so different from our own that it played a role in that culture that differs significantly from the role it plays in ours.

Recognizing that the audience for medieval vernacular translations of French language texts was a multilingual one requires us to revise the ways in which we, too, read them and understand their relationship to the originals. The interpretations developed in this study show how reading across languages in fourteenth-century England gave rise to a particular mode of discourse, showcased prominently in the Auchinleck Manuscript, in which translative revisions generated an intertextual dialogue with source texts. In many cases, this dialogue was both subversive and interrogative, in that it generated an extratextual discussion that revised values that were expressed in the source texts and, in so doing, commented on ideological issues that were important to an early fourteenth-century audience. Moreover, the act of moving texts, which had been read in French for approximately a hundred years, into the English language mimetically effected a revision of another sort by compelling the cultural reorientation of the Anglo-Norman reader and generating a significant extratextual dialogue about vernacular literary production in England.

Neither the pre-Auchinleck translations discussed in chapter four nor the Welsh translations studied in chapter six operate in the same discursive mode, despite the fact that they, too, circulated in a multilingual reading milieu. This suggests that the Auchinleck translations represent an important development in the function of translation and the use of the English language in medieval England. They represent a method of inscribing significance and receiving information that alters the way we think about the transmission of ideas and the use of the English language, which invites new questions regarding the role of English as its use increased and developed through the fourteenth century. In fact, as I discussed in chapter one, Sara Torpey's work suggests that some aspects that characterize this discursive mode—for instance multivalence and the interrogation of traditional values—later become constitutive of Middle English writing on its own terms.<sup>1</sup>

The methodology I have used to analyze the translations in this study problematizes our current practice of studying and teaching medieval literature. It is increasingly being recognized that medieval texts in England circulated in a multilingual literary milieu. We cannot understand the implications of this idea, however, unless we read in a multilingual context, as the medieval reader did. In order to do this, we need to de-compartmentalize literary studies. We must develop courses within English departments in which students read English, Anglo-Norman, Welsh, and Latin texts side-by-side. Recently, the French of England Translation Series (FRETS) has begun to make this possible even at the undergraduate level by publishing English translations of important Anglo-Norman texts. These and other translations will not only help us teach

---

<sup>1</sup> See Torpey 2002.

the multilingual literary context of Middle English literature, but they will ultimately inspire more students to develop the linguistic skills necessary to read the texts in their original languages. In my teaching in the Department of Comparative Literature at UC Berkeley, I have found that students know that reading in translation is never equivalent to reading in the original language, and they have a natural impulse to want to know what the original says and how it says it. They demonstrate an interesting reflex to go back and cross-read, with my help, the translation with the original, which is similar to the type of reading that seems to have been a common practice in the Middle Ages, when most readers were equipped with the skills to do this. In addition to teaching our students to read in a multilingual context, we must take steps to more easily facilitate our own research in this area by producing editions in which variants are provided in more than one language, not just in the language of the edited text, and by creating websites that allow for easy comparison of multiple manuscript versions of texts in several languages. We can start all of this by re-editing *Guy de Warewic* and *Guy of Warwick* together.

## Bibliography

- Ailes, Marianne. 2008. "The Anglo-Norman *Boeve de Haumtone* as a *Chanson de Geste*." In *Sir Bevis of Hampton in Literary Tradition*, edited by Jennifer Fellows and Ivana Djordjević. Woodbridge, UK: D.S. Brewer.
- . 2007. "Gui de Warewic in Its Manuscript Context." In *Guy of Warwick: Icon and Ancestor*, edited by Alison Wiggins and Rosalind Field, 12-26. Cambridge: D.S. Brewer.
- Alford, John A. 1992. *Piers Plowman: A Guide to the Quotations*. Binghamton, N.Y.: Medieval & Renaissance Texts & Studies.
- . 1977. "The Role of the Quotations in *Piers Plowman*." *Speculum: A Journal of Medieval Studies* 52 (1): 80-99.
- Allen, Rosamund. 1988. "The Date and Provenance of *King Horn*: Some Interim Reassessments." In *Medieval English Studies Presented to George Kane*, edited by Edward Donald Kennedy, Ronald Waldron and Joseph S. Wittig, 99-125. Woodbridge: Brewer, xviii.
- , ed. 1984. *King Horn: An Edition Based on Cambridge University Library MS. gg. 4.27(2)*. New York: Garland.
- Archibald, Elizabeth. 2010. "Macaronic Poetry." In *A Companion to Medieval Poetry*, edited by Corinne Saunders, 277-288. West Sussex, UK: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Bancourt, Paul. 1982. *Les Musulmans dans les chansons de geste du Cycle du Roi*. Aix en Provence; Marseille: Université de Provence.
- Barnes, Geraldine. 1984. "Cunning and Ingenuity in the Middle English *Floris and Blancheflur*." *Medium Aevum* 53 (1): 10-25.
- Barron, W. R. J., and S. C. Weinberg, eds. 1995. *Brut, or, Hystoria Brutonum*. By La3amon. Harlow, Essex, England: Longman.
- Baugh, Albert C. 1959. "Improvisation in the Middle English Romance." *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society* 103: 418-54.
- Bell, Alexander, ed. 1925. *Le Lai d'Haveloc and Gaimar's Haveloc Episode*. Manchester: University Press.
- Blacker-Knight, Jean. 1988. "Transformations of a Theme: The Depoliticization of the Arthurian World in the *Roman de Brut*." In *The Arthurian Tradition: Essays in Convergence*, edited by Mary Flowers Braswell and John Bugge, 54-74. Tuscaloosa: U of Alabama Press.
- Bliss, A. J., ed. 1966. *Sir Orfeo*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Bloch, R. Howard. 2003. *The Anonymous Marie de France*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Bredendick, Nancy. 2004. "Introduction." In *Mapping the Threshold : Essays in Liminal Analysis*, edited by Nancy Bredendick, 1-7. Madrid: Gateway Press.
- Brewer, Derek. 1997. "Arming II: The Arming Topos as Literature." In *A Companion to the Gawain Poet*, edited by Derek Brewer and Jonathan Gibson, 175-179. Rochester, NY: D.S. Brewer.
- Bromwich, Rachel, A. O. H. Jarman, and Brynley F. Roberts, eds. 1991. *The Arthur of the Welsh : The Arthurian Legend in Medieval Welsh Literature*. Cardiff: University of Wales Press.

- Bromwich, Rachel. 1991. "First Transmission to England and France." In *The Arthur of the Welsh*, edited by Rachel Bromwich, A.O.H. Jarman, and Brynley F. Roberts, 271-298. Cardiff: University of Wales Press.
- , ed. 1978. *Trioedd Ynys Prydein : The Welsh Triads*. Second Edition. Cardiff: University of Wales Press.
- Brownrigg, Linda. 1989. "The Taymouth Hours and the Romance of *Beves of Hampton*." *English Manuscript Studies 1100-1700* 1: 222-41.
- Brucker, Charles, ed. 1991. *Les Fables*. By Marie de France. Louvain (Belgium): Peeters.
- Bruckner, Matilda Tomaryn. 2006. "*Le Fresne's* Model for Twinning in the *Lais* of Marie de France. *MLN* 121 (4): 946-60.
- Bullock-Davies, Constance. 1966. *Professional Interpreters and the Matter of Britain. A Lecture Delivered at a Colloquium of the Departments of Welsh in the University of Wales at Gregynog, 26 June, 1965*. Cardiff: University of Wales Press.
- Burnley, David and Alison Wiggins, eds. 2003. *Amis and Amiloun*. In *The Auchinleck Manuscript*. National Library of Scotland [database online]. 5 July 2003. Available from <http://auchinleck.nls.uk/mss/amiloun.html>
- . 2003. *The Auchinleck Manuscript*. National Library of Scotland [database online]. 5 July 2003. Available from <http://www.nls.uk/auchinleck/>
- . 2003. *Floris and Blancheflour*. In *The Auchinleck Manuscript*. National Library of Scotland [database online]. 5 July 2003. Available from <http://auchinleck.nls.uk/mss/floris.html>
- . 2003. *Guy of Warwick (couplets)*. In *The Auchinleck Manuscript*. National Library of Scotland [database online]. 5 July 2003. Available from [http://auchinleck.nls.uk/mss/guy\\_cp.html](http://auchinleck.nls.uk/mss/guy_cp.html)
- . 2003. *Guy of Warwick (stanzas)*. In *The Auchinleck Manuscript*. National Library of Scotland [database online]. 5 July 2003. Available from [http://auchinleck.nls.uk/mss/guy\\_st.html](http://auchinleck.nls.uk/mss/guy_st.html)
- . 2003. *Horn Childe and Maiden Rimmild*. In *The Auchinleck Manuscript*. National Library of Scotland [database online]. 5 July 2003. Available from <http://auchinleck.nls.uk/mss/horn.html>
- . 2003. *Lay le Freine*. In *The Auchinleck Manuscript*. National Library of Scotland [database online]. 5 July 2003. Available from <http://auchinleck.nls.uk/mss/freine.html>
- . 2003. *On the Seven Deadly Sins*. In *The Auchinleck Manuscript*. National Library of Scotland [database online]. 5 July 2003. Available from <http://auchinleck.nls.uk/mss/sins.html>
- . 2003. *Otuel a Kni3t*. In *The Auchinleck Manuscript*. National Library of Scotland [database online]. 5 July 2003. Available from <http://auchinleck.nls.uk/mss/otuel.html>
- . 2003. *Reinbroun*. In *The Auchinleck Manuscript*. National Library of Scotland [database online]. 5 July 2003. Available from <http://auchinleck.nls.uk/mss/reinbrun.html>
- . 2003. *The Sayings of the Four Philosophers*. In *The Auchinleck Manuscript*. National Library of Scotland [database online]. 5 July 2003. Available from <http://auchinleck.nls.uk/mss/philos.html>

- . 2003. *The Simonie*. In *The Auchinleck Manuscript*. National Library of Scotland [database online]. 5 July 2003. Available from <http://auchinleck.nls.uk/mss/simonie.html>
- . 2003. *Sir Beues of Hamptoun*. In *The Auchinleck Manuscript*. National Library of Scotland [database online]. 5 July 2003. Available from <http://auchinleck.nls.uk/mss/beues.html>
- Burnley, J. D. 1989. "Late Medieval English Translation: Types and Reflections." In *The Medieval Translator: The Theory and Practice of Translation in the Middle Ages*, edited by Roger Ellis, 37-53. Woodbridge, Suffolk: D.S. Brewer.
- Burton, Julie. 1992. "Narrative Patterning and *Guy of Warwick*." *Yearbook of English Studies* 22: 105-16.
- Calkin Siobhain, Bly. 2008. "Defining Christian Knighthood in a Saracen World: Changing Depictions of the Protagonist in *Sir Bevis of Hampton*." In *Sir Bevis of Hampton in Literary Tradition*, edited by Jennifer Fellows and Ivana Djordjević, 127-144. Woodbridge, UK: D.S. Brewer.
- . 2005. *Saracens and the Making of English Identity: The Auchinleck Manuscript*. New York: Routledge.
- . 2004. "The Anxieties of Encounter and Exchange: Saracens and Christian Heroism in *Sir Beves of Hamptoun*." *Florilegium* 21: 135-58.
- Campbell, Kofi. 2006. "Nation-Building Colonialist-Style in *Bevis of Hampton*." *Exemplaria: A Journal of Theory in Medieval and Renaissance Studies* 18 (1): 205-32.
- Cartlidge, Neil, ed. 2001. *The Owl and the Nightingale: Text and Translation*. Exeter: University of Exeter Press.
- Clanchy, M. T. 1993. *From Memory to Written Record, England 1066-1307*. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Oxford; Cambridge, USA: Blackwell.
- Comfort, William Wistar. 1940. "The Literary *Rôle* of the Saracens in the French Epic." *PMLA* 55 (3) (Sep.): 628-659.
- Conlon, D. J., ed. 1971. *Le Rommant de Guy de Warwik et de Herolt d'Ardenne*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.
- Corrie, Marilyn. 1997. "The Compilation of Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Digby 86." *Medium Ævum* 66 (2): 236.
- Crane, Susan. 1986. *Insular Romance: Politics, Faith, and Culture in Anglo-Norman and Middle English Literature*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Cunningham, I. C., and J. E. C. Mordkoff. 1982. "New Light on the Signatures in the Auchinleck Manuscript (Edinburgh, National Library of Scotland Adv. MS 19.2.1)." *Scriptorium: Revue internationale des etudes relatives aux manuscrits / International Review of Manuscript Studies* 36 (2): 280-92.
- Daniel, Norman. 1984. *Heroes and Saracens: An Interpretation of the Chansons de Geste*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Dannenbaum [Crane], Susan. 1983. "Insular Tradition in the Story of *Amis and Amiloun*." *Neophilologus* 67 (4): 611-22.
- Davenport, Tony. 2008. "Wales and Welshness in Middle English Romances." In *Authority and Subjugation in Writing of Medieval Wales*, edited by Ruth Kennedy and Simon Meecham-Jones, 137-158. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

- Davies, R. R. 1987. *Conquest, Coexistence, and Change: Wales, 1063-1415*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Dean, Ruth J., and Maureen Barry McCann Boulton. 1999. *Anglo-Norman Literature: A Guide to Texts and Manuscripts*. London: Anglo-Norman Text Society.
- Delisle, Léopold, and Bibliothèque nationale (France). 1891. *Manuscrits latins et français ajoutés aux fonds des nouvelles acquisitions pendant les années 1875 1891*. Paris: H. Champion.
- Djordjević, Ivana. 2007. "Guy of Warwick as a Translation." In *Guy of Warwick: Icon and Ancestor*, edited by Alison Wiggins and Rosalind Field, 27-43. Cambridge: D.S. Brewer.
- . 2005a. "Original and Translation: Bevis's Mother in Anglo-Norman and Middle English." In *Cultural Encounters in the Romance of Medieval England*, edited by Corinne Saunders, 11-26. Woodbridge, Suffolk, UK: D.S. Brewer.
- . 2005b. "Versification and Translation in *Sir Beves of Hampton*." *Medium Aevum* 74: 41-60.
- Duggan, Joseph J. 1969. "Yvain's Good Name: The Unity of Chrétien de Troyes' *Chevalier au Lion*." *Orbis Litterarum: International Review of Literary Studies* 24: 112-29.
- , ed. 2005. *La Chanson de Roland — The Song of Roland: The French Corpus, Vol. 2, Part 3: The Châteauroux Venice 7 Version*. Turnhout (Belgium): Brepols Publishers.
- Edwards, A. S. G. 2007. "*Speculum Gui de Warewic* and Lydgate's *Guy of Warwick*: The Non-Romance Middle English Tradition." In *Guy of Warwick: Icon and Ancestor*, edited by Rosalind Field and Alison Wiggins, 81-93. Woodbridge, Suffolk, UK: D.S. Brewer.
- Evans, J. Gwenogvryn. 1898. *Report on Manuscripts in the Welsh Language*. Vol. 1. London: Printed for H.M.S.O., by Eyre and Spottiswoode.
- Ewert, Alfred, ed. 1932. *Gui de Warewic, Roman du XIIIe siècle*. Les Classiques français du Moyen Âge, 74-75. 2 vols. Paris: É. Champion.
- Fewster, Carol. 1987. *Traditionality and Genre in Middle English Romance*. Cambridge: D.S. Brewer.
- Field, Rosalind. 2007. "From *Gui* to *Guy*: The Fashioning of a Popular Romance." In *Guy of Warwick: Icon and Ancestor*, edited by Alison Wiggins and Rosalind Field, 44-60. Cambridge: D. S. Brewer.
- Finlayson, John. 1985. "The Form of the Middle English Lay." *The Chaucer Review: A Journal of Medieval Studies and Literary Criticism* 19 (4): 352-68.
- Frankis, John. 2007. "Languages and Cultures in Contact: Vernacular Lives of St. Giles and Anglo-Norman Annotations in an Anglo-Saxon Manuscript." *Leeds Studies in English* 38: 101-33.
- . 1997. "Taste and Patronage in Late Medieval England as Reflected in Versions of *Guy of Warwick*." *Medium Aevum* 66 (1): 80-93.
- . 1983. "Word-Formation by Blending in the Vocabulary of Middle English Alliterative Verse." In *Five Hundred Years of Words and Sounds: A Festschrift for Eric Dobson*, edited by Eric Gerald Stanley and Douglas Gray, 29-38. Cambridge: D.S. Brewer.

- Fulton, Helen. 2008. "Class and Nation: Defining the English in Late-Medieval Welsh Poetry." In *Authority and Subjugation in Writing of Medieval Wales*, edited by Ruth Kennedy and Simon Meecham-Jones, 191-212. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- . 1985. "The Theory of Celtic Influence on the Harley Lyrics." *Modern Philology: A Journal Devoted to Research in Medieval and Modern Literature* 82 (3): 239-54.
- Furrow, Melissa. 1989. "Middle English Fabliaux and Modern Myth." *ELH* 56 (1): 1-18.
- Gaidoz, Henri, ed. 1879-1880. "*L'Amitié d'Amis et d'Amiles*, texte gallois publié d'après le Livre Rouge d'Oxford, avec une traduction française par M. H. Gaidoz." *Revue Celtique* 4 : 203-244.
- Genette, Gérard. 1987. *Seuils*. Paris: Editions du Seuil.
- , and Marie Maclean, trans. 1991. "Introduction to the Paratext." *New Literary History* 22 (2) (Spring): 261-272.
- Griffith, David. 2007. "The Visual History of Guy of Warwick." In *Guy of Warwick: Icon and Ancestor*, edited by Alison Wiggins and Rosalind Field, 110-132. Woodbridge, Suffolk, UK: D.S. Brewer.
- Guddat-Figge, Gisela. 1976. *Catalogue of Manuscripts Containing Middle English Romances*. München: W. Fink.
- Guessard, F., and Henri Victor Michelant, eds. 1858. *Otinél, Chanson de Geste; publiés pour la première fois, d'après les manuscrits de Rome et de Middlehill*. Paris: F. Vieweg.
- Guillaume, Gabrielle. 1921. "The Prologues of the *Lay le Freine* and *Sir Orfeo*." *Modern Language Notes* 36 (8): 458-64.
- Hahn, Thomas. 1999. "Early Middle English." In *The Cambridge History of Medieval English Literature*, 61-91. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hall, Joseph, ed. 1901. *King Horn: A Middle-English Romance*. Oxford: Clarence Press.
- Hanna, Ralph. 2005. *London Literature, 1300-1380*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- . 2000. "Reconsidering the Auchinleck Manuscript." In *New Directions in Later Medieval Manuscript Studies: Essays from the 1998 Harvard Conference*, edited by Derek Pearsal, 91-102. Woodbridge, Suffolk: York Medieval Press in association with Boydell Press.
- Harf-Lancner, Laurence, ed. and trans., and Karl Warnke ed. 1990. *Lais de Marie de France*. Paris: Librairie Générale Française.
- Higden, Ranulf, John Trevisa, William Caxton, and John Malverne. 1865. *Polychronicon Ranulphi Higden Monachi Cestrensis; Together with the English Translations of John Trevisa and of an Unknown Writer of the Fifteenth Century*, edited by Churchill Babington and J. Rawson Lumby. Vol. I. London: Longman & Co.
- Holden, A. J., ed. 1984. *Le Roman de Waldef*. Cologny-Genève: Fondation Martin Bodmer.
- Holford, Matthew. 2006. "History and Politics in *Horn Child and Maiden Rinnild*." *Review of English Studies: The Leading Journal of English Literature and the English Language* 57 (229): 149-68.

- Hume, Kathryn. 1973. "Amis and Amiloun and the Aesthetics of Middle English Romance." *Studies in Philology* 70: 19-41.
- Huntsman, Jeffrey F. 1986. "The Celtic Heritage of *Sir Gawain and the Green Knight*." In *Approaches to Teaching Sir Gawain and the Green Knight*, edited by Miriam Youngerman Miller and Jane Chance, 177-181. New York: Modern Language Association of America.
- Huws, Daniel. 2000a. *Medieval Welsh Manuscripts*. Cardiff: University of Wales Press.
- . 2000b. "Y Pediair Llawysgrif Ganoloesol." In *Canhwyll Marchogyon: Cyd destunoli Peredur*, edited by Sioned Davies and Peter Wynn Thomas, 1-9. Cardiff: University of Wales Press.
- Kane, George and E. Talbot Donaldson, eds. 1975. *Piers Plowman, the B Version: Will's Visions of Piers Plowman, Do-Well, Do-Better, and Do-Best*. By William Langland. London: University of London, Athelone Press.
- Kelly, Kathleen Coyne. 1994. "The Bartering of Blancheflur in the Middle English *Floris and Blancheflur*." *Studies in Philology* 91 (2): 101-10.
- Ker, N. R., and British Museum. 1965. *Facsimile of British Museum MS. Harley 2253*. London: Published for the Early English Text Society by the Oxford University Press.
- Kleinman, Scott. 2003. "The Legend of Havelok the Dane and the Historiography of East Anglia." *Studies in Philology* 100 (3): 245-77.
- Kölbing, Eugen, ed. 1884. *Amis and Amiloun, zugleich mit der altfranzösischen Quelle*. Heilbronn: Gebr. Henninger.
- Kooper, Erik, ed. 2006. *Sentimental and Humorous Romances: Floris and Blancheflour, Sir Degrevant, The Squire of Low Degree, The Tournament of Tottenham, and The Feast of Tottenham*. Kalamazoo, Michigan: Medieval Institute Publications.
- Langlois, Ernest. 1883. "Deux fragments épiques: *Otinel, Apremont*." *Romania* 12: 433-58.
- Laskaya, Anne, and Eve Salisbury, eds. 1995. *The Middle English Breton Lays*. Kalamazoo, Michigan: Published for TEAMS (the Consortium for the Teaching of the Middle Ages) in association with the University of Rochester by Medieval Institute Publications, Western Michigan University.
- Le Saux, Françoise H. M., ed. 1993. *Amys and Amylion*. Exeter: University of Exeter Press.
- Leach, MacEdward, ed. 1960. *Amis and Amiloun*. Vol. 203. London: Pub. for the Early English Text Society, Oxford University Press.
- Legge, M. Dominica. 1963. *Anglo-Norman Literature and Its Background*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Lerer, Seth. 1999. "Old English and Its Afterlife." In *The Cambridge History of Medieval English Literature*, 7-34. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lloyd, Simon. 1985. "Political Crusades in England, c. 1215-1217 and c. 1263-65." In *Crusade and Settlement: Papers Read at the First Conference of the Society for the Study of the Crusades and the Latin East and Presented to R.C. Smail*, edited by Peter W. Edbury. Cardiff, U.K.: University College Cardiff Press.

- Lloyd-Morgan, Ceridwen. 2008. "Crossing the Borders: Literary Borrowing in Medieval Wales and England." In *Authority and Subjugation in Writing of Medieval Wales*, edited by Ruth Kennedy and Simon Meecham-Jones, 159-173. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- . 1991a. "Breuddwyd Rhonabwy and Later Arthurian Literature." In *The Arthur of the Welsh: the Arthurian Legend in Medieval Welsh Literature*, edited by Rachel Bromwich, A. O. H. Jarman, and Brynley F. Roberts, 181-208.
- . 1991b. "French Texts, Welsh Translators." In *The Medieval Translator*, edited by Roger Ellis. Vol. 2, 45-63. London: Centre for Medieval Studies, Queen Mary and Westfield College, University of London.
- Loomis, Laura Hibbard. 1942. "The Auchinleck Manuscript and a Possible London Bookshop of 1330-1340." *PMLA: Publications of the Modern Language Association of America* 57 (3) (Sept): 595-627.
- Loomis, Roger Sherman. 1958. "Scotland and the Arthurian Legend." *Proceedings of the Society of Antiquaries of Scotland* 89: 1-21.
- Lumby, J. Rawson, ed. 1866. King Horn: *With Fragments of Floriz and Blanche-flur, and of the Assumption of Our Lady, from a Ms. (G G.4.27.2.) in the Cambridge University Library. Also, from Mss. in the British Museum, the Assumption of Our Lady (add. Mss. 10036), and Fragments of the Floyres and Blanche-flur (Cotton Vitellius D. III)*. London: Pub. for the Early English Text Society, by Trübner & Co.
- Macaulay, G.C., ed. 1899-1902. *The Complete Works of John Gower*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Mac Cana, Proinsias. 1987. *Celtic Mythology*. New York: Peter Bedrick Books.
- Machan, Tim William. 2003. *English in the Middle Ages*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- . 1994. "Language Contact in *Piers Plowman*." *Speculum: A Journal of Medieval Studies* 69 (2): 359-85.
- Marx, William C. 2008. "Middle English Texts and Welsh Contexts." In *Authority and Subjugation in Writing of Medieval Wales*, edited by Ruth Kennedy and Simon Meecham-Jones, 13-26. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- . 2000. "An Abbreviated Middle English Prose Translation of the *Elucidarius*." *Leeds Studies in English* 31 : 1-53.
- . 1999. *Manuscripts in the National Library of Wales (Llyfrgell Genedlaethol Cymru), Aberystwyth*. Index of Middle English Prose. Vol. XIV. Cambridge: D.S. Brewer.
- Mason, Emma. 1984. "Legends of the Beauchamps' Ancestors: The Use of Baronial Propaganda in Medieval England." *Journal of Medieval History* 10 (1): 25-40.
- Matonis, A. T. E. 1988. "The Harley Lyrics: English and Welsh Convergences." *Modern Philology: A Journal Devoted to Research in Medieval and Modern Literature* 86 (1): 1-21.
- Matthews, David. 2010. *Writing to the King: Nation, Kingship, and Literature in England, 1250-1350*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- McCreech, Bernadine. 1999. "Translation and Adaptation in *Lay le Freine*." *Forum for Modern Language Studies* 35 (4): 386-95.

- McKenna, Catherine. 2011. "Reading with Rhydderch: Mabinogion Texts in Manuscript Montext." Forthcoming in the *Proceedings of the Seventh Australian Conference on Celtic Studies*.
- Meecham-Jones, Simon. 2008a. "Introduction." In *Authority and Subjugation in Writing of Medieval Wales*, edited by Ruth Kennedy and Simon Meecham-Jones, 1-11. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- . 2008b. "Where was Wales? The Erasure of Wales in Medieval English Culture." In *Authority and Subjugation in Writing of Medieval Wales*, edited by Ruth Kennedy and Simon Meecham-Jones, 27-55. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Mehl, Dieter. 1969. *The Middle English Romances of the Thirteenth and Fourteenth Centuries*. London: Routledge & K. Paul.
- Miller, Jennifer. *Multilingualism in Medieval Britain*. Book manuscript in progress.
- . *Variant Reading*. Book manuscript in progress.
- . Forthcoming. *La3amon's Brut and English Historiography*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- . Forthcoming. "La3amon's Welsh." In *Reading La3amon's Brut: Approaches and Explorations*, edited by Rosamund Allen, Jane Roberts, and Carole Weinberg. Amsterdam: Rodopi.
- . "La3amon's French." Paper presented at the International Congress of the La3amon's Brut Society, Providence, Rhode Island, July 2004.
- Mills, Maldwyn. 1991. "Techniques of Translation in the Middle English Versions of *Guy of Warwick*." In *The Medieval Translator II*, edited by Roger Ellis, 209-229. London: Centre for Medieval Studies, Queen Mary and Westfield College, University of London.
- , ed. 1988. *Horn Childe and Maiden Rinnild*. Middle English Texts 20. Heidelberg: C. Winter Universitätsverlag.
- Mills, Maldwyn, and Daniel Huws. 1974. *Fragments of an Early Fourteenth-Century Guy of Warwick*. Medium Aevum Monographs, 4. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Moland, Louis, and Charles d'Héricault, eds. 1856. *Li Amitiez de Ami et Amile*. In *Nouvelles françoises en prose du XIIIe siècle*, 35-82. Paris: P. Jannet.
- Mone, Franz Joseph, ed. 1836. *Die Sage vom Amelius un Amicus*. In *Anzeiger für die kunde der teutschen vorzeit*, 145-160. München: Kaelsruhe.
- Gameson, Richard, Nigel J. Morgan, Rodney M. Thomson, Lotte Hellinga, J. B. Trapp, John Barnard, and David McKitterick. 1998. *The Cambridge History of the Book in Britain*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- O'Rourke, Jason. 2005. "Imaginig Book Production in Fourteenth-Century Herefordshire: The Scribe of British Library, MS Harley 2253 and His 'Organizing Principles'." In *Imagining the Book*, edited by Stephen Kelly and John J. Thompson, 45-60. Turnhout, Belgium: Brepols.
- O'Rourke, Jason. 2003. English and Latin Texts in Welsh Contexts: Reflections of a Multilingual Society in National Library of Wales MS Peniarth 12. *Yearbook of English Studies* 33: 53-63.
- Ostade, Ingrid, John Frankis, and N.E. Osselton, eds. 1991. *Language Usage and Description: Studies Presented to N. E. Osselton on the Occasion of His Retirement*. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1991.

- Pearsall, Derek, 1977. "Introduction: Literary and Historical Significance of the Manuscript." In *The Auchinleck Manuscript: National Library of Scotland Advocates' MS. 19.2.1*, viii-xi. London: Scolar Press.
- Pelan, Margaret, ed. 1937. *Floire et Blancheflor*. Paris: Société d'édition: Les Belles Lettres.
- Petrucci, Armando, and Charles M. Radding, ed. and trans. 1995. *Writers and Readers in Medieval Italy: Studies in the History of Written Culture*. New Haven, CT: Yale UP.
- Pope, Mildred K. 1956. "The Romance of Horn and King Horn." *Medium Ævum* 25: 164-67.
- Pope, Mildred K., and T. B. W. Reid, eds. 1955. *The Romance of Horn*. Oxford: Published for the Anglo-Norman Text Society by B. Blackwell.
- Poppe, Erich. 2002. "Beues of Hamtoun in Welsh Bardic Poetry." *Cambrian Medieval Celtic Studies* 43: 49-57.
- Poppe, Erich, and Regine Reck eds. 2009. *Selections from Ystoria Bown o Hamtwn*. The Library of Medieval Welsh Literature. Cardiff: University of Wales Press.
- . 2008. "A French Romance in Wales: *Ystoria Bown o Hamtwn*: Processes of medieval translations." *Zeitschrift Für Celtische Philologie* 56: 129-164.
- . 2006. "A French Romance in Wales: *Ystoria Bown o Hamtwn*: Processes of Medieval Translations." *Zeitschrift Für Celtische Philologie* 55: 122-180.
- Price, Huw. 2003. "Wales: Religion and Piety," in *A Companion to Britain in the Later Middle Ages*, edited by S.H. Rigby, 411-429. Oxford, UK: Blackwell Publishing.
- Price, Paul. 2000. "Confessions of a Godless Killer: Guy of Warwick and Comprehensive Entertainment." In *Medieval Insular Romance: Translation and Innovation*, edited by Judith Weiss, Jennifer Fellows, and Morgan Dickson, 93-110. Cambridge, England: Brewer.
- Purdie, Rhiannon. 2008. *Anglicising Romance : Tail-Rhyme and Genre in Medieval English Literature*. Woodbridge, UK: D.S. Brewer.
- Rejhon, Annalee C. 1990. "The Effects of Oral and Written Transmission in the Exchange of Materials Between Medieval Celtic and French Literatures: A Physiological View. *Oral Tradition* 5 (1): 123-148.
- . 1985-86. "The 'Mute Knight' and the 'Knight of the Lion': Implications of the Hidden Name Motif in the Welsh *Historia Peredur vab Efracw* and Chrétien de Troyes's *Yvain ou le Chevalier au Lion*." *Studia Celtica*, 20-21: 110-122.
- , ed. 1984. *Cân Rolant: The Medieval Welsh Version of the Song of Roland*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Richards, Melville. 1970. "The Population of the Welsh Border." *Transactions of the Honourable Society of Cymmrodorion* (Session 1970): 77-100.
- Richmond, Velma Bourgeois. 1996. *The Legend of Guy of Warwick*. Garland Reference Library of the Humanities, v. 1929. New York, NY: Garland.
- Rikhardsdottir, Sif. 2008. "The Imperial Implications of Medieval Translations: Old Norse and Middle English Versions of Marie de France's Lais." *Studies in Philology* 105 (2): 144-64.

- Roberts, Brynley F. 1984. "From Traditional Tale to Literary Story: Middle Welsh Prose Narratives." In *The Craft of Fiction: Essays in Medieval Poetics*, edited by Leigh A. Arrathoon, 211-230. Rochester, Michigan: Solaris Press.
- Roberts, Edward Stanton, Henry Lewis, and William John Gruffydd. 1927. *Peniarth 53*. Caerdydd [Wales]: Gwasg Prifysgol Cymru.
- Rothwell, W. 1994. "The Trilingual England of Geoffrey Chaucer." *Studies in the Age of Chaucer: The Yearbook of the New Chaucer Society* 16: 45-67.
- Rouse, Robert Allen. 2008. "For King and Country? The Tension Between National and Regional Identities in *Sir Bevis of Hampton*." In *Sir Bevis of Hampton in Literary Tradition*, edited by Jennifer Fellows and Ivana Djordjević, 114-126. Cambridge, England: Brewer.
- . 2007. "An Exemplary Life: Guy of Warwick as Medieval Culture-Hero." In *Guy of Warwick: Icon and Ancestor*, edited by Alison Wiggins and Rosalind Field, 94-109. Woodbridge, Suffolk, UK: D.S. Brewer.
- Rudolphus Tortarius. 1933. "Ad bernardum." In *Rodulfi tortarii carmina*, edited by Marbury Bladen Ogle and Dorothy M. Schullian, 266-67. Rome: American Academy in Rome.
- Sandler, Lucy Freeman. 1986. *Gothic Manuscripts: 1285-1385*. 2 vols. London: Harvey Miller.
- Savage, Anne. 1989. "Translation as Expansion: Poetic Practice in the Old English *Phoenix* and Some Other Poems." In *The Medieval Translator: The Theory and Practice of Translation in the Middle Ages*, edited by Roger Ellis, 123-135. Woodbridge, Suffolk: Boydell and Brewer.
- Schendl, Herbert. 2000. "Linguistic Aspects of Code-Switching in Medieval English Texts." In *Multilingualism in Later Medieval Britain*, edited by D. A. Trotter, 77-92. Rochester, N.Y.: D.S. Brewer.
- Seymour, M. C. 1995. *A Catalogue of Chaucer Manuscripts*. Vol. 1. Aldershot, England: Scolar Press.
- Shepherd, Stephen. 1989. "The Ashmole *Sir Ferumbas*: Translation in Holograph." In *The Medieval Translator*, edited by Roger Ellis, 103-121. Cambridge: D.S. Brewer.
- Schofield, William Henry. 1903. "The Story of Horn and Rimenhild." *PMLA: Publications of the Modern Language Association of America* 18 (1): 1-83.
- Shonk, Timothy A. 1985. "A Study of the Auchinleck Manuscript: Bookmen and Bookmaking in the Early Fourteenth Century." *Speculum: A Journal of Medieval Studies* 60 (1) (Jan): 71-91.
- Short, Ian. 2009a. "L'Anglo-Normand au siècle de Chaucer: un regain de statistiques." In *Le plurilinguisme au Moyen Âge: de Babel à la langue une: Orient-Occident*, edited by Claire Kappler and Suzanne Thiollier-Méjean, 67-77. Paris: L'Harmattan.
- , ed and trans. 2009b. *Estoire des Engleis*, by Geffrei Gaimar. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- , ed. 2005. *La Chanson de Roland — The Song of Roland: The French Corpus, Part 1: The Oxford Version*. Turnhout (Belgium): Brepols Publishers.

- . 1994. "Gaimar's Epilogue and Geoffrey of Monmouth's *Liber Vetustissimus*." *Speculum: A Journal of Medieval Studies* 69 (2): 323-43.
- . 1991. "Patrons and Polyglots: French Literature in Twelfth-Century England." *Anglo-Norman Studies* 14: 229-249.
- Siberry, E. 1985. "Criticism of Crusading in Fourteenth Century England." In *Crusade and Settlement*, edited by P. W. Edbury, 127-34. Cardiff, UK: University College Cardiff Press.
- Smithers, G. V. 1987. *Havelok*. Oxford [Oxfordshire]: Clarendon Press
- Stein, Robert. 2009. "Multilingualism." In *Oxford Twenty-First Century Approaches to Literature: Middle English*, edited by Paul Strohm, 23-37. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Stimming, Albert. 1899. *Der Anglonormannische Boeve de Haumtone*. Halle: M. Niemeyer.
- SurrIDGE, Marie E. 1985. "The Number and Status of Romance Words Attested in *Ystoria Bown de Hamtwn*." *Bulletin of the Board of Celtic Studies / Bwletin y Bwrdd Gwybodau Celtaidd* 32: 68-78.
- Thomson, R. L., ed. 1997. *Ystoria Gereint uab Erbin*. Dublin: School of Celtic Studies, Dublin Institute for Advanced Studies.
- , ed. 1968. *Owein; or, Chwedyl Iarllles y Ffynnawn*. Dublin: Dublin Institute for Advanced Studies.
- Thomson, Rodney M. and Nigel J. Morgan. 2008. *The Cambridge History of the Book in Britain. Vol. 2, 1100-1400*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Torpey, Sarah Beth. 2002. "Arguing Romance: The Middle English Romances of Crusading and Conversion." Ph.D. Dissertation, University of California, Berkeley.
- Treharne, R. F., and I. J. Sanders. 1973. *Documents of the Baronial Movement of Reform and Rebellion, 1258-1267*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Tschann, Judith, and M. B. Parkes. 1996. *Facsimile of Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Digby 86*. Oxford [England]: Published for the Early English Text Society by the Oxford University Press.
- Turville-Petre, Thorlac. 1996. *England the Nation: Language, Literature, and National Identity, 1290-1340*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Tyerman, Christopher. 2006. *God's War: A New History of the Crusades*. Cambridge, Mass.: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.
- . 1988. *England and the Crusades, 1095-1588*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Tyler Elizabeth, M. 2009. "From Old English to Old French." In *Language and Culture in Medieval Britain: the French of England*, edited by Jocelyn Wogan-Browne, Carolyn Collette, Maryanne Kowaleski, Linne Mooney, Ad Putter, and David Trotter. Woodbridge, Suffolk, UK: York Medieval.
- Valente, Claire. 1995. "Simon de Montfort, Earl of Leicester, and the Utility of Sanctity in Thirteenth-Century England." *Journal of Medieval History* 21 : 27-49.
- Wathelet-Willem, Jeanne. 1975. *Recherches sur la Chanson de Guillaume: Études accompagnées d'une édition*. Paris: Société d'édition Les Belles Lettres.

- Watkin, Morgan, ed. 1958. *Ystorya Bown de Hamtwn: Cyfieithiad Camol y Drydedd Ganrif ar Ddeg, o, La Geste de Boun de Hamtone*. Caerdydd [Wales]: Gwasg Prifysgol Cymru.
- Weiss, Judith. 2008. *Boeve de Haumtone and Gui de Warewic: Two Anglo-Norman Romances*. Tempe, Ariz.: Arizona Center for Medieval and Renaissance Studies.
- . 2007. "Gui de Warewic at Home and Abroad: A Hero for Europe." In *Guy of Warwick: Icon and Ancestor*, edited by Alison Wiggins and Rosalind Field, 1-11. Woodbridge, Suffolk, UK: D.S. Brewer.
- . 2002. "Emperors and Antichrists: Reflections of Empire in Insular Narrative, 1130-1250." In *The Matter of Identity in Medieval Romance*, edited by Phillipa Hardman, 87-102. Cambridge, England: Brewer.
- . 2000. "The Anglo-Norman *Boeve de Haumtone*: A Fragment of a New Manuscript." *Modern Language Review* 95 (2): 305-10.
- , ed. and trans. 1999. *Wace's Roman de Brut: A History of the British: Text and Translation*. Exeter, Devon, UK: University of Exeter Press.
- . 1986. "The Date of the Anglo-Norman *Boeve de Haumtone*." *Medium Aevum* 55 (2): 237-41.
- . 1979. "The Major Interpolations in *Sir Beues of Hamtoun*." *Medium Aevum* 48: 71-76.
- Wenzel, Siegfried. 1994. *Macaronic Sermons: Bilingualism and Preaching in Late Medieval England*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Wiggins, Alison. 2007. "The Manuscripts and Texts of the Middle English *Guy of Warwick*." In *Guy of Warwick: Icon and Ancestor*, edited by Rosalind Field and Alison Wiggins, 61-80. Woodbridge, Suffolk, UK: D.S. Brewer.
- . 2005. "Imagining the Compiler: *Guy of Warwick* and the Compilation of the Auchinleck Manuscript." In *Imagining the Book*, edited by Stephen Kelly and John J. Thompson, 61-73. Turnhout, Belgium: Brepols.
- . 2004a. "Are Auchinleck Manuscript Scribes 1 and 6 the Same Scribe? The Advantages of Whole-Data Analysis and Electronic Texts." *Medium Aevum* 73 (1): 10-26.
- , ed. 2004b. *Stanzaic Guy of Warwick*. Kalamazoo, Mich.: Medieval Institute Publications, College of Arts & Sciences, Western Michigan University.
- Wilcox, Rebecca. 2004. "Romancing the East: Greeks and Saracens in *Guy of Warwick*." In *Pulp Fictions of Medieval England: Essays in Popular Romance*, edited by Nicola McDonald, 217-240. Manchester, England: Manchester UP.
- Williams, Stephen J., ed. 1968. *Ystorya de Carolo Magno o Lyfr Coch Hergest [The Story of Charlemagne from the Red Book of Hergest]*. 2nd ed. Cardiff: University of Wales Press.
- Williams, Patricia, ed. 1982. *Kedymdeithyas Amlyn ac Amic*. Caerdydd: Gwasg Prifysgol Cymru.
- Williams, Robert. 1907. *The History of Charlemagne. The Translation of "Ystorya de Carolo Magno," with a Historical and Critical Introduction*. London: Hon. Society of Cymmrodorion.
- Wogan-Browne, Jocelyn, Carolyn Collette, Maryanne Kowaleski, Linne Mooney, Ad Putter, and David Trotter, eds. 2009. *Language and Culture in Medieval Britain:*

- The French of England, c.1100-c.1500*. Woodbridge, Suffolk, UK: York Medieval.
- Wright, Laura. 1992. "Macaronic Writing in a London Archive, 1380-1480." In *History of Englishes: New Methods and Interpretations in Historical Linguistics*, edited by Matti Rissanen, Ossi Ihalainen, Terttu Nevalainen and Irma Taavitsainen, 762-70. Berlin, Germany: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Wright, Thomas. 1839. *The Political Songs of England, from the Reign of John to That of Edward II*. London: Printed for the Camden Society, by J.B. Nichols and Son.
- Zupitza, Julius, ed. 1883, 1887, 1891. *The Romance of Guy of Warwick*. Early English Text Society. Extra Series 42, 49, 50. London: Published for the Early English Text Society by the Oxford Univ. Press.
- . 1875. *The Romance of Guy of Warwick. The Second or 15th-Century Version*. Early English Text Society. Extra Series 25-26. London: Published for the Early English Text Society by N. Trübner & Co.