

DAME ELEANOR HULL: THE TRANSLATOR AT WORK

The fifteenth-century translator Dame Eleanor Hull was until recently virtually unknown. In 1987 I gave a paper on her at the first University of Cardiff conference on the theory and practice of translation in the Middle Ages;¹ in 1995 the Early English Text Society published my edition of her translation of a French commentary on the Penitential Psalms,² and she will have her own entry in the *New Dictionary of National Biography*.³ This is an outline of what we know about her at present. Eleanor Hull was born the only child of Sir John Malet of Enmore in Somerset, probably during the last decade of the fourteenth century as her father was dead by 1395. Malet was a retainer of John of Gaunt and of his son Henry Bolingbroke, later Henry IV. Eleanor Hull's mother, Joan Hylle of Exeter, was the sister of Robert Hylle, compiler of the Hylle Cartulary. Perhaps around 1407, the year her own mother remarried for the first of several times, and certainly by 1413, Eleanor Malet married John Hull, esquire, who was also in the service of the Lancastrians: probably much older than his wife, he was a retainer of John of Gaunt and later ambassador to Castile for both Henry IV and Henry V. Eleanor bore him one son, Edward (he was a small boy in 1417), who as Constable of Bordeaux was to die in the last engagement of the Hundred Years War in 1453. In 1417 Eleanor Hull was given a royal grant as servant to Joan of Navarre, Henry IV's second wife, and also in that year she, her husband, and son, like so many other Lancastrians, were admitted to the confraternity of the Benedictine abbey of St Albans. By 1421 she was a widow and seems to have spent much of her time when not at court at Sopwell Priory, a house of Benedictine nuns dependent on St Albans and less than a mile from the abbey. She probably went to France with her son in 1444 to attend the proxy wedding of Henry VI and Margaret of Anjou: Edward became one of the queen's knights. She never remarried, and eventually retired to the Benedictine nunnery at Cannington, near the family seat of Enmore, where she died in 1460, leaving a will written in her own hand.⁴

Eleanor Hull's translations are preserved in Cambridge University Library, MS Kk.1.6,⁵ a large and unusually well-documented manuscript of religious verse and prose put together, and in part written out, by Richard Fox, steward or procurator of St Albans Abbey. When Richard died in 1454 he left a will referring to this manuscript in identifiable terms as still in quires, so it can be very precisely dated. CUL MS Kk.1.6 contains two texts attributed to Dame Eleanor Hull: a translation of a commentary on the Seven Penitential Psalms

(fols 2–147) and a translation of a collection of prayers and meditations (fols 148–179). After the second text Richard Fox records that ‘Alyanore Hulle drowe out of Frenche all this before-wreten in this lytylle booke’, without further explanation. This attribution has been the starting point for all later research. The prayers and meditations are also found, without the attribution to Eleanor Hull, in University of Illinois, MS 80, a manuscript that A. I. Doyle dates as certainly no earlier than CUL MS Kk.1.6.⁶

It seems likely that Eleanor Hull made both translations during the early years of her widowhood, while she was staying at Sopwell and perhaps enjoyed access to the library facilities of St Albans. As an heiress, she must have received a better than average education that included English, Latin, and Anglo-Norman; as a royal servant in fifteenth-century England, she would naturally have a knowledge of spoken and written French, particularly as she had been in the service of the French wife of Henry IV. Further, she probably translated the prayers and meditations, which are written in a style of affective piety very familiar in late-medieval England, before the far more ambitious, and less superficially attractive, commentary on the Penitential Psalms. When Fox was compiling his manuscript in the 1450s she would have been still alive, but relatively inaccessible in the depths of Somerset. The subsequent difficulties in contacting her would account for the carelessness (in places) of the scribal versions of her texts, especially the inaccuracy of some of the Latin quotations, a fault that should not be laid at the door of the translator herself.

But until now it has been hard to gauge Eleanor Hull’s skills as a translator because her putative French sources had not been located. (This is to discount the theory that they did not exist at all and that Fox, for some reason best known to himself, was hopelessly uninformed or lying through his teeth.) The French commentary on the Penitential Psalms that was Eleanor Hull’s source unfortunately remains unidentified. One text in particular seemed a plausible candidate at first: the twelfth-century French Psalter commentary, extant in whole or in part in seven manuscripts, made for Laurette d’Alsace, daughter of Thierry d’Alsace, Count of Flanders. In 1990 Stewart Gregory had published an edition of the commentary on Psalms i–l, of which I was regrettably ignorant when I made my own edition of the translation.⁷ In spite of tantalizing similarities, however, this was clearly not Eleanor Hull’s source. Fortunately, her French original had made extensive and literal use of Latin sources, in particular Peter Lombard on the Psalms and Augustine’s *Enarrationes in Psalmos*. Numerous quotations from the Latin must have passed from the originals into the putative French text, whence they had re-emerged in recognizable form in Eleanor Hull’s Middle English text. Their identification did a great deal for her credibility as a translator.

The Prayers and Meditations (Meditations on the Days of the Week) were a different matter. The text introduces itself as follows:

Thes orysones and thes meditacions þat folowen here ben in party taken of Seynt Austyn, party of Seynt Anselm, party of Seynt Barnard, and party of oþer wrytyngis for-to enflawme the hert and the corage of hem þat redyn it in the

love of God and for-to make a man to know hym self. (CUL MS Kk.1.6, fol. 148)

This introductory self-description is well calculated to make the prospective modern editor despair, given the many collections of prayers and meditations that circulated under the names of Augustine, Anselm,⁸ and Bernard throughout the Middle Ages. Prospects of locating the original seemed unlikely. Only recently did I notice the similarity to the Middle English text's incipit of that of one item in the late thirteenth-century London, British Library, MS Cotton Vitellius F.vii, a manuscript which contains the Anglo-Norman translation of *Ancrene Wisse*. J. A. Herbert had long ago provided this in the extremely useful list of contents he compiled for his edition:

Ces orisons et ces meditaciones qe ici s'ensuient sunt prises partie de saint Augustin, partie de saint Anselm, partie de saint Bernard, partie de seintes escriptures.⁹

MS Cotton Vitellius F.vii (C) was badly damaged in the notorious Ashburnham House fire of 1731, although with patience it is still possible to read most, if not all, of the texts it contains. But fortunately Ruth J. Dean's indispensable *Anglo-Norman Literature: A Guide to Texts and Manuscripts* lists this text as item 942, describing it as 'A series of prayers and meditations drawn from the Fathers and the Bible'. It is extant, not only in C, but also in three other manuscripts: London, British Library, MS Arundel 288 (A); London, Lambeth Palace Library, MS 182 (L); and Dublin, Trinity College Library, MS 374 (D).¹⁰ None of these manuscripts contains the complete text but taken together they indicate the shape of the original, which Dean considered consisted of a prologue and seven parts or chapters, though they are not as obviously discrete as her entry suggests.

The most complete version of this text is found in TCD MS 374, fols 35^r-43^v, dated by Dean as second half of the thirteenth century. It is complete except for the prologue. BL MS Arundel 288, a thirteenth-century manuscript the first two items of which occupy a separate quire and are written in later hands, contains a small section of our text, occupying fols 3^{va}-4^{rb}, as the second item. Written in a different hand from the first item (an Old French poem on the Passion), it is dated by Dean as second half of the fourteenth century. It consists of the prologue, inc. 'Ces oreysons & ces meditaciones ke ci siwent', and the beginning of part I, inc. 'Jhesu le bon, jeo vous vei des oils de bon creance' ('Jhesu moste blessyd, I se you with þe yee of trew beleue' in Eleanor Hull's translation, fol. 148). It ends: 'Des ore mes sui jeo trop maluré si jeo par ma folie perde cele sancté qe le filz Dieu si chier m'ad achaté', which in the translation reads, 'From hens-forward I shold be to kursyd if I by my wykkydnes and foly shold lese þe hale þat the Son of God so dere hath bought me with' (fol. 148^v). The scribe clearly considered the text he had copied to be complete in itself as he follows it by an explicit, 'Ceste oreison fet a dire devant la crucifix del muster u sur crucifix peint en livre' (which roughly corresponds to the opening of part v in D (fol. 41^{ra})), 'Quant vus veez le

crucifix devant vus ou a muster ou en vostre livre paint ...'). A flourish has been drawn under our text; the rest of fol. 4th and the whole of fol. 4^v are blank.

Lambeth Palace MS 182 is dated by Dean to the first half of the fourteenth century. Our text occupies fols 185–9 but is acephalous, so we do not know if it originally included the prologue. It begins: '... creance kar nul non del mund n'est si haut cum le non Jhesu', a passage that comes from part III, a meditation on the Name of Jesus, and corresponds to the Middle English (fol. 151^v) '[it is a-yens the feythe and ayenst alle true] belyeue. For þer is no name in the world so hye as is þe name of Jhesu.' The text is very close to that of D. Indeed, it is possible that this version was copied from D, or a similar manuscript, as the only discrepancies are some omissions, all of which could be accounted for by eye-skip.

We can draw the following comparisons between Eleanor Hull's Middle English text and the presumed Anglo-Norman original. By comparing her translation with C and A (the only manuscripts to contain the Anglo-Norman text of the prologue), we can see that Dame Eleanor translated the prologue in full. By comparing her text with D and C, we know that she also translated in full part I, 'On the Passion of Jesus' (to use Dean's analysis). Part II, 'Dialogue with Jesus', she translated in full (with one minor omission) down as far as 'tutevois vus met jeo sus ke vus averez merci de mei' (D fol. 37^{va}) ('I put always vp-on yow þat ye wole have mercy on me,' fol. 150^v). She then omitted the rest (D fols 37^{va}–38^{va}), which first enumerates the occasions on which Christ shed his blood for humanity and then meditates on Christ's agony in the garden and the apparition of the comforting angel. Possibly she did so because there had already been one Passion meditation and there was to be another, even more extensive, meditation much later on in her own text – the Meditation for Friday – although it does not in fact consider events of the Passion any earlier than the arrest in the garden of Gethsemane. She picked up the Anglo-Norman again at the beginning of part III, 'On the Name of Jesus', which she translated in full with minor omissions. Part IV, 'On the Five Wounds', which links them with the custody of the senses and Christ's own sufferings in his five senses, she did not use at all, again perhaps because so much Passion material is found elsewhere in her translation. We may note that C ends with this section and does not contain parts V, VI, and VII. Its formulaic conclusion, 'Quod ipse prestare dignetur qui uiuit et regnat per omnia secula seculorum. Amen', sounds more like the end of a complete text than of a section. By comparing the translation with D and A, we can tell that of part V, 'Meditation before the crucifix', she translated only the section on the Name of Mary, beginning (fol. 42^{ra}) 'Cest non Marie vus dit autretant cum esteile de mer' ('This blessed name Marye is as mych as to sey as þe starre of the see', fol. 152) through to the end of that section (fol. 42^{vb}), 'issi povum nus en nus meismes esprover cum a bon dreit ad a non mere de misericorde' ('This may we preve in ourself, how rightfully she is called Maria and how rightfully she is called moder of mercy', fol. 153).

The treatment of this section is particularly interesting and shows considerable initiative on the part of Dame Eleanor Hull. In the Anglo-Norman original this section consists of three parts. The first is a meditation on the conventional representation of the crucified Christ, with the Virgin standing on one side and St John the Evangelist on the other, and on the role of the Virgin as mediator with her son and of Christ as mediator with his father. The second is a meditation on the name of John (which should have appealed to Dame Eleanor Hull as her father and her husband shared that name): John means 'God's grace' and the Narrator lists the seven 'graces' that he received. This is followed by the third part, the Meditation on the Name of Mary. The translator, by eliminating the first two parts of this tripartite structure, has created a resonance that was not evident in her original, for now the two meditations on the Names of Jesus and Mary are presented side by side. This symmetry is emphasized by a passage in the Middle English text, some pages further on, that is not derived from the Anglo-Norman: it concludes a long prayer of thanksgiving in Latin with the words 'Dulce nomen domini nostri Jesu Christi et nomen gloriose verginis Marie sint benedicta in secula Amen. Deo gracias' (fol. 153^v). Finally, part vi, 'On the two guardians, love and fear', and part vii, 'Closing prayers' (in verse), are not used at all.

This Anglo-Norman text, then, accounts for fols 148–152^v of the complete text of Eleanor Hull's prayers and meditations – only about 13 per cent of the whole. The structure of that whole, on closer inspection, turns out to be somewhat unexpected. After the material derived from our Anglo-Norman text, ending with the Meditation on the Name of Mary, there is a set of prayers addressed to Jesus. Then follows a series of meditations for the days of the week, beginning with Monday and going through to Sunday. Monday's meditation is on the goodness of God; Tuesday's is on death, Wednesday's on the saints, Thursday's on judgement, Friday's on the Passion, Saturday's on the joys of the Virgin, and Sunday's on the joys of heaven. The apparent disjunction between the varied opening prayers and meditations and the much more structured meditations on the days of the week should have been a clear warning that Eleanor Hull was using not one source but at least two. But we still do not know where the meditations on the days of the week themselves originated. There is a great deal more to be done in tracing the other source, or sources, that Dame Eleanor used.

It is beyond my brief, or competence, to comment in detail on the Anglo-Norman text itself, but its place in the history of medieval spirituality certainly merits more detailed study. It seems to have been written for a primarily male and possibly religious audience (the hypothetical reader is frequently addressed as 'frere N.'). On the one hand, such a reader might have found it a little old-fashioned as it shows no sign of the eucharistic piety that was becoming so important in the thirteenth century (the feast of Corpus Christi was established in 1264) and which is prominent in, for instance, *Ancrene Wisse*.¹¹ On the other, he would have found much of part 1, on the Passion of Jesus, reassuringly familiar. This section incorporates, for instance, a lengthy passage, beginning

'Aspice, Pater pie, piissimum Filium pro me tam impia passum', from chapters VI and VII of the meditations attributed in the Middle Ages to Augustine of Hippo¹² but whose true author was John of Fécamp (d. 1078).¹³ This includes the famous passage that begins 'Candet nudatum pectus', which was to form the basis for several Middle English poems. The first of these, 'Whyt was hys nakede brest', was composed as early as c.1240.¹⁴

Moreover, the topic of part III, devotion to the Name of Jesus, was widespread in the Middle Ages and particularly popular in England. In the eleventh century, Anselm of Canterbury (c.1033–1109) composed a prayer to the Holy Name, while it was probably an English Cistercian who wrote the so-called Rosy Sequence, *Jesu dulcis memoria*, in the late twelfth century.¹⁵ This poem was long attributed to Bernard of Clairvaux (1090–1153), with whom the devotion is particularly associated:¹⁶ the comments on 'Oleum effusum nomen tuum' (Song of Songs i.2) in the Anglo-Norman text draw heavily on Bernard's *Sermones in Cantica canticorum*, XIV.8 and X.4–7.

The development of devotion to the Name of Jesus is closely connected with that of the Five Wounds.¹⁷ This is the central concern of part V of the Anglo-Norman text, which begins by instructing the reader to recite five paternosters in their honour. Prayers and devotions to the Wounds can be found in late-twelfth-century Latin manuscripts of English provenance. Half a century later, the devotion is well entrenched in *Ancrene Wisse*: at the Elevation, the anchoresses are to offer 'fif gretunges, ine menegunge of Godes fif wunden', and later they are given a prayer invoking the Five Wounds.¹⁸

The focus at the end of part II of the Anglo-Norman is more on Christ's blood and blood-sheddings than on the Wounds as such. There were various ways to enumerate these,¹⁹ but the count always began, as here, with the circumcision of the infant Jesus. This text then lists Christ's scourging, the crowning with thorns, the nailing to the Cross, the wound in the side, and finally (though out of chronological sequence) the bloody sweat during the agony in the garden. This amounts to seven occasions if one counts the nailing of the hands and of the feet separately. The point is also made that each shedding of blood involved a different part of the body. This is clearly related to the idea, made explicit in part V and found at least as early as Peter Damian (1007–72), that Christ's sufferings in his limbs can be related to human sinful use of the body and its senses.²⁰

But some of the material might have seemed more novel in the late thirteenth century. Devotion to the Name of Mary, for instance, was far more unusual than the corresponding devotion to the Name of Jesus. Much of part VI derives from a famous passage in Bernard of Clairvaux's Second Homily on the Annunciation, *Missus est angelus Gabriel*.²¹ In the following century, *Ancrene Wisse* contains devotions that point to an embryonic cult of the Name in England. The anchoresses are instructed, 'hwer-se ye eaver hereth Maries nome i-nempnet' in their devotions, to bow if it is a feast day and to fall to the ground if it is a feria.²² They are also given an elaborate devotion to the Five Joys that has been dated to 'the very end of the twelfth century'.²³ This involves

reciting a sequence of five psalms, with versicles and antiphons.²⁴ The author points out that the first letters of each spell out the name 'Maria': 'The salmes beoth i-numene efter the fif leattres of ure Leafdis nome – hwa-sa nimeth yeme.'²⁵ The later thirteenth century saw a growth in devotion to the Name of Mary in continental Europe: in 1268 St Louis of France requested and obtained an indulgenced prayer that linked the Names of Jesus and Mary, while in 1274 Canon 25 of the Second Council of Lyons instructed the faithful to incline the head at the Name of Mary, presumably already a well-established pious habit.²⁶ (A feast of the Most Holy Name of Mary, first established in Spain in 1513, was not extended to the rest of the Roman Church until the seventeenth century.²⁷)

The Meditation on the Name of Mary also invokes Mary as Mother of Mercy, a twelfth-century devotion discouraged by Bernard, who never refers to the Virgin as Mother but always as Our Lady. At least one passage, however, from the sermons of his contemporary Ælfred of Rievaulx seems to have fostered it.²⁸ Again, *Ancrene Wisse* shows signs of this devotion when it invokes the Virgin as 'Leafdi cwen of are ... Meiden of milce' and as 'Mater Misericordiae', quoting the latter phrase from the Latin hymn *O Virgo virginum*.²⁹

Finally, the Anglo-Norman text may well have used the *Legenda aurea*, compiled c.1260 by the Dominican Jacobus de Voragine. The *Legenda* drew on earlier sources, but Jacobus put this largely apocryphal material into wider circulation and his compilation was very popular. Parallels from the *Legenda* can be found for the account of St Andrew's fearlessness when faced with crucifixion in part II and for the various events in the life and death of St John the Evangelist in part VI. Jacobus enumerates Christ's blood-sheddings (five, in his version) in his narrative of the circumcision, while he also comments on Christ's sufferings in the senses.³⁰

But to return to the Anglo-Norman text as source for Eleanor Hull, it should be clear that she could not have used any of the surviving manuscripts. D, the most complete, contains all seven parts but lacks the prologue. C contains the prologue but lacks parts V–VII (part V contains the Meditation on the Name of Mary). L lacks the prologue and parts I–III, while A consists of nothing but the prologue and the opening of part I.

It is unfortunate that MS C cannot have been the manuscript from which the translator worked, as it has an intriguing history not altogether unconnected with Dame Eleanor Hull and her milieu. Though it has been dated as late thirteenth or early fourteenth century, we know nothing of its early history. But its ownership in the fifteenth century is very interesting. On the last page is an inscription first noted by Hope Emily Allen and transcribed by Herbert as follows:

...m.. Duchesse de Gloucestre du dou n d...
 ... Kent: Plesance
 Al en vn'

Herbert goes on to comment that this inscription indicates

apparently, that the volume belonged to Eleanor Cobham, second wife of Humphrey, Duke of Gloucester, who began to build 'Pleasant', afterwards Greenwich Palace, in 1433, and was living there with Eleanor when she was indicted for sorcery in 1441. The donation must therefore have been made between those years, and the donor was doubtless Joan, widow of Thomas of Holand, eighth Earl of Kent.

If in the fifteenth century the book belonged to Joan, Duchess of Kent, and later to the wife of Humphrey, Duke of Gloucester, this is precisely the royal Lancastrian circle in which Eleanor Hull moved. Duke Humphrey, younger brother of Henry V, uncle of Henry VI, regent of England and protector during the latter's interludes of madness, was also closely associated with St Albans. Like Eleanor Hull and her family, he was a member of the confraternity and a generous benefactor of the abbey. His marriage to his second wife, the beautiful but wicked Eleanor Cobham, who had been lady-in-waiting to his first wife, Jacqueline of Hainault (the marriage was dissolved), proved his downfall when Eleanor was accused of necromancy. By a remarkable coincidence Eleanor Hull's earlier employer Joan of Navarre, second wife and widow of Henry IV, was also accused of witchcraft and consequently imprisoned for a while. In her case this seems to have been merely a political ploy so that her stepson Henry V could avoid repaying her dowry, whereas Eleanor Cobham seems to have been quite genuinely attempting to predict (if not compass) the death of Henry VI.

But what does the Anglo-Norman text reveal about Eleanor Hull as a translator? From the samples already given it should be clear that in general she is faithful to her original. We can however go a little beyond that. First, she seems to have had enough historical sense to be aware that translation involves rather more than simply transferring a form of words from the source language into the equivalent form of words in the target language. Her original was a thirteenth-century text, composed not merely in a different language but also in a somewhat different environment. It assumed that the prayers and meditations it offered would be read, that is, read aloud. By the fifteenth century, however, private devotion was more likely to be individual than community-based, and predominantly assumed silent reading in the main rather than spoken recitation or listening to a reader. In the prologue the advice given by the Middle English,

Ner it nedyth allweys to begyn at euery tyme at the begynnyng hereof but þer as hym best lyketh *and hath most devocyon to rede* (fol. 148)

is an expansion of the French, which merely says, 'N'es[toient] pas q'il comence al commencement mes la ou li plerra.'³¹ The French goes on to explain that the text has been laid out with 'lettres [en]luminez'³² (this is not strictly true of any of the extant manuscripts, further proof, if any were needed, that none is the original of the Anglo-Norman text) specifically to facilitate this, 'qe l'oroison ne puisse tourner a ennui par trop longement oïr, par sovent rehercier en un

meisme lieu',³³ emphasizing that the prayers might be both heard and recited. The Middle English, on the other hand, limits the options, translating this as 'by cause the *redyng* shold not turne hem to enoye *for to long redyng*' (fol. 148).

The predominantly oral mentality of the French original also comes through in an interesting passage in the Meditation on the Name of Jesus, preserved in the Middle English:

Yf we wryte þer is no sauer; but if I rede þe name of Jhesu, Jhesus is hony in the mouth and in þe ere melodye, in þe hert gladnes aboue mesure, þat is to sey, swetter to vs þen any hony if we our-self speke of Jhesus, and more swetter þan any instrument if we here anoþer to speke to hym ... (fol. 151^r)

It is instructive that 'rede' here translates *soner*: that is, the Anglo-Norman makes it clearer than the English that the Name of Jesus must be pronounced aloud, not just 'read' in contrast to being 'written'.

On the level of lexical detail, Eleanor Hull faces the usual dilemma of translators from French into English: if there is an English word available that is cognate to the French, should one use it, or prefer a native word? She keeps a balance here, so that her text is neither uncomfortably Gallicized nor ostentatiously Germanic. For instance, in the prologue she uses the corresponding cognate Middle English word for 'orisons', 'meditacion', 'partie', 'quiete', 'entente', 'tourner', 'ennui', 'ceine' (<Lat. *cena*), and 'vis', but translates 's'ensuiet' as 'followen', 'escripture' as 'wrytyngis', 'demorance' as 'abydyng', 'aide' as 'helpe', 'bon talent' as 'gode will', and 'comencement' as 'begynnyng'. In part I, 'On the Passion of Jesus', she uses English cognates for 'remembrez', 'souffre', 'faillir', 'merci', 'obedient', 'horrible', 'crois', 'innocent', 'glorieuse', 'juge', 'forfistes', 'tormentez', 'langur', and 'covoitise', but translates 'esgardés' as 'behold', 'pardonez' as 'for-yeue', 'comencent' as 'begynnyn', 'amiable' as 'louely', 'forfistes' as 'a-mysse dede', 'mortels' as 'dedly'. And in part IV, 'On the Name of Jesus', she uses the obvious cognate words to translate 'saveour', 'parceust', 'doute', 'savez', 'l'aille', 'compareison', 'manieres', 'oignemenz', 'assuagier', '(se) tourne', 'amender', 'confortés', 'servise', 'nourist'. But she translates 'l'espous' as 'husband', 'dolours' as 'sorowys', 'enluminee' as 'lyghtynnyd', 'clarté' as 'clerenes', and 'entierement' as 'hertily'. A lexical curiosity is her translation of 'pres al suthwest de ciel', where 'suthwest' is clearly unmediated English and is not found in Anglo-Norman dictionaries, as 'nye the hynes of heuyn' (fol. 152). (In fact, *sud* and *ouest* are loanwords from English to French.)

Eleanor Hull usually avoids falling into the trap of using cognate English words when they are inappropriate (as they often can be). It is interesting to observe her handling of the 'false friend' 'corage', which she translates variously and (as far as one can judge) accurately according to context as 'hert & corage', 'mynd', 'will', and even once (very early on, in the prologue) as 'corage'. Another slightly slippery customer is 'talent', which of course does not mean 'talent' but 'desire': she correctly translates it as 'will'. In fact, there are very few indisputable mistranslations in her text. Most of the possible candidates

are more likely to be scribal errors. For instance, the Middle English reads:

Ho þat euer be fall in synne so þat he begyn to fall in dyspeyre ...; who þat suffre hym-self to rynne fro synne for þat he wenyth that God hathe no cure of hym; ... lete come to hym the holsom name of mercyfull Jhesu. (fol. 151)

This does not seem to make much sense; indeed, it is quite contradictory. But for the second clause the Anglo-Norman reads:

ki unqes lest cure de peché en peché pur ceo k'il quide ke Deu n'ait cure de lui ... (fol. 39^b)

Here the translator presumably originally wrote 'fro synne to synne', following the Anglo-Norman, but the scribe succumbed to eye-skip.

The French certainly helps make better sense of the Middle English on occasions. For instance, in part 1 the Middle English reads:

His naked brest wexyd all white and pale in his dying; all his syde is rede of blode, his bowellys all stretchyd out begynnyn for-to dye, his feyre begyn for-to languysse. (fol. 148^v)

Obviously a noun is missing after 'feyre' but recourse to the Anglo-Norman does more than provide a conjectural 'eyen':

Sun nu piz enblanchist en la mort. Son coste tut est ruge de sanc. Les entrailles tutes estendues comencent tut a ensechir. Ses bels oilz comencent a languir ... (fol. 35^{va-b})

Clearly, 'dye' is a scribal error for 'drye' ('ensechir'). Later, the ME reads 'to cursyd am I if I wole not now gladly and frely with my pouer love and for-sake þe vanyte of the world' (fol. 149^v). As the Anglo-Norman here has 'Trop sui maluré si jo n'oblie ... les delices de cest secle' (fol. 36^{rb}), 'love and forsake' must translate 'oblie'. It is reasonable to suppose therefore that 'love' is a scribal error for 'leve'. Other minor examples of emendations suggested by the Anglo-Norman are: 'the soeurable name of Jhesu', which should be 'socurable' (Anglo-Norman 'succurable'), and 'This same thynk and know it verryly, þat he is almyghty God' (fol. 151^v), where 'it' should be 'I' (the Anglo-Norman reads: 'Celui meismes pense jeo k'il est tut pussant [*siz*],' fol. 39^{va}).

Other examples of strange Middle English that can be explained by the Anglo-Norman are rather more interesting. Part iv, 'On the Name of Jesus, contains a commentary (derived from Bernard of Clairvaux, as we have seen) on the verse from the Song of Songs 'Oleum effusum nomen tuum'. Bafflingly, the Middle English reads:

Now here whi þe comparison of þe name of your spouse is made to oyle. Ye shull vnderstand þat in þe oyle be iij maner of bownds. (fol. 150^v)

The original solves this puzzle: it reads,

Oiez pur quei la comparison est fete entre le oile et nostre espus. En l'oile i a treis maneres de buntez. (fol. 39^{va})

It is highly unlikely that Eleanor Hull mistranslated 'buntez' as 'bownds', but quite plausible that the scribe did not understand her translation, 'bowntes' or 'bountes' presumably, and 'corrected' it to the more familiar, but nonsensical, 'bownds'.

Another example of even greater clarification provided by the French is a passage from the same meditation:

Shipmen some tyme and pylgrymes wold bere vp-on hem a name þat þei called þe hye name of God, þat non shold nemne but in peryll of dethe. Þis makyn folys the symple pepel to vndirstand, but not verryly þat it is a-yens the feythe and ayenst alle true belyeue. (fol. 151^v)

The Anglo-Norman reads;

ces mariners e ces pelrins porteient entur eus un nons ke l'em apele le haut non Dampnedeu, qe nul ne deit nomer fors en peril de mort. Ceo fet l'em entendre a ceste simple gent. Sachez de fin ke c'est encontre Deu een cuntre sainte creance. (fol. 39th)

One can hypothesize that 'not' in the last main clause of the Middle English is a scribal error for 'note', translating 'sachez', 'know'. That makes everything much clearer: probably 'folys' is a scribal error for 'folkys', a creative translation of the indefinite pronoun 'l'em'. Or was the translator unable to make up her mind whether to render 'la simple gent' as 'folys' or 'the symple people'? Had she jotted down both for the time being, intending to make a final decision later?³⁴

There is a possible example of genuine mistranslation in the following Middle English passage:

Now jt shall apere ho shall ouercome your mercy, lord, with-out any fayle, for shold I wene þat my synnys were more myghty and more strong for-to dampne me þan your mercy to save me? (fol. 149^v)

The Anglo-Norman has:

Ore i parra le quel veincera, vostre misericorde *u mes pechez?* Kar saunz dote jeo ne crei pas ke mes pechez soient plus puissant [*sidi*] e plus efforcibles de mei dampner ke vostre misericorde de moi salver? (fol. 36^{va})

The translator has missed the italicized words and has consequently misunderstood the whole sentence. Another mistranslation is:

than will [I] take me to þe ensample of a man in þat o parte and þe help of God in þat oþer parte, the ton ryght as it shold be þe spycys where-with I will make my lectuary, þat oþer is þat swete tastyng þat I shold tast. (fol. 151^v)

The Anglo-Norman that corresponds to the latter part of this sentence makes more sense, but the sense is quite different:

dunc me prendrai jeo al essample del home une part e al aie de Deu d'autre part. L'un, autresi cum ceo fussent especez dunt jeo voil fere un letuarie. L'autre, ausi cum ceo fust le anguisement dun jeo dei anguisser. (fol. 39^{va})

The English translation reads suspiciously like the kind of stab in the dark that translators take when they are well and truly baffled.

One particularly interesting confusion is the rendering of 'les marines ke mult sunt acustumé d'aler par mer' (fol. 42^{ra}) as 'The shipmen þat costyn the see' (fol. 152). It looks as if 'acustumé' ('accustomed') has been misinterpreted as a verb, 'to coast'. But it is unclear whether 'to coast' could carry the meaning 'to sail (the sea) keeping close to the coast' as early as the fifteenth century. Here, in misunderstanding her original, Eleanor Hull seems to have introduced a neologism into English (see *OED*, s.v. 'coast', *v.*, 4).

Given that Eleanor Hull was a woman, it is interesting to see how she reacts to 'gendered language', even more inevitable in a language (like Anglo-Norman) with grammatical gender than in a language (like English) that possesses natural gender. The Anglo-Norman original is surprisingly ambiguous about the gender of the audience it envisages. Although in part vi the Narrator's address is all-inclusive, 'Quel ke unkes seez, home ou femme, ou en religion ou hors de religion' (fol. 42^{rb}), elsewhere the audience seems to be male rather than female and religious rather than secular. The meditator is encouraged to refer to himself by name as 'jeo cheitif N.' and is several times addressed, both by the Narrator and by Christ, as 'frere N.' (the abbreviation for *noun* or *nomen*). Consequently, in the prologue we are told that the purpose of these prayers is

pur esprendre les corages & les pensers de *celui qi* list en l'amour & en le poer de Dieu, & pur *soi meismes* conoistre. (V, fol. 147)

The English preserves the second masculine reference but generalizes the first: the purpose of the prayer now is

for-to enflawme the hert and the corage of *hem þat* redyn it in the love of God and for-to make *a man* to know hym self. (fol. 148)

Elsewhere, Eleanor Hull translates 'humaine nature' as 'mankynd', 'bachelor' as 'man', 'li juste' as 'þe ryghtwos man', and 'l'espus' as 'husband'. She gratuitously expands 'touz besoigne' to 'euery nede þat fallyth to man', but renders 'unkes home' as 'any creature'. Perhaps one should conclude that she was simply not sensitized and that such language was not an issue in the Middle Ages.

The gender differences between English and Anglo-Norman do lay one common trap for inexperienced translators: that of preserving the French grammatical gender where English idiom makes such a literal translation inappropriate. Eleanor Hull does this infrequently. When she writes:

For right as I see in þe to parte my syknes so grete þat sche may not be heled without the depe of þe Sone of God, so may I se in þe toder syde þat she is not so grete but she may wele take hele with so hye a medycyn as she hath had (fol. 149^v)

she keeps the French grammatically feminine gender for 'mescine'. She also keeps the grammatical genders for 'misericorde' and 'mort' in:

your mercy was a-boue eny mesure gretter; and also grete was she þen as grete is she now, and as full of vertu is 3it your deþe as she was þan, and þat owyth euery cristyn man belieue. (fol. 150)

But rather than committing schoolgirl howlers, she may have conceptualized 'sickness', 'mercy', and 'death' as female personifications in these passages. An indisputable example, however, of an inappropriately retained gender is a reference to oil ('huile') as 'she', in 'she is good for lyght for-to brynne clere' (fol. 150^v). Anglo-Norman *huile* (< Lat. *oleum*) is sometimes masculine and sometimes feminine: here, V treats the word as feminine but D as masculine. Presumably Dame Eleanor's exemplar used the feminine personal pronoun here.

It is always instructive, and revealing, to see what translators choose to add and what they omit. Of those sections of her original that she chooses to translate, Eleanor Hull in fact omits very little. Occasionally she may have omitted a phrase or sentence simply because she could not understand her original. At the end of part iv, 'On the Name of Jesus', the Anglo-Norman, as part of its comment on Philipians ii.8-10, has:

Ço ne dist il [sc. Deu] mie de Agla ne de Eloy ne de Adonay ne de nul autre non, fors sul de Jesu. (fol. 40^a)

The allusion is somewhat obscure: of the three Hebrew names mentioned, 'Adonai' appears only twice in the Vulgate (Exodus vi.3 and Judith xvi.16) and both references are slightly baffling; 'Eloi' appears once, in Mark's Passion narrative (Mark xv.34); but I cannot, any more than Dame Eleanor Hull, identify 'Agla'. She omits the sentence, though her translation indicates that she clearly appreciated its general import:

This worship ner reueren[ce] is not nere may be yeue to none oder name but only to þe name of Jhesu. (fol. 151^v)

One type of omission that is likely to be deliberate is the contraction of two phrases or clauses into one. For instance, the Middle English has omitted the first sentence in:

Jeo me taiserai quant jeo averai talent de parler. Jeo serrai en pes quant j'averai talent d'aler de liu en liu ... (fol. 36^{vb})

When the translator omits the final clause in

le quel que jeo seie en leessce ou en dolor u en pes u en tristur ou en tribulacion ou quant jeo sui grevé ou en bon estat ou en mal estat, ou quel aventure ke m'aveingne ... (fol. 37^{ra})

quite possibly she considered it superfluous. And when she omits 'ou en dormant ou en veillant' (fol. 42^{va}) from 'Yf ye be oft greuyd with your fflessche behold þe sterre and calle Marye' (fol. 152^v), perhaps she thought the reference to stirrings of the flesh awake or asleep indelicate.

One noticeable omission is of two biblical quotations, 'Pater, ignosce ...' and 'Christus factus obediens ...'. The Anglo-Norman gives them complete in

the original Latin and then translates them into the vernacular. But Eleanor Hull provides English translations only (fols 150^r, 151^v), although these are sometimes closer to the Latin than to the Anglo-Norman. This contrasts with her practice in *The Seven Psalms*, where the text contains frequent and extensive quotations in Latin.

Eleanor Hull does occasionally expand her original. There seem to be some additions of substance to the Anglo-Norman, although as we do not have her exemplar we cannot be entirely confident that she made them on her own initiative. In the following passage the italicized sections do not correspond to anything in the Anglo-Norman:

In þis name Jhesu my soule hath wherby she *may kepe here from synne or, yf she synne, by þis name Jhesu she may amend her from synne* ... (fol. 151^v)

Similarly, 'cursyd ben þo þat ben disseueryde from his puple by dedely synne *and will not amend hem*' (fol. 150^v) adds the italicized phrase to 'maluré est que de sun pople n'est [*sic*], par aukun mortel peché' (fol. 38^{vb}). In both cases the translator seems slightly more optimistic, or charitable, than her original. Such a mind-set might also account for the reduction of the Anglo-Norman, 'jeo çoi [*sic*] desturbé par mes pechés *ke jo ai fet et par autres* dunt jo sui sovent tempté' (fol. 36^{va}), to 'I am distorbyd by my synnes by which I am full oft temptyd' (fol. 149^v).

More often, however, her expansions add nothing to the content but raise the emotional temperature by a few degrees. In such phrases as 'This blessed name', 'precyous blode', 'synfull handes', 'foule synnes', 'holy flesshe', 'holy blode', 'þe wild see', 'a bryght sterre', the adjectives are all the translator's additions. Similarly, she often uses two words where the Anglo-Norman has only one: 'lyghtly and corantly', 'gadre and kep', 'wykkydnes and foly', 'all white and pale', 'relesyth and helpyth', 'so hard and so cruel', 'soryful and grevous', 'so feyntfull and so bitter', 'my wyll and myn herte', 'norysshith and maketh fat', 'disawary or in dout', 'enchase and put away', 'no stabilnes nor no uerthe', and 'socour and comfort' are typical examples.

Sometimes she seems to have caught the rhetorical spirit of her original and developed it further herself. The following passage is a faithful translation of the Anglo-Norman apart from the italicized phrases. But those phrases are virtually all expansions of hints provided by the original:

Jhesu moste blessyd, I se you with þe yee of trew beleue, þe which ye have *by your grace* made opyn. Y se you where ye went with your decyplys after your cene to þe place of your passyon and þer, of your owne fre will, ye were betrayed of your owne deciple and all for me; takyn and withhold with cruell Juys *and all for me*; and þer were ye stretyly bound *and all for me*; sore betyn with scorgys *and all for me*; smetyn *in your blessyd visage and opon your neke*, and all for me; your blessyd visage all ouer-couerde with ther orible spettyngis and all for me; cloþyd in purple with a cepttre in your honde, *and all for me*; naylyd with hard nayles, persyde with a spere and hangyd by-twene theuys, and all for me; fed with aysell and galle *and all for me*, and at þe last ye bowed down your hede and yelde vp your speryt, and all for me. (fol. 148^v)

There are numerous additions here, but the only change she makes of any substance is to translate 'de cruels mains' as 'with cruell Juys'. This may have been caused by confusion over the minims in *mains/innues* or may just be an example of medieval anti-Semitism.

While even this is, perhaps, from the translator's point of view another way of raising the emotional temperature, Eleanor Hull does elsewhere attempt to expand on a rhetorical pattern suggested by her original. At the same time she emphasizes existing logical links:

Remembre yow, dere fader, *what it is þat he suffreth and for whom he suffreth and what he is þat suffreth ...* (fol. 148^v)

I synnyd with my corrupt flesshe and for þat ye suffred your holy ffleshe to be turmentyd. *I synnyd in glotony and ye suffred hungur and þryst þerfor.* I synnyd in pryde and þerfor ye meked your self to þe deþe. I synned in covytyse and þerfor ye suffred vpon þe crosse *in þe gretest pouerte þat euer was soffred ...* (fols 148^v–149^r)

Sometimes she not so much adds new material as clarifies her original, providing discreet signposts to guide her readers. The following passage meditates on Christ's prayer, 'Father, forgive them ...', and relates it to the need to avoid despair. The italicized sentences are added to the Anglo-Norman and they definitely make the argument, which would be otherwise somewhat oblique, much clearer:

For in þat same blessyd oure and jn þe same poynt þat ye offerd vp your speryt in þe crosse, ye prayed for hem that crucified yow ... *þan is þer no dout but þat þei were safe for whom ye prayed.* For þogh her synnys were most hugely grete, your mercy was a-boue eny mesure gretter and also grete was she þen, as grete is she now, and as full of vertu is 3it your deþe as she was þan, *and þat ouyth every cristyn man belieue.* *And if your mercy be as grete now as it was þen* and my synne is not so grete as þer was for whom ye prayed þen, whi þan shold not be saved o synfull repentant þat hauyn hope in þe mercy of God, as þo þat crucified you ...? (fol. 150^r)

Similarly, following the passage already cited about the three 'virtues' of oil, the Middle English expounds them in more detail, as follows:

Now here whi þe comparison of þe name of your spouse is made to oyle. *Ye shull vnderstand þat in þe oyle be iij maner of bownds.* One is she is good for lyght for-to brynne clere. Also she is good to make mete sauery and she is good for oyntmentes for-to assuage oure sorowys. All þes iij þingis we fynd in þe name of Jhesus, *yf we take good hede, þat is to sey, lyght, mete, and medycyne:* by þe lyght of þis name is alle þe world lyghtnnyd and put out of derknes of mysbelyeuc *in-to þe lyght of right feyth and right belieue.* By the lyght of þis name is every man that is turnyd to God put out of *þe derkenes of synne* and put in clerenes to know hymselfe and for-to amende his lyfe. ... And right as the oyle maketh sauery all maner of metys, *right so þe name of Jhesu makith sauery and swete all maner þingis þat is don or suffryd in þe love and þe reuerens of þat name.* (fols 150^v–151^r)

The italicized additions certainly help the reader to keep track of the argument, which continues for some pages and through at least one digression.

It is perhaps significant that such additions are particularly noticeable at the beginnings and ends of discrete sections of her original. The Meditation on the Name of Mary begins: 'This blessed name Marye is as mych as to sey as þe starre of the see, and heryth wherfor' (fol. 152). This last clause is not in the Anglo-Norman (fol. 42^{ra}) but alerts the reader to expect the explanation that follows. The passage in fact continues:

The shipmen þat costyn the see ben aqueyntyd with a sterre ... For *by this sterre* whan thei see hym thei knowin wheþer þei ben to mych in the right syde ...

The addition of the italicized phrase makes it less likely that the reader will be confused (as he or she might be, especially as for some reason the 'sterre', which is of course feminine in Anglo-Norman, is referred to as 'hym').

Similarly, at the end of part iv, 'On the Name of Jesus', she seems to have felt that her original, 'Cest non deit l'em apeler en peril de mort, ne mie sulement en co mes en tutes besoignes' (fol. 40^{ra}), was a little bald. She translates this sentence as:

This name shold not be only called in þe perille of deþe but in euery nede *þat fallyth to man*. (fols 151^v-152)

Indeed, this added clause functions as a kind of rhetorical farewell or conclusion as at this point Eleanor Hull ceases to follow the Anglo-Norman. The Middle English text continues, but must be drawing on another source, while the Anglo-Norman text that remains (which is quite substantial) is not further translated.

Particularly at the beginning and again at the end of the whole text, Eleanor Hull shows an awareness of the kind of consolidation and reassurance that readers crave. (Indeed, many of the other omissions and additions already discussed could also be interpreted in this light.) The prologue concludes:

Ner it nedyth allweys to begyn at euery tyme at the begynnyng hereof but þer as hym best lykith *and hath most devocyon to rede* and for þat cause thei ben demed by captell lettres þat þei may begyn where them lust *and leve when þem lust*, by cause the redyng shold not turne hem to enoye for to long redyng, but for the reders shold gadre and kepe tho thinges wherfor þei ware made, *þat is pyte of bert and will to love God and for-to knowe him-self*. (fol. 148)

Each of the italicized expansions, one suspects, has been carefully weighed and is precisely targeted. As suggested earlier, the first emphasizes that this spiritual exercise is an exercise to be read (rather than recited or listened to). The next foregrounds the reader's autonomy and independence: he or she is free to stop and start at will, there is no obligation to read these prayers at any particular length or in any particular order. The final addition is a particularly skilful conclusion, for it harks back to the opening statement of the purpose of these devotions and echoes the very words used there. And the final sentence of the Meditation on the Name of Mary, which concludes Eleanor Hull's use of the Anglo-Norman text, reads: 'This may we preve in ourself, how rightfully

she is called Maria and how rightfully she is called moder of mercy' (fol. 153). The translator has added 'how rightfully she is called Maria', and thus reminds us that the meditation began by considering the significance of the name 'Mary' as 'star of the sea', and then moved on to consider 'here blessyd surname', Mother of Mercy.

Certainly all the evidence suggests that Eleanor Hull was a conscious craftsperson and by no means functioning on autopilot, as seems to have been the case with some Middle English translators.³⁵ She was aware that she had choices, and she made measured and considered decisions. Many if not all of them seem designed to help the reader, especially perhaps the less experienced, possibly female, reader, rather than to accommodate the, perhaps relatively unskilled, female translator.

But on reflection one has to wonder if this text was indeed Eleanor Hull's apprentice piece. It takes a self-confident translator to treat one's original with the freedom she exercises. It is not so much that she omits or adds single words and phrases, as that she excises extensive amounts of Anglo-Norman so as to give her text its own distinctive shape, and does not hesitate to abandon it altogether when it has served its purpose. Although she was a faithful translator on the level of the word and the sentence, she apparently made a conscious decision to discard considerable sections of her original³⁶ and juxtapose two sections that had previously existed quite independently of each other. She even highlights the new entity that she has created by the Latin sentence that ends this section of her text:

Dulce nomen domini nostri Jesu Christi et nomen gloriose verginis Marie sint benedicta in secula Amen. Deo gracias.

Inexperienced translators tend to live in dread of remaking their original, of omitting anything that it has to offer, and of adding anything of their own. But these preoccupations seem to have been the last thing on Eleanor Hull's mind.

University of Waikato

ALEXANDRA BARRATT

NOTES

An earlier version of this paper was given at the Sixth Cardiff Conference on the Theory and Practice of Translation in the Middle Ages, held at Santiago da Compostela, Spain, in July 2001. I should like to thank the University of Waikato for the period of study leave during which this article was researched and written; Dr Charity Scott Stokes, who helped me with the transcription of MS Cotton Vitellius F.vii; and Emeritus Professor F. W. Marshall, who advised on the interpretation and editing of the Anglo-Norman quotations.

¹ Alexandra Barratt, 'Dame Eleanor Hull: a fifteenth-century translator', in *The Medieval Translator: The Theory and Practice of Translation in the Middle Ages*, ed. Roger Ellis (Cambridge, 1989), pp. 87–101.

² *The Seven Psalms: A Commentary on the Penitential Psalms Translated from French into English by Dame Eleanor Hull*, ed. Alexandra Barratt, EETS, os 307 (Oxford, 1995).

³ See also 'Hull, Eleanor (ca. 1394–1460)', in *Medieval England: An Encyclopedia*, ed. Paul E. Szarmach, M. Teresa Tavormina, and Joel T. Rosenthal (New York, 1998), p. 363.

⁴ For a detailed account, see *The Seven Psalms*, ed. Barratt, pp. xxiii–xxxiii.

⁵ For a detailed description, see *ibid.*, pp. xiv–xxii.

⁶ This text remains unpublished. It has been edited by Sheila Cornard, 'Dame Eleanor Hull's *Meditacions vpon the VII Dayes of the Woke*: the first edition of the Middle English translation in Cambridge University Library MS. Kk.i.6' (unpub. Ph.D. diss., University of Dayton, 1995). Some extracts have also been printed in *Women's Writing in Middle English*, ed. Alexandra Barratt, Longman Annotated Texts (London, 1992), pp. 223–31.

⁷ Stewart Gregory, *The Twelfth-Century Psalter Commentary in French for Laurette d'Alsace (an Edition of Psalms I–L)*, MHRA Texts and Dissertations 29/1, 29/2 (London, 1990).

⁸ In fact these opening lines translate the *Prologus* to Anselm of Canterbury's *Orationes sive meditationes*: 'Orationes sive meditationes que subscriptae sunt, quoniam ad excitandum legentis mentem ad dei amorem vel timorem, seu ad suimet discussionem editae sunt ...' (*S. Anselmi Cantuariensis Archiepiscopi opera omnia*, ed. F. S. Schmitt (Edinburgh, 1946), III, 3).

⁹ *The French Text of the Ancrene Riwe Edited from British Museum MS. Cotton Vitellius F. VII*, ed. J. A. Herbert, EETS, os 219 (London, 1944; repr. 1967), p. xi.

¹⁰ Ruth J. Dean, *Anglo-Norman Literature: A Guide to Texts and Manuscripts*, Anglo-Norman Text Society Occasional Publications 3 (London, 1999).

¹¹ See most recently Cate Gunn, "'Efter the measse-cos, hwen the preost sacredð": when is the moment of ecstasy in *Ancrene Wisse*?' *Notes & Queries*, 48 (2001), 105–8.

¹² Printed among Augustine's works in *PL*, XL, cols 902–42 (905f.).

¹³ See A. Wilmart, 'Les méditations réunies sous le nom de saint Anselme', in *Auteurs spirituelles et textes dévots du Moyen Âge latin* (Paris, 1932; rev. edn 1971), pp. 898–942, and J. A. W. Bennett, *Poetry of the Passion* (Oxford, 1982), p. 37.

¹⁴ See *Religious Lyrics of the Fourteenth Century*, ed. Carleton Brown, 2nd edn (Oxford, 1952), no. 1 (p. 1) and the notes on pp. 241f.

¹⁵ The oldest extant manuscript, Oxford, Bodleian Library, Laud Misc. 668, contains works by Ælred of Rievaulx and was 'copiée sans doute quelque part dans le Yorkshire': see A. Wilmart, *Le 'Jubilus' dit de saint Bernard* (Rome, 1944), pp. 32, 220–6.

¹⁶ Gilson rightly points out that strictly speaking the poem's subject is not so much the Name of Jesus as the love of God: 'Ce n'est ni de passion, ni de compassion, ni du nom de Jésus qu'il s'agit ici, main simplement de l'amour de Dieu; le vrai titre du poème serait celui du célèbre traité de S. Bernard: *De diligendo Deo*', 'Sur le *Iesu dulcis memoria*', *Speculum*, 3 (1928), 322–34 (p. 328).

¹⁷ W. Pfaff, *New Liturgical Feasts in Later Medieval England* (Oxford, 1970), pp. 84–91. See also Alexandra Barratt, 'The Prymer and its influence on fifteenth-century English Passion lyrics', *MÆ*, 44 (1975), 264–79 (pp. 271–2).

¹⁸ *Ancrene Wisse*, ed. Robert Hasenfratz, TEAMS Middle English Texts (Kalamazoo, Mich., 2000), pp. 71, 78.

¹⁹ The late-thirteenth-century pseudo-Bonaventuran *Vitis mystica* (often attributed to Bernard of Clairvaux) lists the circumcision; the bloody sweat; the buffeting; the crowning with thorns; the scourging; the nailing to the Cross; and the wound in the side (*Doctoris seraphici S. Bonaventurae ... opera omnia*, 10 vols (Quaracchi, 1882–1902), VIII, 159–229 (caps xviii–xxiii)). This is very close to the set found in a fifteenth-century English poem, 'Ihu, that alle this worlde hast wroghte', *Religious Lyrics of the Fifteenth Century*, ed. Carleton Brown (Oxford, 1939; repr. 1962), no. 92 (pp. 133–6).

Here the occasions are the circumcision, the agony in the garden, the scourging, the crowning with thorns, the tearing away of Christ's garments, the nailing to the Cross, and the wound in the side: 'vii. tymes þi blode þou sched for me.'

²⁰ *Ancrene Wisse* refers several times to the related idea that Christ's five wounds cured mankind of the sins of the five wits: see Alexandra Barratt, 'The Five Wits and their structural significance in part ii of *Ancrene Wisse*', *MÆ*, 56 (1987), 12–24 (p. 12 and note).

²¹ Bernard de Clairvaux, *Cœuvres complètes: à la louange de la Vierge Marie*, ed. and trans. Marie-Imelda Huille and Joël Regnard, Sources chrétiennes 390 (Paris, 1993), pp. 168–70.

²² *Ancrene Wisse*, ed. Hasenfratz, p. 73.

²³ Barbara Raw, 'Prayers and devotions in *Ancrene Wisse*', in *Chaucer and Middle English Studies in Honour of Rossell Hope Robbins*, ed. Beryl Rowland (London, 1974), pp. 260–71 (p. 260).

²⁴ *Ancrene Wisse*, ed. Hasenfratz, pp. 85–9.

²⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 89 and note on p. 427. C. H. Talbot presents evidence to date this devotion as originating in the crusader kingdom of Jerusalem and entering England between 1184 and 1203 in 'Some notes on the dating of the *Ancrene Riwe*', *Neophilologus*, 40 (1956), 38–50 (pp. 42f.).

²⁶ *New Catholic Encyclopedia*, s.v. 'Mary, Blessed Virgin, devotion to'.

²⁷ *Ibid.*

²⁸ See the comments and notes in my edition of this passage in *Women's Writing in Middle English*, pp. 220–7.

²⁹ *Ancrene Wisse*, ed. Hasenfratz, p. 90.

³⁰ See Jacobus de Voragine, *The Golden Legend: Readings on the Saints*, trans. William Grainger Ryan, 2 vols (Princeton, 1993), I, 17f., 50–5, 74, 204f.

³¹ This too is ultimately derived from Anselm's *Prologus*: 'Nec necesse habet aliquam semper a principio incipere, sed ubi magis illi placuerit' (*Opera omnia*, III, 3). All quotations from the Anglo-Norman text other than from the prologue are taken from D (TCD MS 374). For the prologue alone, which is lacking in D (and also in Lambeth Palace MS 182), quotations are taken from C (BL MS Cotton Vitellius F.vii). This manuscript is, however, quite badly damaged and has been conjecturally emended from MS Arundel 288 (such emendations are marked by square brackets).

³² This is adapted from Anselm who here refers not to illuminated letters but to 'paraphrasis ... distinctae per partes', *Opera omnia*, III, 3.

³³ Cf. Anselm, 'ne prolixitas aut frequens eiusdem loci repetitio generet fastidium', *ibid.*

³⁴ She seems to have done this in *The Seven Psalms*: see Barratt edn, p. 229 (note to Psalm xxxvii/759) and p. 272 (note to Psalm cxlii/619; the cross-reference given there should be corrected).

³⁵ Those who consider this a harsh judgement are referred to *The Book of Tribulation*, ed. Alexandra Barratt, Middle English Texts 15 (Heidelberg, 1983), as an example of a devotional text where literalism is taken to the extreme of incomprehensibility, or the Middle English medical treatise *De spermate*, ed. Päivi Pahta, Mémoires de la Société Néophilologique de Helsinki 53 (Helsinki, 1998). Literalism might have many different origins, depending on the type of text: the literalisms of the Middle English *Mirror of Simple Souls*, or of the Wycliffite Bible translation, probably arose for reasons quite different from those of the *De spermate*. Even if one considers only the contrast between 'free' and 'literal', Pahta rightly stresses the 'great variation of methods ... seen in the vernacularisation' specifically of medical texts (p. 72). *The Knowing of Woman's Kind in Childing*, ed. Alexandra Barratt, Medieval Women Texts and Contexts 4 (Turnhout,

2001) is a good example of the opposite extreme of 'translations bordering on original compositions ... paraphrasing, rearranging and excerpting the material from the source text, and further fusing it with material from other sources' (Pahta, *De spermate*, p. 72). A suggestive introduction to the various ways in which medieval translators interpreted their responsibilities is provided by the many translators' prologues found in *The Idea of the Vernacular: An Anthology of Middle English Literary Theory 1280-1520*, ed. Jocelyn Wogan-Browne et al. (Exeter, 1999).

³³ This is not unknown among late Middle English translators. The translator of the later of the two Middle English versions of Ælred of Rievaulx's *De institutione inclusarum* chose to omit most of Ælred's Meditation on Things Present, on his loss of virginity.

Copyright of Medium Aevum is the property of Medium Aevum Publications and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.