

Leeds Studies in English

New Series XLI

2010

Essays in Honour of Oliver Pickering

Edited by

Janet Burton, William Marx, and Veronica O'Mara



Leeds Studies in English

<www.leeds.ac.uk/lse>

School of English

University of Leeds

2010

The Prince's Tale: Narrative Perspective in the *South English Legendary* Life of St Mary Magdalene

Anne B. Thompson

All plain styles, except the very greatest, raise a troublesome problem for the critic. Are they the result of art or of accident?

C. S. Lewis, *The Allegory of Love*¹

Lewis speaks here of the poetry of John Gower but his remarks are relevant for much of the *South English Legendary* (hereafter SEL), a late-thirteenth-century compilation of saints' lives, written in rhyming septenary couplets and surviving in a multiplicity of manuscripts and manuscript traditions. In speaking of the SEL legend of Mary Magdalene, O. S. Pickering has accurately characterized its style as 'noticeably plain, without any expressive variety'.² In returning to this legend, about which I have written in the past, I want first to remind my readers of Pickering's identification of a very different style, also found in the *South English Legendary*, that of the 'outspoken poet', whom he characterizes in the following words:

His personal or 'outspoken' stylistic characteristics, which usually manifest themselves in lively anecdotes (often of contemporary life) or as short interventions in the midst of narrative, include humour, satire, sarcastic deflation of 'bad' characters, identification with victims, questioning, and expressions of wonder.³

This description serves to remind us of the many instances of these qualities and the way they impart vitality and interest to the SEL. It is doubtful that I would have been drawn so strongly to write about the collection were it not for the features identified by Pickering, though my own work did not seek to identify them in relation to a unique poetic voice. Rather, I sought to look at the workings of narrative wherever they seemed worthy of attention and on first becoming familiar with Pickering's work I was inclined to resist the idea that everything about the collection that was artistically noteworthy stemmed from the 'pen' of this 'outspoken poet'. Thus, I commented in my book that, instead of following Pickering in ascribing most of what is appealing and 'original' to the 'outspoken poet': 'I wish to suggest, with regard to

¹ C. S. Lewis, *The Allegory of Love: A Study in Medieval Tradition* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1936), p. 204.

² 'The Outspoken *South English Legendary* Poet', in *Late-Medieval Religious Texts and Their Transmission: Essays in Honour of A. I. Doyle*, ed. by A. J. Minnis (Cambridge: Brewer, 1994), pp. 21–37 (p. 25). A 'slightly refashioned version' (Pickering's words) of this essay appears as 'Outspoken Style in the *South English Legendary* and Robert of Gloucester', in *Rethinking the South English Legendaries*, ed. by Heather Blurton and Jocelyn Wogan-Browne (Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press, 2011), pp. 106–45. The words quoted above and the other two quotations taken from the earlier essay remain unchanged.

³ 'The *South English Legendary*: Teaching or Preaching?' *Poetica*, 45 (1996), 1–14 (p. 8).

differing manuscript traditions, that there are features common to the SEL that lead us to see its “originality” as ubiquitous rather than as uniquely located in one “author” and not another.⁴

Yet Pickering correctly points out that the ‘A’ version of Mary Magdalene employs ‘words and phrases [...] which occur again and again throughout the bulk of the saints’ lives. Unlike the language employed by the [‘outspoken poet’] when his feelings are aroused, they are not special in themselves.’⁵ And I must admit that one misses the wonderfully distinguishing qualities of that language as it is found elsewhere. So I have had to ask myself whether the virtues in the legend are in fact the product of conscious artistry, or just good luck, as Lewis seems to imply.

In order to attempt an answer to that question, I must first sketch the background of the legend. Nearly all medieval versions of the legend of Mary Magdalene conflate her with the Mary who is the sister of Martha and Lazarus in the scriptural account. In the later Middle Ages the alterations move beyond this harmonization of the disparate gospel traditions, with the addition of two entirely new elements: first a new conclusion, influenced by the legend of Mary of Egypt, and second, a Provençal legend which takes this well known saint on a not so well known journey to Marseilles where she engages in missionary activity. Her prayers, as part of this activity, help the local prince and his wife to conceive a child, whereupon the couple undertake a voyage to Rome so that they can learn more about Christianity from St Peter himself. At this point the narrative leaves Mary Magdalene behind in Provence, and follows the pair through a series of lengthy and potentially tragic adventures.⁶

Despite the central position it occupies in Middle English metrical treatments of the life of Mary Magdalene, the Provençal interlude has attracted little notice. In *A Critical Edition of the Legend of Mary Magdalena from Caxton's “Golden Legende” of 1483*, David Mycoff, briefly mentions the other Middle English versions of the legend, but without detailed discussion of its individual components.⁷ In her analysis of medieval treatments of harlot saints, which includes Mary Magdalene, Ruth Mazo Karras does not allude to the episode in any way.⁸ For Sheila Delany, only the episode's beginning, with its affirmation of the saint's role as preacher, is of interest.⁹ The work of Karras and Delany has formed part of a welcome trend with regard to the study of hagiographical texts, for as Jocelyn Wogan-Browne has said, ‘“New historicism” and new thinking about gender [...] offer ways of moving beyond the formal codes and intertextualities of genre to questions of function and relation to social

⁴ Anne B. Thompson, *Everyday Saints and the Art of Narrative in the South English Legendary* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2003), p. 117.

⁵ Pickering, ‘Outspoken Poet’, p. 25. Manfred Görlach, *The Textual Tradition of the South English Legendary*, Leeds Texts and Monographs, n.s. 6 (Leeds, 1974), pp. 6–63, has attempted a reconstruction of the growth of the SEL, assigning the letter ‘Z’ to a hypothetical original collection, and ‘A’ to the first significant revision/expansion. More recently, Pickering has presented a clear and concise summation of the early history of the SEL in ‘Teaching or Preaching’, pp. 1–2. The ‘A’ version of Mary Magdalene is found in *The South English Legendary*, ed. by Charlotte D’Evelyn and Anna J. Mill, EETS o.s. 235 (1956), pp. 302–15.

⁶ Katherine Ludwig Jansen, *The Making of the Magdalen: Preaching and Devotion in the Later Middle Ages* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2000), pp. 18–46, discusses the origins and development of the legend and cult of Mary Magdalene. Jansen further traces the development of the Provençal narrative, which began in 1050 when the abbey church of Vézelay in Provence fabricated a claim to Mary Magdalene's relics.

⁷ (Salzburg: Institut für Anglistik und Amerikanistik, 1985).

⁸ Karras's discussion of Mary Magdalene is found on pp. 120–22 of *Common Women: Prostitution and Secularity in Medieval England* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1996).

⁹ See Sheila Delany, *Impolitic Bodies: Poetry, Saints and Society in Fifteenth-Century England* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1998), pp. 53–54, 89–94.

context.¹⁰ Representations of Mary Magdalene are of particular interest as they reflect and engender medieval attitudes towards women, sexuality, and sin. But our understanding of Mary Magdalene is not appreciably expanded by the Provençal interlude since, with the exception of the preaching activities discussed by Delany, the saint herself is physically absent from the scene of the action.

Nonetheless, as marginal as it may seem to a story *about* Mary Magdalene, the prince's tale, as I shall call it henceforth, occupies a central structural position in her legend, forming a bridge between the opening summary account of gospel events, and the concluding account of the saint's retreat to a reclusive life in the desert. As a long and carefully developed episode contained within the larger frame, it commands our attention in purely narrative terms. D. H. Lawrence once said to trust the tale rather than the teller, by which he meant that statements of authorial intention with regard to meaning must give way to what a narrative appears to mean, considered independently of that intention.¹¹ I propose to skew this recommendation slightly, by trusting the prince of Marseilles, a teller who exists not outside the narrative, but is himself a narrative construct. At a crucial moment in the story, the prince repeats his story to a sympathetic listener; however consciously (or not) this teller has been deployed within the narrative, a close examination of his role elicits interesting new interpretive possibilities.

What does it mean when one of the actors in a narrative is asked to give an account of the tale in which he finds himself? How might his representation affect our own response to what has happened? The homogeneity of much hagiographical tradition has often been noted, with its emphasis on timelessness and eternity, rather than on the joys and griefs of individual experience in a particular moment. But perhaps a character operating within the fictional world of that genre, and not himself a saint, might have a different understanding with regard to that meaning. Is it not possible, moreover, that the prince's memories and the acts of repetition, or retelling, they engender, may in themselves be significant? As Mary Carruthers has written, 'Memory is the matrix of all human temporal perception. This [...] is a medieval commonplace nowhere so eloquently explored as in the final books of Augustine's *Confessions*. *Memoria* makes present that which is no longer so in actuality.'¹² Repetition, moreover, is a way of carrying forward the past into the present, within the temporal framework of the narrative as a whole, a way of reminding us, as Augustine put it, that wherever and whatever past and future may be, 'it is only by being present that they *are*'.¹³ Thus, what is repeated in the moment of the prince's telling, on the one hand serves as an interpretation of that past, and on the other hand takes on added significance by virtue of its participation in the present.

Within the *South English Legendary* collection, there are two completely different and unrelated versions of the legend of Mary Magdalene. The first is found in Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Laud Miscellaneous 108 (c. 1300), the earliest manuscript of the SEL. Odd and interesting as this poem (itself a reworking of a still older stanzaic poem) undoubtedly is, it stands completely outside the central SEL tradition, exhibiting neither the features of the 'plain'

¹⁰ Jocelyn Wogan-Browne, '“Bet ... to ... red on holy seynted lyves ...”: Romance and Hagiography Again', in *Readings in Medieval English Romance*, ed. by Carol M. Meale (Cambridge: Brewer, 1994), pp. 83–97 (p. 85).

¹¹ D. H. Lawrence, 'The Spirit of Place', in *Studies in Classic American Literature* (New York: Viking, 1923), p. 2. Lawrence's exact words are: 'Never trust the artist. Trust the tale.'

¹² Mary J. Carruthers, *The Book of Memory: A Study of Memory in Medieval Culture* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990), p. 192.

¹³ Saint Augustine, *Confessions*, trans. by R. S. Pine-Coffin (London: Penguin, 1961), p. 267.

The Prince's Tale

style, nor those of the 'outspoken poet'.¹⁴ The second and later of the two, which forms the focus of this essay, is found in the majority of SEL manuscripts, all of which belong to the main tradition of the SEL collection, and also to what Pickering has identified as the second stage of SEL composition (Görlach's 'A'), involving a substantive reworking and expansion of an earlier rudimentary collection of short lives. Only in the third stage of expansion (also witnessed in Görlach's 'A' as represented in the D'Evelyn-Mill edition) does the work of Pickering's 'notably creative and interventionist writer' become evident.¹⁵ In the case of Mary Magdalene, as noted above, there is no evidence of a similar revision or expansion by the 'outspoken poet' and the narrative retains its 'plain' qualities throughout.

The *Legenda aurea*, which was composed around 1260 by the Dominican, Jacobus de Voragine, is nowhere mentioned by the SEL as a direct source. Yet the collection was enormously popular and its influence on vernacular English texts began as early as 1280. As Görlach has demonstrated, despite the lack of explicit acknowledgement, there is compelling evidence for the influence of the *Legenda* on the SEL, especially on the July to December portions on the text.¹⁶ With respect to Mary Magdalene (whose feast-day falls on 22 July), the structural similarities alone are enough to suggest its influence. Likewise, the narrative follows Jacobus with regard to the overall proportions of the legend, devoting more attention to Mary's activities in Provence than to any other aspect of her career. I cannot produce factual evidence that the 'originality' of the English reworking of Jacobus is located in the text I discuss here, rather than in some intermediary source, but such differences as do occur are, I believe, more readily seen as properties of the narration itself, than as stemming from a source radically different from Jacobus. In what follows, therefore, I have used Jacobus as a vantage point from which to survey the prince's tale. That the text takes the opportunity significantly to expand on Jacobus's version of the prince's telling, even though the expansion does not alter or add in any way to the 'what' of the events narrated, indicates the need to attend carefully to this textual moment.

Let me now turn back to the prince who, readers will remember, travels to Rome with his wife after the prayers of Mary Magdalene have helped them to conceive a child. Mary Magdalene remains in Marseilles to look after the kingdom, but before the couple embarks she puts the sign of the cross on their shoulders as a safeguard against the devil. During the course of the voyage a storm at sea causes the prince's wife to go into labour prematurely, and though the child is born alive, its mother dies soon after the delivery. Fearful of the bad luck attending such an event, the sailors force the prince to abandon mother and child on a high rock in the middle of the sea, whereupon the prince continues his journey alone. Here is Jacobus's version of what happens next:

Cumque ad Petrum venisset, Petrus ei obvius fuit, qui viso signo crucis in humero suo, qui esset et unde veniret, sciscitatus est. Qui omnia sibi per ordinem narravit, cui Petrus: pax tibi fiat [...] nec moleste feras, si mulier tua dormit, si parvulus cum ea quiescit, potens enim est dominus, cui vult, dona dare, data auferre, ablata restituere, et moerorem tuum

¹⁴ The variant version of Mary Magdalene can be found on pp. 462–80 of *The Early South English Legendary*, ed. by Carl Horstmann, EETS o.s. 87 (1887).

¹⁵ Pickering, 'Teaching or Preaching', p. 2. This identification is based on Pickering's careful assessment of the differing stylistic qualities that can be located even within an individual manuscript, and no one who has read widely in the *South English Legendary* can doubt the fundamental accuracy of this assessment. Pickering demonstrates, for example, that in the case of St Dunstan, a first version of that legend in generic SEL style has been revised and expanded in 'the outspoken poet's liveliest style' (Pickering, 'Outspoken Poet', p. 36).

¹⁶ 'The *Legenda Aurea* and the Early History of the *South English Legendary*', in *Legenda Aurea: Sept siècles de diffusion*, ed. by Brenda Dunn-Lardeau (Montreal: Editions Bellarmin; Paris: Librairie Vrin, 1986), pp. 301–16.

in gaudium commutare.

[When the Pilgrim arrived in Rome, Peter came to meet him and, seeing the sign of the cross on his shoulder, asked him who he was and where he came from. He told Peter all that had happened to him, and Peter responded: 'Peace be with you! [...] Do not take it amiss that your wife sleeps and the infant rests with her. It is in the Lord's power to give gifts to whom he will, to take away what was given, to restore what was taken away, and to turn your grief into joy'.]¹⁷

This, then, is the prince's story as it first appears, a story very much subordinate to the context in which it is embedded. What stands out in Jacobus's narration is not the prince's account, but Peter's recognition of the cross, a moment which completes the Magdalene's earlier action at the time of the couple's departure. The linkage is important in formal terms, fulfilling as it does the logical expectation created when Mary Magdalene made the sign on the prince's shoulder, and also in thematic terms as it joins Christians with one another through the symbol of the cross. In contrast, not only does Jacobus render the prince's account minimal through the use of indirect narration, the events themselves are not re-presented, and the prince expresses no emotion with regard to these non-narrated events which are reduced to the brief phrase: 'omnia sibi per ordinem narravit'.¹⁸ Jacobus passes immediately to Peter's long directly quoted speech of consolation and the story then moves on to tell of the prince's two-year grand tour of Jerusalem and the Holy Land. Taken on its own, this non-representation of the prince's tale seems unexceptionable, a sensible decision in light of the lengthy, complex, and multi-faceted plot of the legend. The telling must be acknowledged, in order to move the action forward, but in Jacobus's view the word 'omnia' is sufficient for that purpose: what need is there to retell a story we already know?

In the SEL version of the legend, we find the following account of the prince's arrival in Rome:

He wend toward Seinte Peter as Marie him sende;
He com and mette him in þe wei as he toward him wende.
Seinte Peter isei þe crois inis ssuldre as hi stode;
He este him sone wat he were, for he þoʒte of gode.
Þis godeman tolde him al þat cas fram gynnynge to þan ende:
Hou Marie Magdalein made him þuder wende,
And hou he hopede habbe a child and hou it was ibore
And hou he hadde, in oure Louerdes wei, moder and child forlore.
(*Mary Magdalene*, ll. 187–94)¹⁹

A full sentence establishes the link backwards to Mary Magdalene's signing of the cross and leads to the first editorial addition. Reading the cross as a sign of the prince's good will, Peter is prompted to ask for his story. The tale itself is first put forward, as in Jacobus, without re-presentation, by means of the words 'fram gynnynge to þan ende'. However, unlike Jacobus's 'omnia per ordinem', this phrase suggests a lengthy narration, one that would take a long time in real time even if that time is not represented in the narration itself. What comes next, while still narrated indirectly, is a re-presentation, whereby the prince himself singles out certain

¹⁷ Jacobus de Voragine, *Legenda Aurea*, ed. by Th. Graesse (Leipzig: Impensis Librariae Arnoldianae, 1850), Chapter 90, pp. 411–12. The translation is taken from *The Golden Legend: Readings on the Saints*, trans. by William Granger Ryan (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1993), pp. 378–79.

¹⁸ *Legenda Aurea*, ed. by Graesse, p. 412.

¹⁹ All quotations from the SEL legend of Mary Magdalene are taken from the D'Evelyn-Mill edition (see note 5).

The Prince's Tale

events. Repeating the word 'hou' four times to build incrementally the rhythms of disaster, the narration relates the prince's desire for a child, how that child was born, and how he had lost mother and child while following God's way. The rhyme words 'ibore' and 'forlore' underscore the centrality of grief and loss with regard to both mother and child.

Though the prince tells Peter that Mary Magdalene had made him undertake this voyage, this is not, strictly speaking, true. Born of a desire to learn more about Christianity, the journey was undertaken voluntarily by the prince. His wife, learning of his plan, had insisted on accompanying him, despite all his attempts to discourage her because of the dangers such a trip would pose for a pregnant woman. Following his wife's death at sea, the prince had offered up a long lament to Mary Magdalene in the course of which he wondered, not altogether charitably, what good her Christianity had done him since it had brought him to such a point of grief and loss. His current re-casting of events for Peter's benefit puts the blame on Mary Magdalene for proposing the trip in the first place, which is probably how it seems to him now that everything has gone so terribly wrong. Perhaps this is an over-reading: this line could simply be the quickest way of providing a rationale for the trip. In any reading, however, this scene plays out very differently from its rendering in *Jacobus*; the effect overall is to impute a greater sense of agency to the prince as well as a greater sense of significance to the events that have transpired and the feelings those events have engendered. As far as the SEL prince is concerned, this story is about his family, whom he has loved and lost. Mary Magdalene is a part of that story, but not the biggest part, and her role is not seen by him at this point in an entirely benevolent light, a reaction which, if not entirely fair to the saint, is understandable in human terms.

Thus, the SEL Mary Magdalene differs from *Jacobus*, not just in its focus on the human and affective dimensions of the story, but also in its determination to allow the participants a share in determining how that story will be told. I believe that the prince's telling also provides the key to the interpretive frame that controls the story as a whole. The importance signalled by his act of remembering and representing and repeating serves to bring past events into the present moment of his narration and to ensure that the image of his wife and child, one dead, the other still alive when last seen, will remain with us as they do with him, even as the narration moves ahead to recount his travels with St Peter. Moreover, the passages that structure a narrative and defer its resolution in this way, what Roland Barthes rather dryly terms a 'dilatatory area' have an emotional as well as a literary function in this context: the truth is indeed both 'long desired and avoided', only here we are not just speaking of our desire to avoid narrative closure.²⁰ The suspense of final meaning suggested by the prince's representation of live child and dead mother as something that forms part of an ongoing present in his memory suggests that the story is not yet finished, and that death may turn out not to be final within this fictional frame. In contrast to the saint's life, where loss and grief in this life are balanced by the calm expectation of eternal bliss, here there is a possibility they may be balanced by joy and reconciliation in this life as well. Thus, the present moment, which allows the prince to dwell upon grief and loss, so that real time and thereby real grief are suggested by the time allotted to representation, further suggests at least a hope for such a complementary moment.

Sure enough, the prince, having set out upon his return voyage, comes to the very same place where he had abandoned wife and babe two years earlier. Once again, the different emphases in each version are telling. *Jacobus* contents himself with the following:

²⁰ Roland Barthes, *S/Z*, trans. by Richard Miller (New York: Hill and Wang, 1974), pp. 75, 62.

[B]iennii spatio jam elapso navem adscendit repatriare curans. Cum igitur navigarent, domino disponente juxta collem, in quo corpus uxoris cum puero positum fuerat, pervenerunt, qui prece et pretio eos ibi ad applicandum induxit.

[[A]fter two years had gone by [the prince] boarded the ship, being eager to get back to his homeland. By God's will, in the course of the voyage they came close to the hilly coast where he had left the body of his wife and his son, and with pleas and money he induced the crew to put him ashore.]²¹

This accidental (or divinely engineered) sighting of the island is replaced in the SEL, with words that make the prince literally responsible for what happens on the return voyage. Here his memory as well as his narration are instrumental, for we hear that:

Pe þridde 3er he nom is leue and gan a3enward drawe;
Euere he bad for is wiues soule and for is 3onge cild is also,
And þat he moste come to þulke stude þat hi were on ido
So þat he spak wiþ þe mariners þat hi ladde him þer ney.
(*Mary Magdalene*, ll. 208–11)

Not only does he continually recall to memory, through prayer, his wife and son, he makes a specific request to revisit the place where he last saw them. Miraculously, the prince finds his little son playing with pebbles by the edge of the sea and his wife, asleep rather than dead, re-awakens to life as he offers up a prayer of thanks to Mary Magdalene. While the saint, as a visionary presence, now re-enters the story, the family reunion remains the primary focus of the narration with, in both cases, a significantly greater emphasis on mutual expressions of joy and tenderness than is found in *Jacobus*. Husband and wife then recount to one another at considerable length what has happened to each of them during the three years of their separation — through the miraculous agency of Mary Magdalene, the wife has shared spiritually in the husband's visit to the Holy Land and can repeat back to him everything that he did and saw with St Peter. Once more, the time taken in narration gives weight to the reader's sense of what the experience has meant.

A final moment of retelling highlights yet again the significance of the prince's tale. Once the couple has arrived safely home in Marseilles, *Jacobus* reports that 'omnia, quae iis acciderant, narraverunt' ('they related all that had happened to them'), which seems bland, to say the least.²² Here the SEL slants the telling in a slightly different way through an expansion which works in part by simple repetition. First the prince speaks of the miracle as actively performed by Mary Magdalene, next as an event which God has sent, and then he re-presents it again as something that has, from their own point of view, simply 'befallen' them. Finally, the importance of a public accounting before 'all that folk' underscores how important it is that the prince be able to tell his own tale:

To hure uet hi fulle adoun and þonkede hure uaste anon
Of þe uaire miracle þat he[o] dude þo hi were fram hure agon
Hi tolde biuore al þat folk þe cas þat God hom sende
And al þat hom biualle was subþe hi fram home wende.
(*Mary Magdalene*, ll. 256–58)

To conclude: in one way there is nothing new about any of this. The increased emotionalism and affective emphasis found in popular religious works like the *South English Legendary* have been well documented by, among others, Klaus Jankovsky and Oliver Pickering, in their

²¹ *Legenda Aurea*, ed. by Graesse, p. 412; *The Golden Legend*, trans. by Ryan, p. 379.

²² *Legenda Aurea*, ed. by Graesse, p. 413; *The Golden Legend*, trans. by Ryan, p. 379.

The Prince's Tale

studies of the collection.²³ But this story, while embedded in a saint's life, is not itself about saints; rather it takes its time to linger on details about domestic life, and the joys and sorrows of being a family. This suggests a privileging of the secular realm, one which confers dignity upon the meaning of human life and the network of human relationships within which that life is embedded. The SEL legend of Mary Magdalene lacks the kind of self-conscious artistry characteristic of Pickering's 'outspoken poet', and would seem clearly to merit the adjective 'plain' with regard to its style. Yet the dignity conferred upon the prince in allowing him, not just to tell, but to control the meaning and direction of his tale, through his memory and representation of it, confers a further emphasis upon the act of story-telling and the role of the story-teller. The prince's act of telling, in other words, helps to ensure that his tale will be present to, indeed will implicate the audience who will hear or read the tale in the future.

It is impossible to say how much the significance I have attributed to the prince's tale formed part of the redactor's intention, and different readers may reach different conclusions with regard to this question. I will, however, allow C. S. Lewis to have the final word here when he suggests that:

The question is perhaps ill put. Not all that is unconscious in art is therefore accidental. If seemingly plain statements rise to poetry, where the subject is imaginary, this shows at least that the writer had his eye on the object; that he was thinking not of himself but of his tale and that he saw this latter clearly and profoundly; and such vision is a poetical, as well as a moral excellence.²⁴

²³ See, for example, Klaus Jankovsky, 'Entertainment, Edification and Popular Education in the *South English Legendary*', *Journal of Popular Culture*, 11 (1977), 706–17; also Jankovsky, 'Personalized Didacticism: The Interplay of Narrator and Subject Matter in the *South English Legendary*', *Texas A & I Univ. Studies*, 10 (1977), 69–77. See also the articles by Pickering cited above ('Outspoken Poet', and 'Teaching or Preaching?').

²⁴ Lewis, *Allegory of Love*, p. 205.