Leeds Studies in English

Article:

John Frankis, 'Languages and Cultures in Contact: Vernacular Lives of St Giles and Anglo-Norman Annotations in an Anglo-Saxon Manuscript', *Leeds Studies in English*, n.s. 38 (2007), 101-33

Permanent URL:

Languages and Cultures in Contact:
Vernacular Lives of St Giles and Anglo-Norman Annotations in an Anglo-Saxon Manuscript.

John Frankis

Twelfth-century vernacular literary activity in England is so varied that it is difficult to envisage some parts of it as emanating from the same society. On one hand, there were various attempts at maintaining Anglo-Saxon literary traditions: at several centres pre-conquest texts continued to be copied and new vernacular prose-works in a pre-conquest style were produced. Extant manuscripts show that there was still a readership, probably largely monastic, for texts of Anglo-Saxon religious prose, especially the homilies of Ælfric, until at least the end of the century. On the other hand, new literary conventions associated with the use of the French language are represented by several Anglo-Norman texts, including Gaimar's verse chronicle, *L'estoire des engleis*, in the first half of the century (as opposed to the Anglo-Saxon tradition of prose historiography that was maintained at Peterborough to the mid-twelfth century) and various verse narratives in the second half, like Thomas's *Tristan* and the long verse romances of Hue de Rotelande.

How far literature of continental origin, like the romances of Chrétien de Troyes, circulated in twelfth-century England is difficult to know, though there are important pieces of evidence regarding some works: the earliest and best extant manuscript of the *Chanson de Roland* was copied in England, the *Breton Lays* of Marie de France, representing a continental literary development, were probably composed in England (the earliest and most complete manuscript of them was copied in Reading in the next century), and various claims have been made for literary patronage at the Angevin court, though the products of such activity can seldom be localised with any certainty in England. On the other hand, Anglo-Norman verse composed in twelfth-century England may sometimes reflect knowledge of the literature of mainland France.

Any contact between the cultural worlds of English religious prose and French secular verse is difficult to envisage: it seems unlikely on the face of it that anyone able to read or understand French narrative verse would be interested in Anglo-Saxon homilies, and *vice versa*. Nevertheless, important aspects of the rival traditions appear in two related but contrasting works of the period, the Old English *Life of St Giles* and the Anglo-Norman *Vie de Saint Gilles*.[1] The *Life of St Giles*, though a post-conquest composition, is a work that continues the Anglo-Saxon tradition of prose narrative and vernacular religious instruction and conforms closely to the established conventions of a saint's life: nothing in its content and style would have seemed unfamiliar to Ælfric. In contrast *La Vie de Saint Gilles* represents the newer world of French verse narrative, drawing on the conventions of secular verse, frequently demonstrating the imaginative inventiveness that appears in French romances of that period, and displaying considerable linguistic virtuosity, so that it is far from typical as a saint's life. These two pieces may stand as representatives of the two contrasting linguistic and literary worlds; apart from sharing the same Latin source they have no apparent contact with each other, but there is a connection, admittedly slight, but curiously revealing.

The manuscript containing the unique surviving copy of *The Life of St Giles*, Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, MS 303, was probably compiled about the middle of the twelfth century[2] and it demonstrates the continuing interest in Anglo-Saxon literary traditions, especially vernacular prose-works of religious instruction, that was perpetuated in several important monastic scriptoria. It contains Anglo-Saxon homilies, mainly by Ælfric, and was probably compiled in Canterbury at the Cathedral Priory of Christ Church, or possibly in Rochester Cathedral Priory, both of which made important contributions to the preservation of Old English texts throughout the twelfth century; indeed, their products share sufficient common features to suggest some kind of collaboration and distinguishing between the products of these two centres is sometimes problematic. From this same south-eastern milieu at a slightly later date comes a similar collection of Anglo-Saxon homilies, Cambridge University Library, MS Ii.1.33, that contains a curious link with the Anglo-Norman *Saint Gilles*.

The Annotations in CUL MS Ii.1.33

CUL MS Ii.1.33 has received a good deal of scholarly attention because of its intrinsic interest.[3] Like the somewhat earlier Corpus manuscript of *The Life of St Giles* it is a late copy of Anglo-Saxon homilies, mainly by Ælfric, showing that interest in these texts was still lively a century or more after the Norman Conquest. This continuing post-conquest interest in pre-conquest writings, evidenced in a number of similar collections from several different monastic scriptoria, has been the subject of numerous studies.[4] Ker's dating of CUL Ms Ii.1.33 to the second half of the twelfth century has generally been accepted by subsequent scholars; there has been less unanimity concerning its provenance but Treharne has assembled a range of evidence pointing to origin in the same south-eastern area as the *St Giles* manuscript, though perhaps in Rochester rather than Canterbury.[5]

Annotations made in the margins of CUL MS Ii.1.33 at a date probably not long after its compilation cast light on aspects of its use and readership. Ker drew attention to the fact that at two points, on fols 70v and 120r, there are brief insertions in French and these were described in more detail by Pope.[6] The initial interest of these insertions is that they are apparently the work of a reader of the late twelfth century who chose to note his thoughts about two Anglo-Saxon prose texts in Anglo-Norman verse, an unusual example of interlinguistic and intercultural reaction that repays detailed examination.

The main text on both these pages is in the same hand, which shows a typical late twelfth-century blend of insular and caroline letter-forms. On fol. 70v the left margin contains an insertion in English with a similar, but not identical, mixture of letter-forms. Ker dates the main text 's.xii2' and the marginal insertion 's.xii.ex'; the two hands, main scribe and English annotator, are different in detail but of the same general type and the hand of the insertion may well be not very much later than the main hand. Because the main scribe is an accurate copyist he preserves Ælfric's language faithfully, but the language of the insertion has several late twelfth-century features. At the foot of the same page is an addition, also from the end of the twelfth century, consisting of four lines of French verse, written as two; as one might expect, there are no insular letter-forms in the French text, but the handwriting of both insertions, English and French, shows some common features, particularly the same *de* ligature in *weorðede, licgende* and *de patras*.[7] Schipper claims that both insertions are in the same hand, but, even allowing for differences that may be due to the use of different languages and a

different pen, this appears unlikely, especially when the content of the two insertions is examined in detail.[8] On fol. 120 there is another French verse-text similarly written at the foot of the page; this is certainly in the same hand as the previous French insertion. These three insertions, one English and two French, show the reactions of two late twelfth-century readers of the manuscript; my main concern is with the two French (actually Anglo-Norman) insertions because of the light they cast on the interests and provenance of this particular reader, and perhaps the location of the manuscript at the time, but all three insertions illustrate aspects of the interest that this collection had at the end of the twelfth century.

The insertions on fol. 70v are of a simple kind and their purpose is clear. This folio contains the end of Ælfric's homily on the passion of St Andrew,[9] and it looks as if this version of the story left both annotators dissatisfied because certain details are omitted by the Anglo-Saxon homilist. Latin versions of the passion of St Andrew include details of the sympathy and support that the apostle received from people close to Egeas, the pagan ruler who condemned him to death, particularly Egeas's wife Maximilla and his brother Stratocles. Ælfric mentions that the brother venerated St Andrew but does not name him; the Cambridge manuscript (like Clemoes's edited text, which is identical here) has *and his broðor heold þæs halgan Andreas lic mid micelre arwyrðnysse* [and his brother held St Andrew's body with great veneration], but after the word *broðor* the Cambridge manuscript has an insertion above the line, probably not in the hand of the main scribe, giving the name *stratocles*.[10] The scribe responsible for this was presumably aware of the name from some other version of the Andrew legend. The writer of the marginal insertion (whose hand is different from that of the supralinear insertion) carries this process even further; his entry is as follows:

> Maximilla was an læfdie inne þære burh ofer þa oðre hlæfdie. heo weorðed*e* sai*n*t Andreu & com mid heore cnihte & nam þone halige licame mid mycele wyrðmunte & hine smered*e* mid aromate. Aromat is gemacad of godes cynnes weorte ðe wille swote stince. hu hæfd*e* gecore ænne swiðne fairne stede on to licgende. Þær hu leide sai*n*tes Andreas lichame mid weorðmunte[11]
>
> [Maximilla was a lady in that city of higher rank than other ladies; she honoured Saint Andrew and came with her servant(s) and took the holy body with great reverence, and anointed it with aromat: aromat is made of herbs of a good kind that will smell

> sweet. She had chosen a very beautiful resting-place; there she laid Saint Andrew's body with reverence.]

The information contained in this comment could have been derived from a number of possible sources: most probably it is adapted from a Latin Life of St Andrew, though these details had long been familiar in Anglo-Saxon hagiography, having been summarised in the *Old English Martyrology*:

> And þæs Egeas broðor, se wæs on naman Stratohles, and Egeas wif, þære nama wæs Maximille, hig bebyrigdon Andreas lichaman myd wyrtgemengnyssum and myd swetum stencum.
> [And Egeas's brother, Stratocles by name, and Egeas's wife, whose name was Maximilla, buried Andrew's body with a blend of sweet-smelling herbs.][12]

The insertion in the Cambridge manuscript could conceivably have been adapted from the *Old English Martyrology*, but a Latin source is more likely and isolated similarities of vocabulary between the *Martyrology* and the insertion may be due to the use of a common Latin source. It is possible that the insertion is a quotation from a lost English life of St Andrew, but it was more probably composed by the scribe who inserted it beside Ælfric's Old English text.

The language of the insertion has some striking features; several linguistic details belong to the period when it was written down, supporting the suggestion that the note was composed by the scribe; an alternative hypothesis, that the writer was copying an earlier text, would involve linguistic adaptation of a kind unparalleled in the main text of Ælfric's homily. Among late spellings are *wyrðmunte* (OE *weorðmynte*), contrasting with *weorte* (OE *wyrtum*), and *fairne* (OE *fægerne*); *hlæfdie* is presumably an archaic spelling and the writer's pronunciation is reflected in *læfdie* in the same line. The form *to licgende* (an inflected infinitive, OE *to licgenne*) has a spelling, apparently influenced by the present participle, which is found elsewhere in early Middle English.[13] The inflected infinitive was in increasing use in late Old English and, although it eventually disappeared in Middle English, it remained in frequent use throughout the twelfth century.[14] The phrase *stede on to licgende*, literally 'place in which to lie down', probably implies a place prepared by Maximilla for her own burial, a parallel to the biblical account of Joseph of Arimathea and the tomb of Christ (Matthew 27. 57-60). Particularly striking is the loss of final –*n* in several words:

\

stince is an infinitive (OE *stincan*) and *gecore* is a past participle (OE *gecoren*); likewise in several adjectival and nominal inflections: *þone halige licame* stands for OE *þone haligan lichaman* and *weorte* is a dative plural in which the expected *-en* inflection (from OE *wyrtum*) is further reduced; *cnihte* could be either dative singular (OE *cnihte*) or a similarly reduced plural (OE *cnihtum*), the latter perhaps giving better sense in the context. The third person feminine pronoun appears once in the normal OE form, *heo*, but twice as *hu* (possibly from OE *heo*, perhaps rather from ON *hun*), which is unusual at this date and not easily localisable;[15] if it were from ON *hun* it would point to origin in an area of Danish settlement, but the loss of final *–n* in this short text is otherwise only in unstressed syllables. Finally, the word *aromat*, a loan from French, is recorded here in English for the first time, and the writer, evidently expecting it to be unfamiliar to English readers, adds a note explaining its meaning.[16]

At the foot of fol. 70 are inserted the lines that Pope describes as 'a metrical passage in French on St Andrew':

> Icest auint en Achaia. dunt plusur unt oi parler.
> dedenz la cite de patras que u*u*s auez oi numer.

In the first line *oi* is inserted above the line, presumably the scribe's own correction. Following the normal conventions for editing Old French verse this may be printed as:

> Icest avint en Achaia,
> Dunt plusur unt oi parler,
> Dedenz la cité de Patras,
> Que vus avez oi numer.
> [This happened in Achaia, of which many have heard spoken, in
> the city of Patras, which you have heard named.]

This identifies the place of Andrew's martyrdom, which is not named in the Anglo-Saxon text. As with the English insertion on the same page, there is no evidence that the lines are quoted from a lost life of St Andrew and there is no known French source; the rather crude style, with an easy rhyme supplied by repeating identical syntax (*oi* plus an infinitive ending in *-er*), suggests that it may be an *ad hoc* composition by the scribe who inserted it below the Old English text.[17] Like the English insertion, it supplies information available in Latin lives

of St Andrew but omitted from the Anglo-Saxon homily; since neither insertion is likely for the reasons given to be a quotation from an existing text, Schipper's suggestion that they are in the same hand implies rather implausibly that one reader chose to use two different languages and styles in order to draw attention to details omitted from the homily. It makes better sense if the two hands are different: one reader drew attention in the medium of his choice to an omission and was followed by a second reader who noted a further omission in a different medium. Which comment was written first, the English or the French, is uncertain: the foot of the page offers more space and the marginal insertion is by comparison more cramped, which suggests that the French lines were written first (this is supported by the similar placing of the Anglo-Norman insertion on fol. 120). If that is the case, the scribe of the English insertion appears to be trying to outdo his French-speaking contemporary by inserting a note that is more substantial, if less decorative.

These additions on fol. 70 may both be characterised as late twelfth-century comments on what were evidently seen as omissions from an Anglo-Saxon text, and the agreement about omissions is unrelated to the choice of language on the part of the annotators; on the other hand, clearly connected with the choice of language is the use of the older English literary form of prose and the incoming French form of rhymed verse.

The second Anglo-Norman insertion, at the foot of fol. 120, is more puzzling: its motivation is unclear but its implications may be quite far-reaching. It is as follows:

> Li uilain dit en repruuier: *de* iueune seint uiel au*er*sier.
> P*ur* ceo dit li uilain uerite: Tels lunt ki ne ten seue*nt* gre.
> Quent*re* laueir e le bricun: Ne s*unt* pas longes cu*m*paignun
> Li uilains dit la v il ueolt, Que oil ne uoit a cuer ne duelt.

A normally edited text would be:

> Li vilain dit en repruvier,
> 'De juevne seint viel aversier'.
> Pur ceo dit li vilain verité,
> 'Tels l'unt ki ne t'en sevent gré.
> Qu'entre l'aveir e le bricun
> Ne sunt pas longes cumpaignun'.

Li vilains dit la u il veolt,
'Que oil ne voit a cuer ne duelt'.
[The peasant says in a proverb, 'From a young saint an old devil'.
Therefore the peasant truly says this, 'Those people have it who
are not grateful to you. As for the miser and the wastrel, they are
not long companions'. The peasant says wherever he wishes (?),
'What the eye does not see does not grieve the heart'.]

A satisfactory translation is not easy as the scribe has apparently introduced some
inaccuracies, either by miscopying or by misremembering. The source of the
insertion was first noted by Pope in a comment combining erudition and caution:
'These three proverbs occur (though very likely not for the first time) in
Guillaume de Berneville, *La Vie de Saint Gilles*'. Clemoes subsequently pointed
out (citing the authority of Dr P. Rickard) that the details of wording make it clear
that the insertion must indeed be a series of quotations from this particular
poem.[18] This is obviously right, for the quotations are not restricted to the
proverbs but include part of the context of the poem from which they are quoted.
The corresponding parts of the poem read in the published text:

Li vileins dit en repruver:
'De jofne seint veil adverser.' (ll. 89-90)

Tels l'unt ki tei ne sevent gré.
Pur ço dit li vileins verté
'K'entre l'aver e le bricun
Ne sunt pas lunges compaignun.' (ll. 305-08)

Li vileins dit: 'La oil u volt;
Ke oil ne veit al quor ne dolt'. (ll. 547-48)
[The peasant says in a proverb, 'Young saint, old devil'. [. . .] The
kind of people who have now got it [Giles's property] won't be
grateful to you; therefore the peasant says truly that 'As for the
miser and the wastrel, they aren't long companions'. [. . .] The
peasant says 'The eye [goes?] where it wishes; what the eye does
not see does not grieve the heart'.][19]

In the Cambridge insertion the third and fourth lines are transposed so that what had originally been part of the context (a comment on St Giles's gift of his property to the poor, as told in the preceding narrative) is now inserted rather inappropriately into the proverb about misers and wastrels. Dr Rickard (quoted in Clemoes's note) notes this mistake and also claims that ll. 7-8 of the insertion in the Cambridge manuscript (the third proverb quoted) give a reading superior to that in the edited text (*la u il veolt* instead of *la oil u volt*): this may well be true, but neither version is fully satisfactory, even though proverbs need not always follow the syntax of normal speech.[20]

These quotations in French on fol. 120 invite various comments. In the first place, they are important as the earliest surviving testimony to the existence of *La Vie de Saint Gilles*, providing an earlier *terminus ante quem* for the composition of the poem. The editors of the poem point to a *terminus post quem* of about 1170 in the names given for the magi (ll. 2113-14) and accordingly date the poem to the last third of the twelfth century,[21] but there was no firm evidence for the end of this period other than the date of the manuscript, which is ascribed to the first half of the thirteenth century. The quotations in the Cambridge manuscript show clearly that the poem was in existence by the time when they were written down, probably by the end of the twelfth century.

Secondly, unlike the French verses on fol. 70v, these quotations from *Saint Gilles* do not relate closely to the accompanying Old English text. Fol. 120 contains part of Ælfric's homily 'De memoria sanctorum', corresponding to ll. 345-76 of the edited text (the facing verso page, equally visible to the annotator, contains ll. 312-44),[22] but it is not easy to see anything in this portion of text that clearly relates to the French insertion. The homily includes an account of sins followed by a list of the virtues by which the sins may be overcome, and fol. 120 of the Cambridge MS contains the last part of this list, the virtues of Spiritual Joy, Perseverance in Good Work, True Love of God and True Humility, with a concluding exhortation; the text on the facing page, fol. 119v, introduces the list of virtues with Temperance, Chastity and Liberality. These virtues are no doubt all exemplified in the person of St Giles, but the proverbs quoted from *La Vie de Saint Gilles* do not make this point. Earlier in the same homily there is a reminiscence of Luke 9.62:[23] *Gif se yrðlincg behylt underbæc gelome ne bið he gelimplic tilia* [if the husbandman look oftentimes backward, he will be no fitting tiller],[24] and the reference to *se yrðlincg* may have prompted the annotator's mention of *li vilains*, but these lines occur some pages earlier in the manuscript. On the previous page, facing the insertion, the discussion of *largitas*, 'liberality'

(ll. 326-333) contains material that parallels the second of the French proverbs, including the sentence, *God nele þæt we beon grædige gytseras. ne eac for woruld-gylpe forwurpan ure æhta* [God willeth not that we should be greedy misers, neither throw away our goods in worldly ostentation],[25] evidently prompting the proverb on *l'aver et le bricun*, but there is no parallel to the first and third French proverbs and there is nothing like the close relationship between text and inserted comment that has been noted regarding fol. 70v.

Thirdly, by quoting proverbs introduced by the phrase *li vilains dit* the text follows a twelfth-century French literary convention found in numerous narrative poems, particularly romances. It appears most famously in the opening line of *Erec et Énide* by Chrétien de Troyes ('Li vilains dit an son respit') and in a passage apparently modelled on this, the opening of *La Mule sans Frein* ('Li vilains dist en reprovier', the same phrase as in *Saint Gilles*, l. 89);[26] there are two examples in *Le chevalier à l'épée* (ll. 416 and 1184),[27] and several examples in Breton lays, one by Marie de France (*Eliduc*, ll. 61-63) and two anonymous (*Tydorel*, ll. 165-68 and *Trot*, ll. 283-86).[28] Further examples appear in a poem written in England shortly before 1190 (hence close in time to *Saint Gilles*), *Protheselaus,* in which rustic proverbs are quoted no less than four times.[29] There is also a collection of such sayings, *Les Proverbes del Vilain*, preserved in several manuscripts and demonstrating the wide circulation of this type of proverb.[30] The alleged rustic proverbs thus connect *La Vie de Saint Gilles* with a wealth of sophisticated French literary activity, but it is hardly likely that this is the sole reason for their appearance in the Cambridge manuscript; indeed it is odd that the annotator systematically selected these *proverbes del vilain*, which are by no means the most memorable or striking lines in *La Vie de Saint Gilles*, for copying into the Cambridge manuscript. The lines are also quoted out of context: in *La Vie de Saint Gilles* it is clear that Guillaume de Berneville has an ironic purpose in introducing the first two of these proverbs, for they illustrate not popular wisdom but popular prejudice and foolishness, *vilainie* as opposed to *courtoisie*. The poet makes it clear that Giles's childhoood piety and subsequent gift of his goods to the poor are entirely praiseworthy but this behaviour is nevertheless the object of popular condemnation. The lines quoted, which may be paraphrased as 'a saintly child grows into an old devil' and 'recipients of charity aren't grateful to you, reckless generosity is as culpable as miserliness', reflect a vulgar and facile cynicism. The third proverb is quoted by Giles himself to express his fear of the corrupting power of wealth, but its potential for a more cynical application ('ignorance is bliss') suggests that Guillaume has an ironical purpose in

introducing it here. By extracting the proverbs from their literary context the annotator deprives them of any sense of irony, although irony is often associated with proverbs in *Les Proverbes del Vilain* (as it also is with the proverbs of Alfred cited in the probably later Middle English poem *The Owl and the Nightingale*, where the proverbs indicate the intellectual limitations of the speakers).[31] The motive for the quotations in the Cambridge manuscript is unclear: presumably the annotator had some purpose inaccessible today, though it is possible that his understanding of Ælfric's text or of Guillaume's poem was imperfect. Nevertheless, whether the annotator had a poor or a subtle understanding of the writings concerned is of less importance than the nature and identity of the poem quoted, for the choice of a life of St Giles, even though this source is not identified, casts a revealing light on the writer of the insertion.

The Augustinian Priory of St Giles and St Andrew at Barnwell, Cambridge.

As explained, there are two Anglo-Norman insertions by the same hand in this collection of Anglo-Saxon homilies: the first refers explicitly to the life of St Andrew and the second is extracted from a life of St Giles (though not acknowledged as such), suggesting that these saints had some significance for the annotator. The conjunction of these two saints is in fact unusual and informative for there was in the twelfth century, and apparently continued to be to the end of the middle ages, only one religious house in the whole of England dedicated to both St Andrew and St Giles, the Augustinian Priory at Barnwell, Cambridge.[32] These two saints were not traditionally linked and they are uniquely joined in the dedication of this monastery as the result of a historical accident in the early years of the house, which was founded in 1092 as a community of regular canons at a church dedicated to St Giles in Cambridge, and was moved in 1112 to the site of a hermitage dedicated to St Andrew at Barnwell; a new church dedicated to St Andrew and St Giles was consecrated in 1191.[33] This might be dismissed as a coincidence of dubious significance if it were not for a further consideration: it has been plausibly suggested that the poet who identifies himself in *La Vie de Saint Gilles* as a canon (*chanoine*, l. 3761)[34] named 'Gwillames de Bernevile' (ll. 1039 and 3765) may be using a French transformation of the English name Barnwell, thus identifying himself as a regular canon of the Augustinian Priory of Barnwell.[35] We can thus deduce with some confidence that the Anglo-Norman insertions in the Cambridge manuscript, which demonstrate a well-informed

interest in the life of St Andrew and some kind of acquaintance with a life of St Giles, were written by someone closely connected with the Priory of St Andrew and St Giles at Barnwell. In the twelfth century the only person likely to have had access to a book like the Cambridge manuscript, and certainly the only person capable of making the kind of insertions described here, would unquestionably have been a cleric (whether regular or secular), and hence he may well himself have been a canon of Barnwell, a contemporary and colleague of the author of *La Vie de Saint Gilles*. It could be further argued that the Anglo-Norman insertions in the Cambridge manuscript, by linking the cult of St Andrew and Guillaume's *La Vie de Saint Gilles,* give some support to the identification of the author of *Saint Gilles* as a canon of the Priory of St Andrew and St Giles at Barnwell. As is argued below, this identification may have some further bearing on the poem.

That a canon of Barnwell should have written *La Vie de Saint Gilles*, or that another canon should have made annotations in a manuscript of Old English homilies, is not surprising in the light of what is known about the interest that Augustinian communities had in vernacular religious writings, an interest that extended both to the composition of original works like *Saint Gilles* and to the reading of vernacular works of the Anglo-Saxon period, though the latter raises questions of access. It is well known that many English Benedictine monasteries had a post-conquest inheritance of books in the English language from the Anglo-Saxon period, and that this inheritance was in several cases substantially augmented by continued copying of Anglo-Saxon texts in the post-conquest period (as described earlier in the present discussion), but the houses of the new religious orders founded in the twelfth century had of course no such inheritance. At that date this is not likely to have been a matter of concern to the strictly monastic orders of the Cistercians (foundations in England from 1128 onwards) and Carthusians (from 1178), who had no need for books other than those in Latin, however much the position may have changed later in the Middle Ages; but the Augustinian canons (several foundations about 1090-1100), while living under a monastic rule, also undertook pastoral work among the laity, so that works of religious instruction in the vernacular, whether English or French, had an obvious relevance to their work.[36] This is in fact reflected in the surviving contents of Augustinian libraries, as was pointed out some years ago.[37] Vernacular manuscripts must have formed only a very small part of the total held in Augustinian houses and they are seldom mentioned in surviving catalogues,[38] and it may be that vernacular works were not always thought appropriate for

inclusion in a monastic library catalogue, but nevertheless an important body of manuscripts containing vernacular texts survives from Augustinian houses.

Works in Middle English and French came in the course of time to be held by, and composed in, many Augustinian monasteries, but it is remarkable that several houses evidently managed to acquire pre-conquest manuscripts in Old English or post-conquest copies of Anglo-Saxon writings; this was presumably done in the first century of their existence since texts in Old English would become progressively less relevant to pastoral work. The exact processes by which Anglo-Saxon manuscripts were acquired are however uncertain. Some Augustinian houses had their origins in pre-conquest colleges of secular priests and may conceivably have inherited Anglo-Saxon books in this way, but in other cases one must assume that such manuscripts are most likely to have been acquired from Benedictine libraries as no other source of Anglo-Saxon books is likely to have been available. The books concerned may have been acquired as gifts or as purchases, or they may have been copies, made either by Benedictine monks to meet an Augustinian need, or by Augustinian canons who had been given permission either to borrow books for copying or to make copies in Benedictine scriptoria. I know of no certain evidence bearing on these matters: one is obliged to argue in terms of reasonable conjectures, given the fact that some Augustinian houses held manuscripts of Anglo-Saxon works copied before the foundation of the houses concerned. Such conjectures may be seen as amplifying a general statement made long ago by Ker to the effect that 'Exemplars must have travelled the country unless scribes went to copy them *in situ*'.[39]

One extant manuscript may possibly contain evidence of having been lent or given to an Augustinian house: Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Bodley 343, a twelfth-century collection of Old English homilies, is likely to have been compiled in the neighbourhood of Worcester, presumably in a Benedictine monastery though possibly not in the Cathedral Priory.[40] A flyleaf note referring to 'our bishop [. . .] Wulstan' was presumably written in the Worcester diocese, but another flyleaf contains part of an antiphon to St Wulfhad, an Anglo-Saxon saint who was not widely venerated but whose shrine was at the Augustinian priory dedicated to him at Stone (Stafforshire) in the neighbouring diocese of Lichfield and Coventry: the antiphon is most likely to have been copied at Stone Priory, so one may conjecture that the manuscript was sent to Stone to cater for the Augustinian interest in vernacular writing.

This whole situation may have some bearing on the question of the history of CUL MS Ii.1.33. Schipper, taking note of the prominent placing of the life of

St Æthelthryth, conjectured that the manuscript was given its present shape in Ely, which would lend support to the suggestion that the manuscript was read and annotated by a canon of nearby Barnwell. Unfortunately, however, Dr Treharne has challenged Schipper's conclusions, citing a range of evidence pointing to the probability that the Cambridge manuscript was written in the south-east, probably at Canterbury or possibly at Rochester.[41] Among the pieces of evidence linking the Cambridge manuscript to Canterbury cited by Treharne is a note of the late thirteenth century on fol. 29, which Ker had compared to a similar note in another manuscript more certainly of Canterbury origin (Durham, Cathedral Library, MS B.III.32, f.2); this thus suggests that the Cambridge manuscript, believed to have been compiled in the south-east, was still there in the late thirteenth century. If the Anglo-Norman insertions described above were made in the late twelfth century by a canon of Barnwell, then presumably either the manuscript had been lent to the Augustinian Priory and subsequently returned to its original Benedictine owners, or a canon of Barnwell went to Canterbury to read, and incidentally to annotate, the manuscript there. One may note in passing that William of Corbeil, who was Archbishop of Canterbury from 1123 to 1140, had previously been an Augustinian canon at St Osyth's Priory in Essex and so was well placed to foster collaboration between the new Augustinian order and the old-established cathedral priories (Benedictine) of Canterbury and Rochester; the entries in the Cambridge manuscript may point to the continuation of such collaboration, if indeed it existed, into the later twelfth century.[42]

The Early Vernacular Lives of St Giles.

The cult of St Giles, indirectly referred to in the Anglo-Norman insertion on fol. 120 of the Cambridge manuscript, began to spread widely in England only after the conquest and gave rise to the two vernacular lives of St Giles, the anonymous life in Old English and the Anglo-Norman life by Guillaume de Berneville (who should perhaps rather be called William of Barnwell). *La Vie de Saint Gilles* is ascribed to the late twelfth century,[43] but, as said above, the Old English life is earlier, being preserved in a manuscript from the mid-twelfth century.[44] Treharne argues that the anonymous Old English lives of St Nicholas and St Giles in the Corpus manuscript are by the same author, who translated them from Latin in the late eleventh century.[45] The scribe who copied *St Giles* tended to make occasional minor changes, mainly orthographic, in the Ælfric texts that he copied, but one

can be reasonably confident that late features of language in the text of *St Giles*, particularly as regards morphology and syntax, are due to the author rather than the copyist.[46] While most of these linguistic features, which are listed and analysed by Treharne, are compatible with composition in the late eleventh century, others fit better with a slightly later date in the early twelfth century. For example, the complete loss of dative inflections in ll. 544-46 is striking:

> Þæt wæs on Kalendas Septembris he geændode his swincfulle lif
> 7 drihten betæhte his sawle 7 Sancte Michael 7 his ængle wyrd to
> begemanne.
> [It was on the first of September that he ended his wearisome life
> and committed his soul to the Lord and to St Michael and his
> angel-host to take care of.][47]

Here *drihten* and *wyrd* are dative in function but have lost the distinctive dative inflections (OE *drihtne* and *werode*; *sancte*, also functionally dative, is an non-distinctive form that may appear in a range of different syntactical contexts). This detail of usage in *St Giles* corresponds more closely to that of the post-1121 continuations of the *Peterborough Chronicle*.[48] The use of OE *cniht*, originally 'boy' or 'servant', as a translation of Latin *militem* in *St Giles*, l. 534, is typical of usage in the period after about 1080, as appears in entries in the *Peterborough Chronicle* for the years 1083, 1086, 1087, 1090, 1094 and 1124, in all of which *cniht* has the sense of 'soldier' or 'knight'.[49] The language of *St Giles* as a whole is variable and difficult to date, and it may well contain archaic elements influenced by pre-conquest saints' lives like those by Ælfric; composition some time between 1080 and 1130 is in general likely, though a slightly later date within the first half of the twelfth century cannot be excluded. The two texts, the Old English *St Giles* and the Anglo-Norman *Saint Gilles*, may thus be separated by about half a century or slightly more, and they illustrate two competing literary forms in twelfth-century England, the older tradition of English prose narrative and the newer French fashion of rhymed verse narrative.

There is no evidence that the Anglo-Norman poet knew the English prose life, and indeed his knowledge of English is impossible to estimate; his fluent poetic style suggests that he was a native speaker of some form of French; his verse includes a few English words, but to what extent he was bilingual seems unknowable. His praise of king Flovent, *Icist Flovenz ert mult curteis, de la franceise nurreture*, 'this Flovent was very courtly, having been brought up in

\

France' (1548-49), may conceivably imply that the author was himself educated in France, although, as the editors have pointed out, his knowledge of France did not extend to the current names of Arles and Nîmes (when he was faced with Latin adjectival forms of these places in his source he extemporised non-existent names in ll. 1068 and 1755).

The two vernacular lives of St Giles, though so different in style and content, seem to have used very much the same source, a Latin *Vita Sancti Egidii* that circulated widely in this period.[50] The adaptation of this source in the Old English *Life* has been analysed by Treharne in her edition, and, in spite of changes made by the author, the Old English *Life* remains a work close in form and content to the Latin source. The author apparently did not know any vernacular form of the saint's name and consistently uses the Latin *Egidius*, unlike the Anglo-Norman author, who uses only French adaptations of the name, *Gires* and *Giles*.

The Anglo-Norman Vie de Saint Gilles.

The Anglo-Norman *Vie de Saint Gilles* is in contrast a free poetic adaptation and expansion of its source, using a skilled narrative technique with abundant descriptive detail and inventive dialogue; a closer examination of the poem reveals the cultural world that underlies the second Anglo-Norman insertion in the Cambridge manuscript. The poem's religious purpose is clear: besides being a saint's life it is a celebration of the eremitical life and shows how this may develop into life under a monastic rule. The religious purpose is served by a range of thematic and stylistic features, so that its impact has much in common with that of secular narratives of the period, particularly romances. Among features that link *Saint Gilles* with secular poetry the citing of rustic proverbs, with the threefold recurrence of *li vilains dist*, has already been noted; also striking is the theme of the watchman on the tower sounding his horn to signal the coming of the dawn:

> Tost par matin, tut dreit al jur
> corne la gueite sur la tur. (ll. 1691-92)
> [As soon as morning comes, at the break of day,
> the watchman on the tower sounds his horn.]

The poet may conceivably be writing from experience of a social reality but it sounds more like the repetition of a literary motif, and the literary connotations are of interest. In *Saint Gilles* the dawn marks the beginning of the hunt that leads to the confrontation of the saint and the king, but the motif of the watchman's dawn-signal is especially associated with the lyric genre of the *alba* or song of lovers parting at dawn.[51] Guillaume presumably introduces the theme here to create atmosphere by referring to the rituals of courtly life, sharpening the contrast between the king and the hermit, but the further connotations of the *alba* would enhance the contrast between religious and secular life.

In her *Anglo-Norman Literature* Dominica Legge rightly draws attention to the poet's mastery of dramatic dialogue, quoting a passage that shows the poet's effective handling of the language of ordinary conversation.[52] The poet's ability to write passages of vivid description is no less noteworthy and his account of sea-voyages (ll. 771-806 and 883-934) shows an astonishing linguistic richness, particularly in its use of the technical terms of seafaring and seamanship. The poet was apparently familiar with sailing and the sea and he provides an remarkable insight into the language of sailors, with its blend of terminology of French, English, Dutch and Norse origin; how much of this terminology was in use in continental French, and how much was peculiar to Anglo-Norman or to a nautical *lingua franca*, remains to be determined.[53] The editors of *Saint Gilles* have compared these seafaring passages with the account of Arthur's voyage in Wace's *Roman de Brut*, ll. 11193-238; the two texts have several items of nautical vocabulary in common, but Guillaume treats the subject at greater length and includes some nautical terms that are not in Wace, so that, although he may owe a thematic debt to Wace, his use of independent material suggests a personal knowledge of seafaring terminology. Wace was apparently a pioneer in the exploitation of nautical terminolgy for poetic effect; it is of some interest that his two most notable twelfth-century successors (whether or not imitators) were both Anglo-Norman poets, possibly East Anglian contemporaries, Guillaume de Berneville and Denis Piramus, each of whom makes an important contribution to the poetic exploitation of seafaring terminology.[54]

Perhaps the most striking feature of Guillaume's style is his gift for compiling poetic lists with an accumulation of terms drawn from a wide range of linguistic styles and registers, showing an apparent delight in the potentialities of language. The nautical passages referred to are a flamboyant example of this but similar qualities appear in several shorter passages. For example, the Latin *Vita* gives no information about the sailors rescued from a storm by St Giles's prayers,

but Guillaume says that they are merchants and he amplifies this with a splendid catalogue of the wares they traded in (ll. 846-55), including numerous kinds of coloured fabrics from exotic locations (silks from Russia, cloth from Alexandria, scarlet, blue and green from Greece), as well as various spices (sugar, cinnamon, liquorice, galingale): this imaginative display of imagery is the work of a highly accomplished writer. One detail, *pailles de Russie* [l. 848, silks from Russia], is noteworthy because any reference to Russia is rare in writing in England before the mid-thirteenth century. Russia is mentioned in the late twelfth century by Hue de Rotelande and slightly later in *Waldef*, but only as a remote and unknown place, whereas Guillaume makes it clear that Russia was known as the immediate source of luxury-goods that presumably came ultimately from the East.[55] A similar catalogue of merchants' wares had been included in Ælfric's *Colloquy* for the purpose of teaching Latin, but Guillaume's use of such material for poetic effect may rather have been suggested by descriptions of fabrics and clothing and the appurtenances of wealth in French romances, especially in *Erec et Enide*.[56] Chrétien's characteristic blend of the colourful, the fantastic and the learned may be paralleled in Guillaume's descriptive writing and examples may be found in the passages describing St Giles's hermitage. Here the Latin *Vita* has brief phrases that refer to the remoteness of the hermitage (para. 9) and the trees and wild animals in the country surrounding it (paras 11 and 13).[57] Guillaume transforms these into two passages of descriptive detail, one on the theme of wild animals (ll. 1229-38), the other on trees (ll. 1921-28), each in its way casting light on the literary background of the poem.

In the former the locality sought out by St Giles is characterised in terms of its wild life:

> Entre le Rodne e Munpellers
> ert le pais large e pleners
> de granz deserz e de boscages;
> assez i out bestes sauvages,
> urs e liuns e cers e deims,
> senglers, lehes e forz farrins,
> olifans e bestes cornues,
> vivres e tygres e tortues,
> sagittaires e locerveres
> e serpenz de mutes maneres. (1229-38)[58]

> [between the Rhone and Montpellier the country was extensive
> and full of great wildernesses and forests; there were many wild
> animals, bears and lions, stags and bucks, boars, wild sows and a
> wealth of game, elephants and horned beasts, vipers and tigers
> and tortoises, centaurs and hyenas and many kinds of serpents.]

This demonstrates the poetic power of a list of names and it also exemplifies, at a time when it was not yet common in vernacular writing, how the eremetical wilderness may develop into the romantic forest in a way that was to be recurrent in European writing for hundreds of years.[59] The hermit's 'desert' is full of life but not inhabited by men. The animals in Guillaume's catalogue include both the familiar and the exotic, the learned and the fantastic, deriving from observation and from reading; some have traditional symbolic associations, especially the lions and serpents, familiar in Chrétien's *Yvain* and still present in Shakespeare's forest of Arden.[60] Several of the animals also receive mention in bestiaries, like the earlier twelfth-century Anglo-Norman *Bestiaire* of Philippe de Thaon, which may indicate the kind of associations that some animals had for the poet, though it is highly unlikely that he intended anything like the allegorical interpretations found in bestiaries. The choice of the word *olifans* (l. 1235) is of interest because Philippe de Thaon, writing in England half a century earlier, consistently uses the form *elefant*.[61] The form *olifans* is in fact ambiguous, referring both to the elephant and to the ivory obtained from it, especially to Roland's famous horn, the *olifan* that plays such a crucial role in the *Chanson de Roland*, so Guillaume's choice of word adds an extra dimension to the surroundings of St Giles's hermitage. The placing of the reference to *sagittaires et locerveres* sounds jocularly pedantic: *locerveres* (l. 1237) may not quite be identical with the *loupscerviers* [lynxes] of modern French, for Philippe de Thaon equates the term with 'hyena', though the latter word no doubt also raises questions of identity.[62] Leaving aside questions both of zoological identity and of bestiary-allegory, this makes Giles's forest a more wild and curious place. As for *sagittaires*, Guillaume presumably knew of the conventional representation in illustrated calendars of the constellation Sagittarius as a centaur; Philippe de Thaon in his *Comput* describes the *Sagittarie* as a human figure to the waist and below in the form of a horse (in his *Bestiaire* he uses very similar wording in his account of the *onoscentaurus* as human to the waist and below as an ass, explaining that *onos* is Greek for ass); so it is safe to assume that Guillaume envisaged the *sagittaire* as a centaur, a creature with a special significance for hermits.[63] St Jerome, in his *Life of St Paul*

the First Hermit, a fundamental text for medieval eremetic ideology, tells how St Antony went to visit St Paul the Hermit in his desert retreat and on the way met a centaur, *Hippocentaurus*, which, in a crude attempt at human speech, gave the saint helpful guidance, demonstrating that it was not a hostile creature; further on the saint met a faun or satyr, a small man with horns and goat's feet, which explained that it was not an infernal spirit but a mortal creature capable of salvation, and asked for the saint's prayers to help bring this about: the adaptation of this passage by Gervase of Tilbury and Walter Map shows that it circulated widely.[64] The *sagittaires* in Guillaume's poem thus denote a locality appropriate to the eremetic life, and may also indicate that a hermit, though removed from human society, may have a religious function in relation to the wild creatures that surround him.[65] Whether the *sagittaires* could be meaningfully linked with the *sete*, 'arrow' (Latin *sagitta*), that wounds Saint Gilles (1. 2004) is more debatable. Finally, the tortoise may seem an unexpected item in a list of *bestes sauvages*; it is possible that Guillaume knew of the powers of divination associated with it by Pliny,[66] but he may never have seen a tortoise and the reference sounds ornamental, or even playful, rather than didactic. The whole passage may imply a comparison betqween St Giles in his hermitage and Adam surrounded by animals in the Garden of Eden.

In the second passage the account of the trees surrounding the hermitage indicates another aspect of the eremetic life:

> virent le liu durement bel:
> tut l'unt purpris li arbreisel
> ki planté furent envirun
> e portent fruit en lur saisun:
> coinz, permeines, pesches e fies
> e alemendes e alies
> e autres fruiz assez plusurs,
> ki jettent les bones flairurs. (ll. 1921-28)[67]

[they saw the place was of great beauty, filled by the trees that had been planted all around and which bore fruit in their season: quinces, pears, peaches and figs, almonds and sorb-apples and several other fruits in great quantity that emit beautiful scents.]

Laurent notes the resemblance of this to the *locus amoenus* of secular narratives and sees it as linking the text to courtly literature. This is partly true: the topos of

the 'mixed forest' was long ago described by Curtius in his seminal study of medieval literary motifs,[68] but Guillaume's list of trees is not a 'mixed forest', it is a collection specifically of trees that bear fruit edible by man, so that it becomes a manifestation of a beneficent nature and ultimately of divine care (*planté* in l. 1923 may imply either human or divine agency), like the hind that brings sustenance to St Giles, and it further suggests the theme of the hermitage as an earthly paradise, so that Guillaume blends the *locus amoenus* of secular narratives with a tradition of eremitical writing.

Guillaume's treatment of the hermitage raises an interesting possibility. The Latin source mentions three hermits and hermitages: first, on the island visited on the voyage to Marseilles, the nameless hermit who becomes a model of the eremitical ideal for Giles (para. 7); second, Veredemius, who becomes Giles's guide into this way of life (para. 9); and third, Giles himself when he establishes his own retreat (para. 11, additional information in 13 and 14); these three hermitages are broadly similar.[69] Guillaume follows this pattern but introduces numerous original and distinctive details. The first hermitage, on a remote island, is beside a stream in which cress, a natural food-source, grows (ll. 938-99); in contrast, the hermitage of Veredemius is in a barren place (ll. 1251-70) where no food plants can grow, no leeks, chives, shallots, onions, lettuce and, in specific contrast to the island hermitage, no cress (ll. 1264-66: another of Guillaume's characteristic lists). Finally, Giles's own hermitage (ll. 1455-1540, 1916-28) combines features of the other two: it is in a *desert* [uninhabited place] (the word occurs repeatedly: ll. 1462, 1487, 1495, 1521, 1524), a cave difficult of access because of the dense growth of shrubs and trees (ll. 1463-67), but with a clear stream running over gravel in which cress grows (ll. 1468-72), enabling Giles to live on roots and (repeated again in l. 1494) cress. Cress growing in running water is represented as a basic natural resource for the hermit.[70] The first hermitage establishes a basic theme of remoteness, but the contrast between the other two is clear: according to Guillaume, but not to the Latin source, Giles makes his first abode in a barren place without water or natural food-resources (no cress), then moves to a place that is well watered and supplied with edible vegetation (a double helping, as it were, of cress and a variety of fruit). No doubt this may be seen as making a general point about faith in God's provision, but there is a striking parallel to the early history of the Augustinian community that finally settled in Barnwell. According to the *Liber Memorandum*, the early record of the house already referred to (note 33 above), the regular canons were first established at the church of St Giles beside the castle in Cambridge on a restricted

site without water that soon became inadequate to their needs. Their next patron, Pain Peveral, became aware of this:

> Uidens autem locum ubi domus eorum sita erat non sufficere ad omnes officinas canonicis suis necessarias, nec eciam aquam uiuam continere, impetrauit ille egregius Paganus Peueral a rege Henrico locum quendam extra burgum Cantebrigie a magna platea usque in riueram Cantebrigie se extendentem, et amenitate situs loci satis delectabilem. Porro de illius loci medio fonticuli satis puri et viuidi emanabant, Anglice Barnewelle, id est fontes puerorum.
>
> [Seeing now that the place where their house was situated did not suffice for all the buildings necessary for his canons and had no running water, that excellent man, Pain Peveral, requested from king Henry a certain place outside the city of Cambridge, stretching from the main road to the bank of the river in Cambridge, very delightful because of the convenience of the situation of the place. Moreover, springs of pure running water came from the middle of that place, called in English *Barnwell*, that is, 'children's springs.][71]

Guillaume's pointed contrast between Giles's first habitation on a harsh site without water and cress and his second beside running water with cress becomes more comprehensible if it is seen as reflecting the history of Guillaume's priory at Barnwell. Furthermore, the same chapter of the account of Barnwell priory goes on to tell that the new site of the priory had previously been the habitation and oratory (dedicated to St Andrew) of a holy man of God named *Godesone* (an assumed religious name, 'God's son'), who had died, leaving the place unoccupied.[72] As a result, where there had previously been a hermitage there was now a monastery, a situation mirrored in Guillaume's lines on the religious house founded by St Giles:

> Primes i out un hermitage:
> meis ore i ad un'abbaie,
> novelement est establie (ll. 3380-82)
> [First there was a hermitage there, but now there is a newly established monastery]

122

Barnwell was by no means the only monastery to have developed from a hermitage, but the parallel must have been striking for the canons of Barnwell in the late twelfth century.[73]

One further example of Guillaume's handling of material from secular poetry may also be connected with the poet's identity. The editors have drawn attention to a quotation from *La Chanson de Roland* in *La Vie de Saint Gilles*, when Gilles speaks of the miracle performed by God for Charlemagne:

> quant pur vus fist de noit le jur,
> en Rencevals, as porz passant,
> pur venger la mort de Rollant. (*Saint Gilles*, ll. 2892-94)
> [when [God] turned night into day for you on your way through
> the mountain-passes at Roncevaux to avenge Roland's death]

Guillaume here quotes a repeated phrase from the *Chanson de Roland*: *Si l'orrat Carles ki est az porz passant* [l. 1071: Charles will hear it [Roland's *olifan*] as he goes through the mountain-passes], and *Karles l'entent ki est as porz passant* [l. 1766: Charles hears it as he goes through the mountain-passes].[74] No doubt the fact that Charlemagne figures so prominently in the legend of St Giles prompted this reference, but it may well have been facilitated for a poet who was an Augustinian canon if what is now the oldest and best manuscript of the *Chanson de Roland* (Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Digby 23, Part II) was held in the Augustinian Abbey at Osney in the twelfth century. Bodleian MS Digby 23 at present consists of two originally separate and unrelated manuscripts: one with Chalcidius's translation of Plato's *Timaeus*, the other with *La Chanson de Roland*; a flyleaf note in the first part records that the Chalcidius was bequeathed to Osney Abbey (probably about 1263) but makes no reference to the *Chanson*, perhaps implying that the two texts were still separate at that point; however, the two parts were evidently bound together by the end of the thirteenth century, so the *Roland* manuscript was presumably already held by Osney Abbey at the time of binding. How long it had been there, and whether it was originally written there, is not known; but it is likely that the manuscript of *La Chanson de Roland* was held in the Augustinian Abbey of Osney at the time Guillaume was writing *La Vie de Saint Gilles* in the Augustinian Priory of Barnwell.[75] The interest in vernacular writing mentioned above is such a striking feature in the surviving books from the libraries of Augustinian houses that it may be presumed to result from a policy pursued throughout the Augustinian order in England (and probably in Wales too,

in the light of the fact that one of the most important repositories of medieval Welsh poetry, the Black Book of Carmarthen, was held in the Augustinian Priory of Carmarthen).[76] What kind of contacts existed between Augustinian houses is a matter on which more evidence would be welcome. Whether the interest that led Osney Abbey to hold a copy of *La Chanson de Roland* was encouraged by the fact that Roncevaux was the site of an Augustinian hospital for pilgrims is obviously more speculative.

   La Vie de Saint Gilles is the work of an exceptionally gifted poet in its inventive adaptation of its source and in its connections with French secular verse from the *Chanson de Roland* to late twelfth-century romances, and it casts a striking light on the ideals, attitudes and activities of the Augustinian Canons of Barnwell Priory at the time of its composition. In marked contrast, the English *Life of Saint Giles* belongs to a very different literary world, unashamedly insular and retrospective, but illustrating an important aspect of twelfth-century English Benedictine monasticism. The interest of the annotations in CUL MS Ii.1.33 is that they show how at least one reader appeared to have had the ability to move in both worlds, though the depth of his understanding of the culture of either world must remain in some doubt.

NOTES

[1] *The Old English Life of St Nicholas with the Old English Life of St Giles*, ed. by E. M. Treharne, Leeds Texts and Monographs, n.s. 15 (University of Leeds, 1997); *La Vie de Saint Gilles*, ed. by Gaston Paris and Alphonse Bos, Société des anciens textes français (Paris: Firmin Didot, 1881), and *Guillaume de Berneville, La Vie de Saint Gilles*, ed. by Françoise Laurent (Paris: Champion, 2003). I am indebted to the anonymous readers of *LSE* for several helpful suggestions concerning the presentation of the material in this article.

[2] Treharne, *St Giles*, pp. 20-21, modifying the slightly earlier dating of N. R. Ker, *Catalogue of Manuscripts Containing Anglo-Saxon* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1957), p. 99.

[3] Description in Ker, *Catalogue*, pp. 23-27, no. 18; important additional comments in *Homilies of Ælfric, a Supplementary Collection*, ed. by John C. Pope, Vol. I, EETS o.s. 259 (1967), pp. 35-39, and *Ælfric's Catholic Homilies, the First Series*, ed. by Peter Clemoes, EETS s.s. 17 (1997), pp. 25-28 (henceforth referred to as *CH* I). A detailed codicological analysis may be found in W. Schipper, 'A composite Old English homiliary from Ely: Cambr. Univ. Libr. MS Ii, 1. 33', *Transactions of the Cambridge Bibliographical Society*, 8 (1983), 285-98; see further Elaine M. Treharne, 'The dates and origins of three twelfth-century Old English manuscripts', in *Anglo-Saxon Manuscripts and their Heritage*, ed. by Phillip Pulsiano and Elaine M. Treharne (Aldershot: Ashgate, 1998), pp. 227-53.

[4] For important recent studies, with references to earlier publications, see *Rewriting Old English in the Twelfth Century*, ed. by Mary Swann and Elaine M. Treharne, Cambridge Studies in Anglo-Saxon England 30 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000).

[5] Treharne, 'Dates and origins', p. 243, points out that Schipper misinterprets Ker's dating without actually challenging it.

[6] Ker, *Catalogue*, p. 23, and Pope, *Homilies*, p. 38. The implications of other annotations in this manuscript are also discussed in Mary Swan, 'Ælfric's *Catholic Homilies* in the twelfth century', in Treharne, *Rewriting Old English*, pp. 62-82 (pp. 78-80).

[7] On the *de* ligature see Treharne, 'The dates and origins', p. 241. Further discussions are noted by M. B. Parkes, 'The date of the Oxford Manuscript of *La Chanson de Roland*: Bodleian Library MS Digby 23', *Medioevo romanzo*, 10 (1985), 161-75, reprinted in M. B. Parkes, *Scribes, Scripts and Readers* (London: Hambledon, 1991), pp. 71-89 (especially pp. 72-77).

[8] Schipper, 'Homiliary', p. 294, n. 12.

[9] Corresponding to the edited text in Clemoes, *CH* I, pp. 518-19, ll. 333-50; the *Passio* is added to the homily *Natale Sancti Andree Apostoli*.

[10] The insertion lacks serifs in both the *st* ligature and the final *s* of *stratocles*, but the scribe of the main text on fols 70v and 120 regularly uses *s* with a serif, both in the *st* ligature

125

(e.g. fol. 70v, l. 5, *apostole*) and in a final position (e.g. fol. 70v, l. 19, *preostas, diocanas*; fol. 120, l. 9, *anrædnys godes weorces*); in fol. 120, l. 13, the main scribe makes a superior insertion, *caritas*, also with a serif in the final *s*.

¹¹ Texts transcribed from this manuscript are quoted with the permission of the Syndics of Cambridge University Library.

¹² Quoted from *Das altenglische Martyrologium*, ed. by Günter Kotzor, 2 vols (Munich: Beck, 1981), II, p. 260. On versions of the Life of St Andrew current in Anglo-Saxon England see *Ælfric's Catholic Homilies. Introduction, Commentary and Glossary*, by Malcolm Godden, EETS s.s. 18 (2000), pp. 318-19, and more generally *Andreas and the Fates of the Apostles*, ed. by Kenneth Brooks (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1961), pp. xv-xviii.

¹³ See Tauno F. Mustanoja, *A Middle English Syntax*, Part I, *Parts of Speech* (Helsinki: Société Néophilologique, 1960), pp. 512-13; Mustanoja characterises the *-ende* spellings as 'southern and south-western', but the only example given (from Lawman, Otho MS) does not preclude a wider distribution, particularly at an earlier date.

¹⁴ Treharne, *St Giles*, p. 71, sees it as a characteristic of the texts discussed by her; on the increasing use in late OE she cites Elizabeth Closs Traugott, 'Syntax', in R. M. Hogg, *The Cambridge History of the English Language*, Vol. I, *The Beginnings to 1066* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992), pp. 168-289 (p. 242). See more generally Bruce Mitchell, *Old English Syntax*, 2 vols (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1986), I, pp. 387-88, para. 921.

¹⁵ *A Linguistic Atlas of Late Medieval English*, by Angus McIntosh, M. L. Samuels and Michael Benskin, 4 vols (Aberdeen: Aberdeen University Press, 1986), I, p. 309 (Dot map 17), shows locations for a range of spellings (*heo, hu(e), hoe, huhe*) that may be grouped together as regards later ME, but may need further refinement for early ME; the spread of examples is so wide as not to be helpful for localising the twelfth-century text.

¹⁶ See *MED* s.v. aromat; the word is used several times in *Ancrene Wisse* and the Katherine Group of spices and ointments referred to in the Bible: see for example *Ancrene Wisse*, ed. by J. R. R. Tolkien, EETS o.s. 249 (1962), p. 190, referring to John 19. 39-40, and *Ancrene Wisse*, ed. by Geoffrey Shepherd (London: Nelson, 1959), p. 14, note on l. 8; the author of *Ancrene Wisse* likewise gives an explanation of the word: see ed. by Tolkien p. 192, 'Aromaz me makeð of myrre & of rechles' [Aromat is made of myrrh and incense] (referring to Canticum Canticorum 3. 6), and ed. by Shepherd, p. 15, 38n.

¹⁷ The lines are not from A. T. Baker, 'The Passion of Saint Andrew', *MLR*, 11 (1916), 420-49, who comments on the paucity of French verse lives of apostles and he records (n. 2) only this one Life of St Andrew; nor are they from Gerald A. Bertin and Alfred Foulet, 'The Acts of Andrew in Old French Verse: the Gardner A. Sage Library Fragment', *PMLA*, 81 (1966), 451-54, which states (p. 451) that extant French Lives of St Andrew, apart from the Passion ed. by Baker and the American fragment, are all in prose.

[18] Pope, *Homilies*, p. 38; Clemoes, *CH* I, p. 28 and n. 1.

[19] Text quoted (with minor changes of punctuation) from Laurent, *Saint Gilles*, pp. 6, 19-20 and 34, who gives a rather free translation.

[20] Laurent translates the proverb in 547-48 rather freely as 'Là où est l'œil est le désir, mais loin des yeux loin du cœur.' The question-marks in my translation signal my uncertainty about both versions of the text.

[21] The *terminus post quem* of 1170 is not certain since the names of the Magi evidently had some limited currency before that date: see *The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church*, ed. by F. L. Cross, 2nd edition (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1974), p. 858, s.v. Magi, and references there cited; but it is true that knowledge of the names in north-western Europe became widespread only after Frederick Barbarossa brought the supposed relics to Germany in 1162. *La Vie de Saint Gilles* survives complete in a manuscript in Florence, Biblioteca Laurenziana, which I have not been able to see: there is a description in Paris et Bos, pp. I-XIV.

[22] *Ælfric's Lives of Saints*, ed. by Walter W. Skeat, 2 vols, EETS o.s. 76 and 82 (1881 and 1885, reprinted as one volume 1966), I, pp. 360-62; henceforth cited as *LS*.

[23] Vulgate: 'Nemo mittens manum suam ad aratrum, et respiciens retro, aptus est regno Dei'; AV: 'No man, having put his hand to the plough, and looking back, is fit for the kingdom of God.' The OE translation of the gospels here has 'nan mann þe hys hand asett on hys sulh and onbæc besyhð nys andfenge godes rice': quoted (with repunctuation) from *The Old English Version of the Gospels*, ed. by R. M. Liuzza, Vol. I, EETS o.s. 304 (1994), p. 122.

[24] Text and translation quoted from *LS*, pp. 348-49, ll. 178-79.

[25] Text and translation quoted from *LS*, pp. 358-59, ll. 329-30.

[26] *Les Romans de Chrétien de Troyes*, I *Erec et Enide*, ed. by Mario Roques, Classiques Français du Moyen Age 80 (Paris: Champion, 1966), p. 1; *Two Old French Gauvain Romances*, ed. by R. C. Johnston and D. D. R. Owen (Edinburgh: Scottish Academic Press, 1972), pp. 61 and 101.

[27] *Two Old French Gauvain Romances*, pp. 40 and 59.

[28] *Marie de France, Lais*, ed. by Alfred Ewert (Oxford: Blackwell, 1947), p. 128 (*Eliduc*, 61-63 and note); *Les lais anonymes des XIIe et XIIIe siècles*, ed. by Prudence Mary O'Hara Tobin (Geneva: Droz, 1976), pp. 217 (*Tydorel*, ll. 165-68) and 345 (*Trot*, ll. 283-86).

[29] *Protheselaus by Hue de Rotelande*, ed. by A. J. Holden, 3 vols, ANTS 47-49 (London: Anglo-Norman Text Society, 1991-93), ll. 7094-96, 7699-701, 8767-69 and 9038-40; see also 82 note; on the date of the poem see Introduction, p.1; see also *Ipomedon, poème de Hue de Rotelande*, ed. by A. J. Holden (Paris: Klincksieck, 1979), p. 474, ll. 9487-90.

[30] Adolf Tobler, *Les Proverbes au Vilain: die Sprichwörter des gemeinen Mannes* (Leipzig: 1895); see further Ruth J. Dean, *Anglo-Norman Literature, a guide to texts and manuscripts* (London: Anglo-Norman Text Society, 1999), p. 146; the collection is preserved

mainly in continental manuscripts but also in a famous English manuscript: see *Facsimile of Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Digby 86*, with an introduction by Judith Tschann and M. B. Parkes, EETS s.s. 16 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996), fols 143-49v; in this manuscript the French text is immediately preceded by the Middle English *Proverbs of Hending*, a collection apparently modelled on *Les Proverbes del Vilain*: in each work a stanza, generally of six lines, describes a common situation and follows this with a relevant proverb, followed by *Ceo dist le vilain* in the French poem or by *Quod Hending* in the English poem. This suggests that the name *Hending* should be seen as an English counterpart of *le vilain*, implying 'the handyman', 'the manual labourer'. Dean, p. 147, records (no. 261) an Anglo-Norman collection of 'li proverbes qe dit li vilains', together with two English proverbs, the latter also noted in Ker, *Catalogue*, pp. 426-7.

[31] On irony in proverbs see Eckhard Rattunde, *Li Proverbe au Vilain: Untersuchungen zur romanischen Spruchdichtung*, Studia Romanica 11 (Heidelberg: Winter, 1966), pp. 103-23; this study also cites (p.121) references to rustic proverbs in some other narrative poems. For a similar attitude in Old English see Paul Cavill, *Maxims in Old English Poetry* (Cambridge: Brewer, 1999), p. 66, referring to *ceorlisc* [rustic] and *stunte* [foolish] people who quote proverbs. *The Owl and the Nightingale*, ed. by Eric Gerald Stanley (London: Nelson, 1960), pp. 34 and 160-63; and *The Owl and the Nightingale*, ed. by Neil Cartlidge (Exeter: University of Exeter Press, 2001), p. 54 (note on l. 235).

[32] Alison Binns, *Dedications of Monastic Houses in England and Wales 1066-1216* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 1989), pp. 51 and 119; previously referred to by M. D. Legge, *Anglo-Norman Literature and its Background* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1963), p. 254.

[33] *Liber Memorandorum Ecclesie de Bernewelle*, ed. by John Willis Clark (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1907), pp. 38-39, 46, 66-67 and 222.

[34] This title could refer in this period either to a secular canon (a member of the secular clergy, normally one holding a prebend in a cathedral chapter, like, for example, Wace) or to a regular canon (a member of the order of Augustinian Canons, monks living under the Rule of St Augustine).

[35] First suggested by Ezio Levi, 'Troveri ed Abbazie', *Archivo storico italiano*, 83 (1925), 45-81 (p. 65); this was long ignored but is considered more sympathetically by Legge, *Anglo-Norman Literature*, p. 254; see further M. Dominica Legge, 'Les origines de l'anglo-normand littéraire', *Revue de Linguistique Romane*, 31 (1967), 44-54 (p. 52). The commonest medieval form of 'Barnwell' is *Bernewelle*: see *Liber Memorandum*, pp. 37, 46-48, 51-55 and frequently throughout; see also *The Place-Names of Cambridgeshire*, by P. H. Reaney, English Place-Name Society Vol. 19 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1943), p. 39. The place-name element *well(e)* is normal for East Anglia in ME, but in more westerly areas a common ME reflex of West Saxon *wiell* is *will(e)*: see Eilert Ekwall, *The Oxford Dictionary of English*

Place-Names (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1951), pp. 480-81, s.v. well; it is conceivable that Guillaume knew of *–wille* as a variant of *–welle*, but more probable that he simply saw the common French place-name element *–ville* as an appropriate substitute for *welle* in a text in the French language. Cecily Clark, 'The *Liber Vitae* of Thorney Abbey and its catchment area', refers to a family named *de Barnauilla* who held lands not far from Barnwell (in Northants and Lincs) but she does not connect this family with Barnwell or with Guillaume de Berneville: see *Words, Names and History: Selected Writings of Cecily Clark*, ed. by Peter Jackson (Cambridge: Brewer, 1995), pp. 320-38 (pp. 324, 332).

[36] J. C. Dickinson, *The Origins of the Austin Canons and their Introduction into England* (London: SPCK, 1950), pp. 214-41; R. W. Southern, *Western Society and the Church in the Middle Ages* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1970), pp. 241-50; Janet Burton, *Monastic and Religious Orders in Britain 1000-1300* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), pp. 43-52.

[37] John Frankis, 'The social context of vernacular writing in thirteenth-century England: the evidence of the manuscripts', *Thirteenth Century England* I, ed. by P. R. Coss and S. D. Lloyd (Woodbridge: Boydell, 1986), pp. 175-84 (p. 178); further material added in John Frankis, 'Towards a regional context for Lawman's *Brut*: literary activity in the dioceses of Worcester and Hereford in the twelfth century', in *La3amon: Contexts, Language, and Interpretation*, ed. by Rosamund Allen, Lucy Perry and Jane Roberts (London: King's College Centre for Late Antique and Medieval Studies, 2002), pp. 53-78 (p. 58). My concern was with the period before 1300, but I noted in passing that 'Augustinian literary activity in the English language continued vigorously to the end of the Middle Ages' (*Thirteenth Century England*, I. 178 and n. 19); on this subject see the magisterial study by Ralph Hanna, 'Augustinian canons and Middle English literature', in *The English Medieval Book, Studies in Memory of Jeremy Griffiths*, ed. by A. S. G. Edwards, Vincent Gillespie and Ralph Hanna (London: British Library, 2000), pp. 27-42; further references to French writings in Augustinian houses are given by Tony Hunt, *Le Chant des Chanz*, ANTS 61-62 (London: Anglo-Norman Text Society, 2004), introduction pp. 12-15 (including on p. 13 a digression on the unrelated topic of Augustinian friars).

[38] *The Libraries of the Augustinian Canons*, ed. by T. Webber and A. G. Watson, Corpus of British Medieval Library Catalogues 6 (London: The British Library, in association with the British Academy, 1998). David Postles, 'The learning of Austin Canons: the case of Oseney Abbey, *Nottingham Medieval Studies*, 29 (1985), 32-43, is concerned with works in Latin and refers (pp. 41-43) to vernacular manuscripts only in connection with declining Latinity in the fifteenth century.

[39] N. R. Ker, *English Manuscripts in the Century after the Conquest* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1960), p. 11; the examples discussed by Ker are from Benedictine houses. David N. Dumville, 'English libraries before 1066: use and abuse of manuscript evidence', revised

version in *Anglo-Saxon Manuscripts: Basic Readings*, ed. by Mary P. Richards (New York and London, Routledge, 1994), pp. 169-219, glances (p. 184) at the subject of Anglo-Saxon manuscripts in post-conquest religious foundations but is not concerned with the distinction between Latin and vernacular texts.

[40] *Old English Homilies from MS Bodley 343*, ed. by Susan Irvine, EETS o.s. 302 (1993), pp. xix and li-lii; Susan Irvine, 'The compilation and use of manuscripts containing Old English in the twelfth century', in *Rewriting Old English*, pp. 41-61 (pp. 55-60). Also discussed with further references in Frankis, 'Regional context', pp. 58-60.

[41] Elaine M. Treharne, 'The dates and origins', pp. 242-44.

[42] See *DNB* under Corbeil, William of; see also *The Peterborough Chronicle 1070-1154*, ed. by Cecily Clark (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2nd ed. 1970), p. 43 (ll. 1123, 32-35, and note on p. 96): 'an clerc Willelm of Curboil wæs gehaten. he was canonie of an mynstre Cicc hatte [. . .] and se kyng him geaf ðone ærcebiscopric'. Burton, *Monastic and Religious Orders*, pp. 46-48, comments on episcopal encouragement of Augustinian foundations.

[43] Paris and Bos, pp. xxv-xxvii. Ulle Erika Lewes, *The Life in the Forest: the Influence of the Saint Giles Legend on the Courtly Tristan Story* (Chattanooga: Tristania Monographs, 1978), wishes to place *La Vie de Saint Gilles* earlier to make it fit in better with her theory of its widespread continental influence; her theories need not be discussed here, but they seem to be based on shared commonplaces concerning the eremetical life and the romantic forest that need not involve any direct contact between the texts concerned.

[44] See n. 2 above.

[45] Treharne, *St Giles*, pp. 74-78; on p. 130 *Saint Giles* is ascribed more vaguely to 'the second half of the eleventh century or slightly later'.

[46] Treharne, *St Giles*, pp. 62 and 75 and n. 227.

[47] Text quoted from Treharne, *St Giles* p. 147, my translation: Treharne's translation on p. 162 misinterprets this passage.

[48] Clark, *Peterborough Chronicle*, p. liii, and see p. 44 for a sentence with similar lexical and syntactical elements and with an obvious accusative inflection instead of the dative, s.a. 1123, ll. 77-78: *betæhte þa eall Engleland to geamene* [. . .] *þone biscop Roger*, 'he then entrusted all England to bishop Roger to take care of'.

[49] Clark, *Peterborough Chronicle*, pp. 7.17, 12.79, 16.50, 17.72, 18.7, 21.23 and 45.8, 9, 12. Treharne, *St Giles*, p. 162, l. 508, translates *cniht* as 'servant' although her Latin text, p. 206, l. 294, has *militem*: the OE text follows the Latin closely here. The late twelfth-century English insertion in CUL Ii.1.33 discussed above apparently still uses *cniht* in the sense of 'servant', though 'knight' or 'guard' might be possible.

[50] Paris and Bos postulate (p. xxxvi) that the Anglo-Norman author worked from a text like that printed in the *Acta Sanctorum*, but the later study by E. C. Jones, *Saint Gilles, essai*

d'histoire littéraire (Paris: Champion, 1914) establishes a more reliable text, edited in her Appendix A from a range of manuscripts, mainly continental. As the source of the Old English text Treharne prints a Latin *vita* from an English manuscript of the late eleventh century (Appendix 2, pp. 198-206), but it is striking that Treharne's text differs from Jones's only in very minor details. Laurent prints the *Vita Sancti Aegidii* from *Acta Sanctorum* (*Saint Gilles*, pp. 244-71; see p.XVII, note 15); this is very close to both Jones's continental text and Treharne's insular text, making it clear that the Old English and Anglo-Norman texts derive from essentially the same Latin source.

[51] The classic account is by Alfred Jeanroy, *Les origines de la poésie lyrique en France au Moyen Age*, 3rd edition (Paris: Champion, 1925), pp. 61-83, who cites (p. 79) a poem (probably from the thirteenth century), *Gaite de la tor*, with a refrain imitating the sound of the watchman's horn: for the full text with music see Friedrich Gennrich, *Altfranzösische Lieder*, 2 vols (Tübingen: Niemeyer, 1955-6), II, pp. 85-88.

[52] Legge, *Anglo-Norman Literature*, pp. 254-57 (p. 256); her assertion on p. 257, following Bos and Paris, *Saint Gilles*, p. LXXXVII, that the Anglo-Norman poem was a source for Lydgate's *Life of St Giles*, needs some modification: Lydgate names the king, Giles's patron, as *Fluent*, which must ultimately derive, presumably through some unknown intermediary version, from Guillaume's *Flovent*, but there is nothing else in Lydgate's poem to suggest any knowledge of the Anglo-Norman poem: see *The Minor Poems of Lydgate: Religious Poems*, ed. by Henry Noble MacCracken, EETS e.s. 107 (1911), pp. 161-73.

[53] Laurent, p. 47, note 3, and p. 57, note 7, refers to studies on this subject.

[54] *Wace's Roman de Brut, A History of the British, Text and Translation*, by Judith Weiss (Exeter: Exeter University Press, 1999), p. 282; Laurent, *Saint Gilles*, pp. 46-58; *La Vie Seint Edmund le Rei par Denis Piramus*, ed. by Hilding Kjellmann (Göteborg: Kungl. Vetenskaps och Vitterhets Samhälles Handlingar, 1935; reprinted Geneva: Slatkin, 1974), pp. 55 and 58, ll. 1375-84 and 1449-80.

[55] For references to Russia see John Frankis, 'Lawman and the Scandinavian Connection', *Leeds Studies in English*, New Series 31 (2000), 81-113 (pp. 95-97), which does not include the reference in *Saint Gilles*.

[56] *Ælfric's Colloquy*, ed. by G. N. Garmonsway (London: Methuen, 1939), pp. 33-34, ll. 158-61. Chrétien, *Erec*, ed. Roques, ll. 1573-1610 (Enide's robe) and especially ll. 1803-10 (gifts to the vavassor); the account of Erec's robe (ll. 6674-747) has, beside the account of rich fabric, learned elements (a reference to Macrobius and the four subjects of the Quadrivium depicted on the robe) and elements of fantasy (the four *feés* who made the robe).

[57] Paragraph numbers refer to the Latin text in Laurent, *Saint Gilles*, pp. 252-8; for more precise references see the almost identical Latin text in Treharne, *St Giles*, pp.201-2, ll. 110-14, 138-43, and 169-72; the OE text here is close to the Latin.

[58] Quoted from Laurent, *Saint Gilles*, p. 76; the translation is my own.

[59] Corinne J. Saunders, *The Forest of Medieval Romance: Avernus, Broceliande, Arden* (Cambridge: Brewer, 1993): pp. 10-19 refer to the eremetical wilderness in relation to the forest of romance.

[60] Further references to the medieval literary traditions involved may be found in John Frankis, 'Magic and the recluse in Arden: Shakespeare's precursors in the forest', in *Shakespearian Continuities, Essays in Honour of E. A. J. Honigmann*, ed. by John Batchelor, Tom Cain and Claire Lamont (London: Macmillan, 1997), pp. 3-22.

[61] *Philippe de Thaun, Le Bestiaire*, ed. by Emmanuel Walberg (Geneva: Slatkine Reprints, 1970), pp. 53-59, ll. 1415-1612.

[62] *Bestiaire*, p. 44, ll. 1177-79.

[63] *Philippe de Thaon, Comput*, ed. by Ian Short, ANTS, Plain Texts Series 2 (London: Anglo-Norman Text Society, 1984), ll. 1401-08, 1727-32; *Bestiaire* ll. 1109-16. Philippe's lines may derive from Isidor of Seville: see *Isidori Hispalensis Episcopi Etymologiarum sive Originum Libri XX*, ed. by W. M. Lindsay, 2 vols (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1911), I, III. lxxi. 30. Illustrated calendars usually show Sagittarius as human above the waist and a horse below, but the twelfth-century St Albans Psalter, f. 13, has as a biped like a Pan with two horse's legs: see the on-line facsimile published by the University of Aberdeen at http://www.abdn.ac.uk/stalbanspsalter/english/translation/trans002.shtml

[64] *Sancti Eusebii Hieronymi Vita Sancti Pauli primi eremitae*, in *Patrologia Latina* 23, col. 23; a copy of this work was held in the twelfth century at Thorney Abbey, not far from Barnwell: see Richard Gameson, *The Manuscripts of Early Norman England (c. 1066-1130)* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, for the British Academy, 1999), p. 140, no. 754; this passage of Jerome is repeated almost verbatim in Gervase of Tilbury, *Otia Imperialia*, I, 18, ed. and trans. by S. E. Banks and J. W. Binns (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2002), pp. 98-99; the same account is paraphrased, but with important changes, by Walter Map, *De Nugis Curialium*, edited and translated by M. R. James, rev. by C. N. L. Brooke and R. A. B. Mynors (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1983), pp. 162-65 (II. 15), where the *centaurus* is said to be a fallen angel.

[65] In the *Vita Sancti Pauli* St Antony asks why St Paul receives beasts but turns away men: *Qui bestias recipis, hominem cur repellis?* (*PL* 23, col. 25).

[66] *Historia Naturalis* xxxvii. 56: see Pliny, *Natural History*, ed. by D. E. Eicholz, Loeb Classical Library, 10 vols (London: Heinemann, 1962), X, pp. 290-91.

[67] Quoted from Laurent, *Saint Gilles*, p. 122; my translation.

[68] Ernst Robert Curtius, *European Literature and the Latin Middle Ages*, translated from the German by Willard R. Trask (New York: Harper, 1953), pp. 193-202.

[69] See also the Latin text in Treharne, *St Giles*, pp. 198-206, ll. 81-89, 110-18, 138-46, 171-72 and 175-76.

[70] A meal of natural foodstuffs, including cress and clear spring water, is eaten by Perceval when he visits his hermit-uncle: see Chrétien de Troyes, *Le Roman de Perceval ou le Conte du Graal*, ed. by William Roach, Textes Littéraires Français (Geneva: Droz, 1959), p. 191, ll. 6499-504.

[71] Clark, *Liber Memorandorum*, p. 41, cap. 9; John Willis Clark, *The Observances in Use at the Augustinian Priory of S. Giles and S. Andrew at Barnwell, Cambridgeshire* (Cambridge: Macmillan, 1897), p. xii, quotes this passage with a translation. The etymology given for Barnwell is questionable, 'warriors' spring' would probably be better: see Reaney, *Cambridgeshire* (n. 35 above).

[72] Clark, *Liber Memorandorum*, p. 42.

[73] On Augustinian houses see Jane Herbert, 'The transformation of hermitages into Augustinian priories in twelfth-century England', in *Monks, Hermits and the Ascetic Tradition*, ed. by W. J. Sheils, Studies in Church History 22 (Oxford: Blackwell, for the Ecclesiastical History Society, 1985), pp. 131-45, and Burton, *Monastic and Religious Orders*, p. 50; on Benedictine and other houses arising from hermitages see C. J. Holdsworth, 'Christina of Markyate', in *Medieval Women*, ed. by Derek Baker (Oxford: Blackwell, 1978), pp. 185-204 (pp. 187-88).

[74] Laurent, *Saint Gilles*, p. 183, and the discussion in Paris and Bos, pp. XLIV-XLV; I quote from *La Chanson de Roland*, ed. by F. Whitehead (Oxford: Blackwell, 1942), pp. 32 and 50.

[75] See Ian Short, 'The Oxford Manuscript of the *Chanson de Roland*: a palaeographic note', *Romania*, 94 (1973), 221-31 (especially p. 231, n. 1); Parkes, *Scribes, Scripts and Readers*, p. 76 and n. 22. Parkes (pp. 87-88 and n. 52) finds that the *Roland* manuscript most closely resembles a group of manuscripts bearing the signature of a royal clerk who subsequently became Bishop of Worcester; Ker, *Catalogue*, p. 433, associates this same group with the Augustinian Abbey of Cirencester. Whether this has any bearing on the Osney possession of the *Roland* manuscript remains uncertain.

[76] Burton, *Monastic and Religious Orders*, p. 192; Dean, *Anglo-Norman Literature*, no. 593, refers to an Anglo-Norman poem by Simon, an Augustinian canon of Carmarthen; see Burton p. 177 for the alternation of English and Welsh control over this priory that resulted in the variation between writing in Welsh and Anglo-Norman.