

PERIPHERY AND PURPOSE: THE FIFTEENTH-CENTURY RUBRICATION OF THE *PILGRIMAGE OF HUMAN LIFE*

Stephanie A. Viereck Gibbs Kamath

Commentary is never far from the activity of translation, as both efforts seek to transport meaning from a source into a new context.¹ For European writers of the late Middle Ages, the idea of transporting meaning jointly through the practices of commentary and translation held particular cultural force, as the powerful *translatio imperii* narrative of westward-moving world hegemony underwrote the tremendous energy surrounding the notion of a *translatio studii*, a movement of learning from earlier times and more central places into the vernacular languages of new locations.² In translation, authoritative works such as the Christian scriptures and patristic doctrine, along with classical literature, attracted not only extensive expository commentary but also allegoresis, a form of interpretative commentary that presumes the source signifies at multiple levels and conveys a meaning that exceeds its denotative expression.³ The expectation that a

I am grateful to members of the London Old and Middle English Seminar, who offered feedback on a presentation containing a portion of this work, and to the editors and anonymous reviewers of *Glossator* for their comments and suggestions. Modern English translations provided within this essay are my own.

¹ Maryvonne Boisseau underscores this similarity in the two practices, the way both “supposent un pré-texte” [are predicated upon a prior text], in her introduction to a new volume on the subject, with a predominant focus on modern texts; see “Présentation,” *De la traduction comme commentaire au commentaire de traduction*, ed. Maryvonne Boisseau, Palimpsestes 20 (Paris: Presses Sorbonne Nouvelle, 2007), 11-19, at 11.

² ‘Central’ in this context refers to the region of the Mediterranean, a name literally meaning ‘middle of the earth’, the core of medieval maps. For more extended study of medieval mapping and the importance of geographic narratives of center and periphery to England’s literature, see Kathy Lavezzo, *Angels on the Edge of the World: Geography, Literature, and English Community, 1000-1534* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2006).

³ In the case of pagan mythography, the term *integumentum*, rather than allegoresis, is at times employed for this form of interpretative commentary and its subject, in order to distinguish commentary on texts considered to be fictive at the literal level, rather than true, as in the case of scriptural works. Rita Copeland notes that “allegoresis proposes itself as co-extensive with the text,” as this particular form of commentary aims to expose layers of meaning already present within the text; Martin Irvine describes the process by declaring that “in allegory one can distinguish the level of expression or rhetorical form from the level of content or additional signification . . . the text and the necessary supplement that discloses what the text signifies.” See Rita Copeland, *Rhetoric, Hermeneutics, and Translation in the Middle Ages: Academic Traditions and Vernacular Texts* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), 81, and Martin Irvine, *The Making of Textual Culture: ‘Grammatica’ and Literary Theory 350-1100* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006, rpt. 2004), 248.

translator's task should encompass rendering commentary and allegoresis was well established by the opening of the fifteenth century, and such enriched translation was perceived as support for the transmission of cultural and political authority. Christine de Pizan, for example, declares that Charles V of France merited praise and benefited France since he "fist . . . translater de latin en françois tous les plus notables livres, si comme la Bible en .iiii. manieres, c'est assavoir: le texte, et puis le texte et les gloses ensemble, et puis d'une autre maniere alegorisée" [caused . . . the most notable books to be translated from Latin into French, such as the Bible translated in three manners, which is to say, a translation of the text, then the text and the glosses together, and then allegorized in another manner].⁴ Medieval thinkers, including Christine, assigned considerable value to the vernacular translation of the commentaries and allegoresis accompanying the most notable works of Latinity, and modern scholarship on the translation of Latin literature into European vernaculars during the Middle Ages has traced significant correlation between this practice and claims of cultural authority.⁵ This essay seeks to trace the influence of the theoretical model underpinning the vernacular translations of authoritative Latin works, with its emphasis on rendering commentary and allegoresis, in a case of translation between two vernaculars, when the transportation of meaning transpires between texts far less distant in space, time, and cultural context. Rather than the ancient wisdom of Jerusalem or Greece and its commentaries, the translator who crafted the mid-fifteenth-century English poem *The Pilgrimage of Human Life* chose to render a source already endowed with internal allegoresis and created less than a single century earlier, just across the Channel, in the vernacular of continental France. Nonetheless, the additional notes, or rubrication, found in the surviving manuscripts containing the *Pilgrimage* suggest that the translator's interest in interpretative commentary was the most visible aspect of a translation presented as service to an English earl in the context of the Hundred Years War.

Although scholars recognize the efflorescence of translations from French to English during the late Middle Ages, the connection between the overarching narrative of the *translatio studii* and the practice of intra-vernacular translation remains understudied, particularly in the case of medieval compositions without roots in early Latin or Greek literature.⁶ The *Pilgrimage* presents such a case, as it translates the *Pèlerinage de la vie humaine*

⁴ Christine de Pisan, *Livre des fais et bonnes meurs du sage roy Charles V*, ed. S. Solente (Paris: H. Champion, 1936), II, 43. The spelling 'Pizan' has been adopted in modern scholarship. For discussion of this method of translation as a model for Christine's own use of tripartite composition structure and its direct imitation in England, see G. Parussa, introduction to the *Epistre d'Othéa*, by Christine de Pizan (Geneva: Droz, 1999), 13, and S. A. V. Gibbs [Kamath], "Christine de Pizan's *Epistre d'Othéa* in England: The Manuscript Tradition of Stephen Scrope's Translation," in *Contexts and Continuities: Proceedings of the IVth International Colloquium on Christine de Pizan*, ed. A. J. Kennedy et al. (Glasgow: University of Glasgow Press, 2002), 397-408.

⁵ One seminal consideration of medieval translation in relation to Latinate authority and the vernacular can be found in Copeland, *Rhetoric, Hermeneutics, and Translation in the Middle Ages*.

⁶ Samuel Workman's classic *Fifteenth-Century Translation as an Influence on English Prose* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1940) demonstrates the extensive translation from French sources transpiring in late medieval England, but direct translations from compositions in French typically receive less individual attention than translations of classical or pseudo-classical works relying on French translations as intermediaries. For example, Humphrey of Gloucester's patronage of translations rooted in classical literature has been the subject of a number of worthwhile studies. See Alessandra Petrina, *Cultural Politics in Fifteenth-Century England: The Case of Humphrey, Duke of Gloucester* (Leiden: Brill, 2004) and Daniel Wakelin, *Humanism, Reading, and English Literature*,

[*Pilgrimage of human life*], a French allegory written by the Cistercian monk Guillaume de Digulleville.⁷ Popular across Europe for several hundred years, Digulleville's allegory was recognized as a production of the Middle Ages and never attributed a more authoritative origin, in contrast to other popular late medieval texts, such as the pseudo-Ovidian *De vetula*. The *Pèlerinage* is the first text in a trilogy of allegorical pilgrimage poems, and far from any pretense of ancient origins, the composition date of 1331 is indicated within the poem.⁸ In the 1350s Digulleville expanded the *Pèlerinage* with several thousand more lines, including Latin lyrics, and added an opening prologue that complained the text had circulated before he had completed it.⁹ This later version of the *Pèlerinage* is the source for the English verse translation, commonly attributed to the Benedictine monk John Lydgate, which acknowledges its French source in an additional prologue, surviving in two manuscripts.¹⁰ The additional prologue of the *Pilgrimage* dates the translation to 1426 and identifies its patron as Thomas Monacute, the earl of Salisbury, commending the earl's victorious campaigns against the French. Although the translation renders a medieval vernacular composition rather than an ancient text, the theoretical expectations guiding the translation of notable Latin works seem present in this prologue, which pairs the transfer of meaning in translation with the transfer of political power. The English earl's "comavndement / Thys seyde book in Englysshe for to make" [commandment to make this aforesaid book in English] (133-4) coincides with his assumption of command in France; the date of the translation is introduced with the phrase "My lord that tymē beyng at Parys" (157).¹¹ To what extent, then, does the practice of the translator reflect the emphasis on

1430-1530 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007). Since John Lydgate may be the translator of the English verse *Pilgrimage*, Wakelin's suggestion that John Lydgate may have created Latin scholarly notes for several of his 'humanist' translations for Humphrey is of interest to this study; see Wakelin 39-43.

⁷ The spelling 'Deguileville' is also current in modern scholarship. For a list of manuscripts containing Guillaume de Digulleville's French texts, French adaptations, and English, Dutch, German, and Latin translations, see Guillaume de Digulleville, *The Pilgrimage of Human Life*, trans. and intro. Eugene Clasby (New York: Garland, 1992). A more complete and up-to-date list of manuscripts containing the French texts appears in *Guillaume de Digulleville: Les Pèlerinages allégoriques, Actes du colloque de Cerisy-la-Salle, 5-8 octobre 2006*, eds. Frédéric Duval and Fabienne Pomel (Rennes: Presses Universitaires de Rennes, 2008).

⁸ The subsequent texts of the trilogy are the *Pèlerinage de l'âme* [*Pilgrimage of the soul*], dated to 1355, and the *Pèlerinage de Jesus Christ* [*Pilgrimage of Jesus Christ*], dated to 1358.

⁹ Roughly 7,000 and 8,000 additional lines of verse appear, although the lack of a modern critical edition of Digulleville's recension text prevents an exact count.

¹⁰ The argument concerning authorship can be found in Kathryn Walls, "Did Lydgate Translate the '*Pèlerinage de Vie Humaine*'?" *Notes and Queries* 222 (1977), 103-105 and Richard Firth Green, "Lydgate and Deguileville Once More," *Notes and Queries* 223 (1978), 105-106. Derek Pearsall sums up the current scholarly view: "There has been debate about the attribution including the possibility that Lydgate may have employed help for this huge translation, completed very quickly under pressure of many other commitments, but there can be no real doubt that Lydgate was commissioned to write it and had a major hand in it." See Pearsall, *John Lydgate (1371-1449): A Bio-bibliography*, English Literary Studies Monograph Series, No. 71 (Victoria, BC: University of Victoria, 1997), 27-8. The identification of the translator as John Lydgate is not an essential component of the analysis presented here.

¹¹ All quotations from the English translation refer by line number to John Lydgate (?), *The Pilgrimage of the Life of Man*, eds. F. J. Furnivall and Katharine B. Loeck, 3 vols., Early English Text Society e.s. 77, 83, 92

the addition and display of interpretative commentary found in the translation of ‘the most notable books’, sources that could lay claim to the patristic or antique authority of Latin literature?

Recent studies of the *Pilgrimage* have drawn attention to the particular resonance that the religious themes and artisanal figures of the French poem assume in their new English context without undertaking close study of the translator’s pattern of practice in rendering the entire poem.¹² Such consideration may appear a daunting task, as the English *Pilgrimage* is roughly twice the length of its French source and the translator’s prologue offers no direct description of the translation’s relation to commentary and interpretation that lie beyond the immediate source. The prologue praises the patron and asserts the moral worth of the text but does not explain textual practice in a way comparable to Christine’s enumeration of the manners of biblical translation.¹³ Instead of direct explanatory statements, evidence revealing the importance of interpretative commentary to this translation from one vernacular language to another appears in the periphery of the manuscript page. Short notes placed in the margins or in the blank spaces between sections of text identify not only the dedicatory prologue but four specific textual passages as the translator’s own additions, and these notes and marked passages focus attention on the translator’s ability to enrich the source text with interpretative commentary. To trace the influence exerted by the medieval concept of a grand translation of learning and power from the world’s center to its periphery, then, we need to pay attention to the paratextual matter that surrounds the central text in surviving manuscripts. When we do so, we find that the interlinear notes that purport to distinguish the translator’s prologue from the source also establish a resemblance between the voices of the English translator and French author, taking advantage of the text’s allegorical structure to present translation as another, integral layer in the text’s interpretative process. The marginal notes that isolate particular contributions to the text made by the translator similarly lend emphasis to the passages in which the translator assumes the authority to expand the text with interpretative commentary, emulating the author’s composition process, as opposed to the passages that enlarge the text with comments predicated on the differences between the French and English languages. Finally, the visual features and language of the marginal notes suggest connections between the translation and authoritative texts that lie beyond the immediate French source. These notes have not received much scholarly attention to date, but their presence signifies an interest in transcending the relationship between source text and translation that is still at issue today; indeed, one

(London: Kegan Paul, et al., 1899, 1901, 1904). Rubrics and notes are not assigned line numbers in this edition; where necessary, I provide the closest possible line number.

¹² Michael Camille, for example, claims Lydgate’s translation “sought to emphasize orthodox attitudes” through imagery; see “The Iconoclast’s Desire: Deguileville’s Idolatry in France and England,” in *Images, Idolatry, and Iconoclasm in Late Medieval England: Textuality and the Visual Image*, ed. Jeremy Dimmick et al. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), 151–71, at 167. Lisa Cooper examines the significance of how artisanal figures were translated in “‘Markys . . . off the Workman’: Heresy, Hagiography, and the Heavens in *The Pilgrimage of the Life of Man*,” in *Lydgate Matters: Poetry and Material Culture in the Fifteenth Century*, ed. Lisa H. Cooper and Andrea Denny-Brown (Palgrave Macmillan, 2007), 89–112.

¹³ A greater amount of overt theorization concerns the transmission of Greek or Latin texts into English, although there are late medieval discussions of translation that describe or allude to translation from French. A collection of texts relevant to theorizing vernacular composition and translation can be found in *The Idea of the Vernacular: An Anthology of Middle English Literary Theory, 1280–1520*, ed. Jocelyn Wogan-Browne et al. (University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1999).

recent analysis of the role played by translator's notes in modern practice links the implications of the apparatus to the medieval tradition of combining the practices of the commentary, interpretation, and translation.¹⁴ Regardless of the provenance of the immediate source, the notes calling attention to the translator's ability to serve as a hermeneutic guide rather than simply a provider of interlinguistic equivalence allow this late medieval intra-vernacular translation to claim the power and authority of the wider *translatio studii* movement.

Scholars have long recognized the importance of interlinear and marginal glosses, notes, and rubrication to the way medieval readers navigated texts. The thirteenth century saw an explosion of artwork and decoration in marginal spaces, which could serve as mnemonics, helping readers to remember or to locate quickly particular textual passages within a manuscript or, at times, serve alternative functions; Michael Camille's study of the development argues that "things written or drawn in the margins add an extra dimension, a supplement, that is able to gloss, parody, modernize and problematize the text's authority while never totally undermining it."¹⁵ Malcolm Parkes also identifies the thirteenth century as a key turning point in textual presentation, noting how manuscripts across Western Europe showcase far more regular and complex use of features such as headings, running titles, subdivisions, lists of contents, and notes. Although such "compilation was not new . . . what was new was the amount of thought and industry that was put into it, and the refinement that this thought and industry produced."¹⁶ Parkes identifies this development as reflecting a transition from meditative reading practices to more discontinuous styles of reading, categorizing texts more precisely and drawing upon sections for reference purposes; Parkes observes, however, that the apparatus thus developing in academic scholastic commentaries on the Bible soon spread to the manuscript design employed for more popular vernacular compositions. Studies examining the paratextual matter in late medieval English manuscripts are most frequently concerned with works composed in English, particularly by canonical authors such as Geoffrey Chaucer and John Gower.¹⁷ In the case of translations, it is frequently assumed, often rightly

¹⁴ Pascal Sardin's approach to the question "que *fait* la note du traducteur au texte en traduction?" [what effect does the note of the translator have upon the text in translation?] insists that the ability of notes to represent the translator's voice and practice leads us back "à l'époque médiévale notamment, lorsque les traducteurs étaient aussi des exégètes et que leurs remarques et ajouts se mêlaient au texte des auteurs qu'ils traduisaient" [notably to the medieval epoch, when translators were also exegetes and their remarks and additions mingled with the texts of the authors they translated]; see "De la note du traducteur comme commentaire: entre texte paratexte et prétexte," in *De la traduction comme commentaire*, ed. Boisseau, 121-135, at 123 and 130.

¹⁵ Michael Camille, *Image on the Edge: the Margins of Medieval Art* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1992), 10.

¹⁶ M. B. Parkes, "The Influence of the Concepts of *Ordinatio* and *Compliatio* on the Development of the Book," in *Scribes, Scripts, and Readers: Studies in the Communication, Presentation and Dissemination of Medieval Texts* (London: Hambledon Press, 1991), 35-70, at 58.

¹⁷ Christopher Baswell studies the effects of the Latin references accompanying Chaucer's Wife of Bath's Prologue and Tale, one of the most heavily glossed tales in manuscripts of *The Canterbury Tales*; see "Talking Back to the Text: Marginal Voices in Medieval Secular Literature," in *The Uses of Manuscripts in Literary Studies: Essays in Memory of Judson Boyce Allen*, eds. Charlotte Morse, Penelope Reed Doob, and Marjorie Curry Woods (Kalamazoo: Medieval Institute, 1992), 121-60; Steven Partridge offers more precise description of the entirety

so, that the note systems accompanying the text borrow from source manuscripts. In the case of the *Pilgrimage*, however, the notes surrounding the translation, both interspersed with text and on edges of page, direct attention to the translator's own efforts, serving as a guide to what the translation aims to accomplish.

A quick consideration of the three interlinear rubrics, notes written in red, dividing the two prologues and the opening of the text in the two most complete surviving manuscripts demonstrates how these external markings differentiate what the translator adds to the text yet invite recognition of a resemblance between the translator and the author as providers of allegoresis.¹⁸ The last line of the English translator's prologue employs deictic language asking the reader to observe the moment as the start of the translation: "Wyth yowre gracē thus I wyll be-gynne" [with your grace thus I will begin] (184). But what immediately follows is not the translation proper but the two rubrics, "Here endyth the prologue off the translatur" and "Her be-gynneth the prologue of the auctour." The beginning of the translator's task is thus the assumption of the author's voice. The author's voice does not continue without interruption, however; another rubric appears in the text, marking the close of the authorial prologue translated from Digulleville's recension. This rubric differentiates the voice of the author from the voice of the central character who narrates the allegorical poem, labeled in these manuscripts as 'the pilgrim'. The translator is thus not the only figure presented as offering introductory commentary external to the narrative. The voice of the author is also set apart from the voice of the narrating character who records the allegory, since the rubric "Here begynneth the pilgrime" appears immediately after the authorial prologue ends (303). The rubrics mark boundaries between the voices of the translator, author, and pilgrim, but suggest that the first-person voice of the text is doubly encased: both translator and author can introduce and comment upon the narrating voice delimited by the frame of the allegory's dream vision.¹⁹ The desire to create such an analogy may even have prompted the employment of rubrics differentiating the voice of the author from the pilgrim character at the end of the prologue. The differentiating rubric at this point appears to be the innovation of the English translator or scribe: I have examined all but one of the extant

of the *Canterbury* glosses, arguing that Chaucer himself was responsible for a certain set, in *The Manuscript Glosses to the Canterbury Tales* (Woodbridge: Boydell and Brewer, 2002). Ardis Butterfield has studied the implications of the headings and divisions appearing in manuscripts of Chaucer's *Troilus* as well as the authorial claims advanced by the apparatus of John Gower's *Confessio Amantis*; see "Articulating the Author: Gower and the French Vernacular Codex," *Yearbook of English Studies* 33 (2003): 80-96, and "Mise-en-page in the *Troilus* Manuscripts: Chaucer and French Manuscript Culture," *Huntington Library Quarterly* 58.1 (1996): 49-80.

¹⁸ The manuscripts are London, British Library, Cotton MS Vitellius C.xiii and London, British Library, Stowe MS 952. Sizable portions of the translation text also appear in the fragmentary London, British Library, Cotton MS Tiberius A.vii. A dedicatory drawing, without text, appears in London, British Library, Harley MS 4826.

¹⁹ Such simultaneous indication of difference and resemblance is a notable feature of textual commentary *writ large* as well as the specific course of medieval translation. Christina Shuttleworth Kraus, for example, notes how commentary can both "serve" and "direct our attention away from the text"; see "Reading Commentaries / Commentaries as Reading," in *The Classical Commentary*, eds. Roy K. Gibson and Christina Shuttleworth Kraus (Leiden: Brill, 2002), 1-28, at 1. Rita Copeland similarly observes that "vernacular exegetical translation forges new links with the Latin cultures of antiquity and the Middle Ages by replicating them at the same time that it registers a profound difference with them"; see Copeland, *Rhetoric, Hermeneutics, and Translation in the Middle Ages*, 106.

French recension manuscripts that have been identified to date, and none features a rubric that distinguishes between an ‘authorial’ voice and that of the internal ‘pilgrim’ at this key point in the text.²⁰

The differentiating rubrics at the text’s beginning establish the first-person voice narrating the English text as a collaborative voice, mediated for the reader by the commentary of both the author and the translator. The text of the translator’s prologue heightens this effect by praising the author for gathering the wisdom of other sources into his allegory, declaring the *Pelerinage* is worth translating into English because “the auctour, wych that dyde hyt ffyrst compyle, / So vertuously spent ther-on hys whyle” [the author who first compiled it spent his time on it very effectively] (139-140). The textual activity of the author as well as the translator is envisioned as compilation, folding together multiple textual voices, with Digulleville being distinguished only as the “ffyrst” to undertake the labor. The opening rubrics and prologues, setting out this role for the translator, work in concert with the series of Latin notes appearing in the margins of surviving manuscripts. The marginal notes connect the English text with quoted (and often cited) scriptural, patristic, and classical writings, identifying the exterior sources the French author may have employed in compiling the allegory. But the marginal notes also specifically remind readers of the role of the translator in compiling the voice of the text: the marginal Latin note, ‘verba translatoris,’ identifies four passages as moments when the first-person text expresses ‘the words of the translator.’

Surviving manuscript copies suggest that the marginal Latin commentary was an integral part of the translation in its circulation, and probably in its composition. The schema of Latin commentary appears in all three extant manuscripts of the translation, now housed in the British Library. Two of the manuscripts use the phrase ‘verba translatoris’ to mark the same four passages of text; the third lacks large segments of text, including the passages marked with this phrase in the other manuscripts.²¹ The earlier manuscript to employ this phrase may have been consulted in the copying of the other manuscript, although they are not exact copies in other senses.²² The small number of manuscripts and unfortunate lacunae thus do not allow a stronger claim for the relation of the Latin commentary to the text than the statement that the commentary circulated with the

²⁰ There are nine French manuscripts of the recension text known to be extant: Cherbourg, Bibliothèque Municipale, MS 42; Paris, Bibliothèque de l’Arsenal, MS 3646; Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, MSS F. Fr. 377, F. Fr. 825, F. Fr. 829, F. Fr. 1138 (missing start of text), F. Fr. 12466; Paris, Institut de France, MS 9 (fragmentary, missing start of text); St. Petersburg, Российская национальная библиотека, F.p.XIV.11. With the exception of the St. Petersburg MS, I have consulted all of the surviving manuscripts. None contain a rubric dividing between the voices of author and character after the newly added prologue, even in the manuscripts which contain rubrics indicating speaker voice elsewhere or which draw attention to the beginning of the dream in another fashion, with a decorated capital letter or an illumination. Nor is such a rubric found in the two early printed editions of the French text created in the sixteenth century.

²¹ The manuscripts containing the ‘verba translatoris’ rubric are London, British Library, Cotton MS Vitellius C.xiii and London, British Library, Stowe MS 952. The fragmentary London, British Library, Cotton MS Tiberius A.vii is missing these sections of text.

²² London, British Library, Cotton MS Vitellius C.xiii is the earlier manuscript, dated to the mid-fifteenth century; London, British Library, Stowe MS 952 is dated to the late fifteenth or early sixteenth century. For studies of owner and scribe John Stowe’s influence in textual transmission, see *John Stowe (1525-1605) and the Making of the English Past*, eds. Ian Gadd and Alexandra Gillespie (London: The British Library Publishing Division, 2004).

three relatively contemporary copies that survived. The likelihood that this schema was original to the translation appears stronger, however, when considered in conjunction with the comparable manuscript tradition of *Reson and Sensuallyte*, another fifteenth-century English verse translation of a French allegorical text often attributed to John Lydgate. Although Lydgate's authorship of the *Pilgrimage*, as well as *Reson and Sensuallyte*, has been disputed, scholars have agreed that the same translator who wrote the *Pilgrimage* created *Reson and Sensuallyte*, an unfinished English verse translation of the fourteenth-century French allegory *Les Echees Amoureux*. Latin notes appear in the margins beside the text of *Reson and Sensuallyte* and also mark certain passages as the translator's (e.g., 'Ista sunt verba translatoris'). Scholarship on this text has generally concurred with the text's early editor, Ernst Sieper, who noted more than a century ago that the Latin rubrics, including the 'verba translatoris' phrases, were likely to be the translator's own, arguing that "if Lydgate did not write the marginal notes himself, they originate from a man who knew perfectly all the conditions of his work."²³

Setting aside the question of the translator's biographical identity, I investigate a different form of attributed identity by considering closely the moments at which the 'verba translatoris' notes appear in the *Pilgrimage*. As noted above, the *Pilgrimage* is almost twice the length of its French source; of all the additional material in the new verse rendering, why did the four passages marked by these notes require such a visual sign of their production by the translator? Examining the passages identified as the translator's words can aid us in determining what medieval readers saw as the role of the English translator when rendering a text written in another vernacular. Analysis reveals that the passages marked as the 'verba translatoris' do not call attention to the French nature of the source or to the French to English linguistic transposition, even though such passages can be found within the translation. For example, the personification of 'Rude Entendement' [Poor Understanding], described in the original text as carrying "vng baston de corneillier" [a club of dogwood] (fol. 47r), has the description of his "gret staff" extended in the English translation, which offers a linguistic gloss, explaining the staff was "yhewe out off A tre / Callyd in ffrench A cornowler" [hewn from a tree called in French a *cornowler*] (10336, 10338-9).²⁴ Such versified explanations of retained French vocabulary draw attention to the work's French source and tendencies towards lexicon expansion; these passages sustain the interest in France displayed in the setting described in the translator's prologue. But no passage of this kind is rubricated as the words of the translator.

The passages that Latin rubrics render distinct, as the translator's alone, do not emphasize the multiple vernaculars of the text, but rather mark the shift between the literal and hermeneutic levels of the allegory, adding to the interpretative commentary or allegoresis present in the original text. The emphasis on what is new within the English translation falls upon such allegoresis rather than the transition between French and English. Indeed, certain of these passages attempt to identify the translation as closely with Latin texts as with the French source, emphasizing direct contact with authoritative ancient wisdom. The choice of Latin as the

²³ Ernst Sieper, Introduction to *Reson and Sensuallyte*, by John Lydgate (?), 2 vols., Early English Text Society e.s. 84, 89 (London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner & Co., 1901, 1903), I.4.

²⁴ For ease of reference, this paper refers by folio number to one of the earliest printed editions, *Le Romant des trois Pelerinaiges*, printed circa 1510-1511 or 1514-1518 in Paris by Barthole Rembolt and Jean Petit. For a discussion of the relative dating of this edition and the 1511 *Pelerinage de l'homme* printed in Paris by Anthoine Vérard, see Edmond Faral, "Guillaume de Digulleville, Jean Galloppes et Pierre Virgin," in *Études romanes dédiées à Mario Roques* (Paris: Droz, 1946), 96-7, note 2. I have compared the early printed edition for sense agreement with multiple medieval manuscripts of the recension.

language for these notes itself contributes to this effect. The insistence on the translator's ability to offer interpretative commentary is most pronounced in the first and final passages noted as the translator's, whereas the two central marked passages forge a stronger connection between the translator and external authorities. Although the first additional passage marked by a Latin marginal note is far longer than the last, which is a mere couplet in length, both issue similar invitations to readers to engage in textual interpretation, asking those "who lyst lere" [who desire to learn] (457) and those "who espye kan" [who can perceive] (4057) for their close attention. Each also focuses on a particular figurative image in the text, and considering each in turn reveals how the words specially identified as belonging to the translator present commentary that aids complex interpretation of the source's meaning.

Near the beginning of the French source, the narrator views for the first time a beautiful city, figuring the heavenly Jerusalem, his ultimate goal as a pilgrim. The first city gate he sees has a portcullis stained with blood, indicating that those who enter the city through this gate do so by suffering violence. After noting that he saw none pass that way while he was watching, the narrator describes the guardian of the gate. The gate, as depicted in French text, can thus be interpreted as representing the martyrdom suffered by early Christians. But the English translation inserts between the narrator's vision of the bloodstained gate and his description of its guardian a figurative interpretation of the violence needed to enter heaven, replacing the observation of the source text's narrator that he saw none enter this gate. In a passage marginally marked as the 'verba translatoris', the narrator explains that "who that loke a-ryht" [those who examine rightly] (450) can see "that gret vyolence & myght" [that great violence and power] (449) is the strength a mortal requires to break into heaven. Explanation of this declaration expands into a microcosm of the entire text, a mini-allegory of personifications on pilgrimage: the text declares "thys is to seyne, who lyst lere" [to those who wish to learn, this means] (457) only virtue can "makyth a man conquere" [make a man conquer], and Virtue (suddenly personified) must have her mistress, Reason, as her guide "to lede hyr also and to dresse / in hyr pylgrymage" [to lead her and to prepare her for her pilgrimage] (464-5) to attain heaven. Rather than representing the martyrdom of the past, by which few now enter heaven, the gate described in the English translation represents the entire text's message, recapitulating in miniature the poem's pilgrimage structure as well as the personifications of Reason and Moral Virtue, who appear as characters in later passages within the poem.²⁵ The words of the translator, when thus visually separated from voices of the author and narrating character, still resemble the work of Digulleville, presenting elaborations on the allegory and commentary on its meaning as well as inviting readers to interpret. The importance of the translator as an interpretative guide is underscored by the placement of Latin rubric indicating the translator's efforts beside the invocation of readers "who lyst lere" [who wish to learn] the text's meaning.

The same role is granted to the translator when the text is describing the personification of Penitence, the last passage to contain words specially identified as the translator's own. In the French text, immediately after Penitence names herself, she declares that she is the guardian of a secret isle and describes her function of

²⁵ One part of the addition made by the English translator to this passage, the incorporation of a Latin phrase from the gospel of Matthew into the verse, finds a parallel in the 1511 printed edition of the French text, which places the same Latin quotation in the textual margin beside the passage (fol. 2v). But nothing like the personification allegory added to the English translation appears in the French printed edition. Likewise, the English translation features none of the six other marginal notes that appear beside this passage in the French printed edition (referring the reader to passages in Genesis, Acts, Hebrews, and the book of Wisdom).

cleansing all filth from her domain, much later identified as the house of which Grace Dieu (the Grace of God) is mistress—that is to say, the soul. The passage added to the English text at this point and marked as the translator’s words emphasizes the need for interpretation and for supplying interpreting readers with guiding commentary, as in the earlier instance. Penitence’s declaration of her guardianship, a single line in the French, is extended in the translation by a phrase inviting close examination of this figure, specifically invoking those who wish to see her true role. In an aside the nineteenth-century editors of the text set apart in parentheses, the English ‘Dame Penance’ says that she is “the cheff wardeyn (who lyst se), / Off thylkë ylë most secre” [the chief warden of that most secret isle (whoever desires to see)] (4055-6). Immediately thereafter, in the additional couplet marked as the translator’s words, she offers an aside very similar to the one appearing in the couplet above: “The wych (who espyë kan,) / Ys yhyd *wit*/Inne a man” [which is hidden within a man (whoever wishes to perceive)] (4057-8). The marginal rubric ‘verba translatoris’ envisions the translator not as a source for explanations of unfamiliar French phrases, but rather as an exegetical guide who directs readers towards the allegorical meaning of the secret island, the model of the human soul, or of the salvific pilgrimage, the journey of human life. The differing lengths of the additional passages related to the island of Penitence and to the heavenly gate, both marked as ‘verba translatoris,’ makes clear that they have not been distinguished as the words of the translator because they are longer interpolations than, say, the added definitions of retained French vocabulary, phrases, or customs. Instead, what these passages have in common is their role in extending attention to the hermeneutic system of the text.

This depiction of the translator as the interpreter and expander of the source text’s allegory also underlies the other passages marginally marked as the translator’s words. Although these two passages appear to be more directly connected to literary and linguistic explication, their focus is not upon French but rather Latin words and works, specifically those important to the text’s rhetoric of authority and allegorical signification. For example, the English translator expands a reference to the Aristotelian treatise on sophistic rhetorical fallacies, designed to explain how mercy is concealed within the symbols of the earthly Church’s power to punish, by naming the author and elaborating upon his authority. At this point in the French allegory, the narrator describes a dialogue between the personification Reason and a character with the attributes of both Moses and the Pope, representing the earthly church. The character, noting he has horns and a sharp staff, has asked Reason whether this means he should be very fierce. Reason gives an extended answer in the form of a sermon about wearing horns on the outside but having mercy inside, an answer that includes a couplet declaring that a fallacy of sophistic rhetoric can be taken as a true model in this case: “Et fallace delenche faire / Peuz bien ycy sans toy meffaire” [The fallacy of *elenchus* can be well enacted here, without you acting wrongly] (fol. 8r).²⁶ The English translator inserts almost thirty lines into Reason’s response after this reference, explaining the meaning of the sophistic fallacies described by Aristotle (such as the discord in inner meaning and external appearance) and attributing to Aristotle a concrete example of deceptive appearance (a

²⁶ This reference at the moment of disclosing the allegorical meaning of the horns of wisdom that are the traditional attributes of the patriarch Moses may be a subtle invocation of the classic ‘horned man’ dilemma of the sophistic rhetoric developed by the Stoics: “If you never lost something, you have it still; but you never lost horns, *ergo* you have horns,” as expressed in Diogenes Laertius, *Lives of Eminent Philosophers*, trans. R. D. Hicks, 2 vols., Loeb Classical Library Nos. 184, 185 (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1938), II 7.187. Alternatively, the couplet may simply refer to the general idea that making things seem to be what they are not is a rhetorical ploy of the Sophists.

bull's gall can make a mark that looks like gold).²⁷ In the earlier extant manuscript containing the 'verba translatoris' note (London, British Library, Cotton MS Vitellius C.xiii), the passage is thrice marked with paraphs in addition to the Latin marginal notes, and at each point, these markings pick out an invitation to interpretation: the first picks out lines declaring that these "wordēs fewe" [few words] are "an exauple ful notable / To folk that be not rekkeles" [a noteworthy example to people who pay attention to advice], the second draws attention to the claim that the example can be understood by "who that lokē wel" [whoever considers well] (1691), and the third gives emphasis to the final reminder that this is an example to "han in mynde" [keep in mind] (1696).

That this passage is not a simple expansion of a brief intertextual allusion in the source but rather a development of the text's allegory and a newly urgent demand for interpretation becomes even more apparent in light of the narrative that follows Reason's sermon in the Digulleville's French text. After the French allegory recounts Reason's sermon and the church ordination process, it describes the administration of the Eucharist as a miraculous dinner. The personified Grace of God responds to the pilgrim narrator's questions on the subject by recounting a story of how Reason and Nature send their disciple Aristotle to debate at length with Wisdom concerning the nature of this marvelous feast. Like the passage marked as the translator's words that presented the personifications of Reason and Virtue prior to their first appearance as characters in the source allegory, the passage discussed here similarly foreshadows the appearance of a character encountered in a later passage of the French allegory, developing the exemplary role of Aristotle as an authority who is nonetheless subject to divine will.

Specially marked additional commentary on the part of the English translator also introduces a far more contemporary Latin authority into Digulleville's poem. The English translator inserts a reference to John of Genoa's thirteenth-century *Catholicon*, one of the earliest Latin-Greek dictionaries, into a passage in the French allegory that employs linguistic definition and stories of etymological derivation in the service of the allegory. Reason, continuing her sermon to the church official, explains the meaning of the sword that the Grace of God has given him in order to defend the heavenly city. She does so by noting that a "glaive" (sword) is so called because it divides the "gueulle" (throat), signifying that judges should truly divide by the throat, giving judgment according to the oral testimony they hear and not for other reasons such as bribes.²⁸ This passage presents a seemingly straightforward dilemma for an English translator, and one would expect the translation to retain the French terms here and explain their meaning, as is done in other passages, so that the

²⁷ It may be worth noting that the question of what exactly 'elenchus' means, especially in relation to Socrates, is still at issue in modern philosophical scholarship and the subject of extensive commentary in English. See Gary Alan Scott, introduction to *Does Socrates Have a Method?: Rethinking the Elenchus in Plato's Dialogues and Beyond*, ed. Gary Alan Scott (University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2002), 1-16, esp. 4-5.

²⁸ "Glaive comme on trouue en escript / Gueulle diuisant si est dit" (fol. 9r). In contrast to the earlier printed edition, the 1511 printed edition of the French text features a citation of the *Catholicon*, placing the Latin note "Gladius dicitur guladius quia gula(m) diuidit. Ut ioha(n)nes iauue(n)sis inquit" in the left margin of the page beside this passage (fol. 10v). But five other marginal notes appear beside this column of text alone on the page, referring the reader to such sources as the Psalms, Tobias, and Acts, and these references are not incorporated into the English translation. If the marginal notes of the later printed edition had an early source that was known to the English translator, the choices made in translation are thus still distinctive.

name of the instrument and its etymology can continue to act as a sign of the ideal administration of justice represented in the French allegory. Rather than simply explaining the terms of the French text, however, the translator inserts into Reason's speech a citation of the *Catholicon*.²⁹ The citation allows the translator to provide the Latin words for sword and throat as the basis for interpretation, in place of the words of the French source. The citation concludes with the words "ffor throte yn Ynglyssh (thys the ffyn) / Ys callyd Gula in Latyn, / Wher-off Glayvë took hys name" [For (this is the point) 'throat' in English is called 'gula' in Latin, from which 'glaive' takes its name] (2459-61). These lines put English first in the narrative order of the terms and present the French term of Digulleville's text as a secondary derivation. Following this emphasis on the Latin underlying the French, the translator reshapes Reason's interpretation of the sword's meaning of throat as signifying the judge's need to rely on spoken witness. The English verse translation instead emphasizes the parts into which the throat is divided when cut, since the judge's powers of interpretation to "discerne" and to "seke and enqueryn" become important as a means to understand the "outher part" (2468-71). This passage, specially marked as the translator's words, thus differs from the many unmarked instances in which the translator chooses to retain and to define some of vocabulary found in the French source. This additional passage, like the three considered above, gives greater emphasis to the interpretive system necessary to find understanding—seeking, looking, enquiring, slicing apart layers of meaning—and associates the translator's voice with this reading process. Like the new interpretation of the gate dividing heaven from earth, the new etymological source allows the translator to claim greater authority by expanding and altering the source's existing allegoresis.

Moreover, the schema of Latin commentary that marks these passages as the words of the translator also visually allies the translator with the other Latin authorities cited in the text's margin (and, in this instance, also within the text). The resemblance is particularly strong in the earlier extant manuscript containing the 'verba translatoris' rubric (London, British Library, Cotton MS Vitellius C.xiii). At moments when there is an intertextual allusion in the text for which the Latin source text and author are given in the accompanying commentary, the scribe often writes the Latin author's name to the right of the Latin quotation; a curving bracket between the name and citation and a red flourish on the first letter of the author's name draw more attention to these instances of naming. This presentation looks remarkably similar to the visual relation of the text and the phrase 'verba translatoris', which occurs four times in this manuscript, each time with a curving bracket linking it to the text and a red flourish at its start. The authority of the translator in explicating the

²⁹ On the complex manuscript history of John of Genoa's dictionary, see Gerhardt Powitz, "Le *Catholicon*—esquisse de son histoire" in *Les manuscrits des lexiques et glossaires de l'antiquité tardive à la fin du moyen âge*, ed. Jacqueline Hamesse, Textes et études du Moyen Âge 4 (Louvain-la-Neuve: Fédération internationale des instituts d'études médiévales, 1996), 299-336. The nature of the citation draws attention to the (relatively) contemporary nature of the source, beginning "By record off Ianuence / (Thys was nat ful yere agon) / In hys book *Catholicon*" (2450-2452). The currency of the *Catholicon* as a source in England is also witnessed by the adoption of the same title, in a colophon dated to 1483, for an English to Latin word list, which includes 'glaudia' under the header of 'swerde' and 'gula' under 'throte'. See *Catholicon Anglicum*, ed. Sidney Herrtage, Early English Texts Society 75 (London: Trüber and co., 1881), ix, 373, 386. In this context, it seems interesting that *Catholicon* defines *interpretatio* in a fashion that allies translation and exegesis, defining the role of the interpreter as interlinguistic translation but also as the expounding of sacred mysteries; see Copeland, *Rhetoric, Hermeneutics, and Translation in the Middle Ages*, 90.

deeper senses of the text is thus bolstered visually, placed on a par with, for example, St. Chrysostom, as a source revealing the inner sense of these moments.³⁰

Like the replacement of French terms with Latin terms in a passage marked as the translator's words, the marginal addition of Latin citations along the sides of the English translation serves to depict the French allegory's author, Digulleville, as a translator and complier of Latin sources. The manner in which manuscripts of the English translation incorporate Latin, even in passages not marked as the translator's words, is not a simple equivalent of any of the other adaptations of Digulleville's verse that made use of the Latin language. Digulleville's French allegory perhaps most closely resembles a compilation from Latinate authoritative texts in a manuscript of Digulleville's second pilgrimage text, *Le Pèlerinage de l'âme*. This manuscript contains Latin glosses in the margins beside the verse text, and it could have been prepared for the great French patron of translation, Charles V, according to Michael Camille's early study. Camille suggests that glosses may have been planned for all three of Digulleville's texts, although no manuscript containing a glossed trilogy is now extant.³¹ Another notable instance of French to Latin movement is the translation of the second pilgrimage text entirely into Latin for the English regent, the Duke of Bedford, in the 1420s; an independent Latin translation of the entire trilogy does survive, although the earliest witness is a manuscript dating from 1504.³² Early print editions of the French text, also dating to the sixteenth century, apply Latin glosses to the *Pèlerinage de la vie humaine*, in both its initial form and its recension. These glosses sometimes overlap with the commentary found in the English translation manuscripts, although the commentary differs enough to be clearly distinct and the print editions of the recension in French, although they may reflect lost manuscripts, were produced a good half century later than the English translation. While the question of influence remains uncertain, the overall pattern of the English translation manuscripts is distinctive. At times deploying marginal Latin glosses separate from the body of the text and at times replacing the French terms of text with Latin equivalents, this translation demonstrates a particular sensitivity to new English passages of hermeneutic guidance and commentary.

Indeed, the English translation replaces the French vocabulary of the source with Latin terms in the passages most concentrated upon defining levels of understanding. This technique makes the French text draw

³⁰ The similarity can be seen clearly on the facing folios 8v and 9r, from which this example is drawn.

³¹ Paris, BnF, MS F. fr. 1648. See Michael Camille, "The Illustrated Manuscripts of Guillaume de Degulleville's 'Pèlerinages', 1330-1426" (Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Cambridge, 1985), 66-77.

³² The Latin translation of the *Ame* survives in London, Lambeth Palace Library, MS 326 (formerly housed in the Sion Abbey collection). Jenny Stratford argues that this manuscript was not the presentation copy in "The manuscripts of John, Duke of Bedford: Library and Chapel," in *England in the Fifteenth Century: Proceedings of the 1986 Harlaxton Symposium*, ed. Daniel Williams (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 1987), 329-350, and Frédéric Duval draws attention to the sophistication of Digulleville's own Latin compositions in contrast to the rather simple Latin translation of the *Ame* in "Deux prières latines de Guillaume de Digulleville à saint Michel et à son ange gardien," in *Guillaume de Digulleville: Les Pèlerinages allégoriques*, 185-211. For a brief discussion of context of the sixteenth-century manuscript containing a Latin translation of the entire trilogy (Paris, Bibliothèque de l' Arsenal, MS 507), see Florence Bourgne, "Medieval Mirrors and Later Vanitas Paintings," in *The Middle Ages after the Middle Ages in the English-Speaking World*, eds. Marie-Françoise Alamichel and Derek Brewer (Cambridge: D. S. Brewer, 1997), 79-90. Bourgne notes differences between the earlier Latin translation of the *Ame* and this one, which appears to translate not Digulleville's verse but rather a fifteenth-century French prose adaptation of the text.

more prominently upon Latin authorities, emphasizing resemblance between the author and the English translator as compilers, much in the manner of the analogy set out by the opening rubric. The debate mentioned earlier in this essay, in which the characters of Aristotle and Wisdom argue about the interpretation of the Eucharist, offers an example of the changes to vocabulary made in the English translation. The English verse translation uses the Latin terms “Vertualiter,” “Corporaliter,” “Realiter,” “Presencialiter,” and “Veraciter” (6050, 6053, 6054, 6055, 6056) in place of the French terms “vertuablement,” “corporelement,” “reaument,” “presentement,” and “vraiment” (fol. 19r) in one passage of contention concerning the nature of the divine presence in material substance. An independent English prose translation of the earlier, shorter *Pèlerinage* text, generally believed to have been composed less than five years after the verse translation of the recension, finds English equivalents for the French terms, such as “vertualliche,” “bodiliche,” “rialliche,” “presentliche,” and “verreyliche” (L.1767-1768).³³ The English verse translation thus chooses to emphasize the Latinate basis of this text’s hermeneutic system even as it makes interpretation more elaborately present in English.³⁴ In effect, the translator represents his task as commentary on the notable texts and terms of Latin academic discourse, even when engaging in vernacular translation, by depicting the vernacular source text as a product of the same practice.

Thus far, this study has remained silent on the subject of the new passage added to the English *Pilgrimage* that has drawn the most critical attention to this text in past scholarship: the praise of Geoffrey Chaucer evidently intended to precede an interpolation of Chaucer’s own translation from Digulleville’s poetry, an acrostic lyric known as the “ABC.”³⁵ It is true that one manuscript does contain an English rubric, “the translator,” above the passage containing Chaucer’s praise. Yet the rubric appears to be a late addition, part of the text written in the bibliophile John Stowe’s hand, and unfortunately the other manuscripts are missing pages or have incomplete rubrics as this point, making the verification of Stowe’s choice as reflective of the rubrics in earlier manuscripts impossible. I hope that in devoting my primary attention to the passages more certainly presented to the eyes of medieval readers as the translator’s words, I have produced a better understanding of the function envisioned for the medieval translator. Certainly, this approach suggests that inserted references to Latin sources and an emphasis on interpretative commentary may have played quite a significant role in valorizing the translator’s labors as this allusion to translation from the same allegory by “the noble poete off Breteyne” [the noble poet of Britain] (19754), Geoffrey Chaucer. The translator emulates Chaucer’s earlier translation by selecting the same contemporary French text as a source. But the translator

³³ Quotations are cited by volume and line number from *The Pilgrimage of the Lyfe of the Manhode*, ed. Avril Henry, EETS o.s. 288, 292, 2 vols. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1985-1988).

³⁴ This difference may also reflect the overall effect of the changes Digulleville made in revising his text: although this passage is relatively unchanged between the two versions, the recension does contain Latin insertions elsewhere, as noted earlier.

³⁵ Unfortunately, none of the extant manuscripts containing the English verse *Pilgrimage* actually contain the Chaucerian lyric discussed. The cultural stakes of comparison with Chaucer have not always generated analysis focused on the intratextual significance of the passage. One scholar quotes the passage of dedication in full simply as a demonstration of how Lydgate’s “spongy line-filling” turns “bracing narrative into laxness”; see Kay Gilligan Stevenson, “Medieval rereading and rewriting: The context of Chaucer’s ‘ABC,’” *Divers toyes mengled’: Essays on Medieval and Renaissance Culture in honour of André Lascombes*, ed. Michel Bitot (Tours: Université François Rabelais, 1996), 27-42, at 29.

also emulates the style of translations from the notable works of antiquity, and the manner in which the translation is displayed upon the page calls as much attention to this aspect of the translator's endeavor as to the emulation of Chaucer's prior effort.

In conclusion, I want to suggest that this vision of the English translator's role is not necessarily restricted to one text and its manuscript tradition. I mentioned *Reson and Sensuallyte* earlier as the example which seems most immediately comparable to the translation examined here, and the marginal notes "Ista sunt verba translatoris" and "Huc vsque verba translatoris" in a manuscript of *Reson and Sensuallyte* similarly draw attention to a moment of added attention to textual allegoresis.³⁶ The goddess Pallas, who tries to win the dreamer away from the worship of Venus in this text, is described as having swans flying about her, and the English translator provides an explanation of the swan's Christological-moral significance. This explanation is not present in the French source, which describes Pallas as surrounded by owls. In fact, the swans the translator allegorizes may have been influenced by a misreading of the word *chieuete*, meaning owl (a much more typical attribute for Pallas Athena) as the word *chienne*, similar to the English word for swan 'cynets'.³⁷ Latin marginal notes not only mark the allegorical interpretation of the swan as the translator's, but also provide the addition with accompanying Latin quotations from St. Paul's Philippians and Alan de Lille's *De Planctu Naturae*, underwriting the medieval text with patristic and neo-classical authorities.³⁸ Like my brief review of the passages marked as 'verba translatoris' within the fifteenth-century verse translation of Digulleville's poem, the transformed 'ugly duckling' of *Reson and Sensuallyte* suggests that the most visible role at least one fifteenth-

³⁶ See Oxford, Bodleian Library, Fairfax MS16, fol. 219r. By way of a contrast, the note 'uerba translatoris' in San Marino, Huntington Library EL 26 A.13, 6r, serves a function similar to the rubrics dividing the prologues of the *Pilgrimage*; the text introduced by this rubric, John Lydgate's *Dance of Death*, a translation of French verses displayed in a churchyard, is in stanza form, divided into a dialogue between characters' voices after the initial introductory commentary.

³⁷ Ernst Sieper, Introduction to *Reson and Sensuallyte*, by John Lydgate (?), 2 vols., Early English Text Society e.s. 84, 89 (London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner & Co., 1901, 1903), II.viii. Sieper's thesis of influence was challenged by Joseph Mettlich, as noted by Caroline Boucher and Jean-Pascal Pouzet in their "La matière des *Échecs amoureux*", d'Évrart de Conty à *Reson and Sensuallyte*," forthcoming in *The Medieval Translator / Traduire au Moyen Age*, eds. Denis Renevey and Christiania Whitehead (Turnhout: Brepols, 2009), 157-71. Boucher and Pouzet do not propose an alternative explanation for the alteration of Pallas' bird, instead drawing attention to the similar interest in mortality found in the French prose commentary designed to accompany the source poem's reference to Pallas' owl and in the glosses that accompany the figure of the swan found in the English verse translation; I am grateful to the authors for sharing their work with me in advance of its publication. Karl Steel of Brooklyn College suggested to me in personal communication that the alteration may have been influenced by negative portrayal of the owl in contemporary medieval literature. See, for example, Jan Ziolkowski, "Avatars of Ugliness in Medieval Litature," *MLR* 79 (1984): 1-20, at 13.

³⁸ The association of the addition with Alain de Lille's allusion to the swan's death song in *De Planctu Naturae*, Prosa 1, may also be an instance of imitating Geoffrey Chaucer's citation and translation practice, since Chaucer alludes to Alain de Lille's *De Planctu Naturae* less than thirty lines before describing the swan's death song in the *Parliament of Fowls* (line 342), a detail Chaucer also incorporates into Dido's final speech in his *Legend of Good Women* (line 1355). Line numbers are drawn from *The Riverside Chaucer*, ed. Larry D. Benson, 3rd ed. (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1987).

century translator working between vernaculars assumed was not so much the linguistic transition of the French into English—indeed, the owl-swan switch in *Reson and Sensualyte* is far from the only moment of deviation from a French source—but rather the task of commentary, the enlargement of the text’s hermeneutic system in a wider context than the vernacular source alone. Analysis of the notes on the periphery of these medieval texts reveals that translations of contemporary vernacular texts, just as much as translations drawn from the classics of antiquity or scripture and patristic doctrine, found their purpose in the translator’s interpretative labor, reshaping the allegorical narrative to bring Latinate authority and meaning into English.

Stephanie A. Viereck Gibbs Kamath is an assistant professor at the University of Massachusetts, Boston. Her translation work includes the first full modern English translation of René d’Anjou’s *Le livre du cuer d’amours espris*, co-authored with Kathryn Karczewska (New York: Routledge, 2001), and her current research in the field of medieval allegory and its vernacular translation is supported by awards from the British Academy’s Neil Ker Memorial Fund and the Huntington Library.