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CHAPTER I

Introduction

The four metrical romances—King Horn, Havelok the Dane, Bevis of Hampton, and Guy of Warwick—selected as a basis for this study are not widely representative. Therefore it is not to be assumed that generalizations applicable to them may be extended to any others, much less to all. At the same time, it will become perfectly clear, I believe, that there are very few narrative features which are in any sense peculiar to the group, or even to any individual romance of the group. Indeed, it is the wealth of convention, both in form and matter, rather than any artistic excellence, which makes these four romances a convenient starting point for a study of medieval imagination and narrative method.

The fact that it is medieval narrative with which we are dealing makes a cautionary statement necessary at the outset. One is compelled to use a terminology of which the significance is closely bound up with the interpretation of a kind of art which

1. The connecting together of these four romances is due primarily to the fact that it is "matter of England" which is embodied in them; cf. Schofield, English Literature from the Norman Conquest to Chaucer, pp. 258 ff. Körting, Grundrisse der Geschichte der Englischen Litteratur, pp. 108 ff., calls them Germanic, and places with them Sir Gawther and William of Palerne. Other resemblances—of subject—matter, form, dialect, and general popularity—have no doubt also been contributing factors in making a group of these romances. A sub-division connects Horn and Havelok on the one hand and Bevis and Guy on the other; cf. ten Brink, I, pp. 150 ff. Bevis and Guy were no doubt associated together long since; cf. the "Beves and sir Gy" of Chaucer's catalogue, Sir Thomas, v. 188.
Seldom found in medieval literature, that is, art which is self-conscious, individual, and often permeated with design, as opposed to art which is conventional, relatively unconscious, and often anonymous in nature as well as in fact. Therefore, the terminology often seems vague and unfitting, to imply qualities foreign to the material, and sometimes to lead to actual confusion. To avoid difficulty, it should be borne in mind that the use of this terminology does not imply anything as to the nature of the romances; and that its significance must undergo some modification in order to suit the material to which it is here applied.

This modification of terminology implies and accompanies a shifting of interest as one turns, for example, from the study of narrative art in Stevenson to narrative art in medieval romance. One cannot compare and contrast the method of Bevis of Hampton with that of Guy of Warwick as one can compare and contrast the method of Stevenson with that of Scott. In the latter case, it is the conscious art of individuals, an art which is the expression of individual personality—in the former case, it is the art of the class, one might almost say of the guild, which is the object of study; differences of individual romances are due usually to the variations of literary type rather than to variations in the mental and emotional equipment of authors. In fact, it is a literature of conventionality.

1. In the matter of terminology, as well as in many other respects, great aid has been rendered by the studies in narrative of W. M. Hart, especially Ballad and Epic, Harvard Studies and Notes, vol. XI, Boston, 1907.
rather than a literature of personality. Of course, it is possible to press the contrast too far. Convention is of tremendous importance in every period of literary history; likewise personality is absent from no literature. But there is a distinct difference between the art in which convention is subordinated and adjusted to individual purpose, and the art in which convention rules. Therefore it is not individual technique and coloring, but conventional and typical characteristics, which must be the chief object of this study.

If this distinction means anything, it must mean that the medieval narrative should be studied not merely as a completed product, but also as a preparation and a symptom; should be regarded perhaps not so much as art as embodying literary tendencies which may become art, and as social material which may throw light on the imaginative life of the Middle Ages and the conditions under which it found expression. Therefore, while my primary purpose is to make a careful analysis of four metrical romances, certain ventures may be made in the larger field of medieval life, where the questions as to the evolution of narrative art, as to the character of medieval imagination in author and audience,


2. This branch of the subject has received very slight attention here; it will, no doubt, be treated fully in Professor Hart's book on narrative art which is to appear in the Types of Literature series, edited by W. A. Neilson.
and as to the social conditions under which such work as has been preserved for us could be produced, confront the student.

In view of this larger purpose not merely of presenting the features of these four romances, but, if possible, of explaining some of them, it seems advisable in this introductory chapter to call to mind briefly the more obvious facts of literary history relating to English metrical romances, and then to outline the theories advanced thus far in regard to the origin and development of the stories which took form in the four romances which it is my purpose here to discuss.

It is agreed that almost all English medieval romances are derived from French sources. These French originals belong to three classes—lais, chansons de geste, and romans d'aventure. The lais are of least importance for us, as none of our four romances has for source or close analogue a genuine lai. More-

1. Especially as concerns their form; the subject matter of course comes from everywhere—from folk-tale and classical story, from oriental tale, Celtic fairy-lore, and Germanic legend.

2. There is a good deal of confusion as to the precise sense in which roman d'aventure should be used. Emile Littré, in Histoire Littéraire de la France, XXII, p. 757, and G. Paris, La Litt. Française au Moyen Âge, p. 112, exclude Celtic material. Here the term is used in its wider and probably more common sense to include the Celtic romances and those which are similar to them in type. Cf. Comfort, "The Essential Difference between a Chanson de Geste and a Roman d'Aventure" in P.M.L.A., XIX, pp. 64 ff.; also G. Paris, Hist. Litt., XXX, p. 15: "les romans arthuriens sont essentiellement des romans d'aventure et d'amour, où les héros sont présentés comme des modèles de prouesse, de galanterie et surtout de 'courtoisie' ."

3. The English Havelok is sometimes called a "lay", but, as Professor Schofield remarks (Eng. Lit., p. 268), "unjustifiably". The French poem (which is not the source of the English version) is, Professor Schofield says, "in the likeness of a Breton lay" (p. 267); that is, it has perhaps been modeled on the Breton lay (ten Brink, I, p. 161).
over, the material and spirit of the lais are pretty well ab-
sorbed in, or at least represented by, the romans d'aventure\(^1\),
the lais representing the Celtic material in a form apparently
nearer popular tradition\(^2\). The other two types are of some
importance for this study, and a few of the distinguishing
characteristics may be noted here in order that the reader may
have them clearly in mind. Attention will be called to others
from time to time.

The chanson de geste is the simpler, the more popular, and
the more nearly primitive of the two. The subject-matter is
war—usually national war directed against the Saracens: If
love is introduced, it is strictly subordinated to the interest
in martial deeds. When present, it is quite frequently a flame
kindled in the hearts of a Christian knight and a Saracen maiden.
There is very little analysis of character or motives, which are,
indeed, not always clear or consistent. Setting likewise is of
subordinate importance. The action usually takes place out-of-
doors. For instance, the orchard is a favorite meeting place
of emperor and followers. But the details of description are
of the slightest and most conventional sort. The personality
of the author remains unrevealed\(^3\).

---

1. Gaston Paris, La Litt. Française, ch. IV, treats them with
the romances of Chrétien, etc., under the title "Les Romans
Bretons."


3. For a full characterization of the type, cf. Petit de Jullieu-
ville's Histoire, I, ch. iii; G. Paris, op. cit., pp. 40 f.;
Suchier, pp. 1 ff.; Comfort, P.M.L.A., XIX, 64 ff.; Gautier, Les
Épopées Françaises, vol. I. The terms in which the charac-
The roman d'aventure, on the contrary, is sophisticated and aristocratic. War occupies an important place, but war, for the most part, of chivalrous knights for love and honor. The single combat is affectionately fostered. But love is of first importance. Amorous adventure takes the place of passionate battle for "sweet France". There is keen interest in character and emotion. The love-sick knight or lady analyzes her feelings with scrupulous exactness. Women become the dominating figures of the literature. There is a great deal of setting; nature is described with a wealth of conventional detail. The author begins to emerge, a conscious artist, deliberately forming his work to please a fashionable, feminized audience.

These two forms existed for a time side by side. The chanson de geste, as a form, is the product of an earlier literary activity, which is only partially indicated by the period of seventy years between the earliest chanson de geste and the earliest roman d'aventure which have been preserved. But before the date of the earliest of the English romances both forms had been in existence for about a century, and the distinguishing marks of the two were beginning to fade. It was the chanson

---


de geste which decayed first, gradually assimilating most of the features of the roman d'aventure, although it seems probable that the difference of type was never entirely forgotten.

Whether or not the distinction was preserved in French literature, there is no reason to believe that it was regarded in English literature. English romance-activity (so far as the remains indicate) began at a period too late for the distinction to have very great significance for English audience or English author or adapter. Yet for us the distinction is of some importance, since we can assign certain characteristics of the type we find to the influence of the chanson de geste and others to the influence of the roman d'aventure. It would be possible to divide English romances into two sections, in one of which the chanson de geste and in the other the roman d'aventure preponderates. Of course, the "matter of France" was originally

1. Comfort, loc. cit., objects to the assertion of Nutt, Celtic and Mediaeval Romance, that the "later works of the Charlemagne cycle are in detail, tone and spirit often as Arthurian as any purely Breton romance." He acknowledges, however, that "the tendency ... was all toward the romance and knight-errantry of the Breton poems" (p. 65). For a brief account in English of the decay of the chanson de geste, cf. Sidney L. Lee's introduction to the Early English Text Society's edition of Huon of Bordeaux.

2. Cf. ten Brink, I, 235: "No organic relation between form and matter, such as we find in the French epic, existed in these English imitations. The chanson de geste was not handled differently from the roman d'aventures, nor the romance of Alexander otherwise than the romances of the Arthurian cycle."

3. The chanson de geste was far in decline by the thirteenth century. Cf. Petit de Julleville, I, ch. iii; ten Brink, I, p. 226.
the subject of the former type, as "matter of Britain" was the subject of the latter type, but the general confusion of matter and form largely obliterated, even in France as already indicated, such general distinctions; and in the transfer to English such distinctions as might have remained became fainter still. A division according to type, therefore, would not coincide with a division according to matter. Besides, the romances in which we are most interested belong neither to "matter of France" nor to "matter of Britain", neither to Charlemagne nor to Arthur. They are "matter of England".

But the "matter of England" does not escape from the influences which molded the "matter of Britain" and the "matter of France". All of our four romances are, it is contended by some scholars, derived directly from French sources\(^2\). However this may be, the influence of the romance-activity of the French and Anglo-Normans was not to be evaded. But to what extent this influence was checked or modified by native tradition, difficult as it is of solution, cannot be altogether neglected in such an inquiry as this; for which reason the investigation which has been directed toward a solution of the problems connected with the origin and development of the stories embodied in the romances shall here be briefly reviewed\(^3\).

---

2. See infra.
3. There is a sharp break, of course, between Anglo-Saxon and Middle English narrative; cf. W. P. Ker in Cambridge History of English Literature, I, p. 277.
Before undertaking this task, a word of explanation as to method may be added. In each case the oldest English version is adopted as the basis for study, and other versions, English or foreign, are used chiefly to throw light on the questions arising from the version toward which study is primarily directed.
A. King Horn.

There are extant four versions of the Horn-story. The oldest is a French roman d'aventure, *Horn et Rimel* — an elaborate and even courtly romance. The other three versions are English. *King Horn*, with which we are here chiefly concerned, is the earliest of all English romances preserved, dating from the middle of the thirteenth century, or nearly a century later than the French redaction. A second English redaction is *Horn Child and Maiden Rimmeld*, one of the poems of the Auchinleck MS., of which the date limits are approximately 1325 and 1340.

2. For information as to editions and discussions of versions cf. Bibliography, pp.
4. There are three MSS. of *King Horn* preserved, all of which are printed both by McKnight and Hall in their respective editions, and information in regard to the same is contained in the introductions. The variations of the MSS. are not very great, but are here taken into account if of significance. Ordinarily, the reading of the Cambridge MS. has been preferred. All references by lines are to Hall's edition. If this edition is not at hand, reference to any other edition will be facilitated by the use of the comparative table of line-numberings printed by Northup in the Journal of Germanic Philology, vol. IV, pp. 531 ff.
English version is the ballad *Hind Horn*. What may be termed an additional redaction is *Ponthus et Sidone*, a French prose romance of the fifteenth century, which is a reworking of *Horn et Rimel*, and of which an English translation was made.

Below, in parallel columns, I give summaries of these versions, with the exception of the ballad, to which a paragraph is devoted at the end. While the *Ponthus and Sidone* throws no direct light on the matter of the origin and development, I have included those portions which correspond to the *Horn et Rimel*, since they show what changes a medieval author did actually make in adapting old material to a new purpose. The portions of the summaries enclosed in brackets have nothing corresponding to them in the other versions.

---

1. No. 17 of Child's collection.

2. Cf. F. J. Mather, Jr., "King Ponthus and the Bair Sidone" in *Pub. Mod. Lang. Association*, vol. XII, i ff. The English translation of the romance is published by Mather, and a comparison with its original is made. The romance was written "in honor of a member of the famous Tour Landry family of Anjou" (p. iv).
King Horn

Murry, King of Suddenne, has a wife Godhild and a son Horn. Horn has twelve companions, all rich men's sons. (1-28).

On a summer day, the king, with two companions, goes riding. At the seashore he sees fifteen ships, loaded with Saracens. The Saracens land, slay Murry and his two knights, then conquer the kingdom, killing all who refuse to forswear their faith. Godhild, however, escaped to a rock and preserves her life and her faith. (29-80).

Horn, meanwhile, is in the hands of the Saracens. An "Admirad" tells him that he must be consigned to the sea. (81-110).

Horn and his companions, placed in a boat, are driven to Westernesse. The children are met by King Ailmar, relate their story, and are taken to the palace. (111-222).

There they are placed in the charge of the steward, Añelbrus. Horn, under the steward's instruction, soon distinguishes himself, and is

Horn Childe

Hæpæolf, king of England north of the Humber, has one child

Horn. Horn has eight companions, all of noble birth. Their names are Hærof, Tebaud, Añelston, Winwald, Gariis, Wihard, Wiking, and Wikel. Arlaund, a highly accomplished man, teaches them to hunt, to harp, to play at chess, etc. (1-48).

(Here follows the account of the adventures of Hæpæolf, ending with his death, vv. 49-240.)

(When Arlaund learns of the intention of the Earl of Northumberland to seize the kingdom, he flees with Horn and his companions to the south of England, vv. 241-252.)

Arlaund, Horn, and the eight children arrive at the court of King Houlac (253-271).

Arlaund continues the education of Horn. The young prince is taught the old and the new laws; he learns to harp and to hunt. He becomes so strong that no
Horn and his companions, concealed in a garden, are discovered by the Saracen invaders and brought before their chief, Rodomont. Rodomont is touched by the beauty of the children, and is unwilling to see them perish. Therefore he has them placed in a boat and abandoned to the mercy of the sea. (1-104).

A northwest wind drives them to Bretaigne, where they are kindly received at King Hunlaf's court. (Horn there relates the misfortunes of his family, particularly of his father Aaluf.) (105-345).

Horn remains in Bretaigne seven years. He and his friend Haderof are confided to the seneschal Herlant. Horn, under his guidance, excels all in knightly exercises. He is also very beautiful and of gentle demeanor, so that all love him, and his fame spreads until Rimel hears of him. (346-436).

King Tiber of Spaine had for wife the daughter of the King of Arragon, and between them they had a son Ponthus, the most famous and most gracious child of his time (ch. 1).

(Story of the Sultan, chs. 1-2.)

Brodas, one of the sons of the Sultan, comes to Spain. Twenty-two of his vessels are dispatched to Couleigne. Disguised as merchants, some of the heathen enter the town and admit the armed forces of Brodas. Thereupon Tiber is slain, and the queen escapes to the woods. Ponthus and his companions (thirteen sons of lords), concealed by a good priest, Dampdenis, in a rock in a garden, are finally compelled by hunger to emerge. They are taken before Brodas, who says they shall die. But a Christian knight, Patricas, who has submitted to Brodas, declares that he will dispose of them so they will never harm the Saracens. By his aid, they are placed in a well-provisioned boat and escape to France. (Patricas tells Brodas that he has placed them in a boat full of holes) (3-6).

Ponthus, with the thirteen companions, arrives in Little Bretayn. Herland the seneschal brings them to King Huguell, who has a beautiful daughter. Ponthus is entrusted to Herland. Pollides is educated by the Lorde de La Val. The other children are given to various lords for training. Ponthus is a very apt pupil, and his fame for
King Horn

loved by all. But Rymenhild, the daughter of King Ailmar, loves him most. (223-62).

She sends for Avelbrus, and bids him bring Horn to her bower. Avelbrus, fearing the consequences of bringing the two together, takes Aulf (one of the twelve companions) instead. Rymenhild takes Aulf in her arms and declares her love. He discloses his identity; Rymenhild upbraids Avelbrus bitterly; and he finally agrees to bring Horn. (265-366).

Horn Childe

knight in England can endure a stroke of his hand. King Houlac has one daughter, Rimmeld, who learns to love Horn very much. (272-312).

She sends her messenger to ask Arlaund to bring Horn to her. Arlaund brings Haperof instead. Rimmeld, thinking it is Horn, receives him with great honor. She offers him fruit and spices and wine white and red, and gives him a goshawk, a pair of gloves, and a leash of greyhounds. Haperof finally declares that he is not Horn. Rimmeld then asks Arlaund to bring Horn the next day. (313-54).

Avelbrus finds Horn serving the king, and sends him to Rymenhild's bower. He goes, kneels, and greets the princess, while the bower is lighted with his fair face. Rymenhild em-

When Horn is brought, he also is received with a feast and gifts—a black steed, elaborately equipped, a horn, and a sword wrought by Wayland, are given to him, and Rimmeld promises to give
Horn et Rimel

The curiosity of Rimel is changed to love when, at a feast of Pentecost, Horn and his companions are presented at court, and Horn is made cupbearer. She hears of his beauty and grace. No lady is able to see him without loving him. He is also elegantly clothed. Rimel sends her confidante Herselote to ask for an interview with Herlant. When he comes she declares that she has loved him for a long time. Wine is brought, and they drink together. She also gives him a ring forged in the time of Daniel and a valuable horse. Then she asks Herlant to bring Horn to her, which he promises to do. But that night he is unable to sleep because of the promise, and decides to substitute for Horn his companion Haderof, the most attractive of all except the hero himself. Meanwhile Rimel is unable to sleep, and waits with great impatience. When Haderof is brought, she receives him with great tenderness. He refuses to be a party to the deceit, but Rimel does not believe his denials until all doubt is removed by an old nurse who enters and recognizes him. Herlant is then obliged to agree to keep his promise. (437-913);

Ponthus and Sidone

At the end of three years a feast is held at Whitsuntide at Venys, the children are brought before the king, and Ponthus is made cupbearer. Sidone sends for Herland, gives him a palfrey, and asks to see Ponthus. Herland agrees to bring him, but substitutes Pollides. Pollides, when he arrives, declares he is cousin-german to the king's son (Ponthus), and Sidone turns on Herland. He excuses himself on the ground that Ponthus was then serving the king. (12-14).

At last, after a period of anxious waiting, Horn arrives, and Herlant is entertained by Sidone's maid Ellious at last sees Ponthus coming. When he enters, he seems like an angel.
King Horn

braces him and tells her love. Horn declares that he is the son of a thrall and a foundling. Rymenhild faints, whereupon Horn kisses her and asks her to assist him to knighthood, and then he will do as she desired. Rymenhild rises and promises that it shall be done. She then sends Horn to Arabelbrus with a cup and a ring, and a message that he shall plead in Horn's behalf with the king. (367-470).

Arabelbrus goes to the king, and suggests that he knight Horn at a feast to be given the following day. The king consents, and says that the twelve companions shall also be knighted. In the morning, Horn and his companions appear. Ailmarg sets Horn on a white (red in L and O MSS.) steed, and dubs him knight. Aulf then requests that the companions of Horn may be knighted, and this is done by Horn. (471-520).

Merry is the feast which follows, but Rymenhild is not there. She sends for Horn, and bids him take her for his wife. He declines on the ground that he must prove his knighthood first. Rymenhild gives him a ring which will render him invulnerable if he looks at it and thinks of her. (521-86).

Horn goes to the stable, mounts his black steed, and sets out. At the seashore he finds a shipload of Saracens. He kills them all, and returns to the king holding the head of the leader on the point of his sword. (587-644).

Horn Childe

herself to Horn as soon as he is knighted. (355-420).

Within a fortnight the knighted takes place (421-26).

At the tournament which follows, Horn wins the prize. (Horn's companions are then disposed of. Tebad and Winwald go to France; Gariis and Arabelston to Brittany; Herrof, Wiard, Wicard, and Wilhel remain in England. The last two plan to betray Horn. (427-80).
Horn et Rimel

the ladies of the princess while Rimel has a private interview with the hero. But he repels her advances on the ground that he is not a knight. He even desires the permission of her father before becoming her lover. After Horn's departure, the attendants endeavor to cheer their mistress, but without success. (914-1287).

Ponthus and Sidone

After some verbal preliminaries, Sidone says that he is her knight, he pledges her his faith, and she gives him a ring. They dance, spices and wine are served, and Herlant is given a cup of gold, filled with wine. (15-18).

The situation soon changes. A body of Africans, under the leadership of the brother of Rodomont, arrives in Brittany. The messengers issue an insolent challenge, and Horn offers to fight if he is knighted. The request is granted; and Horn is victorious in a single combat with Marmorin, a giant, and afterwards distinguishes himself in leading the forces which rout the Saracens. (1288-1773).

Tidings arrive at court that more than 20,000 Saracens have landed in the isle of Breste; and soon a knight and two squires appear with a message from Carodas, another son of the Sultan, bidding the king forsake the Christian law. No one dares reply at first, so Ponthus asks permission to do so, and, upon receiving it, defies the Saracens. The strange knight offers to fight two Christians, but Ponthus alone accepts the challenge and slays him. A battle follows. Ponthus
The following morning the king goes hunting, leaving Fikenhild behind (in L and O Fikenhild rides out with the king). Horn goes to the bower, where he finds Rymenhild weeping. She has dreamed that a fish broke her net, and she fears that she is about to lose Horn. Horn also forbodes evil. (645-85).

Meanwhile Fikenhild tells Ailmar that Horn has threatened to kill him and marry Rymenhild, and that at that moment he is with the princess. Ailmar hastens back, finds the lovers together, and bids Horn depart. Horn prepares horse and armor; then revisits Rymenhild for the farewell. (686-722).

Horn sails for Ireland. There he meets Harild and Ber-

One day Houlac goes out "on his playing" while Horn remains at home for blood-letting. (481-86).

Wikel then tells Houlac that Horn has lain with Rimmeld. Houlac believes him, hurries home, beats his daughter until she bleeds, but finally shuts himself up in his chamber in wrath. Horn visits Rimmeld, and she advises him to go hunting the next morning for the wild roe and to bring it to the king. Horn goes, and returns with five harts, but the king's anger is not appeased. Horn then goes to Rimmeld, who gives him a ring of which the stone will grow wan if she is unfaithful in thought, and will wax red if she lose her maidenhead. Horn in reply says that there is a tree in her arbor under which is a spring; every day she shall look into it, and whenever she sees his shadow there she is to trust him no more. Horn is seen by Houlac at this point and driven out. (497-600).

(Horn in Wales, vv. 601-81.) While Horn is in Wales messengers arrive from Ireland with news that Elidan's son Finlak is hard pressed. Horn accompanies the messengers back to Ireland.
Another interview with Rimel takes place; Horn accepts a ring, and promises to be loyal. (1774-1819).

But Wikle, a relative of Denerez, who had betrayed Aaluf, becomes angered at Horn because of the refusal of a horse which had already been given to Haderof. (1820-70).

So he tells Hunlaf that Horn has seduced his daughter and is plotting to seize the crown. He suggests that the king require Horn to give oath that he is innocent. The plot succeeds, as Horn declines to give oath on the ground that combat was his proper mode of defense. Therefore he is banished, promising to be faithful to Rimel for seven years; and Rimel gives him another ring which will preserve him from death in battle. (1871-2129).

Horn arrives in Westir. As Gudmod, he is welcomed by Ponthus and Sidone

kills Carodas, and the Saracens are put to flight. Ponthus thereupon becomes constable to the king. (19-34).

One of the thirteen, Guenelete, envies Ponthus, and, to try him, asks for a horse that Sidone has given him. Ponthus refuses it, but offers him another. Guenelete becomes very angry. He then has it told to Sidone that Ponthus loves another better than herself. (35-37). (Adventures of Ponthus in the forest of Breselyn, chs. 38-61).

Guenelete tells the king, as he hunts one day, that Ponthus loves Sidone dishonorably, and suggests that he require Ponthus to swear to his innocence. This the king does, but Ponthus refuses to give oath, offering to fight with three or four instead. But the king declines to grant him the right of combat, and Ponthus thinks any other means of establishing his innocence unworthy a king’s son, he is obliged to depart. (62-68).

Ponthus goes to England, taking the name Surdyte. Near
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Child, sons of the king, and tells them his name is Cutberd (Godmod in L). They lead him to King Hurston, who receives him kindly. (751-96).

At Christmas the king makes a feast. A giant appears with a challenge while Hurston is at meat. One Saracen will fight with three Christians, and the combat shall determine the country's fate. Hurston names Cutberd, Harild, and Berild. Cutberd insists on fighting alone. During the fight, which takes place the next day, the giant remarks that he has never received such blows except from Murry. Horn, enraged to discover that he is fighting with his father's killer, looks on the ring and kills the giant. A general fight follows in which the heathen are destroyed, but Harild and Berild lose their lives. (799-892).

In the presence of the knights, Hurston offers his kingdom, together with his daughter Reynild, but Cutberd declines the offer, at least for the time being. However, he remains in the king's service. (895-916);

Horn lives there seven years. Meanwhile Rymenhild is in great distress. A king has come to Westernesse, who wins the king's consent to a marriage with the princess. Aulf writes to Horn and the messenger finds him hunting in a wood. The story is

Horn Childe

There he is met by Finlak's sons, and enters into the king's service. Finlak's forces are gathered in three weeks, but Elidan is hindered by a storm and is late in arriving. Horn urges an immediate battle with King Mankan, the leader of the opposing forces and the slayer of Haedulf. (682-783).

(Mead missing)
Horn et Rimel

King Gudreche, who perceives his resemblance to Aaluf, and Gy Gudreche's sons Gufer and Egfer; and he enters the service of Egfer. Gudreche has a wife and two daughters. The younger daughter, Lemburc, loves Horn, but he receives her advances coldly. (2130-2557).

(At another feast of Pentecost, certain incidents—the putting of the stone, the singing of the lai of Horn and Rimel, etc., occur, vv. 2558-894.)

Five years of peace have passed, and Horn prays for adventure. The prayer is granted. A band of Saracens attacks Ireland. Again Horn shows his valor. But the sons of the king are slain in the general engagement, which is characterized by somewhat elaborate military manoeuvres. (2895-3565).

Horn is offered Lemburc and the kingdom, but refuses both. (3586-3677).

Just then the son of Herlant arrives from Bretagne. Herlant is dead, Wikle is now seneschal, and is about to force Rimel into a marriage with the King of Penoie. (3678-3751).

Ponthus and Sidone

London he meets Henry, one of the sons of the king, and by him is led to the court. (69-71).

(In a war with the Irish, he takes the King of Ireland prisoner, and later brings about a marriage between the captive and a daughter of the King of England, chs. 71-82).

Seven years later the third son of the sultan, Corbatan, lands in England, and is slain by Surdyte; but the king's two sons fall in the battle. (82-86).

Ponthus is offered the king's daughter, but refuses her. (87-88).

Guenelete, meanwhile, becoming powerful, attempts to force Sidone into a marriage with the King of Burgone. She secures a respite until Whitsuntide at the end of seven years. Sidone and Herland send the latter's son Olin for Ponthus. Olin finally reaches the absent lover, who at once returns with a force to Little Britain. (88-93).
told, and Horn bids the messenger return to Rymenhild with the message that he will come Sunday before prime. But the messenger is drowned, and Rymenhild, going out from her house, sees his dead body, which has been washed up by the waves. (917-80).

Horn goes to Furston, tells his story, promises to secure a husband for Reynild, and asks aid. This he secures, and with the Irish knights he arrives at Westeranesse before day. Horn, landing, meets a pilgrim, who tells him of the wedding and of Rymenhild's manifest grief. Horn exchanges clothes with the pilgrim and blackens his face. When he arrives at the gate, he has a conflict with the porter, whom he throws over the bridge. (981-1078).

Entering the hall, he sits in the beggars' row, sees Rymenhild weeping, and wonders about Ælfric, who is watching for his friend from the tower and lamenting his inability to preserve Rymenhild longer. Rymenhild serves the guests, and Horn addresses her, asking that she serve the beggars first. She fills a large bowl for him. He says he will drink only from a white cup, and tells her that he is a fisher who has come to see if a net he left there seven years before has taken anything. Then he adds, "Drink to Horn of

Horn at once prepares to return to England. With a hundred knights he lands under a wood. There he meets a beggar, who turns out to be Wiard. He has been seeking Horn in vain for seven years. Today Rimmeld is to be married to Moring. Horn then discloses his identity, changes clothes with Wiard, and goes toward the sound of "tabours and trumpets." He seizes the bridle of Moring's horse, but Wiard strikes him such a blow that the blood springs from the wound. Moring is sorry and promises to give him what he desires if he will let go the bridle. Horn asks for Rimmeld. Then he tells to Moring and Wiard the parable of the net, after which they ride on, and he follows them into the castle, breaking the shoulder-bone of the porter. (841-960).

An elaborate feast has been prepared, and Rimmeld serves. Horn asks her to serve the poor men, and when she brings the wine he begs her, for the love of Horn, to wait until it has been drunk. He drinks and throws in the ring. (961-1002).
Gudmod at once tells his true story to the king, and asks leave to go to Bretagne; he promises to return if Rimel has really forgotten him. Lemburc admires his faithfulness, and determines to retire to a cloister. Horn arrives in Bretagne on the morning of the wedding. Disguised as a beggar, he approaches the castle. On the road he meets Wikle and Modini, the bridegroom. (3752-4010).

Wikle insolently strikes Horn, to the regret of Modini. Horn then tells the parable of the net. The procession goes on, and Horn follows. The porter is given three blows; a fourth would have killed him. Horn then enters. (4011-4116).

Rimel is serving the guests. After she has made the circuit four times, Horn accosts her, and reproaches her for forgetting the poor. Rimel brings him a horn filled with wine. He refuses to drink at first, and passes the horn to another. Later, when it has been refilled, he throws the ring into it, drinks half of the contents, and asks Rimel to drink what is left. She discovers the ring, asks about the owner, and de-
King Horn

horn." Rymenhild, troubled, fills a horn with wine. Horn drinks, and throws in the ring. Rymenhild goes to the bower and finds the ring. She sends for the pilgrim, who tells her that Horn has died and the bringing of the ring was in response to his dyring request. She seizes a knife to slay herself, but Horn wipes the black from his face and reveals his identity. (1079-1210).

After the embrace, Horn returns to his men, and Rymenhild goes to Aþulf to tell him the good news. Aþulf follows Horn and overtakes him. Then an attack is made on the hall, and all within but the king and Horn's twelve companions are slain. (1211-46).

The wedding of the lovers is celebrated, Horn tells his story, and declares that he will not receive Rymenhild as his wife until he has regained his father's kingdom. (1249-88).

With Aþulf and his Irish followers, he sails for Sudenne, arriving in five days. On landing, they find a knight sleeping. On being aroused, he tells them the story of the conquest of the kingdom by the Saracens, the death of Murry, and the banishment of Horn. He wonders that Horn does not come, and speaks of his own son Aþulf. A happy recognition follows, and Horn learns that his mother yet lives. A battle ensues, the Saracens are slain, the churches are rebuilt, Horn's mother is found, and a merry feast is made. (1289-1388).

Fikenhild, however, has in the meantime built a castle, surrounded by water at high tide, but approachable when the sea withdraws. He then plots to wed Rymenhild, and leads her into this castle by

Horn Childe

Rymenhild swoons, and is taken to her chamber. She calls for Haþerof and sends him to Horn. Horn learns from Haþerof of the tokens by which he may know Wikard and Moging. Haþerof returns to Rymenhild, and Horn goes to his men. (1003-68).

After the feast, a tournament is held; Moging is overthrown; Wikard is slain; and Wikel loses an eye. Horn weds Rymenhild that night, and a five days feast follows. Horn then gathers a force to recover his own kingdom, and goes north with a large force. (1069-1136).

(The rest of this version is missing.)
Horn et Rimel

clares her intention to seek him in all places until she shall find him. The beggar replies that the ring is his, and goes on to say that he left a falcon there seven years before, and if he finds it as good as he left it, he will carry it away, but if it has lost any of its feathers, he will not claim it. At these words, Rimel smiles and says, "You are Horn." Horn then says that he is a poor man, and asks if she can give up a great king for him. Rimel replies that she will suffer what he suffers. Then Horn tells the truth as to his position. (4117-4329).

A tournament follows, in which Horn and his followers are victorious. The King of Fenie departs; Wikle is forgiven, and Horn's marriage with Rimel is celebrated. (4330-4587).

But Horn is determined to regain his father's kingdom. Hardre, who was formerly the seneschal of Aaluf, assists Horn and his men in trapping Rodomont. In the battle, Rodomont is slain. Horn is crowned king. Returning from the chase one day, he meets his mother at the door. Recognition and great joy follow. (4588-4967).

In the meantime, Wikle has secured the upper hand in Bretagne and threatens to seize the crown if Rimel is not given to him as his wife. But Horn is warned in a dream of the

Ponthus and Sidone

In the jousts which follow, Ponthus slays the King of Burgone. (101-106).

Ponthus makes a vow not to marry Sidone until he has conquered his native country. With a large force he reaches Spain, finds his uncle, the Earl of Destrue, and Sir Patricias, who saved him and his companions from death at the hands of the Saracens years before, in a chapel. Plans are made to regain the kingdom. A battle follows, Brodas is slain, the Saracens are conquered, and Ponthus is crowned king. At the feast which follows, the mother of Ponthus appears as one of the thirteen poor people, and is recognized by her son. (107-124).

Guenelete forges letters to the effect that Ponthus is dead, and wrings from the king consent to his own marriage with Sidone. Sidone withdraws to
night. Horn dreams that Rymenhild is shipwrecked, and that Fikenhild prevents her from reaching the shore. Thus warned, he sails for Wester-ness. The wedding feast has begun when his ship arrives under the tower. He is met by Arnoldin (Aulf's cousin), who tells of Fikenhild's treachery. Horn and his companions then disguise themselves as minstrels and approach the castle singing. They are admitted. Horn makes a lay for Rymenhild, who swoons. Then, looking on his ring and thinking of his mistress, Horn strikes Fikenhild dead. (1389-1492).

Horn makes Arnoldin king of Westernesse after Allmar. He then sails to Modi's kingdom, which is given to Aelbrus; then to Ireland, where Aulf weds Reynild. After thus caring for his friends, Horn returns to Suddenne, and lives there happily with his queen. (1433-1530).
Horn et Rimel

impending disaster, and arrives in Bretagne just as Rimel is being led to the altar. In the fight which follows, Wikle is slain. (4968-5215).

The marriage of Haderof with Lemburc follows. The birth of Haderof, the son of Horn, is announced, whose adventures are to be told by Gilemot, the son of the author of Horn et Rimel. (5216-5250).

Ponthus and Sidone

a tower, and there Guenelete besieges her and her father until the king is nearly dead from starvation. A month's respite is finally granted. On the day when this expires, which is to be the wedding day, Ponthus arrives in Brittany. With his companions, all in the disguise of dancers, he enters the hall. After dancing about the room two or three times, Ponthus throws off his disguise, and slays Guenelete. (124-138).

Feasts and jousts follow. When these are over, Ponthus goes to England, where a marriage takes place between Pollides and the English' king's daughter. Ponthus gives Pollides a long discourse on the conduct becoming a man in pollides' position, and returns to Brittany. (139-150).
The ballad of "Hind Horn" resembles most closely the
Horn Childe and Maiden Rimbeld. It will be noticed from the
following summary that the transitions are characteristically
abrupt.

There was a baby born in Scotland who was called Hind Horn. The king's daughter Jean, with whom he was in love, gave him a diamond ring, saying:

"When this ring grows pale and wan,
You may know by it my love is gane."

One day he looked at the ring and found that the diamonds actually were pale and wan. The first man that he met on coming to land was an old beggar. From him he learned that there was a wedding in the king's hall. The two exchanged clothes, and Hind Horn proceeded to the king's gate, where he asked for a drink. The bride came with a glass of wine; Horn drank, and dropped the ring in the empty glass.

"O got ye this by sea or land?
Or got ye it off a dead man's hand?"

"I got not it by sea, I got it by land,
And I got it, madam, out of your own hand."

The lady offered to cast off her costly gowns and follow him, but he assured her that it was unnecessary, as he would make her lady of many a town.
The study devoted to the relations of the extant versions of the Horn story has brought out many interesting suggestions, but has not led to generally accepted results. Only upon one point may there be said to be substantial agreement, namely, that neither King Horn nor Horn et Rimel is directly derived from the other. The question of the relation of Horn Childe to the other versions has not been settled quite so easily. Three opinions seem still to be current: (1) that HCh arose from HR; (2) that HCh and HR are derived from a common source; (3) that HCh is independent of the other versions. Of these, (3) has the fewest defenders. Correspondingly, there are three views as to

1. Ponthus and Sidone is not considered in the discussion which follows. Whether it goes back directly to Horn et Rimel as we have it or is derived from some other version closely resembling it is an open question; cf. Mather, op. cit., 1 ff., who says that while there is no clear instance where P has borrowed from HR, the freer treatment makes unnecessary the supposition of another version of HR. Schofield (P.K.L.A., XVIII, table, p. 81) seems to think there is an intermediate version between HR and P&S. Nelles (J. Am. Folklore, XXII, p. 59) regards P&S as substantially derived from HR, but thinks certain elements come from KH. There is agreement as to the main fact that P&S is derived from a French version which either actually is HR or very closely resembles it.

2. The earlier and uncritical opinion of Tyrwhitt, Warton, Ritson, Morris, and others (cf. Hartenstein, op. cit., pp. 35 ff. for precise references) made the French version the source of the English. This theory, long questioned, was definitely brushed away by Wissmann (King Horn, Strassburg, 1876, Quellen und Forschungen XVI; cf. also Das Lied von King Horn, Strassburg, 1881, Q. & P. XLV, and "Studien zu King Horn," Anglia, vol. IV, pp. 342 ff.). His derivation of HR from KH has likewise been generally rejected (Stimming, Englische Studien, vol. I, pp. 351 ff.—a review of Wissmann's King Horn; Caro, "Horn Childe and Maiden Rimneld," E.S. XII, pp. 323 ff., E.S. XVI, pp. 306 f.; Mettlich, Bemerkungen zu den Anglonormannischen Lied vom Wackern Ritter Horn (Münster, 1890).

3. Wissmann (King Horn, p. 114) thinks it must have arisen from HR or from some source which had material in common with it,
the origin of the ballad of "Hind Horn": (1) that it descends from HCh\(^1\); (2) that it is of independent origin; (3) that it belongs to the same stream of tradition as HCh\(^2\). The distinction between (2) and (3) is perhaps due to vagueness of statement on the part of the defenders of (2) rather than to essential difference of opinion between the respective advocates of the theories. As for (1) and (3), if any advantage of opinion, it seems to be on the side (3).

Bearing in mind, then, that no one of these four versions has been shown positively to be the source of any other, and that any one and every one of them may contain features which are original, what light has the vast amount of philological and critical inquiry devoted to the subject thrown upon the origin and

except that the story of Hæfeolc was evidently taken from other songs and sagas. Ward (Cat. Rom. B.M., I, p. 459) says much of HCh looks like an abridged translation of RH. McKnight, (King Horn, E.E.T.S., p. xv) supports the theory of influence from RH to HCh, although he believes in the existence of a northern version which also was a source of HCh. Harenstein (Studien zur Hornsage, pp. 118 ff.) thinks the author of HCh knew RH although he had a northern redaction of the Horn story as a foundation for his work. This is approximately the opinion of Nelles ("Ballad of Hind Horn," J. Am. Folklore, XXII, pp. 42 ff.). Schofield (P.M.L.A., XVIII, pp. 1 ff.) traces the Horn elements of HCh back to HR. Stimming (Englische Studien, I, p. 35) has argued emphatically for entire independence. Why should there not have been, he asks, quite a number of variations of the Horn story of which RH was the first to become fixed? And Child (English and Scottish Pop. Ballads, I, pp. 191 ff.), although not quite definite in his statements, seems to think no one of the redactions dependent on another. The theory of a common source for HR and HCh in some lost version of the story is upheld by Caro (Eng. Stud., XII, p. 324) and Hall (King Horn, p. liv). The latter indeed regards HR as uniting two general streams of tradition, one represented in RH and the other in HCh.

1. Wissmann, King Horn, p. 123; Brandl, Paul's Grundriss, II, p. 855; Schofield, op. cit., p. 81; Caro also apparently belongs here, ibid. cit., p. 335.

2. Ignoring the distinction between (2) and (3), the following
and history of the story? So various have been the theories advanced that it is not easy to make a classification. In many discussions a distinction is made between the birth of a saga and the later development of the saga into a romantic story. The saga may have come into existence among one people, and yet the finished romance may owe most of its qualities to another people, who gave it literary form. With the caution, then, that the race to which a romance belongs does not necessarily mean the race which brought it into being, I shall divide the theories into two main groups: (1) those which regard the story as essentially Germanic, and (2) those which regard the story as essentially French.

The champions of the theories of the first class regard the material as English. Two studies, however, are devoted primarily to showing that the material is Germanic, without attempt at more exact classification. Stimming declared that the whole saga was of Germanic origin, as indicated by the names, by the expeditions on the sea, by the fact that the residences of the kings are on the sea, and by the presence of a shore guard.

are advocates of this theory: Stimming, *Eng. Stud.*, I, p. 35; Child, op. cit., I, pp. 191 ff.; Hartenstein, op. cit., p. 124; Hall, p. LV. Nelles, loc. cit., is somewhat more definite. He thinks "Hind Horn" descends from a ballad or ballads which were the chief source of HCh. McKnight's statement (King Horn, p. xv) that the story in "Hind Horn" seems to rest, along with HCh on a northern redaction of the story, is somewhat indefinite, but seems to entitle him to a place in this group of names.

1. A fuller discussion of theories than can be given here will be found in Hartenstein's Studien. However, several of the most important contributions to the subject have appeared since this work was published.

2. Earlier it was believed by J. Grimm, Michel, and others, that the story came from Germany; cf. Hartenstein, pp. 130 ff.; but this theory was long since abandoned.

McKnight, defending the same thesis, makes the interesting conjecture that in an earlier version of the story of revenge was of greater importance and the love element, if present at all, was of less importance. This he regards as characteristically Germanic. This original story has been greatly expanded, he holds, in a romantic fashion, and "the English King Horn is an abridged, ballad version of a larger story." Horn et Rimel, he


2. McKnight thinks that King Murry, the twelve companions, and Arnoldin show signs of being survivals from a story in which they played more significant parts.

3. Other Germanic features, according to McKnight, are: (1) story of the exiled prince; (2) the rescue incident; (3) violence of Rymenhild's passions; (4) primitive life and cruel customs; (5) the "formal challenge" on the part of a champion in an invading host to a duel upon the result of which shall depend the marriage of a princess or the fate of a kingdom; (6) Horn's backwardness in meeting Rymenhild's advances; (7) the general etiquette of the duel. At least two of these features, i.e. (3) and (6), are as we shall see (cf. pp. 296 ff.), conventional features of the chanson de geste; and most of the others may be found in chanson de geste and often in roman d'aventure. These may be Germanic, of course, so far as the chanson de geste contains Germanic elements.

4. P. 232. In the introduction to his edition (p. xiii) McKnight says: "The English gleeman's version quite likely was composed directly from oral tradition." Of what proportions was the story in oral tradition?
thinks, is "constructed from an English story."¹ That King Horn
is thoroughly English has also been the view of Mätzner², Brandl³,
and Söderhjelm⁴. Ten Brink⁵, Ward⁶, Hall⁷, and others⁸, regard
the story as the outgrowth of the Danish raids on the coast of

1. King Horn, pp. xii f.

2. Altenclische Sprachproben (Berlin, 1867), I, p. 207.

3. "Wahrscheinlich auch nicht übersetzung, sondern original;
nicht gelehrt angehaucht, sondern so recht aus der damaligen
Stimmung des eroberten, aber nicht sich verloren gebenden
Engländervolkes geschöpft" (Paul's Grundriss, II, p. 624).

auteur de Tristan et du Thomas auteur du Horn."

5. History of English Literature, p. 231.


7. P. LV.

8. Additional references are given by Harterstein, p. 136.
England, the original Danes having become the Saracens of the redactions preserved. Schofield, on the contrary, contends that it arises from the Norwegian incursions on England in the 9th or 10th Century. He accepts the view that King Horn had an immediate French source, but regards the essentials of the story as English, and the source of both King Horn and Horn et Rimel as Anglo-Saxon. Nelles, attacking the problem from a different angle, also concludes that there was an Anglo-Saxon version, from which the Hereward story borrowed, and from which the ballad of "Hind Horn" is a descendant. The theory that Celtic as well as English influence has left its marks on the story finds support from Hall and Heuser. The former (identifying Suddene with "the country of the Southern Damnonii, that is, Cornwall") regards the story as "based on events which actually occurred in the southwest of England during the English conquest. It is represented in direct line, though transferred to another period and much enlarged by subsequent accretions, by the southern

1. Loc. cit. Schofield's attempts definitely to identify the place names of the story. His views have not met with wide acceptance. For an adverse criticism cf. W. Heuser, Anglia, XXXI, pp. 106 ff. "Schofield, der in einer interessanten arbeit ein umfassender material in imponierender geschlossenheit der auffassung vorführt, beut sein ganzes system auf der sprachlichen identifizierung von Sudene mit Surrey, d.h., der Südinsel Man auf. . . . . gegen Schofield muss ich mich so lange ablehnend verhalten, als nicht neue und zwingende gründe für die identität von Sudene (so die ursprüngliche form!) und Surrey gebracht werden, denn damit steht und fällt sein kunstvoller aufbau" (p. 106).

2. Loc. cit. Hall also remarks (p. 1v) that "the episode of the bride's deliverance has been bodily transferred" to the Gesta Herwardi.

3. P. Paris, Hist. Litt., XXII, p.554, suggested that MR might have had a Breton lui for its source.
version KH.¹ Heuser thinks an original saga developing out of the Scandinavian-Irish Viking struggles was bretonisiert in a lai in Cornwall, and by the Britons passed to the Saxons, the English redaction probably dating from the first half of the eleventh century².

So far the views discussed have credited at least a very important part in the construction of the story to the English, although the probability of a French original for KH has been acknowledged by Schofield, and not denied by some of the others. But recently two important studies have appeared attacking very sharply this opinion and crediting neither saga nor romance to

1. P. liv. Hall's theory of the origin of the other versions is stated by him as follows: The story "was carried to the North somewhere about the time when the Norsemen of the Continent combined with their allies from Ireland to harry the north country, and was strongly modified to suit the local circumstances. HC is the direct representative of this Northern version, while the ballads are a branch of the same stem. HR is founded on a lost redaction made by a man who was acquainted with both streams of tradition and combined them. The peculiar talent of Master Thomas has completely transformed the simple tale of adventure, embellishing it with the details and investing it with the atmosphere of a French romance of chivalry."

2. Anglia, XXI, pp. 105 ff. Heuser's study, like most others of recent years, is based on the names. He believes that the names in the French version have suffered comparatively little change, while the names of KH are very corrupt. This comparatively greater purity of the names in HR he endeavors to establish by a comparison with the corresponding Norse names, which of course he regards as being original. But he finds Celtic influence present also. Some of the names in HR—Rabel, Morwan, Iocerant, Torol-al—given to Bretons, are evidently Celtic. Rigmel, he says, is probably a Celtic corruption of an ON Reg(e)nchildr.
the English. The first, by Morsbach\(^1\), consists of a careful
investigation of the names, and the conclusion is that a Viking
saga, on English soil, passed through French or Anglo-French
hands. "Einen oder mehreren von ihnen verdankt der Verfasser
des King Horn nicht nur die Anregung, sondern auch den wesent-
lichen Inhalt."\(^2\) Deutschbein, using Morsbach's study as a
starting point, has endeavored to work out in some detail the
progress of the material from saga to romance\(^3\). His thesis is
as follows: The Irish and the Westernesse incidents are vari-
ants of a single tale, the Irish incidents representing the
original more accurately. The two variants of the story, Wes-
tennesse and Irish, he names respectively A and B, A being romantic
and B historical. The historical origin of the Horn saga was
in North England or Ireland, the fortunes of a Viking furnishing
the kernel. One or more versions spread through England, losing
historical coloring and taking on romantic elements. Thus
arose Horn A. Horn B, representing a purer form of the saga,
is the representative of Scandinavian tradition in England. A
and B were joined by the Anglo-Normans, who also added romantic
elements, and constructed the romance of which \textit{King Horn} is the
best representative. This theory, too, has met with severe

\(^{1}\) "Die Angebliche Originalität des Frühmittelenglischen
King Horn" in \textit{Festschrift für W. Foerster} (Halle, 1902).

\(^{2}\) p. 290. The original Norse names were transformed by French
influence, according to this theory.

\(^{3}\) \textit{Studien zur Sargengeschichte Englands} (Göthen, 1906), I,
pp. 1 ff.
criticism, particularly from Heuser\textsuperscript{1} and Binz\textsuperscript{2}. The criticism of the latter is, in part, somewhat fundamental and applies equally well to the stories of the other romances here studied. It is mentioned here because, if his position is tenable, it should be borne in mind throughout the discussion. By the twelfth century, he says, the desire to \textit{fabulieren}, as in Geoffrey of Monmouth, had spread throughout Europe. Is one justified, then, in seeking always a historical kernel? "Die berechtigung solcher bemühungen wird nur dann--indessen nicht ohne Vorbehalte--zuzugegeben sein, wenn die Namen der Hauptpersonen und Ortschaften sich decken mit denen von geschichtlich beglaubigten menschen, deren schicksale denjenigen der helden der dichtung gleich oder wenigstens ähnlich sind. Vorbedingung für eine solche gleichsetzung der Namen ist aber die sicherheit über ihre ursprüngliche gestalt in der dichtung. Diese sicherheit ist aber nicht immer erreichbar, weil die verschiedenen versionen oft von einander abweichen, ohne dass ein entschied darüber, welche von ihnen dem ursprünglichen am nächsten kommt, möglich wäre."

\textsuperscript{1} Deutschbein's theory is based chiefly on a classification of names, according to which the names of B are Norse, those of A English. Heuser makes a searching criticism of both Morsbach's and Deutschbein's views. Both Morsbach and Deutschbein (who relies upon Morsbach) \textit{base} their theories "auf der annahme, dass die Namen des King Horn ursprünglich seien" (p. 106), while Heuser regards the French as less changed. Cf. also the specific criticism of Binz (see reference below), who thinks a study of names should be restricted to those occurring in all the versions. These--Horn, Fikenbild (Wikel, Wikle), Rimnild, Modin--are the names found in the romantic portion (A) of the story. "Wenn nur diese Namen in der Überlieferung festhalten, wird man sich schwer entschliessen, gerade A als jüngere, ausschmückende fortbildung einer mehr geschichtlichen version B anzusehen." (p. 9).

\textsuperscript{2} \textit{Zeitschrift zur Anglia}, XVIII, pp. 1 ff.
This hasty review of the Horn literature must suffice. It has shown, at least, that every attempt to trace the evolution of historical kernel into a somewhat complicated romantic narrative has met with discredit. The critical labor has been more effective than the constructive. Conclusions that seem to be accepted by the consensus of opinion are practically restricted to these: (1) that King Horn represents, in some particulars, a life earlier than the life of thirteenth century England; (2) that the form of the story, likewise, probably pretty closely approximates a form that existed earlier than the earliest MSS.; (3) that while neither King Horn nor Horn et Rimel (the two most important versions) is derived from the other, Horn et Rimel represents a later, more romantic, and more French handling of the story.

Before entirely abandoning the "theory of evolution" as a means of explaining the narrative structure of Horn--i.e. transformation through a process of long oral tradition--it seems necessary to study that feature of the story which, it has been said, points to a fusion of two versions. This is the doubling

1. Whether or not a French redaction lies back of King Horn does not seem a vital question. It has certainly not been proved that such a version existed (cf. Heuser, pp. 124 ff.; Miss Billings, pp. 3 ff); and, if so, it either was not much like KH or it was not very much like the French narrative literature of the period at which it must have existed--i.e. about the time of Horn et Rimel. The evidence of names is more than doubtful, because the names may have been borrowed from one source or various sources without regard to fitness. The presence of a few romantic elements seems only to show that certain motives familiar in western European literature and tradition have crept into it, but there is no sufficient reason for restricting the possibility of such a transfer to any one people or any one country.
of incidents. Opinion on this point, as on others, has been divided. P. Paris¹, Ward², and Deutschbein³ regard the duplication as a result of fusion of versions. Wissmann, speaking of the double rescue, remarks that in other poems somewhat similar to King Horn "die handlung zweimal sich zu einem höhepunkte erhebt, und zwar so, dass der zweite höhepunkt kaum mehr als die kopie des ersten ist."⁴ Schofield somewhat doubtfully remarks of the second rescue that "it does not impress one as original," and seems to regard conscious duplication as more probable⁵. Binz⁶ and Hartenstein⁷ likewise, and more emphatically, reject the theory of a fusion of similar versions of the same story, especially as connected with the Irish and Westerinesse incidents.

2. Cat. Rom., I, pp. 451 ff. He cites Quatre Fils Aymon as an instance of repetition as the result of fusion.
3. Cf. supra, p. 36.
4. Anglja, IV, p. 399. McKnight refers to this passage by Wissmann, but adds that "at the same time various slight differences suggest a possible duality of origin for the two disguise scenes" (P.M.L.A., XV, p. 225).
6. Anglja Beiblatt, XVIII, pp. 1 ff. The Irish incidents, he thinks, were a conscious addition to fill in the period of Horn's exile.
7. P. 52. The duplication, he says, "gehört zweifellos dem Urhorn an."
As indicated there is duplication (1) of the events at court (in Westernesse and in Ireland) and (2) of the rescue incident. If we accept the explanation by fusion it seems that each of the versions fused must have contained one set of court events and one rescue incident. Below are presented in parallel columns the two stories for the purpose of comparison.

I have separated the rescue incidents from the earlier parts of the corresponding stories since it cannot be said certainly how they should be joined.

Horn lands in Westernesse, is received by King Ailmar, is educated by A Felbrus. (In HR Horn is first seen by Herlant ( = A Felbrus), who is hunting with twenty knights.) (In HR Hunlaf makes a great feast at Pentecost.) Horn engages in a fight with Saracens who land on the shore, and is victorious.

Horn and Rymenhild fall in love.

Horn lands in Ireland (Westir in HR), is welcomed by Hurston, and enters his service. (In HR Horn is first seen by Guffer and Egfor, the King's sons, who are hunting with twenty knights.) (In HR the Irish king makes a feast at Pentecost.) Horn meets Saracens who make an attack on Ireland, and is victorious. One of them is the slayer of his father.

Horn is offered Reynild, the King's daughter. (In HR, the corresponding figure, Lemburc, is violently in love with Horn.)

Horn, in Ireland, is told by a messenger that Rymenhild is to be forced into marriage, and at once gathers forces and sails to rescue her. The ship arrives before daybreak. Horn is met by a pilgrim, who tells him of the marriage celebration. (In HR this beggar turns out to be Wiard, a faithful friend.)

Horn, in Suddenne, is warned by a dream that Rymenhild is in danger through Fikenhild, and sails to her rescue.

The ship arrives before daybreak. Horn is met by Arnoldin, a cousin of Aulf, who tells of the capture of Rymenhild.
Horn, disguised as a pilgrim, Horn, disguised as a minstrel, secured admittance to the castle, enters the feasting hall. where the wedding feast is in progress. A conflict follows; the prospective bridegroom is slain. Fikenhild is slain.

It is to be noted that not only are essential features reproduced, such as the disguise, but in minor details—the arrival of the rescuing ship before daybreak, the meeting with some one on the shore—there is the same duplication. In the first set of parallels, the resemblance of Westir to Westernesse (in HR) and of Reynild to Rymenhild (in KH) seems at first glance almost beyond the possibility of explanation except as the result of fusion. Would an author, deliberately repeating a set of incidents, have made it a point partially to reproduce the names?  

1. I venture in a note to suggest what the original version might have been, assuming that Horn is the result of such a fusion as has been suggested. The name Westir (being more intelligible than Westernesse), and the connection of the flight of Horn and the Saracens there with Horn's quest for vengeance, point to Ireland as the original locality of the story. The second rescue, being connected likewise with the exile story, would seem more probably to be nearer the original. Joining these together, and borrowing from the less original portion of the Horn story sufficient for making intelligible our hypothetical version, the following is the result:  

Horn and his companions, banished from their native land (Suddenne), take refuge in Westir (Ireland), where they grow to manhood. Horn gains a distinguished victory over the King's enemies (who are also his own) and is offered the hand of the King's daughter. He accepts, but is determined to regain his father's kingdom before marriage. But while he is in Suddenne, a treacherous friend endeavors to force the King's daughter into a marriage. Horn, warned barely in time, arrives on the wedding morning, secures admittance in disguise, and rescues the bride. 

Supposing that two versions of the story, containing essentially these features, but differing slightly in names and subsidiary incidents, came into the hands of a minstrel who felt called upon to reconcile them, would not the result have been substantially what we find in King Horn? If he were an English-
It seems impossible to prove that such a fusion of versions did not actually take place. Yet I venture to suggest two or three reasons which lead me to question the process. (1) There is absolutely no support to be gained for the hypothesis in any differences to be found in the versions of the story which we have. (2) The original version to be obtained by a simplification of the story as we now have it would seem to possess a certain literary stamp—that is, to have been influenced by motives and perhaps by methods in the comparatively highly developed chansons de geste. This leads me to doubt if it was a genuine saga or folk-tale and subject to the changes which naturally arise through oral transmission among unsophisticated classes. (3) In this duplication, as has already been suggested, and as we shall have occasion to indicate in a somewhat detailed manner, we have a process familiar to medieval narrative, and many instances which occur can hardly be due to anything less than conscious repetition.

Our results so far, then, are chiefly negative. No doubt there are elements of popular tale and tradition in the Horn material. But there seems no reason for doubting that the material was shaped with a pretty free hand by some one who wrote down

man, and Westernesse and Hymenhild seemed English to him, he would naturally subordinate the Irish part to the English, and Reynild would no longer be the favored princess and the object of a rescuing voyage. Horn, of course, would not need to reconquer his country more than once; therefore the first rescuing voyage would have to be made from Westir instead of from Sudenne. With these slight changes, the essential features of the story of KH as well as of HR would be established.
the Horn story, whether the kernel of it came from a tradition connected with a supposedly historical Horn, or from a motive more or less familiar in current narrative. Others who worked with it later felt an equal freedom. They were not bound to respect a widespread tradition, for such did not exist. They merely constructed a tale or romance in the most interesting fashion they could, governed by the literary types and conventions of their time. To what extent literary types and conventions entered into Kin Horn and the other romances of our group is one of the chief aims of this study. But first it is necessary for us to turn to the other romances and determine, if possible, whether or not critical study has been more successful than in the case of Horn in indicating the probable evolution of the stories embodied in them.
B. Havelok the Dane

The story of Havelok has not been preserved in that interesting variety of forms which complicates and makes fascinating the Horn-problem. Yet, in this case also, there are four versions of the story which, it has been thought, may throw some light on its original character. The oldest seems to be the Havelok-story as told in Geoffrey Gaimar's *Estorie des Engleis*, of about 1148. The *Lai d'Haveloc le Danois*, which very much resembles the Gaimar story, dates from about 1170. The date usually accepted for the English *Havelok the Dane* is about 1300. A brief version of the story is also contained in an interpolation in the Lambeth MS. of the *Chronicle* of Robert of Brunne (1338). The following summaries in parallel columns will show the correspondences:

5. For the Interpolation, Skeat's copy (*op. cit.*, pp. xlv ff.) has been used.
Havelok the Dane

In former days there was a King whom all loved. In his time chapmen might go from one end of England to the other unmolested. He punished all evil-doers, protected the helpless, and was a terror to his country's enemies. His name was Ægelwold, and his heir was his daughter Goldborough (vv. 1-113). Falling ill, and distressed for the sake of his young child, he summons his earls and barons to Winchester, and asks them who may best care for Goldborough and England until the princess shall be of age to rule. Godrich of Cornwall is suggested; and he is made to swear solemnly that he will marry Goldborough to the best, fairest, and strongest man alive, and to give over to her the kingdom. The King dies, and the years pass. Goldborough grows into a beautiful woman, and Godrich determines that she shall not have the kingdom, but it shall be given to his own son. Therefore, he sends the girl to Dover and has her imprisoned in the castle there (114-329).

At that same time there was in Denmark a King Birkabein, who died leaving one son and two daughters, all very young. Before his death he selected Godard as guardian of children and kingdom, making him swear fidelity. Instead of keeping his promise, Godard shuts the children in a castle, has them mistreated, and at last kills the two girls with his own hands. Havelok's life is spared for the time because of a gleam of pity in Godard, who, not the less determined

Lai d'Haveloc le Danois

(In the lai the account of Argentille's early years follows that of Havelok's.)

Alsi was King at Lincoln and to the north; while Ekenbright was King toward Surrey(114-329). The latter had for wife Alsi's sistercrease, and by her had a child Argentille. Ekenbright, feeling his life ebbing away, summons Alsi and entrusts to him land and daughter. Thereupon he died, and his queen did not long survive him (vv. 193-354).

Gunter, the father of the hero (known both as Havelok and as Guaran), was King of Denmark. King Arthur determined to subdue him and exact tribute, crossed the sea, and conquered. Gunter was slain by the treachery of Hodulf. Arthur left the kingdom, and Hodulf was the most powerful in the land (1-50).

Before the battle with Arthur Gunter had placed his wife in a castle by the sea and entrusted to a baron named Grim. Havelok, who was with her, was only seven years old, and when he slept a
Gaimar's l'Estorie

In the time of Constantine, the nephew of Arthur, there were two kings in England—Adelbrit of Norfolk, a Dane; and the other Edelsie of Lincoln and Lindsey. They were sworn friends, and Adelbrit was the husband of Edelsie's sister Orwain. They had one child—Argentille. Adelbrit died, and Orwain did not long survive him. (1-100).

The Lambeth Interpolation

(In the Interpolation, the account of Argentille's parents follows the story of Havelok's early life; see below.)

Edelsi, of "Breton kynde," King of Lyndesye, had married his sister Orwayn to Egelbright, a Dane, King of Norfolk. They had a daughter, Argentille, born to them, soon after which both died, whereupon King Edelsi was glad. He took Argentille and all the kingdom into his own hands. (vv. 31-40).

Gounter and his folk go into Denmark. Soon a Breton king comes out of England to ask the tribute which Arthur formerly received. A battle results, Gounter is slain, and Eleyne, his wife, takes Havelok, their son, and flees. (1-13).
Havelok the Dane

The mother of Havelok and Grim fear Hodulf, and embark on the sea. Soon they meet outlaws, who slay all except Grim (whom they know), his family, and Havelok. These float and sail until they come to Grimsby. Grim cuts his ship in two, sets up the ends, and thus makes a dwelling. He lives by fishing and selling salt. Havelok grows and becomes strong, and at last Grim suggests that he take service in a king's court. Thereupon Havelok and two of Grim's sons set out (79-192).

(Here the account of Argen-tills's parents; cf. above.)
At the haven she meets Grim, a good mariner, who embarks with them. They are attacked on the sea by outlaws, the Queen is slain, and only Grim, Havelok, and five others are saved. They come to Grimsby, where Havelok is nourished as Grim's own son. He becomes a man of great might. (14-26).
Havelok the Dane

Clothed in a coat made of an old sail, the barefoot Havelok goes to Lincoln. There he enters the service of the Earl's cook; and, because of his strength and cheerful disposition, is an excellent servant and loved by all, particularly children (859-996). Godrich summons a parliament to meet at Lincoln, and, with the earls and barons, there comes many a champion. In putting the stone Havelok is an easy victor; and his strength is so much talked of that Godrich hears of him, and thinks here is his chance to marry Goldborough to the best, fairest, and strongest man alive, according to his promise. Accordingly, he summons Goldborough from Dover, calls for Havelok, and forces the unwilling couples to wed (999-1180).

Havelok, fearing Godrich, and with a wife on his hands, now returns to Grimsby. When he arrives Grim is dead, but the five children, now prosperous, receive them kindly. That night Goldborough, wakeful and grieving because of her unnatural marriage to a thrall, sees a bright light issue from the mouth of her husband; and sees also a gold red cross on his shoulder. At that moment an angel speaks telling her not to be sad, as the cross betokens that Havelok is to be King of England and Denmark. Havelok, awaking, tells of a dream that he was in Denmark, and everything there cleaved to his arms; and of another dream that he flew over the sea to England, which likewise became his. Goldborough assures him that the dream indicates that he is to be King.

Lai d'Haveloc le Danols

Havelok and his companions go to Lincoln, where Alai is holding court. He enters the King's service as cook; and is so liberal that he is usually considered a fool, and is given the name Cuaran (=scullion). His strength is marvellous, and ten of the strongest are unable to resist him (235-178).

At this time the barons come to court and demand that the King give Argentille a husband. The King asks for time for consideration; and finally, on the day set for the answer, tells them that he has sworn to give Argentille to the strongest man he could find in the kingdom; therefore he will give her to a groom in his kitchen named Cuaran. The barons are obliged to see the marriage performed (279-370).

One night Argentille dreams that she sees a great fight of animals in which a boar is finally successful; also that two lions come and kneel to Cuaran. On awaking she sees a flame come from her husband's mouth. Her cry arouses him, whereupon she tells her dream. Cuaran tries to reassure her, giving it a trivial interpretation. In the morning Argentille repeats her dream to a chamberlain, who takes her to a holy hermit dwelling in a wood. The hermit tells Argentille that her husband is of royal descent and shall be a king. Argentille then returns to Havelok and asks him about his people. He replies that they live at Grimsby. At her request, they, with Havelok's
Gaimar's l'Estorie

Cuheran is a cook, a strong and beautiful lad in the employ of the King. He is very generous and a universal favorite. To him the King gave Argentille for wife, thinking by thus disgracing her to make it impossible for her ever to reign (101-194).

The Lambeth Interpolation

After a time Havelok takes leave of Grim, and goes to the court of King Edelsi (a Breton), who ruled the kingdom of Lindsey. (Here follows the account of Argentille's parents; see above.)

Havelok becomes Edelsi's "quistron" and is called Co-raunt. He is strong as a giant, courteous, and fair, so that all folk love him. (41-44).

The King, for "couetise of desheraison", has Havelok and Argentille wedded. She is greatly humiliated, and lives with her husband at court in poor estate. One time she asks Havelok of his home and kindred, and says she would rather lead a life of poverty than to live the life of a queen in shame and sorrow. Therefore, they go to Grimsby. Grim and his wife are dead, but they find Aunger, Grim's cousin. (45-58).

One night Argentille dreams that she and Cuheran see a great fight of animals, in which a boar is finally successful; also that two lions kneel to Cuheran. Awaking, she sees a flame issuing from her husband's mouth. She embraces him, so that he awakes, and she relates her dream, to which he gives a trivial interpretation. He also says that he knows nothing of the flame except that it escapes him while he sleeps. (195-300).

She asks him where his family is and he answers "Grimsby." She suggests that they go there. Next morning they asks leave of the King, who grants it good-naturedly. They
Havelok the Dane

of England and Denmark. The next morning Havelok goes to the church, prays for the success of his enterprise, and places an offering on the altar. Returning home, he rehearses his story to his foster-brothers, and asks them to accompany him to Denmark (1181-1444).

(Folio missing; Havelok is in Denmark and talking with the Danish earl, Ubbe, when the narrative is resumed.)

Havelok, ostensibly a merchant, asks for permission to travel through the country with his wares, presenting to Ubbe a gold ring. Ubbe, admiring the newcomer, invites him to bring his wife and eat with him. Havelok, fearing to refuse, consents, and they are well feasted. Afterwards they are sent to Bernard Brun's to be lodged (1445-1765). As they are about to eat, some sixty strong fellows come up and demand admittance. Being refused, they break open the door with a stone, but Havelok draws the bar from the door, and slays the three foremost at a blow. A desperate fight follows in which Havelok and his fellows are at last victorious, slaying all their opponents. The next morning Ubbe hears of the disturbance, rides over to the house of Bernard Brun, and hears the story from Bernard himself. Havelok, who has been wounded, is then taken together with his friends, to the castle of Ubbe and lodged in a bower next to Ubbe's own (1765-2069).

The very first night, Ubbe, awaking about midnight, sees a light in Havelok's bower. Investigating, he notes that

Lai d'Haveloc le Danois

foster-brothers, go to Grimsby. Grim is dead, and his daughter Kelloc has married a merchant. From her is learned the story of Havelok's parentage. (Havelok, although seven years old when he left Denmark, thinks himself the son of Grim up to this time.) (371-641).

A ship is manned; they cross to Denmark, and are directed to the city of the Steward, Siger the Stallere (642-66).

Siger receives them courteously, and entertains them at a meal (667-90).

After eating, the steward has them conducted to an inn. Some onlookers desired the lady and followed them in the street; but Havelok killed five with an axe, and cuts off the hand of a sixth. An outcry arises. Havelok escapes to a minster, from the tower of which he defends himself by throwing stones from the wall. The steward learns of the trouble, comes with his knights, and, seeing Havelok on the tower, is reminded of his dead lord, King Gunter. He learns that the young man's name is Havelok, gives him assurance of safety, leads him and his companions to his own castle, and makes them lie in his chamber. He orders one of his men to watch if a flame comes from his mouth (691-836).

The man watching soon sees the flame and notifies his lord. Thereupon the steward summons all in the country who hate Hodulf. The
then go to Grimsby, together with the two sons of Grim. There they find a fisherman, the husband of Grim's daughter. He and his wife Kelloc then tell Havelok and Argentille that Havelok's father was Gunter, King of Denmark, who was slain in a war with Arthur; that Grim, with Havelok and his mother, had fled; that they were attacked on the sea, and Havelok's mother lost; that they had come to Grimsby, made a house of the ship, etc. Kelloc's husband (now a merchant, it seems) has recently been in Denmark and knows of many who desire the return of Havelok. (301-478).

Two ships are fitted out. Havelok and his wife go to Denmark, where they meet Sigar Estalre, who was steward of King Gunter and justice of his land (479-532).

(A passage is missing at this point.)

Six youths attack Havelok and seize the lady; but Havelok grasps an axe, strikes down three, kills two, and cuts off the hand of the sixth. He then proceeds to an inn; afterwards, when an outcry arises, to a minster. There he defends himself and wife by throwing stones from the wall of the tower, and when Sigar comes riding up he has already killed five. Sigar is reminded of Gunter, makes a truce, leads him home, and asks his name. Havelok replies that men call him Cuherant, but that he knows well Havelok is his name (533-620).

Sigar remembers the King's son and thinks of the flame which was accustomed, long since, to issue from his mouth when asleep. That night he has his servants watch. They soon call their master, who, when he sees the flame, calls an assembly of knights, footmen, and pioneers. When Havelok is led...
Havelok the Dane

It comes from Havelok's mouth. He also sees a cross on the right shoulder, the light of which is brighter than gold. Ubbe and his knights (who have also entered) know it is their king, and at once offer homage to him. The next day Ubbe summons earls, barons, drenges, thanes, clerks, knights, etc.; rehearses the story of Birkebein and Havelok, and all swear loyalty to their newfound king. Havelok is dubbed knight and becomes King, amid games and feasting, the foster-brothers becoming barons at the same time. (2000-2355).

Havelok, with a large force, now proceeds against Godard. Robert (a son of Grim) and Godard fight, and the former is wounded. However, Godard's men flee, and the traitor is captured and bound. A trial takes place and Godard is condemned. He is flayed, drawn to the gallows, and hung. (1354-2511).

After making Ubbe steward, Havelok returns to England; founds a priory of black monks at Grimsby for Grim's sake. Godrich, hearing of his arrival, raises an army which meets at Lincoln on March 17. With Earl Guntor and Earl Reyner of Chester as his chief supporters, he proceeds towards Grimsby. A great battle results. Godrich fights valiantly, cleaves the shield of Havelok, but finally loses his hand, and is captured. The English then submit. Godrich is condemned, is bound to a stake, and burned (2512-2849).

Earl Reyner of Chester agrees to marry Grim's daughter Gurnild; Bertram the cook (Havelok's old master) is made Earl of Cornwall and married to Grim's second daughter Leuine. Havelok

Lai d'Haveloc le Danois

The next morning Havelok is conducted into the presence of a company of friends, but, fearing that he is about to be condemned, he seizes an axe for defence. He is soon reassured, however, and all kneel and swear loyalty. Havelok is dubbed knight. The steward sends a letter to Hodulf demanding that he surrender the land (837-934).

Hodulf collects a force, but when the two armies meet Havelok suggests a single combat. Hodulf accepts and is slain. His men submit. Havelok reigns quietly for four years (935-931).

Argentille desires Havelok to return to England, and a great expedition is prepared. Havelok crosses into England with four hundred and eighty ships full of folk (982-99).

When Alsí learns that his cook has come to fight him he laughs. However, he gathers an army, which meets with the force of Havelok at Thetford. A desperate battle ensues and many Danes are killed. Havelok is ready to return to his fleet; but the Queen suggests a ruse. At night stakes are cut and sharpened, and by means of them the dead men are set up with the living. In the morning, when Alsí and his knights see the host they decide to yield. A treaty is made. Ekenbright's land is given to Argentille. Alsí lived only fif-
into the hall, he has great fear at sight of the crowd. He turns to seize an axe, but Sigar reassures him. Then a horn is brought which no one can sound unless the King or his rightful heir. Havelok, although he had never blown a horn, sounds it as well as ever did his father. All then receive him as their lord (621-734).

A defiance is sent to King Edulf; and two great armies meet in a plain. In the battle Edulf is defeated; and his friends ask for mercy at the hands of Havelok. Havelok is then made King amid feasting and rejoicing (735-59).

Afterward he passes the sea with a great host, and defies Edelsi. The two armies meet in a plain, and an indecisive battle is fought (759-72).

The Queen teaches Havelok a trick, by which he gains the kingdom easily. During the night the dead men are set up on stakes. When Edelsi's men see them, they demand that the king yield. He is compelled to do so, and the kingdom is given to King Havelok. Edelsi lives fifteen days, after which Havelok and

The Lambeth Interpolation

Sykar promises to help Havelok recover his heritage, and a force is assembled. (67-69).

King Edulf also gathers an army, marches against Havelok, and is defeated. Thus Havelok regains his kingdom. (The fate of Edulf is not told.) (70-72).

Soon afterward Havelok sails with an army to England to win his wife's heritage. Edelsi hears of it, and gathers a great host, but is defeated in the battle. (73-77).

He yields Argentille her heritage; and because she is "next of his blod," gives her Lyndeseye after his day, so that at the
Havelok the Dane is crowned King of England at London and rules for sixty years, during which time he and Goldborough are never separated. They have fifteen children, all kings or queens. (2950-3001).

Lai d'Havelok le Danois is crowned King of England at London and rules for sixty years, during which time he and Goldborough are never separated. They have fifteen children, all kings or queens. (2950-3001). Afterwards Havelok reigns twenty years and is a victorious king (999-1106).
and his friends have Edelsi's land. He reigns twenty years and is a conqueror (773-818).
Of the four versions thus summarized, it is evident that Gaimar, the Lai, and the Interpolation stand pretty close together. Therefore, no one now claims that the English Havelok is derived from any one of them. It seems likewise pretty much agreed that no one of the remaining three is dependent upon another. The Lambeth Interpolation, which had been regarded as an abridgment of Gaimar, was shown by Putnam to contain independent features, and his opinion that it is derived independently of other versions has been generally accepted. The independence of Gaimar and the Lai had already been recognized. Their source Kupferschmidt thought to be a French romance in octosyllabic couplets, and Putnam traces the Interpolation to the

1. The opinion of Kupferschmidt (Rom. Studien, vol. IV, pp. 411 ff.) that the Havelok story in the Brut d'Engleterre, an Anglo-Norman prose chronicle, is an independent redaction of the story has not met with acceptance. For criticism, cf. Heyman, Havelok-Studies, and Brie, Eng. Stud., XXXV, pp. 360 ff. Heyman and Brie agree that the Brut d'Engleterre story is based on an interpolation in a MS. of Wace in that portion of Wace's history which is lost; this interpolation being derived from Gaimar. However, Brie says that "schen der interpolator der ihm zugrunde liegenden Wace-handschrift eine ähnliche englische Überlieferung bekannt haben muss, wie der name Birkabeyn beweisst." Brie concludes that as this MS. is probably not later than the middle of the thirteenth century the Brut proves the existence of an English Havelok earlier than the Havelok which is preserved.


same source. However, the existence of this French romance
and the precise relation of the three versions to it cannot be
said to have escaped from the realm of hypothesis.

Whether or not the English Havelok had a French source is
still an open question. However, that the story is thoroughly

3. The older opinion that Havelok had the Lai for its source,
   held by Madden and Ward, seems now to have no defenders. Putnam
   asks the question (p. 15) if the English Havelok may not have
   had for source the lost French romance, but replies negatively.
   "It seems extremely improbable that this lost French version
could have been the source of the English. For this there are
numerous and significant reasons, among which may be mentioned
the complete dissimilarity of names, the fact that the English
has no mention whatever of Arthur, the great variation in even
the more important incidents, the difference in tone, the fact
that the English appears to be closer to tradition, and the lack
of convincing evidence that the English is a translation from
(4th ed.), p. 110, goes so far as to say: "Der germanische
(Skandinavische?) Ursprung der Haveloksage kann ebensowenig
zweifelhaft sein wie der der Hornsage, und es darf von dem uns
erhaltenen englischen Havelok-Lai mit Sicherheit angenommen
werden, dass es unmittelbar auf alte Volksüberlieferung zurück-
geht und nicht von französischen Einflüssen berührt worden ist."
On the contrary, Holthausen (p. IX) says that the "English poem
is probably a translation of a French one, which is however lost,"
and Deutschbein, after quoting with approval Ward's remark that
with the exception of the childhood incident the "peculiarities
of the English poem are due to natural changes of tradition",
continues (p. 159): "So steht das englische Gedicht der alten
Sage nur noch sehr fern gegenüber und damit entscheidet sich
für uns auch die Quellenfrage. Unser Ergebnis hat uns dahin
geführt, dass der englische Spielmann kaum ältere (mündliche)
Quellen für seinen Stoff benutzt hat; sondern wie seine übrigen
Landstreute wird er wohl eine französische Vorlage gehabt haben."
English in the sense that it arose on English soil is not a matter of dispute. It is also very generally held that it took root among Danish settlers in England. There, according to Deutschbein, it came into the hands of the Anglo-Normans, who gave it literary form, from which descended the English Havelok, as well as the Gaimar account, the Lai, and the Interpolation. Whether this is the true account or not, it seems pretty well agreed that the resulting redaction was by no means characteristic French; and the temptation to regard the original literary version as probably in the English language is strong. Moreover, the extremely popular character of the English romance makes it doubtful if it could really have been constructed by Anglo-Normans for Anglo-Normans.

---

1. Cf. Skeat, Havelok (E.E.T.S.), p. iv: "From every point of view, whether we regard the British tradition, the Anglo-Norman version, or the version printed in the present volume, the story is wholly English."


4. In addition to citations in the preceding notes, cf. Heyman, pp. 147 ff. Deutschbein's position in this case seems determined by his belief that the English were incapable of performing anything beyond "eine Vermittlerrolle." For criticism of this assumption, cf. Ker, Mod. L. Review, II, pp. 176 f. Deutschbein also avers (p. 235) that "die Haveloksage ist direkt engländerfeindlich." However it may have been originally, it probably was not recognized as such in the twelfth century, since it apparently was popular with the English in the thirteenth century; so it seems unfair to deny the possibility that the story was worked over by the English.

5. Heyman, p. 147, thinks the story was put in writing before the Norman Conquest—in English, of course.
If, then, we have here a story which is popular in tone, should it not have retained clear marks of the saga out of which it grew? The results of investigation, while meager, seem more trustworthy than those which the study of the Horn story has brought forth. It has long been believed that Havelok, as well as Horn, represents historical occurrences and conditions. Skeat traced the story back as far as the sixth century, identifying Ægelwold with Ægelberht of Kent, and suggesting that Havelok may have been a Briton. Later investigation, however, goes back to the studies of Kristian Köster, Sagnet om Havelok Danske and Gustaf Storm, Havelok the Dane and the Norse King Olaf Kuaran. They noted the apparent connection of the name Havelok with Anlaf, and called attention to the fact that there lived in the tenth century a king with the name Anlaf Cuaran, which would corre-

2. This study (Copenhagen, 1666) first called attention to the etymological relation of Havelok and Olaf.
3. First published in Christians Videnskabsselskabs Forhandlingser (1879), No. 10; reprinted in Englische Studien, III, pp. 533, to which references are here made.
4. For identification of the names Anlaf with Havelok, cf. Storm, p. 534; also Gollancz, Athenaeum, No. 3603 (1896), p. 681; Wohlfeil, p. 16. Storm's statement is as follows: The Norse Ælfr, originally Anleifr, corresponds with the Anglo-Saxon Anlaf, the Irish Amlaib, pronounced Awlay, and the Welsh Abloc. Thus in the Welsh chronicle Brut y Tywysogion (ed. by the Rev. John Williams ab Ithel, Lond. 1860) the predecessor of our Anlaf is named 'Abloyc' (A.D. 942). We find A.D. 960 the 'meibon Abloyc' i.e. the sons of Abloc Cuaran and A.D. 989 the death of Glumane mab Abloyc (the Irish Gluniaran, iron-knee) noticed. And as Abloc is the Welsh form of Anlaf or Olave, thus Aveloc—in later English Haveloc—must be the Anglo-Norman pronunciation of Abloc."
pond with Havelok Cuaran. As this identification has been generally accepted, the brief statement of the story of Anlaf Cuaran which Storm gives will show the points of connection with the Havelok story. "His father Sigtryg, descended from the Norse dynasty in Dublin, reigned in the Danish Kingdom of Northumberland, but on his father's death (927) Olave [or Olaf, the Norse name of which Anlaf is the Anglo-Saxon equivalent] was expelled by the English conqueror Athelstan. Olave afterwards dwelt many years in Scotland, and in this exile he married the daughter of the Scottish king. But in 940 he returned to England and after the death of his cousin and helper Olave of Dublin in 942 he recovered not only his father's kingdom Northumberland but also the north-eastern Mercia and reigned for some years (942-44) over 'all Danelage north of the Watlingastraet.'" Anlaf was also present at the battle of Brunanburgh, where he "and his father-in-law King Constantine were put to flight by the English King Athelstan."  

The fact that the resemblances of the two stories are limited to name and one or two commonplace incidents has not escaped notice and criticism, and is well stated by Deutschbein: "Man wird nicht verkennen, dass die Vertreibung des jungen Anlafs aus Northumbrien, seine, wenn auch vorübergehende, Rückeroberung Northumbriens eine Ahnlichkeit mit Haveloks Jugendgeschichte hat; 

1. Of the French versions; Cuaran does not appear in the English Havelok.

2. For a review of the life of Anlaf so far as known see Dict. Nat. Biog. on Olaf Sitricson.

Das exile-return motif gilt auch von Anlaf Cuarans Leben. Doch ist dieses Motiv in Geschichte und Sage so häufig, dass wir kaum auf den Gedanken kommen würden, das sich hinter Havelok der historische Anlaf Cuaran verberge, wenn nicht die Namen dafür sprächen. Besonders ist das Verhältniss Anlafs Cuarans zu Konstantin ein ganz anderes als Haveloks zu Edelj, an dessen Hof er als Vertriebener gelangte. "Although this very fundamental point of the identification of names has been questioned, as it seems, by Sommer as well as by Binz, it seems pretty evident that the identification was made by one of the sources of Gaimar."


Deutschbein endeavors to strengthen the connection by showing that certain facts in the life of Reginwald, uncle of Olaf, are reproduced in the saga\(^1\). But the hypothesis of the identity of Havelok and Olaf must rest on the resemblance of name, and this may amount to nothing more, so far as the Havelok story is concerned, than the borrowing of a name\(^2\). That we have in the Havelok story a fusion of a variety of almost disconnected historical occurrences into a single popular story must at best remain an interesting hypothesis\(^3\).

---

1. A brief statement of Deutschbein's chief contribution, which is certainly very interesting and may prove to be of real value, may be added here. D. finds only two names to be purely Anglo-Saxon—those of the traitors—for which reason he concludes that the saga arose among enemies of the Anglo-Saxons. The historical kernel is primarily to be found in the life of the Viking Reginwald. After the death of Ethelfleda, "the Lady of the Mercians", her brother Edward took the Mercian ealdorship into his own hand, and carried away her daughter Aelfwyn into Essex" (D.N.B. under "Ethelfleda"). In Caradoc.'s History of Wales Edward is represented as treacherously disinheriting his niece "upon the pretense that she, without his knowledge (whom her mother had appointed her Guardian) had privily promised and contracted Marriage with Reynald, King of the Danes." The Danes, according to Caradoc, then invaded the land of Edward, and were defeated at Chester. According to D., Reginwald (=Reynald) is superseded in the saga by his nephew Anlaf Guaran, while the place of Edward is taken by his son Aethelstan (i.e. Edelsi). This is the most important historical parallel noted by Deutschbein, although he notes additional elements more or less connected historically with Anlaf which he believes were absorbed into the saga.

2. Cf. Heyman, pp. 81 ff. "We are of the opinion that Havelok may, from an historical point of view, be considered as an expression of Scandinavianism in England, and that it is impossible to prove that the character of the Danish prince is copied exclusively from one single person" (p. 91).

3. If Havelok"is the same as Abloec or Abloyc, the ordinary Welsh form of Anlaf or Olaf", and if it can be shown also "that the names of Orwain and Argentille are Welsh", it is necessary
One other theory deserves a paragraph. Gollancz\(^1\) pointed out and discussed resemblances between the Havelok-story and the Hamlet-tale, the latter being indebted to the former, according to his view, in some rather important particulars. Zenker\(^2\), however, accounts for the resemblance by the more daring theory that the "Haveloksage ist in ihren Grundzügen identisch mit der Hamletsage." Consequently, in accordance with Zenker's main hypothesis that the Bevis-saga and the Hamlet-saga have the same source, Havelok is brought into connection with Bevis. At the root of all these tales, he contends, lies the Bellerophon-story. It will be impossible to go into the details of Zenker's very interesting and elaborate study. It must suffice to remark that his views have failed to convince very many students of the

\(^1\) Gollancz, *Hamlet in Iceland*, pp. xlvi ff.

\(^2\) A. Ahlström, *Studier i den Fornfranska Lais--Litteraturen* (Upsala, 1892) thinks he recognizes Celtic elements.

1. *Hamlet in Iceland*, pp. xl ff. The setting up of dead men on stakes is the most important motive common to the Havelok-story (French versions) and the Hamlet-story. Gollancz states that the evidence "seems to point to the Celtic West, more particularly the Scandinavian Kingdom of Ireland, as the locality where the northern tale of 'Hamlet,' as we know it from Saxo, was finally developed sometime in the eleventh century--about the same time as the Welsh minstrels of Strathclyde were forging their tale of 'Havelok'" (p. lv). This proximity would account for influence from one story to the other. Ward's suggestion of identity of the names Havelok and Hamlet (*Cat. Rom.*, I, p. 860) is rejected by Gollancz (note, p. lv). Cf. also Ward's review of Elton's *Saxo Grammaticus in Eng. Hist. Review*, vol. X, pp.

As in the case of the Horn-story, it seems safest for our purpose to ignore the historical element and to be cautious in calling upon a hypothetical popular story. If there is a historical nucleus such as Deutschbein claims, or if their is a nucleus of classical story, as Zenker believes, it is evident that it has undergone changes which render it practically unrecognizable. As a matter of fact, there is no proof that the story was not constructed by the free hand of an individual author. At best, it is impossible to pick out those elements which the first literary redactor obtained from a traditional story about Havelok, and those which came from other popular or literary narratives. Deutschbein himself has well shown that most of the motives of the story were familiar medieval material. If a lump of history ever existed in the story it is thoroughly dissolved in fiction in the story as we have it. Shall we not, as Binz suggests, attribute the story primarily to the lust zu fabulieren which was so fully alive in the twelfth century?

---

1. Cf. Deutschbein, p. 167;
C. Bevis of Hampton

The story of Bevis made a powerful appeal to medieval lovers of fiction. There are French, English, Welsh, Irish, Norse, Italian, Russian, Netherlandic, Jewish, and Roumanian versions. There are no less than eleven French MSS.—nine preserving the story in verse and two in prose. There are six English MSS. A Netherlandic version was printed in 1504, and English versions came from the presses of Wynkyn de Worde and Richard Pynson at about this same time. The oldest version preserved (represented by two of the French MSS.) is the Anglo-Norman Boeve de Haumtone. Very closely connected with it are the Welsh, the Norse, the English, and the Irish redactions. The editor of the Anglo-Norman poem expressed the opinion that the continental versions do not preserve any elements which are original, but the evidence presented by Boje seems to indicate pretty clearly that the Anglo-Norman version which we have and the continental French versions are independently derived from a common source. With

1. Boje, pp. ff., has most thoroughly discussed the versions; cf. also Stimming, p. iii, Kölbing, pp. xxxiv ff.


3. Edited by Stimming in Bibliotheca Normannica, VII, Halle, 1899. He dates the version in the first half of the thirteenth century (p. lviii). He suggests that the original poet probably lived in the neighborhood of Southampton, and that northern dialectal forms are due to the latest redactor.


5. Boje, pp. 27 ff.
the continental French versions belong all the remaining continental versions; and as some of these, likewise, may contain original features, the question of the development and spread of the story is a very complicated one. Boje has summarized, in parallel columns, the stories of the two main branches of the Bevis-literature—the Anglo-Norman and the continental French—and as the continental versions have not been published, use has been made of his summary in determining what features of the English Bevis not in the Anglo-Norman version may be found in the more remote group of Bevis stories. For our immediate purpose it seems safest to direct attention chiefly to the English Bevis and that version which most nearly represents its source—the Anglo-Norman Boeve de Haumont.

On the English MSS., the Auchinleck is the oldest, and is made the basis of the summary which here follows. However, as Kölbing has indicated, it does not always represent best the original French version. Therefore, attention will be called to other MSS. when differences seem significant. In the following summary I shall indicate the lines of the Anglo-Norman version corresponding to those of the English version; while the more important variations in the story will be indicated in foot-notes. If any feature of the English Bevis, not in the A.N. version, is in the continental version, the fact will likewise be indicated.

1. Boje, pp. 29 ff.
2. Cf. Kölbing, pp. xl f.; for classification of MSS., see pp. xxxvii ff. His texts, taken with the notes, show all variations.
3. Kölbing's notes give all differences of the slightest importance; cf. also Stimming's introduction where the variations are collected and classified.
4. However, Boje's summary is not full enough to show in many cases whether or not C.F. differs from the other versions.
Guy, Earl of Southampton, an old man, marries the daughter of the King of Scotland. To them is born Bevis. The lady is not happy, however, and regrets that she did not marry a young and vigorous man. Therefore, when Bevis is seven years old, she sends a messenger to Doon, the Emperor of Almaine, a former lover, asking him to come on the first of May to the forest by the sea with a force of men, so that he may slay her husband, whom she will send there. The messenger crosses the sea, finds the Emperor, and returns with the desired promise. (E. 1-174; A.N. 1-117).

On the first day of May, the treacherous wife lies in bed, pretending illness, and sends her husband to the forest to slay the boar of which she desires the meat. The earl goes to the forest, is surprised by the Emperor and his men, and is slain. The head of the old man is then sent to his widow. (E. 175-294; A.N. 118-208).

Bevis, on learning the news, reproaches his mother bitterly. She strikes the child down, and his master, Saber, picks him up to carry away. The lady follows, and commands Saber to slay the boy. Saber, on arriving home, slays a swine, and sprinkles the blood on the child's clothing. The boy is then clothed meanly, and sent out in the field to guard sheep. (E. 295-378; A.N. 207-55).

Bevis, however, soon leaves the sheep and returns to the tower. The porter refuses to admit him, but Bevis cleaves his head and enters. Going into the hall, he demands his mother and property from the Emperor, and finally strikes him three times, so that he falls unconscious. Bevis's mother commands the knights to seize him, but they, sympathizing with him, let him pass out. (E. 379-456; A.N. 256-314).

---

1. In Beoeve the age is ten.
2. In the A.N. the countess arises and goes to the earl, complaining that she is ill.
3. In the A.N., Sabaut (=Saber) throws the bloody clothes in the water.
Hastening away, he meets Saber, tells what he has done, and is taken to Saber's house. Soon the mother comes and demands the boy. Saber shows the bloody clothes, but this evidence very naturally is not accepted. Bevis, hearing his master threatened, shows himself, and, at his mother's command, is taken to the seashore and sold to Saracen merchants. (E. 457-510; A.N. 315-63).

Bevis is then carried to the land where Ermin is King, and where lives a beautiful princess, Josian. The merchants present the boy to the King, who is so pleased with him that he offers to marry him to Josian if he will forsake the Christian God. This Bevis refuses to do, but he remains in favor at court until fifteen years old and of great strength. (E. 511-64; A.N. 364-415).

His first battle occurs on Christmas day. As he and fifteen Saracens are out riding, a quarrel arises over the difference of religion. In the fight which results, Bevis slays all his enemies, but is severely wounded. When the King threatens to take the life of the boy for this, Josian intercedes in his behalf, herself brings him from his chamber, reconciles him with her father, and cures his wounds. (E. 585-738).

After this Bevis undertakes to slay a boar which has destroyed many men. When he arrives in the wood, he sees the bones of the boar's victims. At the first encounter, Bevis's spear

1. In Boeve, Sabaut says he has thrown the boy's body in the water.

2. The English version says everybody loves Bevis; but according to the Anglo-Norman some of the Saracen knights are envious.

3. These lines do not appear in the A.N. However, there is a corresponding passage in the C.P. (Continental French) version (Boje, p. 30). In the English version, Bevis is introduced as riding Arondel, although the horse is given to him later. In C.P. this is explained by the fact that Bevis was placed in charge of Arondel, the King's steed, and was riding it to water at the time of the fight.

4. The description of the boar is apparently peculiar to the English version:

   At is mouth fif tuskes stoden out,  
   Euerich was fif enches about,  
   His sides were hard & strong,  
   His brostles wer gret & long,  
   Him self was gret & cou^te fiȝte,  
   No man sle him ne miȝte (vv. 745 ff.).
bursts on the boar's hide. The fight lasts until evening, when the hero finally succeeds in thrusting his sword through the beast's mouth to the heart. (E. 739-836; A.N. 416-59)\(^1\).

When Bevis is returning, he is attacked by an envious steward with twenty-four knights and ten foresters\(^2\). With the head of the boar as a weapon, he manages to secure from one of his enemies a sword. Therewith he slays the steward and his men. Josian sees the fight from the castle, and loves the valiant Christian. (E. 837-908; A.N. 460-89).

Three years later\(^3\) King Bradmond appears in Armenia (the land of Ermin) and demands Josian for wife. Ermin summons a council, and Josian suggests that Bevis be made knight. This is done, Josian gives Arondel to the hero, and in the battle which follows he succeeds in capturing Bradmund himself. When he announces his victory, Ermin is rejoiced and bids Josian serve the young knight. (E. 909-1082; A.N. 490-662).

Josian takes Bevis to her own chamber and declares her love. He at first declares himself unworthy, and holds out against pleading and reproach, saying that he will go to another country. Josian sends Bonefas, her chamberlain, to his lodging with a petition for his favor, but Bevis politely sends the messenger back, giving him a rich mantle. Josian, still persistent, goes herself to Bevis, and offers to forsake her own gods for Christianity, whereupon Bevis grants her his love. (E. 1083-1200; A.N. 663-774)\(^4\).

---

1. The description of the fight occupies only eleven lines (439-49) in the A.N. as compared with forty-six lines in the English version.

2. In the A.N. and in part of the English MSS. there is nothing about a steward, and Bevis's fight is with ten (A.N., twelve in English MSS.) foresters.

3. This happens immediately after the boar fight in the A.N. version.

4. It is interesting to note that while in the A.N. and English versions the fact that Josian is heathen is apparently the reason for declining her love, in the C.P. version the main reason is that Bevis has not yet avenged his father and that he is unworthy (Boje, p. 31).
But two knights, whom Bevis has befriended, falsely report to the King that Bevis has lain by his daughter, and suggest that he be sent to Bradmond as the bearer of a letter, the letter to contain instructions for Bevis's punishment. This is done, the hero swearing to show the letter to no one. (E. 1201-62; A.N. 775-819).

Meanwhile Saber has sent his son Terri to seek the lost child. Terri is sitting under a medlar tree beside Damascus when Bevis rides up, hears Terri's story, and tells him that Bevis has been hung by the Saracens. Terri laments and returns to his father. Before going, however, he suggests to Bevis that he read the contents of the letter which he bears, but Bevis refuses to permit it. (E. 1263-1344; A.N. 820-82).

Bevis goes on to Damascus, slays a heathen priest in a "mameri", and throws the heathen gods in a fen. He appears before Bradmond while at meat and delivers the letter. The latter reads it, has Bevis seized, bound to a great stone, and cast into a deep prison. (E. 1345-1432; A.N. 863-970).

Josian meanwhile has been told that Bevis is gone to England, and she is married against her will to Yvor, King of Monbraunt. She preserves her virginity by means of a magic stone in a ring she wears. On the journey to Monbraunt Yvor swears to ride Arondel, which was given to him by Ermin, into his own city, but is thrown and greatly hurt. Arondel, after being caught, remains tied for seven years, all men fearing to approach. (E. 1433-1534; A.N. 971-1034).

In his prison Bevis finds snakes, newts, and toads, and is wounded in the forehead by a "nadder", but finally slays them all. When he has been in his dungeon seven years, his jailors hear him praying and one descends by a rope to kill him. Bevis, however, still has sufficient strength to strike him dead with

---

1. The passage in which this is told has no A.N. equivalent.
2. In the C.F., Bevis tells his story to a strange pilgrim whom he meets. There he is introduced merely to make the offer to read the letter.
3. In the A.N. it is a magic girdle.
4. In the A.N. Arondel kicks Yvor in the stable and wounds him.
his fist. The second jailor, also descending, is thrust through. Three days Bevis lives without food or water; but at last, in answer to prayer, his fetters break and he is freed from the stone. Ascending by the rope which the jailors had used, he seizes arms and a horse (as it is midnight) and deceives the porter into letting him out by telling him that he is pursuing Bevis, who has escaped. (E. 1535-1707; A.N. 1035-1146).

In the morning the escape of Bevis becomes known. Men are sent in pursuit, among whom is a king, Grander by name, who has a horse of "gret pris", Trinchefis. He meets Bevis, and, after a long combat, is slain, with seven other knights. When this has happened, Bevis sees Bradmond approaching with a great host. He prays for aid, and, with Trinchefis, plunges into the sea, over which he swims in a day and a night. (E. 1708-1826; A.N. 1147-1263).

After reaching land, he rides along until he comes to a castle. He asks the lady of the castle for a meal, but she refuses, and finally summons her lord. This lord proves to be a great giant, a brother of Grander. Again a fight and a victory, after which Bevis is fed and goes on his way. (E. 1827-1858; A.N. 1264-1345).

The hero next visits the Patriarch at Jerusalem, who forbids him ever to take for wife any one who is not "clene maide." The next day, however, he determines to go to "Armonie" to see Josian. He soon meets a knight from Armenia from whom he learns that Josian is married and a queen in Mombraunt. Thereupon he turns his steed toward that city. (E. 1959-2048; A.N. 1346-1380).

1. In the A.N. Bevis escapes by an underground passage; in the C.F. through a window (Boje, p. 32).
2. In the A.N. Bradmond and his nephew Grander are both slain by Boevo. Grander, apparently, does not appear in the C.F. version (Boje, p. 37).
3. In the A.N. and C.F. the passage of the water lacks this rather startling supernatural detail.
4. The English version says thirty feet long—a detail not found in the A.N.
Before entering the town, Bevis exchanges clothes with a palmer. At the gate of the castle he joins a group of palmers and learns from them that the Queen will appear between "middai & noun". He walks about the castle and, as he passes by a turret, hears Josian lamenting for him. Bevis rejoins the palmers, and when Josian appears receives meat and wine with the rest. Each one is asked if he knows anything of Bevis. The disguised hero says he knows him, and asks to see Arondel. As soon as the horse hears his master's voice, he breaks loose and runs into the court outside the stable. Bevis leaps on his back, and Josian at once knows him. She tells him that she is still a maid and he agrees to take her away. (E 2040-2200; A.N. 1581-1490).

Yvor, meanwhile, has been away hunting. When he returns, he asks the newly arrived palmer for news. Bevis tells him that there is war in Dabilent, the king of which is besieged in a castle. Yvor cries out that it is his brother who is thus besieged, and at once starts with fifteen kings to rescue him. The Queen is left in the charge of an old king named Garcy, who has a gold ring in which he can see what any man does. Bonefas, however, puts an herb in Garcy's drink which makes him sleep a day and a night. Josian, Bevis, and Bonefas escape, taking treasure with them. (E 2200-2614; A.N. 1491-1566).

The next day Garcy sees by his ring that a Queen has escaped with the palmer, and immediately a force of knights pursue the fugitives. These escape by concealing themselves in a cave, and the pursuers return home, leaving Ascopard, a giant, on guard. After two days Bevis is compelled to go hunting to procure food. On his return he finds that two lions have slain Bonefas, but that Josian is safe because lions cannot injure one who is at the same time a king's daughter, a queen, and a maid. A desperate flight, during which Bevis refuses rough aid from Josian, finally ends with the death of the lions. (E 2315-2500; A.N. 1589-1740).

Bevis and Josian then begin their journey anew, when they are confronted by Ascopard, armed with a great club. The latter falls in attempting to strike Bevis, who is then about to cut off his head; but Josian petitions for his life. Bevis somewhat unwillingly grants the request, and Ascopard becomes their servant. (E 2501-2550; A.N. 1741-1840).

1. In C.F., but not in A.N.
2. In the C.F. the situation is somewhat different. The King is away on an expedition when Bevis arrives.
3. In the A.N. Josian's request is directed to Ascopard that he consent to become the servant of Bevis. Boje's summary does not indicate clearly whether or not the C.F. agrees.
They find a ship at the strand, Arondel drives off the Saracens in it, and the three sail to Cologne, where Bevis's uncle, Saber Florentin, is Bishop. Josian is baptized; but Ascopard fears that the Bishop intends to drown him and declares that he is "to make to be cristine!" (E. 2551-96; A.N. 1941-1879).

Bevis's next adventure is with a dragon which has been troubling the neighborhood of Cologne. Ascopard refuses to aid in the fight on the ground that he is "weri". Bevis, at first, has the worst of the encounter, but his strength is renewed by means of a magic well in which he falls, so that in the end the dragon is slain. (E. 2597-2910)².

One day³ Bevis learns from his uncle that Saber is living in the Isle of Wight, where he is trying to make war against the Emperor of Almaine. Bevis determines to go to his assistance, and leaves Ascopard to guard Josian. (E. 2011-50; A.N. 1960-2003).

He first visits Southampton, where he and his companions are entertained by the Emperor. Bevis gives his name as "Gerard", and offers to aid him against Saber. The Emperor furnishes Bevis with a band of knights, all of whom are thrown overboard by Bevis's men when they are at sea⁴. (E. 2951-3032; A.N. 2004-2041).

Bevis and his companions are joyfully received by Saber, and a messenger is sent to Devoun with the information that Gerard is no other than Bevis, who now demands the "seignori of Hamtoun". The Emperor, in a rage, attempts to slay the messenger, but the knife which he throws pierces his own son to the heart⁵. When Bevis hears of it he laughs and has "gode game." (E. 3053-3113; 2042-2050).

---

1. In the C.F. this comic scene is apparently absent (cf. Boje, p. 35).
2. The fight with the dragon is not in the A.N. or C.F.
3. In the A.N. Bevis departs immediately after Josian is baptized. In the C.F. Bevis gets news of his old friend from a merchant.
4. The incident of throwing the Emperor's men overboard is peculiar to the English.
5. This incident occurs after v. 3504 in the A.N. version; not in C.F., in which the hero goes from Cologne direct to Sabaut, whose service he enters, disguised, and later is recognized by Sabaoth's wife, by a cross on his shoulder.
Josian, during Bevis's absence, is wooed by an Earl Mile, who tricks Ascopard and shuts him up on an island. She is forced into marriage, but strangles her husband with a towel in the wedding chamber. The next day the deed is discovered, and Josian is condemned to the stake. Just in time, however, Ascopard and Bevis arrive, rescue Josian, and sail with her to Wight. (E. 3117-3304; A.N. 2051-2192)².

Bevis and Saber, on the one side, and Devoun the Emperor, on the other, now gather large armies. The latter approaches the castle of Saber, where a terrible conflict takes place. Bevis is victorious; Devoun is captured by Ascopard, and later placed in a kettle full of pitch, brimstone, and hot lead. Bevis's mother sees from a castle the fate of her husband, falls, and breaks her neck. Bevis is now lord of Hamptonsire, and is quickly wedded to Josian. (E. 3305-3436; A.N. 2193-2398).

On Saber's advice Bevis visits King Edward at London, receives from him his heritage, and is made the King's marshal. (E. 3467-3510; A.N. 2889-2470)⁵.

About Whitsuntide Bevis succeeds in winning a thousand pounds of gold, which is the prize awarded the winner of a horse race. Arondel, Bevis's steed, thus attracts the attention of the prince, who asks for the horse. On Bevis's refusal, he attempts to steal Arondel, but is kicked in the head and is killed. The King desires to put Bevis to death, but the barons will not permit it, and Bevis gets off by agreeing to leave the country. (E. 3511-38; A.N. 2471-1645).

Ascopard, finding his master's fortunes fallen, goes to Yvor, and agrees to bring Josian if forty knights are placed at his command. This aid Yvor grants. (E. 3539-3614; A.N. 2646-2673).

1. In C.F. the strangling incident does not occur.

2. In the A.N. version the incident of the messenger to the Emperor occurs here; cf. above.

3. In C.F. the dispute of Bevis and Doon is decided by single combat, in which the latter is slain by Bevis's sword. Bevis's mother had already asked pardon for her past offences.

4. In A.N. she learns of her husband's death through a messenger, whereupon she mounts to a tower and throws herself down.

5. Only one day's time intervenes between this and the following incident in the A.N.
In the meantime, Bevis, Josian, and Terri are traveling toward Ermonic. In a wood the two men prepare a lodge, and at Josian’s injunction depart. In this lodge Josian gives birth to two boys. But before Bevis and Terri return, Ascopard and his men come and take her away. Knowing the properties of herbs, she succeeds in picking from the ground one which quickly transforms her into the likeness of a leper. When she is brought before Ivor, he curses the unlucky traitor and places her in a separate castle in Ascopard’s care. (L. 3615-3703; A.N. 2674-2716)  

Bevis and Terri, returning to the lodge, find the two newborn boys, but no mother. One of the babes they leave with a forester and the other with a fisherman—naming them, respectively, Guy and Mile. (E. 3709-3752; A.N. 2716-285; 2790-2813)  

Going on, Bevis and Terri come to a town, and learn from their host at an inn that there is to be a tournament there for the hand of the King’s daughter. They decide to take part. Bevis is the victor. When the lady learns that he has a lost wife, she says she will take him as her lord “in clene manere” for seven years, and if his wife returns she will then take Terri for her lord (L. 3753-3840; A.N. 3917-3907).  

Saber, who has remained at Hampton, dreams one night that Bevis is wounded. His wife interprets the dream as meaning that Bevis has lost wife or child. Saber sets out, with twelve knights, all attired as palmers, discovers Josian, and slays Ascopard. An ointment restores Josian to her natural appearance; and she, also dressed as a palmer, goes with Saber to seek Bevis and Terri. After seven years of hardship they arrive in the land where Bevis and Terri live. Guy and Mile are brought, Terri weds the lady of the land, and there is rejoicing. (L. 5041-5981; A.N. 2728-2897; 2959-3034).  

1. In C.P. Bevis assists; then he and Terri go to hunt for food.  
2. In the A.N., after the birth of the children, Josian is captured, but there is nothing about the herb, etc. In C.P. Escopard and his men take away with Josian one of the children.  
3. A fisherman gets the only boy left in C.P.  
4. Between 2728 and 2790 of the A.N. occurs the story of Josian’s rescue by Sabaoth; see below.  
5. In the A.N. not a tournament but a battle gives Bevis opportunity to prove his prowess.  
6. In A.N. Bevis repels the attack of two dukes on his lady’s land, in addition to his first victory (vv. 2902-52).  
7. The order of events, as the line numberings indicate, is by so means the same in A.N. as in L. In the former, following v. 3054 are some details not in the English version. To Terri and his lady is born a boy who is named Boeve, and Boeve and Josian
Bevis, Terri, Josian and the two boys now go to Ermonie. They find Ermin in danger from an army under Yvor, but their valor soon changes the situation. Yvor is captured and compelled to pay a large ransom. Soon Ermin dies, Guy receives his crown, and all the land of Ermonie is "made cristien wi' dand or sword." Saber takes leave and returns home. (E. 3963-4028; A.N. 3065-3410).

King Yvor has a thief, who steals Arondel and brings him to Mombraunt. Saber is warned in a dream of the loss, goes to Mombraunt, captures the stolen horse, and rides towards Ermonie. Josian, on a tower, sees him coming, pursued by three thousand Saracens. She warns Bevis, who, with his sons, goes to the rescue, and they slay all the pursuers. Yvor, hearing of the loss, gathers an army and comes to revenge the death of his men. He challenges Bevis to single combat, the two knights meet on an island, and after a long struggle Yvor is slain. When the Saracens try to flee, they are cut down by Terri, Miles and Guy. Bevis is crowned King of Mombraunt. (E. 4039-4556; A.N. 3414-3697).

One day as Bevis and his friends are at the river, a messenger comes with the news that Rohaut, Saber's son, has lost his estate through King Edgar's treachery. Saber, Bevis, Miles, Guy, and Terri go to England with sixty thousand knights. Bevis with six knights goes to the King at Westminster and demands his old heritage. His request is granted, but a false steward follows him to London, stirs up the people against Bevis, and precipitates a conflict. Bevis kills the steward; but the press is so great that he gains the victory only when his two sons, hearing rumors of the fight, come to his rescue. All Thames is blood-red, and 32,000 are slain. When the King learns that Bevis has slain his men, he decides to make peace by giving his daughter to Bevis's son Miles and making him heir to the throne. This is done, and after a feast of a fortnight Bevis returns to Mombraunt, leaving Hamptonshire to Saber. (E. 4257-4587; A.N. 3696-3904).

** have a daughter who is called Beatrix.

1. In A.N. the two traitors who caused his banishment are slain by Bove.
2. The lengthy account of a single combat between Yvor and Bevis is not in the A.N. version.
3. This incident of the stealing of Arondel not in C.F.
4. In the A.N. version the Pope comes to crown Bevis.
5. The incident of the London fight is not in any other version.
Bevis and Josian live happily for twenty years. Then the Queen falls ill, and her sons, Terry and Guy, are summoned. One day Bevis, going to the stable, finds Arondel dead. Much grieved, he enters Josian’s chamber, and she too is soon dead. But before her body is cold, he takes her in his arms, and both die together. A chapel is erected to receive their bodies, and a house of religion is built.

For to singe for sire Beuoun
And ek for Josian Æ fre. (E. 4588-4620; A.N. 3805-3850).

* * * * * * *

The attempts to trace the development of the Bevis story out of historical conditions have apparently been even less successful than in the case of either Horn or Havelok. It seems pretty certain, however, that the English romance had for its source an Anglo-Norman version of the story. It very closely resembles the Anglo-Norman Boeve de Haumore. But certain differences from the Anglo-Norman version which we have indicate that the English poet had before him an older version. Moreover, as there are some rather important features peculiar to the English romance, it seems that the English redactor made additions rather freely. However, there is not the slightest question

1. In the A.N., Bevis and Guy, returning to Mombraunt, find Josian already at the point of death. In C.P., Bevis survives Josian, becomes a hermit, and lives in a cell for five years.

2. A summary of Bevis-investigation is given by Boje, pp. 43 ff.; also by Jordan, pp. 1 ff.

3. The date of the English Bevis is near the beginning of the fourteenth century (Schofield, p. 463); of the French Boeve, the first half of the thirteenth century (Stimming, p. lvi). The earliest English MS. is the Auchinleck, "probably not younger than 1327" (Kölbing, p. vii).

4. Stimming, p. cxlix, particularly table, p. clxxvi; Boje, p. 22. Boje's study confirms Stimming's opinion at this point.
that the English poet had before him a highly developed and organized story; consequently the narrative characteristics of the romance are, for the most part, to be credited to his original.

It is still impossible to say with certainty very much about the earliest literary form of the story, much less about a possible pre-literary form. The investigation thus far devoted to the Bevis-story has only gone to show that the problems are extremely difficult and complicated. A very brief summary will show that it is impossible for the student of narrative characteristics to make use safely of any of the theories of origin and development, although the analyses made and the parallels collected are very helpful.

First of all, there are three claimants for the honor of best representing the Ur-Bevis. The view earliest in the field was that of Rajna, who thought that the Italian Bovo d’Antone represented best the primitive form¹. This opinion was rejected by Stimming in the introduction to his edition of the Anglo-Norman Boeve de Haumtone. He thought an Anglo-Norman version, of which the English², the Norse, and the Welsh redactions, as well as the Anglo-Norman Boeve were representatives, was also the course of all the continental versions³. Jordan has recently


2. The Irish version is according to the editor (Robinson, Zeitschrift für Celtische Phil., VI, pp. 9 ff., 273 ff.) probably a free redaction of a lost English version (cf. pp. 17 ff.). It contains many details which differ from the English versions preserved.

3. "Da aber die anglonormannische Version die Älteste ist,
come to the defense of the hypothesis of Rajna, declaring with
great positiveness that the Venetian version most truly repre-
sents the Ur-Boeve. The latest investigator, Boje, has advanced
the hypothesis that it is the continental French versions to
which we must look for additional light on the character of
the Ur-Bevis, recognizing for them and the Anglo-Norman a common
source, the Italian versions forming merely a branch of the Con-
tinental French group. Interesting as have been the arguments
presented in support of these theories, it seems doubtful if
any solution will be generally accepted before all the material
is easily available. The continental French MSS., representing
several versions, have not been printed as yet, and it will be
difficult to determine their precise importance until they are
readily accessible.

Nor has the investigation devoted to the task of discover-
ing the probable origin and earlier development of the story

so könnten von ihr abweichende Angaben der festländischen Ge-
dichte nur dann ins Gewicht fallen, wenn man annehmen dürfte,
dass sie unabhängig von jener direkt aus einer gemeinsamen
Quelle, eben aus der von Rajna vermuteten deutschen Saga stamm-
ten. Zu einer solchen Vermutung liegt jedoch nicht der
geringste Anlass vor, vielmehr beruhen die jüngeren Bearbeitung-
en ohne Zweifel ausschliesslich auf der anglonormannischen, und
die dort vorkommenden Abweichungen von dieser sind durch
selbständige und willkürliche Aenderungen der Bearbeiter veran-
lasst, können aber nicht als von Anfang an der Sage angehörig be-
trachtet werden" (Stimming, p. clxxii).

1. Leo Jordan, Über Boeve de Hamstone. "Wenn ven. mit A (A.N.
version), oder irgend einer Hs. seiner verwandtschaft zusammengeht,
so besetzen wir den ursprünglichen Vorgang. An den Stellen, wo
dies nicht der Fall ist, haben wir ven. unbedingt den Vorzug zu
gaben, da es eine wesentlich ältere und treuere Redaction reprä-
sentiert, als alle anderen" (p. 35).
2. C. Boje, Über den altfrz. Roman von Beuve de Hamtone. For
his criticism of Jordan, see footnote, pp. 19 f.
3. In a review of Boje's study, Brugger (Zeitschrift für Fr.
been much more successful. Here, too, the lack of editions of the continental French versions has been felt, and Boje's investigation of them, so far as it goes, seems to show that they are important. Rajna, starting from the Italian versions, concluded that the Bevis has sprung from a German saga, and that Hamtone (Hanstone) was located near Mainz. Stimming, reviewing the question of the possibility of the transfer suggested by Rajna, leaves the matter open, but sees difficulties with Rajna's theory. Suchier, in a brief "Nachtrag" to Stimming's "Einleitung," gave the opinion that the Bevis-tale was at bottom a Viking saga of the tenth century. Settegast believed that he

Sprache und Litt., XXXV, p. 53) remarks: "Es hat nach meiner Meinung nicht viel Zweck, dass man immer neue Untersuchungen über die Überlieferung des Beuve anstellt, ohne dass man das gesamte Material zur Verfügung hat."

1. Reali di Francia, ch. iv. Rajna points out that Boeve speaks of "douce France" as if his own country; that Mayence, the home of the traitor, is near Hanstone; and that one goes from one country to the other without crossing the sea, apparently. The Venetian MS. has nothing to say of England. G. Paris (Romania, II, pp. 358 ff.), while suggesting the need of extending the field of investigation, stated that he was inclined to regard Beuve d'Hanstone, in its essential traits, as an altered form of a Germanic story of high antiquity. Cf. also Grüber's Grundriss, II, 1, p. 573.

2. pp. clxxx ff.—particularly clxxxviii f.

3. Stimming, p. cxxxv f. Suchier's evidence is chiefly that of names. Yvori, for instance, "stimmt zu Ivor oder Ivar"—a name common among the Vikings. This opinion is rejected by Deutschbein, p. 210; by Jordan, p. 94. Schofield, p. 274, adopts the view.

4. R. Wülcker's opinion (Geschichte der engl. litt., vol. I, p. 98) that Bevis is Celtic has apparently not been taken very seriously. Likewise Hoyt's interesting paper "The Home of the Beves Saga" (P. M. L. A., 1902, pp. 237 ff.) has failed to make much impression. He regards the Bevis story as simply a working-over of the Horn saga. He shows very clearly the undoubted paral-
had found in the *Shahnamah* of the Persian poet Firdusi a source, or a pretty close representation of a source, of the Bevis-story. A more fascinating hypothesis is that of Zenker, which makes the Bevis-saga, in its kernel, identical with the Hamlet-saga, the common source being a "Verschmelzung der Bellerophonsage, wie sie in dem Drama des Euripides vorliegt, mit der römischen Brutussage," of which the Khosru stories of the *Shahnamah* are also a representative. Deutschbein finds in the Bevis "eine Zusammenhäufung verschiedenartigsten Elemente", which took form in the territory between Picardy and Normandy; the elements consisting of material brought by the Crusaders from the Orient, borrowed motives from the Horn, Mainet, and other stories, and a historical element from the adventures of one Bivinus, who lived in the ninth century. Jordan, who had already pointed out the historical Bivinus, in his latest study, traces the existing versions of the Bevis-material to a *märchen* of the

lels; but the explanation suggested by him seems somewhat forced. Such a working over is contrary to what we know of medieval method.

1. Settegast, *Quellenstudien zur Gallo-romanischen Epik*; cf. particularly pp. 338 ff. In the Persian story a horse, Bahsad, breaks away after his master's death, and is finally bridled only by the master's son, Kai Khosru. Settegast finds additional parallels in the *Shahname*. He also finds certain Armenian elements in Bevis, which leads him to believe that "die Annahme nicht unbegründet erscheint, dass ursprünglich persische Sagenstoffe, ehe sie nach Griechenland und dann weiter nach dem Abendlande gelangten, ihren Durchgang durch Armenien nahmen und hier localisiert wurden" (p. 344). For summary and criticism of Settegast's views, cf. Boje, pp. 45 ff.

twelfth century\textsuperscript{1}, and behind this he believes we are unable to go\textsuperscript{2}. Lastly Boje, after collecting a vast number of parallels from Old French narrative literature, concludes "dass wir es in BH überhaupt nicht mit einer aus geheimnisvollen Tiefen entsprungenen Sage, sondern ganz einfach mit einem Roman zu tun haben, mit dem Werk—von den Bearbeitern abgesehen—eines Einzelnen, wenn dieser uns auch nach mitteralterlicher art seinen Namen nicht überliefert hat, wenn wir auch nicht mehr an allen Stellen des Romans die Fassung, die er ihm gab, herstellen können."\textsuperscript{3}

Thus the latest investigators—one of them contending that the \textit{Bevis} is a traditional story\textsuperscript{4}, and the other that it is a


2. "Kurz, das Märchen aus der Kreuzzugszeit ist die letzte erreichbare Quelle, es müsste denn einmal einer kommen, der uns sagen kann, wer Boeve war und wo Hanstone wirklich lag und wo einmal eine umnatürliche Mutter den Gatten ermordete, den Buhlen heiratete und das eigene Kind in die Verbannung schichte" (p. 107).


4. Jordan, p. 79: "Die beiden Redaktionen, die wir von der Bovosage besitzen, geben keine poetische Quelle wieder, sondern eine Sage, eine Erzählung, die im Volksmunde lebte, im Charakter die Erfindung des XI. und XII. Jh.s des Zeitalters der Kreuzzüge, zeigt, und dann im Laufe des XII. und XIII. Jh.s, an zwei stellen Frankreichs unabhängig von einander in Verse gegossen wurde."
product of literary manufacture—are not much nearer together than earlier students. Yet they agree in abandoning the attempt to trace the story back to historical deeds (whether of Vikings or others) which were enacted centuries before the earliest redaction preserved. Boje seems justified in regarding the immense number of parallels in contemporary literature as indicating that Bevis is essentially the product of contemporary literary types and motives\(^1\). That it is the product of simple construction at the hands of one man seems less likely, nor is there any reason to reject the surmise that a popular tale has been worked over into the romance. Thus far Jordan may be right, although his reconstructed \(\text{m\c{a}rchen}\) surely has the stamp of literature upon it. The Bevis we have is to be explained not so much by the conventions of the folk-tale as by the conventions of the \textit{chansons de geste}. I hope this will be made clearer when we examine in detail the narrative features of the English romance.

---

1. Brugger's criticism (\textit{loc. cit}) of Boje's conclusions as not showing whether Bevis was the product or the cause of the wide currency of the motives contained in it, while to be taken into consideration in individual cases, surely can scarcely be applied to the very considerable total of Bevis-motives.
The story of Guy of Warwick, although its wanderings were less extensive than those of the Bevis-story, was tremendously popular, especially in England. There are no less than four Middle English versions of which we know, each apparently derived separately from a French source. There are references which show the story to have had considerable vogue, and, in some form, it frequently reappeared until the beginning of the nineteenth century. The French MSS. fall into two groups, and all of the English versions are derived from representatives of the same French group. There is also an Irish version which, according to the editor, is, like the Irish Bevis, a free redaction of a lost English version of the romance.


Rohaud¹, Earl of Warwick, a rich and powerful lord, has one child—the beautiful, accomplished Felice. Her hand is sought by suitors from the end of the world, but none of them will she have. At this same time, the Earl's steward, Syward of Walingford, has a son Guy, the Earl's cupbearer, who is wise, courteous, and beloved of all. Guy is also very accomplished, having been taught "of wodes & riuer & ofer game" by Herhaud of Arden. (1-164).

On the occasion of a great feast of Pentecost, the Earl calls Guy before him and bids him go and serve, for that day, his daughter Felice. Guy dresses himself carefully, and so distinguishes himself that many maidens love him. But he loves only Felice. Indeed so great is his passion that he falls ill, because he does not dare confess his love to one so far above him. At last, driven by desperation, he returns to Felice, and on his knees makes a passionate declaration, threatening his own life unless she will have mercy. But she scorns him and sends him away. (165-414).

Guy's distress is greater than before. He wonders why Death does not take him. He burns "so spark on glede." His father and his mother, and even the Earl, are sorry for him, but do not know the cause of the trouble. Physicians are summoned, but to no effect. At last he determines to visit Felice again. He finds her in a garden, repeats his declaration, and swoons from the violence of his passion. Felice's maiden weeps for him and reproaches her mistress. Felice is so far moved that she at last agrees to grant her love when he becomes a knight. (415-675).

Guy finds himself recovered as soon as this encouragement is granted. He hastens to the Earl and obtains the promise of knighthood at Holy Trinity. Guy and twenty sons of barons are dubbed with due ceremony. The lover at once appears before Felice and reminds her of the promise; but she says that he is no better for the dubbing; he must prove his might. (675-748).

¹ The Auchinleck MS., upon which the analysis is based, is composed of two distinct parts, representing two versions. The latter part of the poem, in the tail-rhyme strophe, has a beginning of its own, and was intended to be complete in itself; cf. Weyrauch, pp. 55 f. In this case no attempt has been made to indicate important variations in other versions, inasmuch as the only versions which would be really helpful, the French, have not yet been published; and no satisfactory summaries are available.
The hero now crosses the sea in the company of his teacher Herhaud and two other knights, Torold and Urri. At Rouen, in Normandy, they learn from their host that there is to be a tournament of which the prize is the hand of the Emperor’s daughter. The next day they go to the tournament; Guy overthrows many knights, among them Duke Otous of Pavia, and Duke Reynier of Saxony; and on the third day he is declared the victor. The white falcon, the steed, and the two greyhounds which he receives are sent to Earl Rohaud. Guy and his companions then pass through Germany, Lombardy, France, and Normandy, winning great fame; after which they return to England. (749-1100).

All rejoice to see the young knight. Soon he presents himself to Felice. But she declares that he may not have her love for fear sloth might overcome him, and though she holds him dear she will grant her love only when he is held the best under heaven. Guy takes leave weeping, asks Rohaud’s permission to depart again, resists his parents’ entreaties, and crosses the sea. In many tournaments in Normandy, Spain, Germany, and Lombardy he wins praise. (1101-1266).

But misfortune comes. In a tournament beside Benevento Guy is wounded, and as he and his companions are continuing their journey they are set upon by Earl Lambard and fifteen knights whom Duke Otous sends to take advantage of Guy’s weakness. Urri and Torold are slain, and Herhaud is struck down; but even then Guy is too much for his foes, and only one of the assailants—Gwichard—escapes, he being wounded. As he is galloping towards Pavia, he meets Duke Otous returning from the chase, and tells him of the ill success of his treacherous enterprise. (1267-1552).

Meanwhile, what for his wounds and his grief at the fate of his comrades, Guy swoons. When he has recovered, he seeks out a hermit, who promises to bury Torold and Urri. Then he takes the apparently dead Herhaud to an abbot and begs for proper burial for his old friend, after which he goes his way, and a hermit heals his wounds. Herhaud, at the abbey, recovers consciousness and at last health, and as Guy is on the point of returning to England he meets his old teacher, who likewise is returning home. (1553-1794).

But when they are about to embark at St. Omer, a palmer appears and tells of war between the Emperor of Germany and Duke Segyn, of Lorraine, the Duke having slain Sadok, the Emperor’s nephew, at a tournament. Guy and Herhaud determine to go to the Duke’s assistance. At Arascoun, where the Duke is besieged, they are well received, and the day after their arrival, Guy takes the Emperor’s steward prisoner and, with the assistance of
the knights of the city, drives away the Emperor's forces. A new army is raised by the Emperor, and appears before the city. A fierce battle ensues. Herheud, and then Guy, meet Otous in single combat, but both times the Duke is rescued by his men. The emperor's troops are defeated, when Sir Tirri, son of Aubry of Gormoise, comes up with thirty knights and rallies them, but after another conflict he is forced to give way. Wounded and bleeding, he finds the Emperor playing chess, and tells him of the victory of the Emperor's enemies. The Emperor gathers his army and himself proceeds against Arascoun. Every day he assaults the city, but without success. (1795-2448).

One summer day the Emperor says he will go hunting next morning. A spy overhears his remark and reports it to Segyn. While pursuing a boar, the Emperor and a few followers find themselves in the power of their enemies. However, they are courteously requested to take dinner with Duke Segyn. The Emperor accepts, and he and his men are well entertained. Next morning, when the Emperor is at church, Duke Segyn appears before him weeping, barefoot, and with a rope about his neck. He asks for pardon. All except Otous plead for him, and the Emperor forgives him and offers his sister for Segyn's wife. (2448-2800).

As Guy is returning from hunting one day, he meets some merchants who are just arriving. From them he learns that Emperor Emul of Constantinople is engaged in a war with the Sultan. Guy and Herheud, with a hundred knights, proceed to Constantinople, and are well received by the Emperor. They at once show their prowess by defeating a force of Saracens before the city. On Guy's return to the city, the Emperor promises him his daughter for wife and to make him heir. The Saracen Esclandar, meanwhile, whom Guy has wounded, appears before the Sultan with news of the valor of Guy. Thereupon the Sultan swore to attack Constantinople within three days. (2801-3152).

While the Emperor, rejoiced at the success of Guy, is at the river, Morgadour, the Emperor's steward, invites Guy to visit Clarice, the Emperor's daughter. Guy consents, is kindly received by the maiden, and plays chess with Morgadour. After a time Morgadour slips away to the Emperor and says that Guy has lain by Clarice. The Emperor refuses to believe the story, and Morgadour hastens back to Guy and tells him that the Emperor is about to slay him because of the very accusation which Morgadour himself has made. Guy believes the report, collects his fellows, and leaves the city with the intention of joining the Saracens. But they meet the Emperor, an explanation follows, and Guy returns to Constantinople. (3153-3390).

The Sultan and his army now appear and a great battle follows. In a single combat Guy has the better of the Sultan, who is obliged to withdraw. Enraged at his defeat, the Sultan beats his gods, and does them all manner of shame. (3391-3716).
Morgadour, dissatisfied with the ill-success of his first plot against Guy, devises a new one. He suggests that a messenger be sent to the Sultan; a council is summoned, and Guy undertakes the task. He finds the Sultan eating in the presence of ten kings, and delivers his message. When the Sultan learns that Guy is before him, he commands that he be slain. Guy strikes off the Sultan's head, seizes it, kills those who would prevent his escape, and finally rides away pursued by a great number. Herhaud, warned in a dream, summons his friends and rides towards the camp of the Saracens. They meet Guy just as it seems certain that he will fall into his enemies' hands. The Saracens are driven off, and Guy presents the Sultan's head to the Emperor. (3717-4106).

That same evening a lion which is fighting with a dragon is rescued by Guy and insists on following him. The next day is the day set for the wedding of Guy and the Princess. But just before the ceremony is to be performed, Guy remembers Felice, swoons, and when he recovers asks that the wedding be postponed. He then goes to his inn, where he is ill for a fortnight. He tells his trouble to Herhaud, who at first advises him to marry Clarice, but on learning that Guy still desperately loves Felice agrees that he should be true to her. At the end of a fortnight, Guy goes to the court accompanied by his faithful lion; but when he returns to his inn the lion is asleep in the orchard. The steward takes the opportunity to stab the lion, which hastens to the inn and dies at Guy's feet. Learning that Morgadour is the one who has thus injured him, Guy cleaves the traitor from head to foot. After this he leaves the country. (4107-4502).

One day in May, Guy remains in a forest to listen to the birds while his followers go to a city nearby to take lodging. While riding along he hears a groaning, and finds a wounded knight under a hawthorn bough. It is Tirri of Gormoise, who tells Guy, whom he does not recognize, how he has run away with Oisel, daughter of the Duke of Lorraine, because she was about to be married to Duke Otous of Pavia, but had been surrounded by outlaws while asleep, and Oisel has been taken away. Guy, after hearing the story, pursues the outlaws and rescues the maiden. But, when he has brought her to the place where he left Tirri, the latter has disappeared. Hastening on, he finds that Tirri has been captured by some of Otous's men. The wounded lover is rescued, is reunited to Oisel, and finally is healed of his wounds. Soon after, Guy and Tirri become sworn brothers. (4503-4930).

Guy is once more on the point of going to England, when one day while talking to Tirri he sees through a window a knight. It proves to be a follower of Aubry, Tirri's father, whom Duke Loyer, father of Oisel, is besieging. Guy agrees to go with Tirri to the rescue. Duke Loyer's forces are soon beaten off. The Duke, learning of the defeat, at the advice of Otous renews the attack with more than a thousand knights. In a combat with
Otous and his men, Guy's sword is broken, but Herhaud rescues him. Later Herhaud suffers a similar misfortune, and he, in turn, is rescued by Guy. Duke Loyer's men are utterly defeated. (4931-5504).

Duke Otous then suggests that Loyer's enemies be overcome by treason. A message is sent to Aubry that Loyer is now ready to give Oisel to Tirri, if they will come to the city of Lorraine. The offer is accepted, and in an unexpected moment Tirri and Herhaud are seized by the men of Otous and Loyer. Guy, however, escapes, after a hard fight, by crossing a water of which his pursuers are afraid. Loyer takes Herhaud to Lorraine, and Otous takes Oisel and Tirri to Pavia. He intends to marry Oisel at once, but finally agrees to a respite of forty days. Tirri is placed in a prison so dark that he does not know whether it is night or day. (5505-5952).

After his escape, Guy is entertained by Amis of Mounteyn, who proves to be an old friend and offers assistance. This Guy declines, and goes to Pavia alone in disguise. To Duke Otous he represents himself as a mortal foe of Guy and Tirri, and is made Tirri's jailor. A Lombard overhears him talking with Tirri, and hastens to Duke Otous to tell the secret, but is struck dead by Guy in the Duke's presence, Guy excusing himself on the ground that the Lombard had been giving Tirri food. Tirri is finally set free and goes to Amis of Mounteyn. The day of Oisel's wedding arrives, and the Duke and Oisel start for the church. Guy follows, reveals himself, kills Otous, wounds Otous's nephew Berard, and finally brings Oisel safe to her lover. (5953-6542).

Guy now determines to attempt to set free Herhaud and other friends in the prison of Duke Loyer. A large force is gathered for the enterprise. But Duke Loyer repents of his misbehavior, sets his prisoners at liberty, and consents to the marriage of Oisel and Tirri, which soon takes place. (6543-6713).

One day Guy, pursuing a boar, outstrips his companions, slays the animal in a forest of Brittany. His horn is heard by Earl Florentin, who sends his son to bring the hunter. The young man treats Guy rudely, strikes him with a staff, and is finally slain by a blow from Guy's horn. Guy departs and comes to Earl Florentin's castle, where he is entertained. While still at table, word comes to the Earl of the death of his son, and Guy is pointed out as the slayer. The Earl throws an andiron at Guy, but misses. The visitor finally makes his escape from the castle by pleading the rights of a guest. Outside he is pursued, unhorses the old Earl, to whom he returns his steed, and returns safely to Lorraine. (6714-7032).

Guy now returns to England. At Warwick he finds King Apelston, who receives him with honor. One day when the King and Guy are playing at chess, news comes of a dragon from Ireland.
which has been eating men and beasts. Guy volunteers to fight the monster, and proceeds to Northumberland, where it is devastating the country. Guy's weapon will not pass through the dragon's scales, and the knight is wounded. At last he pierces it beneath the wing and slays it. The dragon's tail is taken to the King. (7033-7306).

Going to Walingford, Guy finds his father dead. After making his inheritance over to Herhaud, Guy proceeds to Earl Rohaud at Warwick. He relates his adventures to Felice, and she grants her love. Soon after, the Earl asks Felice why she will not take a husband, and she replies that she loves Guy and will wed no other. The Earl is pleased, and broaches the subject to Guy as they are returning from the chase one day, and offers his daughter. The wedding soon takes place, and the feast lasts a fortnight. (7307-st. 20 v. 6).

But one night, as Guy is watching the stars from a turret, he suddenly remembers how little he has done for his Savior, and how many men he has slain. While he is lamenting his sins, Felice comes to him, and he tells her that he must become a pilgrim to expiate his sins. At first she fears that he has a wife elsewhere. She begs that he try another means for expiating his misdeeds. But Guy persists, gives her a sword which she shall place in the hands of their yet unborn son when he shall be of proper age, receives a ring from Felice, and sets out across the sea. When Rohaud learns of Guy's departure he sends messengers to seek him, but they return unsuccessful. Herhaud himself searches through many countries in vain. (St. 20 v. 7–st. 43 v. 12).

Guy has meanwhile gone to Jerusalem and Bethlehem. On his way to Antioch he meets a sorrowful pilgrim, who relates his story. He is Earl Jonas, who with fifteen sons was captured by Saracens and imprisoned at Alexandria. During their imprisonment, their captor, King Triamour, and his son Smink Fabour attended a feast of the Sultan, and in a quarrel over a game of chess, the Sultan's son Sadok was slain by Fabour with the chess-board. Triamour and Fabour escaped, but were summoned to appear before the Sultan's Parliament, and Triamoun was forced to agree to a combat with a gigantic Saracen. However, he secured a respite of a year and forty days in which to find a substitute. Triamour asked Jonas if he knew of any one who would undertake the combat. Jonas suggested Guy or Warwick or Herhaud of Arden, whereupon Triamour promised if he could bring either of them that he and his sons should be released; otherwise all should perish. When he meets Guy the period is almost gone, and his search has been in vain. (St. 42–st. 72).

Guy volunteers to undertake the combat, and, although he is meanly clad, Jonas accepts the offer thankfully. They then go to Alexandria, and King Triamour promises to release all Christian prisoners if Guy is successful. All go to the Sultan's court. Guy is given a helmet once the property of King Alexander and a sword which was Hector's. Amoraunt, the Saracen champion, is also
well armed. The battle takes place before the city. The steeds of both combatants are slain. Neither champion seems to get much advantage. At last Amoraunt becomes thirsty and asks permission to drink. Guy grants it on the condition that the favor shall be returned. The fight is renewed, and after a time Guy, becoming weary, asks leave to drink. Amoraunt at first declines, but finally says he will let Guy drink if he will tell his right name. But when he learns that Guy of Warwick is before him he refuses to keep his promise. Guy nevertheless turns, runs to the river, and leaps in. Having drunk his fill he manages to get out of the river, cuts off first the left, then the right hand of Amoraunt, and at last severs his head from his body. Jonas and his sons are set at liberty. Jonas accompanies Guy to Jerusalem. When they part Guy reveals his identity, charging his old friend to keep it secret. (St. 73-st. 141).

In his wanderings, Guy reaches Germany. Under a cross he meets a pilgrim, wringing his hands. At Guy's request he tells his story. It is Tirri, Guy's sworn brother. Berard, Otous's nephew, having become the Emperor's steward, accused Tirri of causing Otous's death. Tirri's reply was a challenge, but finding no security, he was imprisoned and his lands seized. His wife was compelled to flee. At last Tirri was released on the condition that he bring Guy to undertake the combat for him. But Guy was nowhere to be found. On hearing this story from Tirri, the hero swoons from pity. At last he says he will accompany the unfortunate man to the court. On the way they halt to rest. Guy sees an ermine come from the mouth of the sleeping Tirri, and run into a hole of a hill nearby. Tirri, awaking, says he has dreamed of a treasure in the hole in the hill, beside which lay a dragon and a brown sword. They go to the hill, find treasure, sword, and dragon, and Guy takes the sword with him. (St. 142-st. 167).

At the Emperor's court, Guy, without revealing his identity, undertakes Tirri's cause. The combat takes place beside the city. Berard, clothed in two coats of mail and two helmets, feels secure. Tirri is praying in a church. Everyone else goes to the fight. But finally Tirri hears that a pilgrim is fighting with Berard, goes to the field, is reminded of Guy without suspecting the pilgrim's identity, then returns to the church to pray. (St. 168-st. 192).

The first day's combat is not decisive. At night Berard sends four knights to slay the pilgrim. Finding him asleep, they pick up his bed, and cast bed and pilgrim into the sea. When

1. In the Caius MS. there is at this point a long passage concerning the adventure of Guy's son Reinbrun.
Guy awakens, he sees only stars and water. But a fisherman in a boat rescues him and takes him home. Next morning at the time for the fight to be renewed the pilgrim has disappeared. The Emperor calls upon Berard to produce him, and the Duke responds angrily. As they are disputing, the fisherman comes and tells how he found the pilgrim on the sea. The combat is now renewed. At length the two helmets are cut through and Berard slain. Tirri receives his land again, and is made steward in place of Berard. Tirri then goes home, accompanied by the pilgrim. Oisel is found on an island in a nunnery. Guy determines to leave and asks Tirri to accompany him outside the city. After a walk of half a mile, Guy tells Tirri his name. Tirri weeps and swoons, offers his friend all of his earldom, or to accompany him on his wanderings, but the pilgrim declines reward or companionship, and goes forth alone. (St. 193-st. 232).

Guy now returns to England. King Aapelstan, he learns, is at Winchester, counseling with his lords. Anlaf, King of Denmark, has invaded England, and with him is Colbrond, a giant from Africa. The Danish King has summoned Aapelstan to surrender or to present a champion to oppose Colbrond. But no one dares to undertake the combat, for Herhau has gone in search of Reinbrun, Guy's son, and Earl Rohaud is dead. Guy, having learned all this, proceeds to Winchester. The King meanwhile has offered half of his land as a reward for a champion. At night an angel appears to him, telling him to go to the north gate the next day, and there he should see a pilgrim who would take the battle. So it happens. The King meets Guy, who at first pleads old age and feebleness. But at last he consents to fight Colbrond. (St. 233-st. 249).

Guy is splendidly armed and proceeds to the place of battle. A great multitude gathers to see the fight, and the two kings swear to abide by the result of the combat. Colbrond appears, so large that no horse can carry him, with armor black as pitch. Guy's horse is soon slain, and Guy is unable to reach higher than the giant's shoulder. Nevertheless he gives him a severe wound. But at last the pilgrim's sword breaks, and Colbrond refuses to lend him one of his battle-axes. Guy manages to seize one, however, and cuts off the giant's right arm. As Colbrond stoops to pick up his fallen weapon with his left hand, he receives a stroke which severs his head from his body. The Danes leave England; and great rewards are offered the pilgrim. He declines them all, and departs. He is accompanied outside the town by the King, and reveals his name on the condition that none other shall know it. Aapelstan begs him to take half of England, but Guy refuses, and goes his way. (St. 249-st. 177).

Guy now makes his way to Warwick, and joins himself to the poor men at the castle gates. Felice, who is the countess, feeds thirteen poor men every day for Guy's sake. She pities the poor pilgrim, feeds him well, and bids him come every day.
Guy, however, goes into the forest and lives in a hermitage for the nine months during which his life continues. He is warned by the angel Michael of his approaching death. Just before the appointed time, he sends his page to Felice with the ring which she gave him many years before. Felice, recognizing the ring, hastens to the hermitage. Guy looks at her, and dies, and the angels take his soul to heaven. A sweet smell comes from his body all that day. Bishops and abbots come to take his body to Warwick, but a hundred men cannot move it. Felice lives only a fortnight, and is buried by Guy's side. Tirri, hearing of Guy's death, asks Aelstan for the body, and when his request is granted takes it to Lorraine. There he builds an abbey for to sing for him to Euermore til domesday. (St.179-st.299).

* * * * * * *

The Guy-story has not yet been subjected to as much critical study as have the other three romances which are here discussed. The English versions are not yet all printed. None of the French versions have been printed. When all the material is easily available study will probably be directed toward the solving of the Guy-problems. The English versions go back to French sources, and as the English versions already printed stand pretty close together, it seems probable that the translator of the version represented in the Auchinleck MS. made few if any important additions.

1. The precise meaning of this is not very clear, as Tirri moves the body without difficulty soon after.

2. Zupitza's death prevented the appearance in the publications of the E.E.T.S. of the concluding volume which would have rendered accessible the English versions. The completion of the work has been entrusted to Prof. Schleich.

3. Cf. the investigation of Weyrauch (pp. 77 ff.) as to the manner in which the English translators treated their original. His conclusion is that the portion of the Auchinleck MS. in couplets is fairly exact (ziemlich genau), the portion in the tail-rhyme strophe somewhat free. The Caius MS., to which reference is sometimes made, also represents an exact translation.
As to the source of the Guy-legend, it has long been supposed that the romance contains a kernel of genuine historical tradition. Ellis suggested that Guy might stand for Egils, "who did in fact contribute very materially to the important victory gained by Athelston over the Danes and their allies at Brunanburgh; and it is not impossible that the warlike foreigner, becoming the hero of one of the many odes composed on the occasion of that much celebrated battle, may have been transformed by some Norman monk into the pious and amorous Guy of Warwick.* Although the identification of Guy with Egils may no longer be considered as possible, there is no question that the battle of Brunanburh was fought by Athelstan and Anlaf, who are the kings of the romance. At the same time it was not fought near Winchester. It has been suggested, however, that this Anlaf may have become confused with Olaf Tryggvason, of Denmark, who, in the reign of Ethelred, gave southern England a great deal of trouble. But

1. Cf. Ellis, Specimens of Early English Metrical Romances (London, 1848), pp. 183 f. This identification is of course now rejected. S. Lee calls it "philologically absurd." D.N.B. under "Guy of Warwick".


3. "Tradition has here, after its usual fashion, confounded two Anlafs or Olafs; one the invader of the North, and the other of the South; one opposed to Athelstan, and the other to Ethelred; namely, Anlaf Cuaran and Olaf Tryggvason. . . . (The latter) probably served with his maternal uncle Josteinn at the battle of Maldon in 991. But the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle first names him under 993, when he attacked London in company with Sweyn of Denmark, and afterwards harried the southern counties both by land and sea, and took up his winter quarters at Southampton. It is not actually stated that he besieged Winchester; but it is stated that King Ethelred, who was then (994) holding court at Andover, sent the Bishop of Winchester and Ethelward the Alderman (probably the historian) to buy peace from Olaf". Ward, I, p. 472. Evidence that chroniclers confused the two persons is also given,
this identification of Anlaf Guaran and Olaf Tryggvason is vigorously attacked by Deutschbein\(^1\). He even denies that the Colbrand episode is derived from Anglo-Saxon saga, on the ground that the duel is foreign to Anglo-Saxon custom.

At any rate the historical element, it is agreed, is extremely small\(^2\). Deutschbein has endeavored to show that the first part of the poem is essentially a courtly romance, and that the second part is ascetic and clerical, having numerous motives in common with the Eustace and Alexius legends. This, he thinks, removes the story, as we have it, from the realm of early tradition. "Hat so der I. Teil der Guysage ein höfisch-ritterliches, der II. mehr ein klerikales Gepräge, so können die Grundlagen unserer Sage kaum über 1100 zurückverlegt werden; sie kann kaum als eine alte volkstümliche Sage verzeichnet werden, wenigstens nicht in ihrer Gesamtheit."\(^3\) The Colbrand-episode he regards as added to the Guy-story in the twelfth or even perhaps the thirteenth century. "Darin muss natürlich alles, was von dem ags. König Aęelstan erzählt bez. wiedererzählt wird, gelehrt bez. in erklehrten Ursprungs sein; ein franz. Mönch,

---

pp. 472 f.


2. Cf. Sidney Lee on "Guy" in D.N.B.: "It is clear, nevertheless, that the mass of the details in the romance is pure fiction."

in einem Kloster Englands, mit der Geschichte Englands vertraut, konnte sehr leicht auf den Gedanken kommen, seine Kenntnisse in diesen Sinne zu verwerten und seine Helden um einige Jahrhunderte zurückzuversetzen, Wir haben also in dem Zweikampf kein volks-tämisches Sagenelement vor uns, sondern nur ein halbgelehrtes Product.¹ In other words, the historical element is practically restricted to the names.

Whether or not the story of Guy arose precisely as Deutsch-bein suggests, his general conclusion in regard to the historical element in Guy seems to be thoroughly sound. Not even in its general outline can it represent historical tradition. It is the product of invention, dealing with motives familiar in the literature of the twelfth or thirteenth century. There may be elements of popular tradition in it, but they are of trifling importance.

* * * * * * *

It is impossible to say how much of popular story we have in these four romances. In Bevis and Guy, the literary conventions are so evident that it is conceded that they are at least the predominating element. There is more question in regard to Horn and Havelok. But of genuine history I think it must be agreed that the element is so small that it may be ignored. And it may be said that it is unsafe to regard these romances as reflecting historical conditions of pre-Conquest

¹. Deutschbein, p. 220.
days. Possibly there are traces of early custom in Horn, but apparently none are to be found in the other romances\(^1\), and the tendency of recent investigation has been to trace the characteristics of these romances to the literature of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, and the multitude of parallels seems to justify the attempt to explain our romances, primarily if not solely, as the product of literary tendencies. Folk-lore elements of course were constantly creeping into literature, just as the written story sometimes became a popular tale. Possibly King Horn was derived immediately from a popular tale, which, in turn, had a literary progenitor. But it is pretty safe, by the principle of economy, to explain each individual medieval piece of literature by a study of types and tendencies in contemporary literature.

But, even so, is it possible to dissociate entirely the sense of history from these medieval romances? When the story, by whatever means, was once composed and associated, as it might be, with familiar names of persons or places, did it not command something of the respect of history, and was not its essential integrity as history regarded by the redactor? We have examples of romance being taken up bodily by the chronicler, as in the case of Havelok. That the romances were often regarded as embodying history we have abundant proof. On the other hand, there are the abundant examples of widely varying redactions of a

---

1. The vigorous criticisms made by Bédier, *Les Légendes Épiques*, on the historical element in the *chansons de geste*—which has seemed so firmly established—suggests extreme caution in the cases where English historical tradition may be present.
single story, showing how freely deliberate changes must have been made. In the case of Ponthus and Sidone we have a clear example of the adapting of a romantic tale to the names of historical persons. And, in addition, we have the examples which prove that history itself was not free from daring revision at the hand of the imaginative historian, especially if some material interest was at stake. So, even for the romance which seemed perhaps semi-historical, the resulting conservatism on the part of a redactor was probably not much greater than the conservatism of a redactor of a well-known story, who felt bound to preserve familiar incidents. A redactor who had the self-confidence and inventiveness was probably as free to add to, or take from, or reshape his material as Chaucer was when dealing with the story of Troilus and Cressida.

---

CHAPTER II

Plot

A. Structure

The state of organization in which the material constituting the metrical romances has come to us often scarcely deserves the name of structure. Yet that is the term most convenient for use in collecting certain observations in regard to the formal character of these metrical tales. Moreover, the romances are by no means all of one type in this matter of the character of the structure. While in all there are certain features pretty well stereotyped, there are, in a few, clear traces of originality and freshness, even in design. To romances of the latter type the term is not inappropriate, and, with caution, it may be extended to all. We shall be at the heart of the matter if we attempt, in a paragraph, to state what is the narrative content of each of our romances.

The story of King Horn consists of two main and one subordinate element. The main elements are: (1) the exile and return of Horn; and (2) the romantic love story of Rymenhild. In the first, a young prince is driven from his kingdom, but later returns and triumphs over his enemies. In the second, this prince, entertained at the court of a foreign king, is loved by and loves the king's daughter, is maligned by a supposed friend, exiled, and returns in time to save his betrothed from a forced and hated

1. The name "exile and return" is applied to this element because of its common application to stories in which a young prince is exiled and later returns to become king of his fatherland.
marriage. This element is lengthened by a repetition of the rescue incident. Horn's adventures in Ireland comprise the subordinate element.

The story of Havelok resembles that of Horn not only in the fact that it too is of the exile and return type, but also in the presence of a double plot. Two stories are developed separately, are joined, and run along together to the conclusion, interwoven, but not indistinguishable. In both cases a dying king summons his barons to council, and on their advice gives the care of kingdom and heir over into the hands of a trusted lord who is to be regent and guardian until the young child shall be of age to rule. In both cases the regent thus selected swears loyalty upon "messe-gere". In both cases the oath is broken and the heir to the throne cruelly mistreated. In both cases the heir withdraws from the kingdom, but later returns, overcomes the regent in battle, and puts him to death. The union of the stories is brought about by the marriage of the respective heirs of these kingdoms. With this main plot are loosely connected a long account of the heroine's father and certain incidents in the life of the hero which are purely episodical.

In Bevis once more the exile and return furnishes a central motive. As in Horn, the hero's father is treacherously slain, his inheritance seized, and the young heir driven from the land. After years have passed he, like Horn and Havelok, returns to regain his inheritance and take vengeance on his enemies by force of arms. With this story of vengeance and war is connected a story of love and war, as in Horn. The hero is welcomed at a
foreign court, wins the love of the king's daughter, is maligned by supposed friends, held a prisoner by the king of a neighboring country, and wins his lady only after she has been forced into marriage with a heathen king. Further complication of the romantic story is caused by the capture of the heroine by her former husband after she has been married to Bevis and has become the mother of two children. A long separation ensues and reunion occurs only after many years and many adventures. But these central elements by no means comprise the story. There are numerous adventures, some slightly, some not at all connected with the more essential elements of the plot. Of the first type are the fight with the lions, the rescue of Josian when at the stake, the tournament at Aumbeforce; of the second type are the fight with the dragon, the horse race, the fight in London.

In Guy of Warwick the enveloping, unifying story is even less essential and less binding. The hero, a steward's son, loves his lord's daughter, and, spurred by the promise of her love, succeeds in obtaining knighthood. Still unable to get his lady's favor, he goes abroad and obtains fame in many tournaments. He returns and again meets rebuff from his beloved, who demands that he become the most famous knight in the world. Again he departs and, after winning fame all over Europe, returns and weds the lady. But penitence seizes upon him, and he departs to expiate his sins by traveling through the world as a pilgrim. After many years he returns, an old man, to live his last year as a hermit near his old home. His wife is summoned when he is dying, receives his last look, and herself passes away in a fortnight. But what is here related is only a small portion of
the romance. Both before and after the turning point when Guy changes from knight to pilgrim, there is a succession of disconnected adventures. Sometimes Guy is fighting for an old friend, sometimes for a stranger whom he meets as he passes through the world, sometimes against the Saracen, and again against Christian, sometimes for a foreign monarch, sometimes for his own country against dragon or giant. But only the presence of a single hero and the occasional reappearance of some dramatic persona already known gives assurance that it is the same story throughout.

It is at once evident that we have here four romances of descending degrees of unity. The unity of Horn is far from complete; the falls, as we have seen, into parts; nevertheless it is, on the whole, unusually well-knit and consistent. The parts are interwoven. There is the palpable need of something to fill in the time between exile and return, whether from Suddenne or from Westernesse, which is met—in the one case by the greater portion of the romantic story, in the other by the subordinate Irish element or episode. In the midst of the Irish element, the reader is recalled to the enveloping exile and return story by the meeting of Horn with his father's murderer, and the vengeance which follows. This element is not long enough (163 lines) to cause the reader to lose sight of the Rymenhild story; yet here we have Horn's refusal to consider a marriage with Reynild until seven years shall pass, with its obvious reference to the period that he is to be absent from Rymenhild (vv. 905-16). Horn's journey to Suddenne to regain his kingdom (vv. 1249-1378) gives opportunity for Fikenhild's treachery and leads up to
the second rescue. Main and subordinate elements appear in the conclusion in the marriage of Horn and Rymenhild, of Adulf and Reynild, and the second return of Horn and his queen to rule his father's kingdom. However far apart the elements of the story originally may have been, they come to us combined in a tale of surprising unity and sustained interest. In Havelok the unity, so far as it exists, is one of character and atmosphere. As we shall see more clearly in discussing the treatment of objective point, the prime interest in the succession of incidents is not that they are leading somewhere, but is rather in their intrinsic appeal, and the natural way in which they spring from the general circumstances of the story. The unity of character and atmosphere is not entirely absent from Bevis and Guy. In Bevis there is the further fact that a considerable portion of the story is immediately concerned with the relations of hero and heroine. But in the last analysis it is only the hero who is consistently present throughout, and the incidents are not suited to exhibit his character, nor do they spring from the circumstances of the story, but they are taken freely from the great storehouse of medieval romantic incident. Thus it is only in Horn that we find diverse elements really unified into a plot in something of the modern sense of the word.

This impression of unity in Horn is in part due to the brevity and simplicity of the story. Altogether there are 1530 short lines. There is little elaboration, and that of plot only. There are few episodes. There is doubling of incident, but even so the incident in almost every case serves to advance the story.
There is no long drawn-out account of battle merely to show the hero's prowess. There is little interest in mental states in character, or in purpose. A series of pictures is presented, each picture momentary but vivid, much as in the ballad, but with the connections more carefully made. The reader is never lost in a maze, as in so many of the later romances.

Havelok is about twice as long as Horn; yet the story is shorter. Nor is the length due to elaboration; it is due rather to the leisurely manner of the author and his interest in matters not directly connected with the plot—such as the adventures of Havelok at Lincoln, the details of Grim's life, and the fight at the "greyue's" in Denmark, which altogether occupy several hundred lines. Then, too, there is the long introduction in praise of Ædelwold's qualities as king. There is less complication, less elaboration of plot than in Horn. Where elaboration occurs—as in the account of the preparation of the boat for the escape of Grim and his companions from Denmark, or in the account of the games at the crowning of Havelok (2320ff.)—it is due to interest in the homely setting of popular life. Emphasis on prayers, on oaths, and interruptions to call down curses upon some wrongdoer, indicating interest in the religious and moral aspects of the tale, increase the length of Havelok. But nowhere is the elaboration a result of interest in the development of a stirring plot.

In Bevis we have a romance about three times as long as Horn and about one and one half times as long as Havelok. Yet there is neither elaboration nor complication of plot. Indeed, the incidents are, as a rule, told briefly and with simplicity. A little more detail is given in connection with the fights than in Horn; the connections are more definitely set forth; but there is, as a matter of fact, much less grouping of incidents for elaboration. The story is thinner; but it is much longer because there is no end to the number of adventures in which the hero may engage. There are no less than fifty distinct incidents in the romance; and the number might be considerably increased if the somewhat obscure subordinate incidents were counted. Bevis is little more than a joining together of a large number of conventional incidents by means of a hero.

But even Bevis, as romances go, is not long. Of our group only Guy—more than twice as long as Bevis and consisting of seven times as many lines as Horn—deserves this adjective. This is due to elaboration and to multiplication of incident. There are actually not quite so many incidents as in Bevis, but they are loosely connected by means of a hero in an identical manner. However, the incidents are elaborated by the increased number of dramatis personae, by greater attention to states of mind, and by infinite and often monotonous detail of battle.

Thus we see that there is in our four romances variety of plot-type, of length, of simplicity, and of degree of elaboration. The significance of this variety will become more evident as we proceed with a detailed examination of the elements

1. The Roman de Troie of Benoit de Sainte-Maure contains 30,316 lines.
of plot-structure, especially as we see it side by side with a high degree of conventionality. Bevis and Guy, by reason of length and lack of unity, far from the possibility of popular story. The collection of miscellaneous motives is indeed in the manner of the later chansons and romances. The prose romances show the process carried to extreme\(^1\). Havelok and Horn belong to a much simpler type. The former may owe its simplicity to the fact that it had for model the Breton lay. The latter may retain some of the simplicity of the folk tale. But it is enough to note here that variety of type greets the reader on his first survey of the field.

**Introductions**

The formal introductions of the English metrical romances are thoroughly stereotyped. They fall, however, into two general classes, not too sharply distinguished, of which one is represented in our group by the introductions to Horn, Havelok, and Bevis, and the other by the introduction to Guy. The first type is the call of the minstrel for attention. It usually consists of a prayer or blessing, the name of the hero, perhaps a word in his praise, but sometimes is merely a request for listeners.

\(^1\) The romances printed by Caxton furnish the most familiar examples in English. Huon of Bordeaux is a good example of the chanson de geste in its last stage.

2. In Horn et Rimel (about 5000 lines) and Ponthus and Sidone (the English version fills 150 good pages) we have examples respectively of the mature and elaborated French romance and the hodgepodge of its decline.
There are certain dissimilar features in these three introduc-
tions to which I shall return later, but what I wish to empha-
size here is that they are the familiar address of minstrel to
audience. The prayer so frequently introduced serves to make
clearer that the minstrel was making his bow. It will be impossible to quote all the examples in the English metrical romances, but I shall give enough to establish the existence of the class.

Lef, lythes to me
Two wordes or thre
Off one that was faire and fre
And felle in his fighte (Sir Perceval of Galles, l-4).

Jhesu Lorde oure hevyn kynge,
Graunte us alle thy dere blessynge,
And bylde us in thy bowre!
And ye ye ony yoye wylle here
Of them that beforne us were
\[\text{fat levede in grete honour}\]
Y schalle talle yow of a knyght, etc. (Sir Eglamour, of Artois, vv. l ff.).

Lord Gode in Trynite,
Yeoff home hevene ffor to se,
That lovethe gamene and gle,
And gestys to ffe. 
Ther ffolke sitis inffere,
Shulde men herkene and here
Off gode that beforne hem were,
\[\text{fat levede on arthed;}\]
And y schalle karppe of a knyght, etc. (Sir Degremont, vv. l ff.).

Will ye lystyn, and ye schyll here
Of eldyrs that before vs were,
Bothe hardy and wyght, etc. (Sir Cleges, vv. 1 ff.).

For goddes loue in trinyte,
At that ben hende hekmith to me,-
\[\text{I pray gum par amouret}\]
What whilom fel beyond ϕα see, etc. (Amis and Amiloun, vv. l ff.).

1. In Emere there is an interesting instruction to minstrels;
Menstrelles \(\text{fat walken fer and wyde}\)
Her and \(\text{feriin every`syde,}\)
In mony a dyuerse londe,
Sholde at her bygynnyng
Spekon of \(\text{fat ryghtwes kynge}\)
\(\text{fat made both see and sonde (vv. 13 ff.).}\)
In addition to these examples, I would refer to the introductory lines of Sir Isumbras, Ipomedon, Horn Childe, Libeaus Desconus, Seven Sages, Torrent of Portyngale, Wright's Chaste Wife, Sir Ferumbras, Sege of Melayne, and Octavian.

Among these examples there may be a few where one can hear pretty clearly the author speaking through the minstrel. But in the second type either we do not hear the minstrel at all, or we are reminded of his presence rather unexpectedly by a word at some point. Because of the length of many of the introductions of this type I shall be able to quote in full only the one in Guy, which approaches the second type rather than actually belongs to it.

Syth the tyme Dat Cryst Thesu,
Thorough hys grace & vertu,
Was in Dis world bore
Of a mayd without hore,
And be world crystendom
Among mankynd first becom,
Many aduentures he wrouzt
Dat all men knoweth nouzt.
Therefore men shull herken blythe,
And it vnderstonde right swythe,
For they that were borne or wee
Fayre aduenturis hadden they;
For euere they louyd sothfastenesse,
Faith with trewthe and stedfastnesse.
Therefore schulde man with gladde chere
Lerne goodnesse, vndirstonde, and here:
Who myke it hereth and vnderstoodeth it
By resoun he shulde bee wyse of witte;
And y it holde a fayre mastrye,
To occupye wisedome and lute folye.
For why as of an Erle i shall you telle,
How of hym it beefelle (Guy, vv. 1 ff.).

Here follows a brief summary of the story, after which the author yields the stage to the minstrel in the lines:

A wyseman it vnto vs seyd,
That it wrote and in ryme it loyd.
I woll it not any longer concei, 
But open the sentence as ye may fele (vv. 33 ff.).

With Guy, but more clearly of the second class, may be placed Sir Gawayn and the Grene
Knyght, Morte Arthure, William of Palerne, Lancelot of the Laik, Alisaunder, Destruction of Troy, Generides, Chevelere Assigne, Richard Coeur de Lion. In some of these (especially Lancelot) the author goes into details as to the reason for his writing the poem, in the manner of the later French romances, and in something of the manner which Chaucer exhibits more than once. While I do not wish to make too much of the differences between these two types of introduction, and freely confess that introductions furnish no necessary indication as to the character of the romances which are to follow, they do, taken together, I believe, tend to split into types which belong to distinct classes of romances. And so far as the four romances before us are concerned, this assumption finds complete support.

If we turn to the French narrateive literature, we find that the abrupt beginning of the earliest chansons de geste has no English parallels. The abruptness of the chanson, however, soon disappears. Brief summaries are sometimes given,

1. The tendency to connect stories with history is exemplified in the first line of this romance:

   Si pen fe sege & fe assaut wes sessed at Troy.

2. The first part of the English MS. is missing, but the introduction no doubt was not unlike the one in the French version.

3. The first type seems closely related to the usual introduction of the chanson de geste.

in the manner not infrequently found in the English romances\(^1\). Sometimes the difficulties under which the minstrel labored are noted in an emphatic call for silence\(^2\): The appeal to history, reference to source which might be regarded as historical, assertion of truth, recommendation of the story are likewise often met\(^3\). Perhaps the English audience was less skeptical and less critical, as these recommendations and protestations are much less frequent. In the romans d'aventure and in the chansons which most nearly approach them, the consciousness of the author emerges pretty clearly. For instance, there is the frequent opening with a declaration that he who knows something

1. Gautier, I, 231 f. The Chanson d'Antioche and the Chanson d'Aspremont are examples. Cf. also the continental French version of Beues:

\begin{align*}
\text{Oiès, signor, por Dieu le créateur,} \\
\text{Boine carçhon; ainz n'oistes millor:} \\
\text{Ch'est de Guyon a la fière vigour} \\
\text{Qui de Anstone tient la terre et l'onour.} \\
\text{Vienz fu li Dus: Si fest mult grant folour,} \\
\text{Car belle dame prist et jovene à oiseur;} \\
\text{Puis en mourut à deul et à dolour.} \\
\text{Beuves ses fix qui tant ot grant valour,} \\
\text{En fu mens en tere païenor;} \\
\text{Car de sa mère fu pris en tel haour} \\
\text{Sa mort jura, c'oirient li plusor:} \\
\text{Elle voloit prendre autrole Signour} \\
\text{Ename ot un felon traitour,} \\
\text{Do du maienche un mavais boiseour (Hist. Litt. XVIII, p. 749).}
\end{align*}

2. The Chanson d'Antioche begins as follows:

\begin{align*}
\text{Seigneur, soies en pais, laisses la noise ester,} \\
\text{Se vous voles chancon gloriose escouter,} \\
\text{Ja de nule millor ne vous dira jouglor:}
\end{align*}

3. Cf. Gautier, loc. cit. The following is an example:

\begin{align*}
\text{Seignour, oiez chancon de grant nobilité,} \\
\text{Tout est de viable estoire faite sans fausete;} \\
\text{James n'orez meilleur en trestot vostre ae (Renaud de Montauben, 1 ff.).}
\end{align*}
should not keep still about it. The aristocratic character of the later romances is sometimes indicated by the dignity and proud confidence of an author who despises all readers who are not of the nobility. There is a conspicuous absence of such haughtiness in English romances.

And now as to certain distinctions about which a word was promised. The introductory lines of Bevis and Horn are too brief and too conventional to have much significance. The introduction to Havelok, however, is longer, and shows very clearly the familiar relation of minstrel and audience, not only in the familiar request that "wiues, maydnes, and alle men" should hear him, but also in the asking for a cup of good ale. The chief features of the introduction—the prayer, the praise of the hero, the forecasting of what is to happen—are thoroughly conventional, but the author has apparently swung a little away from the familiar formulae. This may account for the unnecessary length and the repetition which somewhat mar these opening lines (vv. 9 f., 25 f.). In Guy, in spite of the difference in type, should be noted the resemblance to Havelok and many other romances in the matter of glance-forward, or hint at what is to follow, which is a feature occurring frequently in transitional

1. Cf. Guillaume de Palerne:
   Nus ne se doit celer ne taire,
   Sil set chose qui doie plaire
   Kil ne le desponde in apert,
   Car bien repont son sens et port,
   Qui nel despont apertement
   En la presence de la gent.
   Very similar are the opening lines of Thébes.

But besides this formal introduction falling into more or less conventional phraseology, there is the longer and more important one which introduces the reader to the story, being joined to the one which has just been discussed and often not entirely separable from it. It, too, has its conventional features. In Horn this further introductory portion falls into two parts. In the first there is a brief account of the parents of the hero, of the companions of the hero, and of the hero himself, comprising twenty-four lines. Then actual narrative begins with the story of the father's adventure with the Saracens and his death at their hands, preparing the way for the adventures of the hero and introducing a prominent motive—the quest for vengeance on a father's murderers. The entire introduction is compressed into the somewhat surprising compass of eighty lines.

The education of the hero, ordinarily a part of the introduction, is thrust into the midst of the narrative by reason of the dual character of the story. Horn is banished and has found a home in Westernesse at so early an age that it is necessary to continue the account of his education before the romantic story is initiated by Rymenhild becoming enamoured. Horn's education is entrusted to Aethelbrus, and he learns all the accomplishments which a young knight ought to know—harping, carving, serving the cup, and the craft of wood and river (vv. 227 ff.)

1. The introductory account of ancestors which is found in Beowulf may be compared with the convention of telling of the parents of the hero in the romances.
2. It is not to be understood that there is any repetition of introduction. In Horn Childe the situation is practically the same as in King Horn. The fourth stanza is devoted to the accomplishments of Arlaund, to whom Horn and his companions
In *Havelok*, the lines dealing with the respective fathers of the hero and the heroine are introductory in the larger sense. Of the 214 lines devoted to Abelwold, however, eighty are given over to a discussion of his qualities as a good king, betraying were entrusted "to lern hem to ride." Later, at Houlac's command, Arlaund continues Horn's education, which is to include instruction in the laws, as well as harping and reading romances.

Outside this feature, the introductory portions of *Horn Childe* and *Horn et Rimel* furnish a decided contract with that of *King Horn* and with each other. In *Horn Childe* the father of Horn is Hapeolf, and the account of whose adventures takes up about one-fourth of the romance as we have it. Indeed the author states:

*Y wil you telle of kinges tvo,*

*Hende Hapeolf was on of to (vv. 7 f.)*,

so that the poet probably regarded himself as telling the story of two heroes. As a matter of fact, this part is too long for a mere introduction and too brief and general for a separate romance. It is to be noted that it furnishes a historical background much fuller than is presented in *King Horn* or in *Horn et Rimel*. The other elements of the introduction—the account of the hero's appearance, the enumeration of his companions—are told with even greater detail than in *King Horn*. *Horn et Rimel* pursues a very different plan. After the usual address to the reader, the story begins without preparation with the discovery by the Saracens of Horn and his companions concealed in a garden.

Seignurs oi auez le uers delparchemin
Cum li bers aaluf est uenuz a sa fin
Mestre thomas ne uolt kil seit mis adaclin
Kil ne die de horn le uaillant orphanin
Cum puis lunt treit li felun sarasin
Vnen iot guaigna (?) del lignage chain
En language alfrican lapelant malbroin
Ci troua primes horn repuns enz un gardin (vv.1 ff.).

Later in the story Horn related to the King of Bretagne the story of his father's death (vv. 344 ff.) in true epic fashion. This leads Paulin Paris to inquire if the author may not have been acquainted with classical models (*Hist. Litt.*, vol. XXII, p.555). Whether so or not, we have here an artistic device cleverly and consciously utilized.
the patriotic mind of the author, but contributing nothing to
the story. The remainder is a somewhat detailed account of the
death of the king and the appointment of Godrich as regent. Lines
338-407 occupy the same position in the Havelok story as 106-237
do in the Goldborough story. The greater brevity is due to
the fact that the character of Birkabeyn is only incidentally
mentioned, and the account of his sickness, the parliament of
barons, the appointment of a guardian, and the king's death,
is but a shortened repetition of what has already been related
of Abelwold. These introductions are disproportionately large
from our point of view, but, in themselves, they are both
interesting and significant, and in a story so loosely construc-
ed as Havelok, so lacking in compactness and unity of plot, dis-
tinction between introduction and main body of story was probably
not clearly in the author's mind.

As in Horn and Havelok, so in Bevis, the introductory
portion deals with the hero's father. As in Horn, the father's
death leaves the hero unprotected, leads to his banishment,
and introduces the quest for vengeance. The narrative, occu-
pying almost all of the 294 lines of the introduction, is
quite detailed.

The introductory portion of Guy differs from what we have
found in Horn, Havelok, and Bevis. A general account of the
rank, wealth, and power of the heroine's father is followed
by a description of the heroine and her accomplishments. Cor-
respondingly, there is given then a character sketch of Guy's
father, the steward, a man of great worship and a preserver of
peace; which is followed by an account of the hero's beauty and education. The actual narrative begins with the adventures of the hero and heroine, which in no wise spring from anything that had happened to the parents. It may be noted in passing, however, that this introduction without narrative has a length of 182 lines (Gaius MS.), due to elaboration of the features present.

We find again certain features characteristic of these introductions, apart from the general resemblance of the first three, due to identity of type of story. First of all, there is the indifference to length, due to loose construction. Then there is the interest in the father of the hero, and, in a lesser degree, in the father of the heroine, back of which lies the medieval desire to know about the families of heroes. There may be, too, somewhat of the influence of chronicle, with its story of successive kings related by blood. More important, perhaps, is the fact that the chansons de geste, for the most part, belonged to cycles, the heroes of each cycle being genetically connected. Thus, at the beginning of a chanson, there might be a resume of one preceding. The convention once established encouraged the fabrication of accounts of parents of heroes if such accounts were not already in existence. Also to be noted

1. As compared with 26 in Horn, 54 in Bevis, 113 in Havelok.
2. Cf. in this respect Horn Childe (one fourth of the poem) and Lancelot of the Laik (334 lines).
3. It is unnecessary to give examples, as they occur everywhere.
is the fact that the education of the young hero is emphasized, and the accomplishments of his teacher lauded. The general features of education are much the same in most romances, and no doubt represent fairly well the actual training of the children of the nobility. Havelok, however, furnishes a notable exception in this as in so many other respects.

Objective point

What we term the climax in modern drama or tale, to which all the threads of narrative lead, is frequently not to be recognized in medieval romance. Often there is no real objective point. The story might just as well be half or twice as long. Its development is by accretion, not by growth. Yet this is not always true; it is not often true of earlier French chanson de geste or romance. In our group, it is not true of Horn; and it is true only to a very limited degree of Havelok. The differences are so great in this matter and the common elements so few that it is necessary to discuss the romances separately, and to reserve general remarks for a concluding paragraph.

In Horn, the objective point of the exile and return element is the reconquest of Suddenne by Horn. With the interest in the romantic story dominant, this falls very far into the background. Occasionally, however, the story looks

---

1. Cf. The Seven Sages, Ipomedon, Tristrem, Alisaunder; also Hall's note to l. 226 of Horn.

2. I have found it necessary occasionally in this section to use the word "climax". It is employed untechnically to denote the critical scenes.

3. Note the Chanson de Roland and Chrétien's romances.
forward to it. In the early part of the romance the Admirad, in consigning Horn to the sea, says

\[\text{zet fu mote to liue go} \]
\[& \text{fine feren also,} \]
\[\text{zet hit so bi falle} \]
\[\text{pe scholde slen vs alle (vv. 97-100).} \]

And again in Horn's address to the ship when he and his companions have arrived safe in Westernesse the reader is reminded that Horn must be revenged and must return.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Schup, bi pe se flode} \\
\text{Daies haue fu gode:} \\
\text{Bi pe se brinke} \\
\text{Bo water pe nadrinke.} \\
\text{zet fu cume to suddenne,} \\
\text{Gret fu wel of myne kenne,} \\
\text{Gret fu wel my moder,} \\
\text{Godhild quen pe gode;} \\
& \text{seie pe paene kyng} \\
\text{Jesucristes witering,} \\
\text{at ihe am hol & fer} \\
\text{On is lond arived her;} \\
\text{And seie at hei schal fonde} \\
\text{pe dent of myne honde (vv.139-52).}
\end{align*}
\]

The reader is taken back briefly to this story in the midst of the Irish adventures when Horn is avenged on his father's slayer. When the return of Horn to Suddenne finally occurs it is told with some detail in one hundred lines. Human interest in the return is given by the meeting with Aþulf's father at the shore, which occupies about seventy lines. The battle itself is barely mentioned. Nothing is made of the reunion with Godhild and other friends. Indeed Horn's twelve companions (except Aþulf) apparently do not accompany him on this expedition, the necessary assistance being rendered by the Irish followers. When the reader is informed that Horn's absence has

1. The failure of the author to introduce Horn's companions at this point has been regarded as ground for the belief that they did not belong to the original saga; cf. Deutschbein, p. 4.
resulted in new misfortunes for Rymenhild and he is again called upon to rescue her, the entire adventure assumes the value of an episode in the more important tale. The interest of the exile and return element springs chiefly from its relation to the romantic element. Moreover, there is a certain ungeschicktheit, from the point of view of modern narrative art, in the partial vengeance of Horn in the middle of the story, and the consequent weakening of interest in the real objective point.

In the romantic element there is a double climax. Twice it is necessary for Horn to rescue Rymenhild from persecutors. One of the rescue scenes was perhaps original and the other an imitation, according to the repetitive method familiar in medieval narrative. Possibly the double climax is due to a fusion of versions. As we have the romance, the first rescue is more fully prepared for and more elaborated. Horn's banishment through the treachery of Fikenhild sets up at once the antagonism from which the reader expects consequences. Rymenhild's gift of a ring to Horn is followed by references to it in the account of each of Horn's fights (vv. 613, 873), and it is used for identification on Horn's return. The period of Horn's absence, seven years, is emphasized at his departure, is recalled when he refuses to accept Reyhild as his wife for seven years, and the listener or reader learns that the entire period has elapsed before Horn returns (v. 1140). Rymenhild's dream of the fish that breaks her net forecasts the misfortune about to befall the lovers, and is recalled by Horn when he hands the cup of wine to the supposed palmer. All of these motives are emphasized in the climax and help to bind the parts of the
story firmly together. Indeed, the climax is very fully elaborated, occupying more than two hundred lines. Besides the disguise, the meeting of the lovers, the death of Modi, and the submission of Fikenhild, there are the conflict with the porter, the brief glimpse of the hall, the beggars' row, the weeping bride; Aelfulf's absence is noted; then comes the swift transition to the friend in the tower looking eagerly out to sea for Horn's sail and weeping because he looks in vain. All in all, it is detailed, picturesque, swift, exciting.

The second climax is less elaborate and shows signs of haste. In one respect, however, it is more logical than the first. Fikenhild now is the main antagonist, having shut Rymenhild up in a castle with the intention of marrying her. In the first climax Fikenhild plays a small and doubtful part, and the comparatively inoffensive Modi is brought to the front. Thus there is an absence of personal antagonism and consequently so much less interest. But in the second rescue the logical antagonist assumes the proportions of a true villain. However, the subsidiary motives which cluster about the first rescue are absent—the recognition by means of a ring, the friend lamenting his absent comrade, the hall scene with its mixture of cheer and grief. As a substitute, we have the picturesque incident in which Horn and his companions, disguised as harpers and "gigours", approach the castle by the gravel, playing and singing. Then in a few lines the listener is told that Horn sat on the bench and "makede Rymenhilde lay", that she swooned, whereupon Horn, looking on the ring, struck Fikenhild dead. Here is the same vividness, the same rapidity which we saw in
first climax, but less detail and less pathos. Yet, as a whole, the second climax has its justification, even for the modern reader, and it furnishes one of the most satisfactory examples of the medieval trick of doubling incidents.\(^1\)

The discussion of a point in the other romances need not be so detailed, inasmuch as this feature is in them of less significance. In *Havelok* the objective point of the story is, of course, double—the regaining of the kingdom of Denmark and vengeance on Godard on the one hand, and the obtaining of England and vengeance on Godrich on the other. However, the simplicity of the story prevents vagueness. We find here again the transitional glance forward in prayer or curse. Thus when Goldborough is placed in prison, the author passes to Havelok with

*Ihesu Crist, that Lazarun*  
To liue brouhte fro dede bondes,  
He lese hire with hire bondes;  
And leue sho mote him y-se  
Heye hangen on galwe-tre,  
\(\phi\)at hire haued in sorwe brouht,  
So as sho ne misdede nouht! (vv. 331 ff.).

Similarly when Godrich gives Havelok over to grim to be put to death:

*Ihesu Crist, \(\phi\)at makede go*  
\(\phi\)e halte, and \(\phi\)e doumbe speke,  
Hauelok, \(\phi\)e of Godard wreke! (vv. 542 ff.).

Such passages remind the hearer that he is listening to a tale of vengeance and keep his interest aroused for the issue. There is a glance forward, too, in the words of Grim when he recognizes in the boy whom he has been on the point of destroying

---

the heir to Denmark:

"Goddot!" quath Grim, "wis uere eir
at shal ben louerd of Denemark,
He shal ben king, strong and stark;
He shal hauen in his hand
Al Denemark and Engeland;
He shal do Godard ful gret wo,
He shal him hangen or quik do flo;
Or he shal him al quic do graue,
Of him shal he no merci haue." (vv. 606 ff.).

This states pretty clearly what is to happen, and a critical listener might have wondered at Grim's prophetic power in recognizing in Havelok a future king of England. The dream of Goldborough at Grimsby is also a prophecy of honors to come. These are the hints which the author of Havelok throws out to bind part to part and to keep the interest aroused. The recurring references to the light issuing from Havelok's mouth (586 ff., 1247 ff., 2090 ff.) and the retelling of Havelok's early history in the middle of the poem (2204 ff.) are also unifying elements.

But there is no sharply defined climax. It has been noticed how the climax in King Horn was embellished by subordinate incidents, and the interest heightened by massing of elements of emotional appeal. There is nothing of the sort here. The recovery of the kingdom of Denmark is the objective. The recovery of the kingdom of Denmark is the point of the Havelok element. It is delayed, not led up to, by the story of the fight at the inn. The discovery by Ubbe of the light issuing from the mouth of the hero, which leads to the crowning, in itself not a very significant incident, since Havelok or any one of his companions might just as well have imparted the information that Ubbe was host to a prince. The crowning has the conventional elaboration of feast and games.

Hwan he was king, þer mouhte men se
 þe moste ioie þat mouhte be:
Buttinge with he sharpe spere,
Skimming with taleva at men beres,
Wrestling with laddes, putting of ston,
Harping and piping, ful god won,
Leyk of mine, of hasard ok,
Roumanz-reding on pe bok;
per mouhte men here pe gestes singe,
pe gleumen on pe tabour dinge;
per mouhte men se pe boles beyte,
And pe bores, with hundes teye (vv. 2320 ff.).

There were gifts of clothes, plenty of meat and wine, and the hero's friends were made barons. Then follows, in general narrative, an account of the regaining of the kingdom and, finally, of the capture of Godard. Here there is no dramatic meeting of opposing forces, no clash of rival passions. It is true that the disgraced Godard is brought before Havelok, but only to note the contrast of the relative positions of the two now and formerly, and to give occasion for quoting the maxim proverb:

"Old sinne makes new shame." Vengeance is the result of legal process. A real climax scene is hardly to be discovered.

The second point—the conquest of England and the defeat of Godard—is of superior interest. In this element of the story, plot is more significant. It is the villain's own act in marrying the princess Goldborough to a supposed thrall (in the hope thus to establish his own power) that results in his destruction. Both hero and heroine are here concerned. The marshalling of the opposing forces is more clearly indicated. The battle is somewhat elaborately described, and it is necessary for Havelok himself to strike the blow which overthrows Godrich and wins the battle. This is more truly the climax of the story; it is the English climax, the one which meant more to hearer and reciter. But even here there is no elaboration, no emotional ap-
peal, both of which are strikingly present in the Horn climax.

As has been said, Bevis consists of a group of incidents joined somewhat artificially together. As many of these incidents are connected within the frame of an exile and return story, the regaining of the hero's patrimony and vengeance on the father's murderer may be regarded as an objective point. This, though often lost sight of, is brought to the hearer's attention at intervals. There is a glance forward in Bevis's threat when he learns of his father's murder:

"Ac oping, moder, i schel þe swere:
žif ich euer armes bere
And be of eldre,
Al þat haþ me fader islawe
And ibrouȝt of is lif dawe,
Ich schel hem ȝilden" (vv. 313 ff.).

Again when Bevis is interviewing the king of Armenia he declares

"If it euer so be-tide,
þat ich mowe an horse ride
And armes bere ȝ scheft to-breke,
Me fader deþ ich schel wel wreke (vv. 549 ff.).

And the introduction of Terri into the story on the occasion of his meeting with Bevis under the medlar tree (1263 ff.), purposeless as it seems, is a recall to the main plot. From this point until Bevis is in Cologne (1345--2910) there is no return to the enveloping story; and the somewhat astonishing inference is that Bevis had been there some time before inquiring about his old home.

On a dai sire Beues sede:
"Leue en, what is to rede
Of me stifader Deuoun,
þat holdeþ me londes at Hamtoun" (2911 ff.).

Whereupon the bishop told him that there was constant war be-
tween Saber and Devoun. After this, the exile and return element draws rapidly to its close. Bevis's vengeance begins, and it is carried out in three distinct incidents. First, Bevis and his companions trick Devoun into entertaining them. Soldiers (to help fight Saber, who, at the proper moment, are thrown into the sea. Second, a messenger is sent to Devoun to tell him that he has been entertaining his hated stepson unaware; and in his rage the emperor, attempting to slay the messenger, *hurls* a knife to the heart of his own son. Third, Devoun is decisively defeated and meets death in a caldron of boiling lead before the eyes of his wife, who falls from the castle wall upon which she is standing and breaks her neck. When all this has happened, the vengeance element is complete, and the story passes on to other matters. Thus there is practically no approach to the climax, and certainly no pretense of making it more than an incident or succession of incidents among many others. Yet there does appear this interest of rising movement. It is to be noted that there is a considerable interruption, however, between the second and third step, an interruption consisting of the exciting story of the rescue of Josian from the stake; and after this, the account of the battle of Bevis and Devoun seems take. There is little evidence of structural skill.

There are, of course, objective points scattered throughout the romance—particularly in the parts connected with Josian, and in connection with these occur examples of the conventional

---

1. Such a slip as this may very well be credited to translator or even to scribe; there is nothing of the sort in the Anglo-Norman version, but the stories do not agree at this point; cf. summaries.
glance forward of which Bevis furnishes so many examples. And occasionally a sign of preparation may be noted. As an example of forecasting on the part of the author, the following lines thrown in at the beginning of the incident of the slaying of Bevis's father may be quoted:

Alläs, dat he nadde be war  
Of his fomen, dat weren dar,  
Him forte schende:  
Wi trosoun wor he er islawe  
And i-brouzt of is lif-dawe,  
Er he hom wende (vv. 205 ff.).

Poking forward in a general way to a number of incidents in the story is the remark made when Saber is introduced:

A was ibrouzt in tene & wake  
Ofte for dat childes sake  
Ase wel ase jo (vv. 328 ff.).

Perhaps it is merely the need of a rhyme tag which makes the author add, after saying that Saber had sprinkled Bevis's clothes with blood, and intended to show them to his mother, "And so a dede" (v. 354) instead of allowing it to become known in the regular course of the story. More significant is the author's remark when Bevis once spares the life of Brademon:

"Allas, dat he nadde him islawe  
And ibrouzt of is lif dawe" (vv. 1063 f.).

Likewise the author says of two knights whom Bevis has preserved:

Him hadde be better, he hadde hem slain! (v. 1204).

The stealing of Arondel is vaguely forecast in

Wel sorc aneizd schel Beues be,  
Er dan ne Saber eft ise! (vv. 4027 f.).

---

This forecasting contributes little to the story and is merely a conventional trick. As a sign of real preparation, perhaps, may be taken the occasional introduction of a little incident which does not appear as significant until later in the story. Thus when Bevis is sent to Brademond with the letter containing the order for his own death, he is made to promise not to break the seal (vv. 1243 ff.). When Terri and he meet, the former notices the letter and asks to be allowed to read it, but Bevis will not break his promise. Then again when Bevis visits Jerusalem, the patriarch

"forbede him vpon his lif
  vat he never toke wif
  Boute þhe were clene maide (vv. 1967 ff.).

One is reminded of this later when Bevis refuses to receive Josian until she assures him that she is a virgin. Another instance is perhaps Bevis's suspicion of Ascopard (v. 2547) when Josian begs for his life, a suspicion which is later justified somewhat unexpectedly. We find, then, traces of preparation, but it is preparation of the slightest and crudest sort.

All of this but emphasizes the fact that we have here a romance of almost disconnected elements. Since it is impossible to trace any consistent development, it only remains to point out certain loose connections which do exist, in addition to those already mentioned. The reappearance of the dramatis personae is the most important. Besides the hero, most prominent are Josian, Saber, and Ascopard, all of whom take part in many adventures. The horse Arondel is hardly less important. Yvor is twice the captor of Josian and once of Arondel, and he is
finally disposed of in a fierce fight with the hero. Bradmond, after being conquered by Bevis and compelled to relinquish claim to Josian's hand, is later the captor of Bevis. Thus the list of dramatis personae is prevented from becoming unmanageable. In a large way, the separation of Bevis and Josian, first as lovers and later as husband and wife, and the consequent efforts to be reunited, furnish a bond of general interest, and a vague sense, sometimes at least, of getting somewhere.

Fully as loose as the organization of Bevis is that of Guy. This romance is like Bevis in the fact that there is for the earlier portion a binding element which is lacking for the last third of the romance. This connecting, or better perhaps, enveloping portion, is the romantic love story. So far as there is progress at all, it is marked by incidents in the romantic element. Five times Guy declares his love to Felice, and each time there is a difference. When the humble cupbearer tells the Earl's daughter that he loves her, she calls him a "garsoun", and sends him away with scorn.

"Goo hense swithe! vp arise,
   And come nomore here in this wise!" (C. vv. 413 ff.).

When Guy presents himself for the second time he is received coldly, but his passionate love finally moves her to say in rather vague terms that if he becomes a knight "strong in armes and hardi" (v. 670) she will accept his love. This defect on the side of Guy is soon remedied. Guy is dubbed knight, and at once claims the love of the exacting lady. This time she declares that she cannot be his until his knighthood is proved. For this reason Guy must go abroad. After victories in many
tournaments (vv. 749-1100), he returns to England, and for the fourth time he asks the love of Felice. This time she confesses that he is dear to her, but declares that she cannot yield her love until he is held the best in arms that "and man mai finde". Once more Guy travels over Europe seeking adventures. When his friends are slain he seems to have a moment of penitence when he remembers that they have died on account of his love for Felice (v. 1559); but his warrior career goes on, apparently for some years. When finally he returns, the most famous knight in the world, Felice is ready to fall into his arms. Here is an objective point—the winning of a maiden's love—and gradual approach. The many adventures are bound together by the fact that they are undertaken for the sake of the fair lady. But this is the extent of the connection. Between the fourth and fifth steps of the love story as just given is more than half of the romance (vv. 1169-7306); and the various adventures which comprise this portion are for most part undertaken without a thought of Felice. Guy is on the point of returning to England as early as v. 1790, when news of war leads him away. Indeed so forgetful is Guy of Felice that at one time he almost marries without once thinking of his early love. Yet one is inclined to credit this forgetfulness to the author rather than to the hero. The latter part of the romance—made up of Guy's adventures as a pilgrim—is nothing but a series of incidents, and the only necessary end to them is the hero's death.

1. In the hodgepodge of adventure which is thrust upon Guy, author, reader, and, one suspects, the hero himself are completely lost. It is worth remembering, however, that the author may have been under the influence of the forgetful lover motive; see p. 205.
However, besides the romance as a whole, one may look at separate incidents or groups of incidents for evidence of organizing skill, of the use of objective points, and of power to develop plot. Guy offers a particularly favorable opportunity for this, since several of the adventures are related with some detail. For our purpose the chief of the single combats seem to offer the best material, since there is a certain concentration of interest upon them. These all fall in the latter part of the romance— the fight with Amoraunt, the fight with Berard, and the fight with Colbrond.

The story of the fight with Amoraunt comprises ninety-seven twelve-line stanzas. Before Guy becomes an actual participant, the reader or hearer is fully informed as to what has already happened; his sympathies are aroused; and the need of a champion is made very plain. This preliminary account is placed in the mouth of Earl Jonas, whose life is at stake, as well as the lives of his fifteen sons. It also emphasizes the difficult battle before the hero by a vivid picture of his terrible opponent, who seems like a fiend from hell. Pity for Jonas is called forth by the account of his long search for Guy of Warwick and Herhaud of Ardern, and of his desperate straits when he has failed. Guy, having heard the story, offers himself as a champion, and proceeds with Jonas to Alexandria, where the combat is to take place. Here certain features of the situation are emphasized or added—the terrible position of Jonas, the fact that the dis-

1. The fights of the romances are discussed in a general way pp. 209 ff; they are considered here only as the central feature of brief sub-stories.
guised Guy is in the presence of enemies, and the fact that there are Christian prisoners who are to be freed if he is successful. An elaborate description of Guy's armor, of the terrible appearance of Amoraunt, and of the armor of Amoraunt, is followed by the account of the fight, which is itself elaborated by the use of accessory details. Thus one finds full preparation, a strong appeal in more than one direction for the sympathy of the reader, and elaboration of what may be called the climax of the incident.

The Berard episode repeats many of the features of the Amoraunt episode. There is the same preparation by the introduction of Terri, who tells his unrecognized friend the details of his misfortune, of his long search for Guy, and of his urgent need of a champion. There is a certain heightening of interest because Terri and Berard are already known. Numerous details emphasize the climax—a quarrel between Guy and Berard, the arming of Guy by the princess, the search for a place of combat, the description of the armor of Berard, the comments of spectators, and the glimpse of Terri, praying at the church, then hastening to the scene of the fight. A new feature is added in the incident of the attempt on Guy's life by putting him asleep in the sea on his bed, picturesque in itself, but adding a touch of suspense, and heightening the interest in the defeat of the author of the treachery.

The Colbrond story has a somewhat different interest because it has been regarded as the kernel of the romance.

1. See pp. 95 f.
For the medieval listener there was the patriotic interest, since the fate of the nation was at stake. The preparation is again quite full. Guy, still the unrecognized pilgrim, has returned to England. On asking about the king, he is told that the Danish monarch has invaded England, and that in his army there is a giant whom no one dares to meet in single combat, since Herhaud is gone from England and Rohaud is dead. Guy proceeds to Winchester, where the king is holding parliament, and offering half his land to the one who will be England's champion. But no one responds. Then follows the dream which directs the king to the pilgrim, a long description of the armor given to Guy, an account of the oaths of the two kings to abide by the result of the combat, a description of the armor of the Danish champion. As before, the feelings of the spectators watching the fight are mentioned from time to time.

I have referred to these episodes in this detailed way to point out that there are within the cumbrous bulk of the romance a number of rather brief stories which have a fairly complete interest in themselves, that they are fully motivated, approach a climax which is prepared for, and lead to a definite conclusion. However, within the limits of a romance like Guy, there is no reason why the number of such episodes might not be greatly multiplied.

As in the case of Bevis, there are certain features not so immediately concerned with the preparation for and treatment of the objective point which seem best mentioned here. We find again that trick of looking forward in a line or two of comment by the author. Then, too, as in Bevis, there is the frequent

1. Cf. p.127 ; the references of this kind in Guy are
reappearance of certain *dramatis personae* in disconnected incidents. Herhaud and Tirri, corresponding to Saber and Terri, appear most frequently. Below them in importance may be placed Felice, Otous, Berard, and the Emperor of Germany. Of preparation for important incidents there is very little. The giving of the ring, which later is a token from Guy to Felice, is of course borrowed from the common storehouse of romance.

On the whole, it must be said, it is more difficult to get a view of the entire story of *Guy* than of *Bevis*. Perhaps this is partially due to the fact that in *Bevis* the starting point for an incident is likely to be something which happens to the hero. He is sent away on a mission, his favorite horse is stolen, or his wife is carried off. But Guy goes away for adventure because he meets some merchants from Constantinople who say the emperor there is in difficulty; or he meets a traveler who is in need of help; or he chances on a messenger. Guy's adventures are largely due to chance. Even when he helps his own friends, it is likely to be on account of a chance meeting.

We see, therefore, that in preparation for and treatment of objective points there are considerable differences among these four romances. These are in part due to the fact that they are of different types. *King Horn* has a pretty definite story to tell, just as do *Sir Gawayn* and the *Grene Kyght*, or the *Chanson de Roland*, or one of the *lais* of Marie de France.

---

1. Note his meetings with Tirri (vv. 5523 ff.; st. 142 f.). A chance meeting with Herhaud also occurs (vv. 1729 ff.).
But Guy and Bevis are collections of somewhat miscellaneous adventures, and any criticism upon them in the point of structure is directed at a type of which there are numerous representatives, Malory's Morte Darthur not the least. In such romances the chief feature connecting incident with incident is a hero with the friends or enemies most closely related to him. The naive device of suggesting to the hearers that something important is about to happen is a medieval commonplace, and one which has been admired in no less a poet than Chaucer himself. As has been said before, in Horn and Havelok we find something of the compactness and clearness of folk tale or lay; in Bevis and Guy we find the miscellaneous character of late chanson de geste or roman.

---

1. Cf. Troilus and Criseyde, vv. 53 ff.:
   Now herkneth with a good entencioun,
   For now wol I gon streight to my matere,
   In which ye may the double sorwes here
   In Troilus in loving of Criseyde,
   And how that she forsook him or she deyde.

   This trick is not confined to romances; cf. Gaimar, Estorie Engleis, vv. 98 ff.:
   Giez ke fit cel felon reis,
   Pur le te kil covertat
   Sa nece mesmanar.

   These expressions are usually made in connection with transitions. In some romances they are very plentiful (e.g., Richard Coer de Lyon).

2. The lays, the Chanson de Roland, the Pélérinage de Charlemagne, and Chrétien's romances represent sufficiently the earlier type of narrative.
Conclusions.

The conclusions of the romances are of less importance than the introductions. A romance naturally begins with the ancestry and education of the hero, of which a pretty full account is usually given. There is an equally obvious point at which to end a romance, viz. the death of the hero, or, which is perhaps no less obvious, with his marriage. But these do not lend themselves to extension, since a reference to specific events after marriage, or an account of the children of the hero would be the beginning of a new story. The conclusion, therefore, is in general hardly anything but a hasty stowing away of the dramatis personae, with feast or funeral, and a conventional parting salute to the audience.

The merry ending does not show marked difference from that of other stories of all times. Everybody is given a wife or a kingdom, and there is general feasting. Horn ends in the marriage of the hero with Rymenhild, and of Aþulf with Reynild. Aþulf by his marriage becomes heir to the throne of Ireland. There is no feasting mentioned, but the ending is too brief for elaboration. The conclusion of Havelok, which is much fuller, has the same features elaborated. Havelok's foster sisters are given husbands; his old friend, the cook, is made an earl; Havelok himself is crowned at London; Ubbe is to rule Denmark. There is a feast of forty days. The information is given that the chief dramatis personae are happy ever after. Havelok and Goldborough live sixty years, and have fifteen children,

Hwar-ôf ðe sones were kinges alle,  
So wolde god it sholde bifalle;
And she douhtres alle quenes (vv. 2980 ff.)¹.

In spite of the fact that the death of Bevis is elaborated into a distinct incident, the features of a merry ending are found in the lines immediately preceding. Bevis's son Miles is married to King Edgar's daughter and made heir of England, on which occasion there is a royal feast lasting a fortnight; the earldom of Hamtonshire is given to Saber; and Bevis withdraws into his own kingdom, where he lives with Josian for twenty years "wiþ oute treie & tene."²

The romances very frequently end with death, yet they very seldom have a tragic close³. The author usually seems to feel that he is concerned with the life of his hero and that his romance is not completed until his hero is buried. Even of the hero and heroine of Horn we are told "Nu ben hi boþe ded." And at the end of Havelok the reader is obliged to look forward to old age and death through the "sixti winter" during which Havelok was king. There is no good narrative reason for Bevis, Josian, and Arondel to perish; yet their end is elaborated into a pathetic incident. For Guy death is the only means of release from his self-imposed penance; therefore it has more significance.

¹ Fifteen children or fifteen sons seems to have been a favorite number. Jonas in Guy had fifteen sons; Eger, of Eger and Grine, was the father of fifteen children; the hero of the ballad of "Sir Gawline" (No. 61 of Child's collection) had fifteen sons.

² Most of these features are common to fiction. For marriage feast of a fortnight or forty days, cf. Sir Eglamour, Sir Degrevant, Irpomegon, Libeaus Desconus. Sometimes there are tournaments, giving of gifts, and descriptions of the pomp of chivalry.

³ Morte Arthure is the most conspicuous exception among English romances.
But the introduction of death, even in romances ending happily, is a commonplace.  

This suggests a very common characteristic of romance endings, namely, some kind of religious appeal. This regiosity manifests itself in certain conventional ways. The building of religious houses is one of these. Thus Terri made a fair abbey in Lorraine "for Gyes sake", the richest of "all the abbeyes in that contre" (vv. 11088 ff.). The son of Bevis had erected for his father and mother

A faire chapel of marbel fin,  
φat was ikast wi? queint engin;  
Of gold he made an hiz cornere  
And leide φem φar in bo?c ifere.  
An hous he made of religioun,  
For to singe for sire Bevoun  
And ek for Iosian φe fre.

With this may be placed the lines of *King Horn* which furnish a sort of conclusion for the exile and return element.

1. The romances with historical or pseudo-historical basis would naturally perhaps so end; cf. *Richard Coer de Lyon*, *Alisaundre*, *Morte Arthure*, and the prose *Godfrey of Bologne*. But note, too, *Sir Perceval of Galles*, *Sir Isumbras*, *Sir Degrevant*, *Ipomydon*, *Amis* and *Amiloun*. Most of these are on the same general lines. The following is typical:  

Thrytty wyntur and mare  
Thei lyvede to-gydr without care,  
And sevène chyl[?]ur she hym bare,  
That worthy in wede;  
And sene sche dyed, y undurstord,  
He seysed hys eyre with hys hond,  
And went into the Holy Lond,  
Hevene be hys mede!  
At Port-gaff was he slone,  
ffeor-justyd with a Souldone:  
Thus to Gode is he gone,  
Thus dou?ty in dede! (Sir. Degre vant vv. 1889 ff.).
Horn let wurche
Chapeles & chirche.
He let belles ringe
&Wasses let singe (vv. 1379 ff.)¹.

There may be a prayer for the soul of the dead.

God on here saules haue pite
& also for Arondel,
?f if men for eni hors bidde schel (Bevis, vv. 4616 ff.).

Nu ben hi be the dede;
Crist to heuene hem lede! (Horn, vv. 1523 f.).

bus endyth the geste of Sir Gye,
God on hys sowle have mercy! (Caius Ms. Guy, vv.
11093 ff.).

Sometimes the body manifests in some supernatural way the sanctity of the spirit which had inhabited it. To Guy God did "gret honoure":

1. Cf. the following:
   Anon ße hend barons tway,
   ßey let reyse a feire abbay
   And feffet it ryzt wel ßoo,
   In Lumbardy in ßat contray,
   To senge for hem tyl domesdaie,
   And for hor eldes also (Amis & Am., vv. 2497 ff.).

Sir Gowther founds an abbey (Gowther, vv. 691 ff.) and later is buried in it (vv. 733 ff.). In Marie's Eliduc, hero and heroine retire to a monastery. In Perceval of Galles the hero is slain in the Holy Land. This feature turns up frequently in the chansons de geste; cf. Moniaç Guillaume.

2. Cf. MS. A, Libeaus Desconus:
   Here endes ße lyfe
   I tell ßow, with outen stryfye,
   Of gentyll Libeus Disconenus.
   For his saule now byd ße
   A pater noster and aue,
   For ße loue of Jhesus,
   That he of hys sawle haue pyte
   And of owrys, iff hys wyll be,
   When we schall wend ßer to (st. 186a, Ashmole MS. 61).
A swete bræde com fram his bodi, 
̄at last ̄at’day so long, 
̄at in ̄is world spices alle

No mĩt cast a swetter smalle

As ̄en was hem among (st. 294 vv. 8 ff.)¹.

The formal dismissal of the story, with the conventional address to the hearer, the word of comment, the prayer or blessing, has almost the same features everywhere.

Her ende ̄e tale of horn, 
̄at fair was & nožt ̄orn; 
Make we vs glade Euere among, 
For us vs glade Euere among, 
Jesus ̄at is of heuene king 
̄en vs alle his suete blessing (Horn, vv. 1525 ff.).

Havelok has a brief summary of the story, followed by the author's assurance that he has told it "eueridel", after which he adds:

And for i ich wolde biseken you, 
̄athauen herd ̄e rime nu, 
̄at ilke of you, with gode wille, 
Seye a pater-noster stille 
For him ̄at haueth ̄e ryme maked, 
And ̄er-fore fele nihtes waked; 
̄at íesu Crist his soule bringe 
Bi-forn his fader at his endinge (vv. 2994 ff.).

Here the minstrel speaks clearly in the name of him "̄at haueth ̄e ryme maked". The close of Bevis consists of but two lines:

¹. In Renaud de Montauban a light issued from the body of the hero, the chanting of angels is heard, bells ring of their own accord; the sick are healed; and the body marches at the head of a procession. A sweet odour came from the body of Alexis; and it also had healing properties. Cf. also Sir Gowther, vv. 733 ff. The studies of Bédier (Les Légendes Épiques), according to which the early chansons de geste are the product of collaboration of monks and jongleurs, point to an obvious explanation of any convention of a religious character, not only in the chanson de geste, but in other narrative forms which the chanson de geste might have influenced.
The Auchinleck MS. of Guy ends as follows:

Now haue be herd, lordinges, of Gij,  
Dat in his time was so hardi,  
& holden hende & fre,  
& euer he loved treuete & rist,  
& served god wiþ al his mist,  
Dat sit in trinite,  
& &er-fore at his ending day  
He went to be ioie Dat laste ay,  
& euermore schal be.  
Now god leue ous to liue so,  
Dat we may Dat ioie com to,  
Amen, par charite (st. 299, v. 1 ff.)

The tendency to moralize which is so marked in the conclusions of many romances appears only faintly in our group. The conclusion of Guy is extremely religious, but no moral is drawn.

1. A few parallels may be quoted to show how conventional endings were, even to phraseology:

Dat endyd Richard our kyng:  
God give us alle good endyng,  
And hys soule reste and roo,  
And our soules whenne we com ther to (Richard, vv. 7133 ff.).

Lord gode in Trinite,  
Gyff hem Heven for to see  
That loves gamene and gle,  
And gesto fede (Sir Derreyant, vv. 1901 ff.).

With this may be compared the ending of the ballad "The Battle of Otterburn" (No. 161, Child):

Now let vs all for the Perssy praye  
To Jhesu most of myght,  
To bryng hys sowlle to the blysse of heven,  
For he was a gentyll knyght.

2. Cf. the conclusion to Reinbrun:

De ceste estorie uoil fin faire:  
Plus nen uoil desore treaire.  
Bel ensaunple i peut enbrandre  
Qui bien la siot u veut entendre  
De pruesce, amer, leaute tenir,  
De tuz biens faire e mal gerpir,  
In *Havelok*, where the moralizing tendency is marked throughout, there is a proverb-like concluding sentence:

"Him stondes wel at god child strenes (v. 1983)."

The features of the romance conclusion are, as we have seen, thoroughly conventional. The ordinary prayer or blessing was no doubt pronounced perfunctorily enough. Occasionally, however, there is a glimpse of the author, anxious about the success of his venture, or trying to impress a lesson. The almost universal presence of some religious note in the ending

---

1. "Nu is his tale brozt to fende
   Of Floris and his leman hende,
   Hu after bale hem com bote (Floris and Blancheflur, vv. 819 ff.)."

   Thus clerkys seyth yn her wrytynge,
   That falsnosse cometh to euel endynge (Octavian, S.E. version, vv. 1957 ff.).

   Ther is ladis now in lond fulle foe,
   That wold haue seruut hor lord soe (Amadace, st. LXX).

A more or less jocose moral frequently closes the fabliau, as in the following examples:

   Par example cis fabliaus dist
   Fame est fete por decevoir ("Des Perdriz", vv. 151 f., in Montaiglon et Raynaud's Fabliaux, 8, p. 193).

   Par cest fablel prover vous vueil
   Que cil fet folle et orgueil
   Qui fame engingnier s'entremet;
   Quar qui fit & fame I mal tret,

2. Sometimes the author feels it necessary to apologize; cf. The Romans of Partenay. Reference to source is very common; Gawayn and the Grene Knkyght is a conspicuous example.
is perhaps indicative of the part played by the church in the construction of popular stories. A division of the formal conclusions into types is scarcely possible. The abrupt conclusion of the early chanson de geste is contrary to English usage. There are in some of the later English romances endings without the formal leavetaking, but this simply means that the romances were for reading rather than for the recitation of minstrels; but all the members of our group show clear evidence of belonging to the minstrel type of romance.

Incident.

The chief element entering into the structure of the narrative is the incident. In order to comprehend as precisely as possible the significance of this element it will be necessary to study it from several points of view. The incident is often commonplace, is usually commonplace indeed; yet it may be used in a manner not commonplace. Or an incident may seem to be original, and yet be characterized by features which are commonplace. Therefore, it is desirable to distinguish the conventional incidents and the conventional treatment of incident from unconventional incident and unconventional treatment. This means, in any case, a study of the choice of incident, and the relation of incident to the narrative of which it is a part. It will make necessary, too, a study of the incidents as to brevity, picturesqueness, visualization, realism; as to typical motives which enter into them. It will mean an analysis of classes of incidents—those of war, those of love, journeys, voyages, games; and it will mean the discussion of such a special feature as the doubling of incidents. Incidents are of course intimately connected with character and with setting, but here we are interested in them as elements of plot. It seems desirable to discuss separately the each of the four romances with respect to those features which are more likely to be individual—the relation of incident to plot, brevity, picturesqueness or visualization, and realism; and afterwards treat those characteristics which are more likely to prove to be typical.

Taking Horn first, a study of the incidents as such reveals a considerable narrative knack. They are well selected; the
situations are usually striking, and the story nearly always advanced. They are brief, yet vivid. Take the incidents which represent Horn's life in Westernesse up to the time of his banishment.

(1) Horn, surrounded by his companions, says farewell to the ship and promises vengeance on his enemies (vv. 133-152).

(2) Horn, in the presence of King Ailmar, relates his story and is given into the care of Ælbrus for education (vv. 155-240).

(3) Ælbrus and Æulf in Rymenhild's bower (vv. 295-366).

(4) Horn in Rymenhild's bower (vv. 381-464).

(5) Horn and his companions knighted (vv. 495-522).

(6) Rymenhild and Horn in Rymenhild's bower; the ring-giving (vv. 523-586).

(7) Horn's first fight (vv. 597-620).

(8) Rymenhild and Horn discuss Rymenhild's dream (vv. 649-684).

(9) Aylmar and Fikenhild in the field; the betrayal (vv. 685-704).

(10) Horn driven out of Rymenhild's presence (vv. 705-714).

(11) Farewell to Rymenhild (vv. 721-740).1

Within the range of 600 lines there are eleven distinct incidents. For most part they are very brief. The story of Horn's first fight occupies only twenty-three lines. There is a pleasing absence of blows and counterblows, of shields broken and helmets crushed. The romantic incidents receive greater emphasis. The first interview of Horn and Rymenhild fills nearly one hundred lines. About 200 of the 600 lines are devoted to their interviews in four distinct scenes, each with its own interest. The first presents Rymenhild wooing and Horn hesitating;

1. This list might be lengthened by the addition of two very slight incidents: (1) Ælbrus meets Horn in the Hall and gives him Rymenhild's message (vv. 368-378); Horn arms himself to
the second is the ring-giving; the third shows the lovers discussing the dream and foreboding evil under the spying eyes of Fikenhild; the fourth is the farewell. As here, so through the entire story, the incidents are quickly told, and what elaboration there is results from the clustering of subsidiary incidents about the important ones rather than from the lengthening of the single incident. It is true also that the romantic incidents receive fuller treatment than the incidents of adventure.

Briefly told as the incidents are, they show evidence of considerable visualizing power. There is a certain freshness and even unexpectedness about the aspects of the incidents which the author presents that indicate a very concrete imagination. As will be shown, the transitions from scene to scene are frequently personal; emotions are presented by means of some physical manifestation; and the setting is nearly always indicated. This same trait is shown in the treatment of the persons who appear in an incident. The bodily movements indicated in the first meeting of Horn and Rymenhild, conventional enough for most part, are yet presented with unusual detail. When Horn entered the bower,

On knes he him sette
& swetoliche hurc grette (vv. 383-4).

After he had made his address,

Rymenhild vp gan stonde
& tok him bi φε honde:
Heo sette him on pelle
Of wyn to drinke his fulle:
Heo makede him faire chere
& toke him abute φε swere.
Oft heo him custe
So wel so hire luste (vv. 399 ff.).

depart from the country (715-20).

1. Cf. discussion of climax-scenes, p. 120.
When Horn declined to give her his love,

Armes heo gan buje,
Adun he feol iswoxe.
Horn in herte was ful wo,
& toke hire on his armes two:
He gan hire for to kesse
Wel ofte mid ywisse (vv. 427 ff.).

Scenes which do not lend themselves so easily to conventional treatment are a little less doubtful. There is a realistic touch in the last two lines of the following:

že knižtes žeden to table,
& horne žede to stable.
Far he tok his god fole
Also blak so ony cole;
že fole schok the brunie
 že al že curt gan denie (vv. 587 ff.).

The realism and pathetic genuineness of the scene where Rymenhild finds drowned the messenger she had sent to Horn do not need proof beyond reading.

Rymenhilde undude že dure pin
Of že hus žer heo was in,
To loke wiž hire že
If heo ov’t of horn isige.
žo fond heo že knauæ adrent
že he hadde for horn isent;
& že scholde horn bringe.
Hire fingres he gan wringe (vv. 973 ff.).

Here is a good deal of conventionality so far as expression goes. Yet one feels that the writer has picked out the conventional expressions, and joined them in the way, to reveal concrete imagination.

Turning from Horn to Havelok, we find that the incidents in the latter romance are not so vivid, and that they do not succeed one another with as much rapidity, as in the former. Compare with the series of incidents from Horn xxxxx xxxxxx xxx the series which makes up Havelok's first sojourn in England.
General narrative, telling of Grim's life at Grimsby, fills fifty-six lines (733-89). Then follows:

(1) Havelok works for the first time (789-820).

(2) Grim sends Havelok away, making a coat for him out of an old sail (vv. 839-862).

(3) Havelok thrusts down "barmen" and carries meat for the cook from bridge to castle (vv. 866-78).

(4) The next day he carries a load of fish to castle, and enters regular employment (vv. 879-925).

General narrative follows, relating what Havelok had to do as a servant, and telling of his gentleness and popularity.

(5) Putting the stone (vv. 1009-59).

(6) Godrich summons Goldborough and declares that she shall marry a "gadeling" (vv. 1103-30).

(7) Havelok is given to Goldborough (vv. 1131-80).

(8) Havelok and Goldborough return to Grimsby and are welcomed by Grim's children (vv. 1199-1246).

(9) Havelok's dream (vv. 1247-1352).

(10) Havelok visits the church and prays for vengeance (vv. 1353-95).

(11) Havelok counsels with Grim's sons about returning to Denmark (vv. 1391-1444).

In these seven hundred lines there is about the same number of incidents as in the six hundred lines from Horn. But as a matter of fact a great deal more actually happens in the Horn made portion, as is evident by comparing the lists of incidents given, and much more so by reading the passages. Indeed, the Havelok list is made as long as it is only by including every portion of the narrative which is marked by a shadow of concreteness. It is at once noticeable, for instance, that there is no striking dramatic situation in the Havelok, with the possible exception of the scene in which Goldborough and Havelok are brought together before Godrich; and certainly in vivid narrative and emotional
content, this is considerably inferior to the scene in *Horn* where Angelbras and Ælfdred visit Ryemhild in her bower (vv. 295-366), or to the scene of the ring-giving (vv. 523-80). There is lacking the quick flash of word and the corresponding change of mood. There is also in *Havelok* a greater amount of general narrative. There is no love interest. Incident is only loosely connected with incident. Thus the only significance of the putting of the stone for the rest of the story is that the fame which Havelok thus obtains brings his name to the ears of the king and suggests him as a husband for the princess.

Despite the defects of the incidents of *Havelok*, there are two characteristics of value. The first of these is the selection of incidents familiar to the experience of a popular audience, such as the putting of the stone, the rude tussle with the "bar-men" for the privilege of carrying the fish, the victory obtained by breaking heads with a doortree. Incidents of this character predominate in the story. Closely connected with this first characteristic is the second, namely, the marked realism of many of the incidents, which seems to spring from familiar acquaintance, on the part of the author, with the humble life which he is describing. The preparation for the escape from Denmark is somewhat minutely described.

Grim solde sone al his corn,
Shep with wolle, net with horn,
Hors, and swin, and geet with bord,
*he* goos, *he* honnes of *he* yerd;
Al he solde, *fat* ouht douhte,
*fat* he eure selle mouhte,
And al he to *he* peni drou.
Hise ship he greyede wel inow,
He dāde it tere, and ful wel pike,
*fat* it ne douete sond ne krike;
*er-inne* he dide a ful god mast,
Stronge kables, and ful fast,
Ores gode, and ful god seyl;  
forinne wantede nouht a nayl,  
-dat euere he sholde forinne do:(vv. 699 ff.).

Here is to be noted the tendency to catalogue which is an element in the realism of Havelok. Compare the well-known list of fishes which Grim caught.

He tok *e sturgiun, and *e qual,  
And *e turbut, and lax with-al,  
He tok *e sele, and ek *e el;  
He spedde ofteswite wel:  
Keling he tok, and tumberel,  
Hering, and *e makerel,  
*e butte, *e schulle, *e *ornbake (vv. 753 ff.).

Note, too, the description of the feast set before Havelok and Coldborough by Ubbe.

>anne he were set, and bord leyd,  
And *e beneysun was seyd,  
Biforn hem com *e beste mete  
-dat king or cayser wolde etc;  
Kranes, swannes, ueneysun,  
Lax, lampreys, and god sturgiun,  
Pyment to drinke, and god clare,  
Win hwit and red, ful god plente (vv. 1722 ff.).

Besides this realistic narrative detail, there are many vivid, picturesque, homely touches, which have the effect of realism. The following are examples:

Hemaden here backes al-so bloute  
Als here wombos, and made hem rowte  
Als he weren kradelbarnes (vv. 1909 ff.).

The cross on Havelok's shoulder

Sparkede, and ful brihte shon  
So doth *e gode charbuckle-ston,  
-dat men *e mouhte, by *e liht,  
A peni chesen, so was it briht (vv. 2144 ff.).

Godard, while being bound,

rorede als a bole

1. Lists of various kinds are very familiar in medieval literature; cf. The Romaunt of the Rose, vv. 1359 ff.
That wore parred in an hole
With dogges forto bite and beite (vv. 2438 ff.).

Whatever fault, there may be found with the manner in which incidents are fitted into the structure of the narrative, and whatever fault may be found with them in respect to variety and rapidity, there is a homely freshness and vigor in them, an interest in details, a sympathy with humble life, which are compensating elements of interest.

In Bevis one finds some of the qualities of Horn—a quick succession of rather striking incidents, having some dramatic value, with give and take of word and blow. But in structure, in originality, in visualization, it is inferior. For comparison I shall analyze the incidents which make up Bevis's life in Armenia. The introductory remarks about King Ermin and his daughter are very brief (vv. 5 5-26).

1. Bevis presented to King Ermin and received into service (vv. 527-76).

General narrative of Bevis's early life in Armenia (vv. 577-84).

2. Bevis's first battle, in which he slays fifteen Saracens (vv. 585-645).

3. Josian saves Bevis from the king's wrath (vv. 646-78).

4. Interview of Josian's messengers with Bevis (vv. 679-96).

5. Interview of Josian with Bevis, and

6. Interview of Bevis with the king (vv. 697-738).

General account of the boar (vv. 739-50).

1. This of course does not mean superior power of concrete imagination. In this respect Havelok is inferior to Horn; cf., however, vv. 586 ff.; 601 ff.; 1920 ff.
(7) Bevis slays the wild boar (vv. 751-836).

(8) Fight with the steward and his men (vv. 837-908).

(9) Bradmond, with an army, demands Josian; Bevis is dubbed knight so that he may help in the defence (vv. 909-988).

(10) Bevis is victorious, and captures Bradmond (vv. 989-1068).

(11) Bevis presents his prisoner to King Ermin (vv. 1069-82).

(12) Josian offers Bevis her love (vv. 1083-1136).

(13) Josian sends Boniface to interview Bevis (1137-78).

(14) Josian seeks Bevis at the inn (vv. 1179-1200).

(15) Two knights maliciously accuse Bevis to the King (vv. 1201-34).

(16) Bevis is summoned before the king, and is sent to Bradmond with a sealed letter containing an order for his death (vv. 1234-62).

When one compares the incidents of these 750 lines with those in the portions selected from Horn and Havelok, it becomes evident at once not only that a great deal is going on, but that the incidents are not well connected. Thus if we look upon the battles as the really important elements of the narrative, as the author seems to do, we note that Bevis's first battle is in no way connected with what goes before; that the fight with the boar and the fight with the steward are disconnected adventures; and that the fight with Bradmond, although it is more important for the general course of the story, in no sense springs from what has already occurred. The comparatively greater emphasis upon the battles and less emphasis upon the romantic incidents than in Horn may be noted. It is also to be noted

1. Note the length of the battle incidents as compared with others.

2. The love scenes, including the messenger's part, occupy little more than 100 lines; the climactic scene is only 21 lines.
noted that within the limits of a single incident there is a
great deal of action, that the dialogue, if any, is brief and
pointed, and that the climax of the scene is quickly reached.
There is very little general narrative, very little elaboration
of setting or states of mind. In Bevis action is emphasized
at the expense of the other elements of narrative.

The matter of realism and visualization need not detain us
long. The incidents themselves are so conventional that it is
only in the treatment of them that distinction is to be found.
Nor is the distinction considerable here, since the phraseology
is so frequently stereotyped. However, there is a certain rough
realism of dialogue\(^1\), and there are also lines here and there
with some realistic force, perhaps involving visualization. Thus
when Bevis succeeds in getting past the porter into the presence
of the king and his court,

Al aboute he gan be-holde (v. 421).

When Bevis, going to Bradmond, unexpectedly meets Terri, the
latter

Sat and dinede in a wede
Vnder a faire medle tre (vv. 1286 ff.).

And for their meal he laid before them

Bred and fleisc out of is male
And of his flaketes win and ale (vv. 1297 ff.).

Perhaps there is an element of visualization in the recognition
scene, which occurs after Bevis's long imprisonment.

---

\(^1\) This is discussed elsewhere as an element in characteriza-
tion; cf. p. 278.
Iosian be-held him be-fore, 
the se; his browe to-tore;
After Bonefas the gan grede,
At stable dore to him the sede:
'Be he moder that me ha bore,
Ner his mannus browe to-tore;
Me wolde thenke be his fasoun,
at hit were Beues of Hamtoun (vv. 2149 ff.).

The realism in these passages is not very marked. However,
there are a few incidents which receive emphasis by what is ap-
parently a conscious artistic device. For instance, there is a
case of repetition. The seven year old Bevis is confronting the
emperor.

For alat weren in je place,
tries a smot him wi is mace
And wi is honde.
tries a smot him on je kroun;
at emperur fel swowe adoun,
فار a sat (vv. 445 ff.;)

Much more striking than this is the account of the passage of
time while Josian lies fearfully in bed, the body of her dead
husband hanging on the "rail tree".

Dai is come in alle wise,
A morwe the barouns gonme arise
Sum to honten and sum to cherche,
And werk men gonme for to werche.
the sonne schon, hit drou3 to vnder,
the barouns far of hadde wonder;
at perl lai so longe a bed,
Gret wonder far of he hedde.
Que? sum: 'Let him lie stille;
Of Josian he hap al is wille.'
Middai com, hit drou3 te nounre,
the barouns speke far eft soune;
Que? the boldeste: 'How mai his be?
Wende ich wile vp and ise'(vv. 3227 ff.)2.

1. Cf. the A.N. Boeve, 1. 306: Treis cops li dona e III
plais le fest.
2. Most of these lines have no equivalent in the A.N.
version.
The incidents of Bevis, while less visualized than those of Horn, and less realistic than those of Havelok, are characterized by rapidity, fullness of action, and sometimes by a skillful presentation which must have had something to do with the tremendous popularity of the story in the Middle Ages.\footnote{The great number of favorite motives is probably the chief reason.}

As has already been stated, the structure of Guy is most nearly like that of Bevis. So here again we have incidents, many of them conventional, loosely connected together. However, they are longer, more fully elaborated, have greater emotional content, and incidents combine more frequently into something of an independent story. The portion of the story most nearly corresponding with the portions of Bevis, Horn, and Havelok analyzed above is that concerning Guy's residence with the Emperor at Constantinople, which consists of the following incidents:

1. Guy is welcomed by the Emperor, and is offered the hand of Clarice, the Emperor's daughter (vv. 2868-96).


3. The Emperor greets Guy, returning victorious, and again promises him the hand of his daughter (vv. 3067-90).

4. Esklander, whom Guy has mortally wounded, flees to the Sultan and tells of Guy's valor (vv. 3091-3136).

5. Guy, at Morgadour's invitation, visits in Clarice's chamber (vv. 3148-3210).

6. Morgadour declares to the King that Guy has seduced Clarice (vv. 3211-34).

7. Morgadour tells Guy that the Emperor has determined to slay him (vv. 3265-82).

8. Guy, departing, meets the Emperor, and the two come to an understanding (vv. 3282-3390).

9. Conflict with the Saracens (vv. 3391-3716).

10. Guy, by Morgadour's contrivance, is chosen to carry
a message to the Sultan (vv. 3717-3870).

(11) Guy slays the Sultan and escapes (vv. 3971-3996).

(12) Herhaud dreams that Guy is in danger (vv. 3997-4028).

(13) Herhaud with his companions rescues Guy from pursuing Saracens (vv. 4029-98).

(14) The Emperor again offers Guy the hand of his daughter (vv. 4099-4108).

(15) Guy saves a lion which is fighting a dragon, and the lion becomes his friend (vv. 4109-67).

(16) Preparation for Guy's wedding with Clarice and his refusal to proceed at the last moment (vv. 4168-4238).

(17) Guy consults with Herhaud as to whether he shall marry the princess or be faithful to Felice (vv. 4239-4280).

(18) Morgadour slays the lion, and Guy avenges the injury (vv. 4281-4400).

(19) Guy takes leave of the Emperor (vv. 4401-98).

Here we have twice as many lines as in the passage from Bevis analyzed above; yet no more, if as much, has happened. This greater length is due not only to greater elaboration of the action, but to the detailed manner in which scenes, essentially connective, are worked out. Compare (10) of Guy with (16) of Bevis; and note the absence, in the latter, of anything to compare with scenes like (17), which is concerned with an attempt of the hero to make up his mind, or (19), which fills about one hundred lines in getting the hero away from Constantinople. And as for the fights, while the battle of Bevis against Bradmond occupies less than a hundred lines, Guy's principal battle with the Saracens occupies three hundred lines. However, it is to be noted that the incidents are somewhat more closely connected together than those of Bevis. A single antagonist appears repeat-
edly—in the portions of the story connected with the Saracens, with the lady, and with the lion—to cause the hero trouble. In Bevis the hatred of the steward merely results in a fight in which he is slain. Bevis's fight with the boar is merely an added honor to the hero. Guy's rescue of the lion from the dragon leads to the final clash of hero with villain, and this, in turn, furnishes an excuse for the hero's departure. Thus, as has already been said, there is more structure here than in Bevis. As compared with Bevis, too, may be noted a stronger romantic tinge, more leisurely dialogue; that objective point is more fully prepared for by subsidiary incidents; and that states of mind receive an attention unknown in Bevis.

In no other of these four romances are realism and concrete imagination so wholly lacking. In spite of the wealth of detail which makes the romance so long, there is absolutely none of the clear vision of the author of Horn. Compare, for instance, the scene where Guy, disguised, returns to Felice with the one where Horn, in palmer's weed, greets Ryemenhild in the hall. There is nothing that is not vague and conventional in the former.

\[\text{\textbf{4.}}\text{\textbf{. This }}\text{\textbf{is not so evident in this portion of the romance as earlier; but note (5), a conventional romantic scene in the lady's chamber.}}\]
Sir Gij fonked yat leuedi oft,
But alle anofer was his pouzt
Can he wald to hir say.
When ye grace was y-seyd,
& ye bordes adoun layd,
Out of town he went his way (St. 281 f.).

The love scenes, with all their falling on knees and falling in swoons, are equally vague. Likewise, there is none of the homely realism of Havelok. For vagueness and conventionality where realism is distinctly possible, note the following: Duke Loyer is going to the emperor at the church to ask for pardon.

In his sherte he stone allone:
For him was made mikill mon.
To the Emperor he gooth soo,
An Olyue boughwe in his handes twoo,
That pees shuld beetoken betwene theim.
All weping his way forth he doth keene.
Thurgh the strete barfote he gooth
And barehede in his sherte forsoth
With a pope aboute his swere.
Many man behelde him there (vv. 2613 ff.).

Here is the acme of conventionality. It is not necessary to give other instances because they appear on almost every page.1

**Episode**

In the light of our study thus far, it is evident that the word episode can have only small significance for many romances, since in the common type nearly every incident is an episode; or, perhaps it would be more accurate to say, where there are no episodes because the story has no main course. This statement is not altogether true, however, of Havelok and of Horn. In the former, there is, as has been pointed out, a main story; but this main story, lacking as it does romantic tone,

is less interesting than the episodical portions. Grim's efforts to make a living at Grimsby, Havelok's adventures at Lincoln as the cook's servant (i.e., the carrying of the fish and water, the putting of the stone, etc.), or the rude battle with the sixty lads at Bernard Brun's house, furnish a greater interest than the mere regaining of a kingdom, whether England or Denmark. The main story is fairly conventional; it is the subsidiary incidents and episodes which give free play to the author's interest in common life. Perhaps it is the author's comparative neglect of the main narrative—his mere acceptance of the conventional tale—which permits the really original elements of the story to become prominent.

The episodes of Horn need a little more careful consideration, because they lead us into a problem which extends far beyond the mere matter of episodes themselves. As has already been indicated, the episodes are few. Horn's first fight has no place in the main narrative except to indicate the prowess of Horn, so that he may feel himself worthy of Rymenhild's love, for Rymenhild requires no such proof. There is no preparation for the battle. There has not been a word said about enemies being in the neighborhood. Horn says:

"Today, so crist me blesse,
Ihc wulle do prussse
For qi lue in pe felde
Mid spere & mid schelde" (vv. 555 ff.).

Then he arms himself, rides "more fan a myle" to the shore, and there is a ship standing "wid hefeno homle". When all are slain, the hero, bearing the heathen master's head on the point of his sword, rides back to the court to relate his deed to the king. The incident comes with a shock of surprise; it is much
like the ballad, where the hearer's imagination fills in the
gaps. But here the imagination cannot fill in the gap, as it is
too evident that the attack is unexpected. Yet the episode is
told in an interesting fashion. The fight itself occupies less
than half of the fifty-eight lines. The author is fully as much
pleased with the sight of the young knight riding from the court,
on his black steed, the armor sounding and Horn singing, and with
his return bearing the enemy's head on his sword as a proof of
his valor, as with the blows of sword and the falling of heads.
Except for the author's failure to prepare for it, the episode is
worthy enough:1

The Irish story of Reynild is also episodical. Its presence
seems to show the author's fondness for the romantic elements of
his story. For the main narrative, it serves only the function
of proving Horn's fidelity to Rymenhild2, and of course of filling
in the gap of seven years between Horn's departure and his return.

Both of these episodes contain features of incidents related
elsewhere in the romance. This becomes clear when the events of
Horn's career in Ireland are compared with those in Westernesse.
In both cases Horn, an exile, is entertained at the court of a
foreign prince. In both cases he saves his prince by defending
his country against an incursion of Saracens. In both cases

1. In Horn Childe instead of a chance fight with the Saracens,
"a turnament þe king ège cric" at the time of the knighting.
In Horn et Rimel the fight with the Saracens occurs, but is fully
prepared for. In fact, it is Horn's offer to fight the Saracens
which brings about the knighting.

2. The reader is left in doubt as to whether or not Horn would
have married Reynild if not summoned to Westernesse within
seven years.
the king has a daughter for whom Horn is a possible husband. In addition, there is the obvious resemblance of the names Rey- nild and Rymenhild. If, as Deutschbein believes, the Irish story was the original, and later was modified to make room for an English heroine, we have an obvious explanation of the presence of the episode, which indeed was originally not an episode at all? However, this can only be considered as a possible explanation. The medieval tendency to repeat is so marked, and the popular tales are so full of inconsistencies, that one must question all additional explanations.

Doubling of Incidents.

The doubling of incidents, so clearly present in Horn, is a feature not infrequently met in medieval romance. It seems, in fact, almost to have become a convention. Sometimes, as in Horn, the doubling is of a series of incidents, making up a complete story. Sometimes it is of a single incident. Probably not one explanation is sufficient for all cases. Besides the fusion of two versions of one story, there are paucity of material, naive delight in repetition, and the natural tendency toward conventionalization, which must be taken into consideration. Closely connected with this doubling of incidents is the retelling of a portion of the story, which is so often found. And not altogether to be forgotten are conventionality of phrase, situation, movement, emotion, motive, since all these too may

1. In Horn et Rimel and in Horn Childe the name of the Irish princess (Lembür in HR; Acula in HCh) does not resemble that of the betrothed of Horn. However, in both these cases, the Irish love story bears marked resemblance to the Westermesse story in the eagerness of the maiden and the reserve of the knight.

2. Cf. p. 36.
be the outcome of the same psychological conditions—whether or not they represent precisely the same aspects of the psychological conditions. In our four romances there is a considerable amount of material of the kind which should throw light on the problem.

In Havelok, as in Horn, there is a double story, and at the outset at least there is no way to know whether one story was modeled on the other, or two stories have sprung from one source and been reunited, or two stories, originally only vaguely resembling each other, have been connected and some of the characteristics belonging at first to one only have become the property of both. But in any event here is another clear case of "duplication" of incidents.

The general features of the resemblance of the two elements of the romance have already been pointed out\(^1\), but a more careful comparison of the two in respect to one feature—the giving of the oath—will show how complete the resemblance is. Aelwold, knowing he must die, has fears for his daughter, summons his lords, and has them sit in his presence, while he asks of them

"Hwo may yemen hire so longe,  
Bo en hire and Engelonde,  
Til at sche wuman be of helde,  
And at she mowe hit yemen and welde?"  
He ansereden, and seyden an-on,  
Bi Iesu crist and bi seint Ion,  
That erl Godrigh of Cornwayle  
Was trawe man wit-uten faile;  
Wis man of red, wis man of dede,  
And men haueded of him mikel drede.  
"He may al er-best hire yeme

\(^{1}\) Cf. analysis, p. 101.
In almost identical fashion, Birkabeyn has his knights sit about him,

"For þorw hem he wolde wite,
Hwo midte yeme hise children yungo,
Til Þat he koupen spoke wit tunge (vv. 367 ff.).

Finally Godard, the King's own friend, mis selected, whom the King thought the truest, and is made to swear

"On auter, and on messe-gere
On þe belles Þat mon ringes,
On messe-bokþe prest on singes,
Þat þou mine children shalit wel yeme,
Þat hire kin be ful wel queme,
Til mi sone mowe ben knihtx" (vv. 389 ff.).

This comparison makes it perfectly clear that we have here one incident twice told.

In Guy there are several cases of repetition of incident, which, while not on quite the scale that we find in Horn and Havelok, belong in most respects to the same class. The first case that I mention would not seem important except for the identity of the names of two persons appearing in the same role in the two incidents. The first is related to Guy by a palmer whom he meets at St. Omer. The Emperor of Germany held a tournament, at which Duke Segyn had won honors. Sadok, the Emperor's nephew, being jealous of Segyn, challenged him to just, although the former was without his hauberk. The Duke refused because his challenger was his lord's nephew. But
Sadok called him a coward and struck a blow which carried away a quarter of the shield and wounded the arm of Segyn, whereupon the latter struck Sadok dead. When this word came to the Emperor, he prepared to take vengeance on the slayer of his nephew (vv. 1822 ff.). Corresponding to this is the story of Sadok, son of the Sultan. The Sultan held a festival, at which King Triamour and his son Fabour were present. Sadok invited Fabour to take part in a game of chess, but became angry in the course of the game, and struck his opponent. Fabour replied that were the insulter not his lord's son he should die; whereupon Sadok struck him again. Then Fabour struck Sadok dead with a blow of the chessboard. As a consequence, the Sultan determined to take vengeance. Here the resemblance lies in the fact that in both cases conflict breaks out as the result of the death of a near relative (son or nephew) of a king, at the hands of another man who is strongly provoked, both son and nephew bearing the name Sadok

The lengthening of battle scenes by repetition occurs more than once. Thus in a battle with an army of the Emperor of Germany, Herhaud attacks the leader, Duke Otous, reproaching him for his treachery in Lombardy. Otous replies:

"You extinguished me, and you shall wise a shield for me."

They clash, and both horses fall. Then they fight with swords, and Herhaud drives Otous back; but the latter is rescued by his men. Then Herhaud in turn is hard pressed, but Guy sees his

1. This is of course a conventional incident; for parallels cf. p. 206.
plight and rescues him (vv. 2007 ff.). Now Guy meets Otous, reminds him of his previous treachery, the two fight, and Guy would have taken Otous's head had not two hundred knights rescued him. Guy is driven back, but finally his men rally around him and win a victory (vv. 2071 ff.). A similar and even more striking duplication, in which the same persons play the principal parts, occurs some three thousand lines further along in the romance. Guy and Herhaud are assisting Tirri in his conflict with Duke Loyer and Duke Otous, who are aided by an army of Lombards. At one point in the battle the Lombards are being worsted, and Otous turns and flees with Herhaud in pursuit. Again Herhaud reminds him of his former treachery.

'Biwende fe,' seyd Herhaud fre,
"Je douke of Paul, & wer fou fe
Of fat ich wicked felonie
Fat fou ous dede in Lombardy'
(vv. 5247 ff.);

At that Otous does turn, and gives a blow which knocks out a quarter of Herhaud's helmet. The return blow made the duke's horse to kneel. Then Guy comes and strikes Otous, crying,

'To me ward fou wendo on hast,
& were fe of fat felonie
Fat fou dest me in Lombardie'
(vv. 5267 ff.);

Otous strikes Guy through the thigh, but Guy succeeds in carving away a quarter of the Duke's helm. Guy would have slain Otous had not 150 knights come to his rescue. Gimbald, a Lombard, strikes Guy through the shoulder, and Guy is beset by ten other knights, when his sword breaks.

"Allas," qua Gij, "dis unlang!
Were no may y me nouitlang."
Per come prikeand a prout Lombard,
Atte last he held him, a musard.

---

1. Lombards often play cowardly and treacherous parts in the romances; cf. Bevis, vv. 4497 ff.
Bi ðe nasel he tok Gij,
& seyd him a gret vilainie"(vv. 5311 ff.).

Guy breaks his neck bone with a blow of his fist. Another knight comes to take Guy prisoner, but Herhaud arrives and gives Guy a sword, whereupon the Lombards are compelled to retreat. Shortly after this we find Herhaud in pursuit and then in conflict with Otous once more. Herhaud smites down a quarter of the Duke's helmet, wounds him, and is on the point of capturing him when many knights come to the rescue. Herhaud's horse is killed, Herhaud himself is wounded in the shoulder, and finally his sword breaks.

"God, what schal y do?" ðan seyd he,
"No lenger may ich weri me!" (vv. 5423 f.).

Then comes a Lombard who seizes Herhaud "by ðe nasel", but

Herhaud smot him wi ð his fest ðo,
& at his nek-bon brak atvo" (vv. 5437 f.).

Herhaud is taken prisoner, but Guy and Tirri soon arrive, rescue him, and supply him with a good sword. Here is the same incident told twice with only slight variations, except that Guy and Herhaud exchange parts.

While there is no other duplication quite like the one just discussed, we find again and again recurring situations which are treated each time in almost precisely the same manner. Each time that Guy leaves England upon his adventurous tours he visits the same countries. The first time, after winning a tournament in Normandy,

Ø0 wente guy in-to farrer londe

Tournementis and ioustes for to fonde.
In Almaine and in Lombardie;
In Fraunce and in Normandie (vv. 1063 ff.).
The second time,

Come he is in-to Normandye,
Knyghthode he secheth full hastily.
Pro thense he wente him in-to Ispaigne
And so fro thense in-to Almaigne.
At euery turnement Guy hath bee,
And moche preised ouere al is he.
Pro thense to lombardie he is wont (C. vv. 1255 ff.).

Note, too, the manner in which a hostile lord or king learns of the defeat of his army. Otous is returning from hunting, when

A kniʒt he seye cum prikeing,
His armes to-rent, his woundes bledeing (vv. 1521 f.).

The Duke recognizes Gwichard, and plies him with questions, only to learn of the defeat and death of his men (vv. 1519 ff.).

Emperor Reyner was playing chess when Terri came pricking, a sword in his hand.

His hauberk was al to-tore,
& his nasel ayled before.
Æurch his bodi þe blod ran;
Tirri made no semblaunt of þan;
His strong scheld al to-hewen was,
Nouȝt a fot hole þer-of nas (vv. 2287 ff.).

He does not wait for questions, but immediately tells of the capture or death of the Emperor's friends. As Otous "Fyr sorwe ʒede ner wode" so the Emperour almost "hæf his witt forlore" (v. 2308). When Guy defeats the Sultan's forces, Esklander comes to his master with a lance through his body, with blood running out before and behind. This time the Sultan asks his question before the messenger strikes into his tale of woe (vv. 3091 ff.). We find, too, the same situation repeated twice in the account of the manner in which Guy, after having, as a palmer, performed prodigious feats, reveals himself to Earl Jonas, to Terri, and to King þelston. After saving Jonas, Guy accompanies
him to Jerusalem; then he tells him he is Guy of Warwick, but requests that his secret be preserved. Jonas falls on his knees weeping, and offers Guy an earldom, which is refused (sts. 137 ff.). Tirri accompanies Guy out of the city for about half a mile. When he learns that it is indeed Guy who has rescued him, he weeps and swoons, and again falls on his knees and weeps, offering Guy his earldom, but this too is refused. Likewise, Adelston goes with the pilgrim half a mile. Guy then tells his name, asking the king to reveal it to no man for a year. The king then falls on his knees and offers Guy half his kingdom, which is of course declined (sts. 273 ff.).

This by no means exhausts parallels, but many others seem quite over the border line into the stereotyped. Some of the features in the cases of duplication noted are of course stereotyped, but, for the most part, the author seems to have borrowed from himself rather than from a stock of romantic material. This conventionalizing of material is, of course, closely connected with duplication of incident, and perhaps has the same psychological basis, but the problem seems less involved if duplication is separated from mere convention.

However, there is another kind of repetition which may be discussed here, and that is duplication by putting into the mouth of some dramatis persona an incident or series of incidents already related in the course of the narrative. In Horn the story of the hero's exile from Suddenne is told three times, once by the author (1 ff.), once by Horn (175 ff.), and once
by Aelf's father (vv. 1315 ff.). The story of Havelok's escape from Denmark is repeated by Havelok himself (vv. 1400-34), and by Ubbe (vv. 2203-51). More striking is the repetition of the story of Havelok's fight with sixty lads (vv. 1954-2007). In Bevis and in Guy there is nothing quite comparable to this; but many parables may be noted elsewhere.

We find, therefore, in three of the four romances a considerable number of examples of what may be called duplication. When an incident is retold by a dramatis persona while still fresh in the mind of the auditor, the only explanation seems to be that the author felt that he had something good and he told it again for his own pleasure perhaps as well as for that of the hearers. There is, of course, no idea of coloring the new account with the personality of the relator, in the fashion of The Ring and the Book. Likewise the duplication of incidents of which there are so many examples in Guy seems to signify that the author was pleased with an incident or situation as once presented and felt it unnecessary to go to the trouble of endeavoring to invent another just as good. Besides, there were the stereotyped situations which occur so often in many different romances. Why may not the same situation or incident, in slight disguise, be used in the same way in a single romance? Moreover, there is the primitive delight in repetition, in the familiar, in knowing what is going to happen, which appears in ballads, in popular tales, even in epic poetry, a delight which is perhaps no less

1. The repetition of the story near the end of Boccaccio's Teseide is sometimes mentioned as a defect. Cf., also, Caxton's The Four Sons of Aymon (E.E.T.S.), pp. 288 ff.; 327 f.
strong in a modern cultivated audience. If the reader today is pleased to note in a work of art the main theme repeated, or symbolized, or emphasized in a score of subtle ways, why may not the medieval man have been pleased with the same repetition presented in an overt way? Of course, there is often an infinite difference between the two types of repetition; the indolence, and lack of imagination of writers must be taken into account; we know that to a Chaucer the obvious kind of duplication and repetition was tedious to the last degree. But can we call the duplication of Horn and of Havelok wearisome? Indeed, is there not a fusion of similar elements in something approaching an artistic fashion—especially in the Horn? Is it necessary, then, to explain this characteristic by referring to the accidents of growth which floating tales and romances experienced? May we not connect it with the other cases of doubling and repetition which cannot be so explained, and associate this phenomenon with one of the fundamental traits of narrative art, of simple art often, of medieval art certainly? The duplication in Horn and in Havelok may be due to a division and a subsequent reunion, to a gradual approximation of diverse stories, or what not, but in any case it is not foreign to medieval narrative method.

1. It is not necessary to call upon music for examples. Note the duplication of theme in King Lear, or the symbolism of Maeterlinck.

2. The repetition of the ballad is different in kind and certainly, as a rule, is more effective. But it is worth remembering in this connection.
It is worth while also to bear in mind repetition in the chanson de geste, which may well have had some effect on later narrative. When, in the Chanson de Roland, we are told three times how Oliver begs the hero to blow his horn, and each time Roland proudly refuses in slightly different terms, the effect is not dissimilar to that of incremental repetition in the ballad. But this device is practically unknown in English romance. Is the wearisome repetition of Guy a degenerate descendant? This seems to be not improbable. But the duplication of Horn, and, in part at least, of Havelok, is a different matter.


2. Nothing more nearly approaching it has been noted than the passage from Bevis (vv. 445 ff.) quoted above, pp. 154.

3. A certain parallelism of details of single combats must have been consciously attempted sometimes; cf. Richard Coer de Lion, 517 ff.; Arthur and Merlin, 3446 ff.; Ipomyden, in many places, especially the three days combat. Note, too, the two inn scenes of Floris and Blancheflor, 413 ff., 491 ff.; the proposals of the two treacherous knights to the Empress of Almayne in Erl of Tolouse, vv. 529 ff.; 619 ff.; Torrent of Portynâle, 243 ff., 1634 ff.; 520 ff., 1482 ff.
Transitions.

We have now arrived at that element of structure—the transition—which is perhaps the most conventional of the more formal elements of romances. The term is used in the broadest sense. What is called a transitional phrase may be merely a means of making a fresh start; it may not really connect two things. But it does, in any case, mark the close of one thing as well as the beginning of something else, and is therefore somewhat loosely included under the name Transitions. We shall find, with all the conventionality, certain differences; and it seems worth while, in a study of medieval narrative art, to study somewhat in detail this important element of structure.

It has seemed worth while, also, to consider here a class of incidents which are essentially transitional, that is, are chiefly important structurally in connecting together main incidents. This task will be attempted first.

In Horn the voyages, the handling of messengers, or even the omission of such transitional elements, are of a piece with the author's general method. There is likely to be a jump where a good deal of general narrative would be required for a smooth connection. Of the six sea voyages all but one present some brief picture of the voyage. The third is a typical one.

Horn dude him in pe weie
On a god Galeie.
pe wind him gan to blowe
In alitel proye.
pe se bigan to posse
Rijt in to Westernesse.
Hi strike sail & maste
& Ankere gynne caste (vv. 1007 ff.).

So with the handling of messengers. When Rymenhild sends Afel-
brus for Horn the author stops for a brief view of their meeting in the hall.

Horn in halle fond he φo
Before φe kynng on bonche
Wyn for to schenche (vv. 368 ff.).

And when the boy whom Rymenhild had sent in search of Horn was drowned, the author is not satisfied with merely stating it; he presents the picture.

φe se bigan to φrose
Under hire wore.
φe kraue φere gan adrinke (vv. 969 ff.)¹.

Thus the connective parts tend to be concrete so far as is consistent with brevity. Or the connection may be omitted in true ballad fashion. A good example is the passage describing the banishment of Horn. Aylmer, directed by Fikenhild, returns and finds Horn in Rymenhild's arms. "Awei ut, fule φeof!" he says; and again at the close of his eight-line speech:

"Wend ut of my londe
Oφer φu schalt haue schonde" (vv. 713 f.).

Here is an opportunity for rejoinder on Horn's part, for pleading or fainting on the part of Rymenhild. But no; the poet goes on:

Horn sadelede his stede
& his armes he gan sprede (vv. 715 ff.).

This abruptness is striking and pleasing here, as it is in the ballads².

---

1. The little boy who is the stock messenger of the ballads is recalled; but there is probably no connection.

2. In the simple ballad, of course, this characteristic is much more marked; cf. Hart's comparison of King Horn with the Ballad Hind Horn in Ballad and Epic, pp. 16 f.
In other romances this ballad-like abruptness is absent; but some of the other features are to be found. The voyage of Havelok and Grim to England is not dissimilar from a voyage in Horn. For example, note the wind which drives them to their destination.

Pro londe worn he bote a mile,
Ne were it neuerco but ane hwile,
Hat it ne gan a wind to rise
Out of the north, man calleth ‘bise,’
And drof hem intil Engelond (Havelok, vv. 721 ff.)

In the English version, as we have it, this is the only voyage. There is a passage in the French Lai, however, which probably represents something in the complete English version.

En mier se met quant orre a,
Et la reyne od lue mena.
Quatre vinz & quatre cenz
Out Haueloc, pleinz de genz.
Tant out Nage & sigle,
Q’en carleflure est ariue
Sur le haueue se herbergerent,
Par le pais viande querrent (Lai d’Haveloc, vv. 991 ff.)

We have here apparently the same material as in the Horn, but used somewhat less concretely. Of the land journeys almost nothing is made. Nor is anything said about messengers.

In Bevis and in Guy there are few concrete, vivid transitional incidents. Scarcely anything is made of journeys or voyages. The messenger of Bevis's mother to the Emperor of Almaine was brought across the sea by a wind that "was al to gode"; and we are told of his meeting with a swain who directs him on his way (vv. 109 ff.). The journey of the messenger of Bevis to the Emperor is briefly indicated, yet there is a touch of vividness.

For‡ a wente ase hot
Ouer pe water in a bot,

1. Cf. the N.W. wind in Horn et Rime which drove the hero from
For a wente also whate
In at e castel gate (vv. 3079 ff.).

In Gwy nothing is made of the sea voyages. The journeys by
land are related with somewhat more detail, but with convention-
al detail. One scarcely ever knows the route a traveler takes,
or the length of time a journey requires.

This kind of vagueness was characteristic of medieval ro-
mance. When so little was known of the world by the audience
which heard the stories told, numerical realism was out of the
question. One was willing to be transported from place to place
as abruptly as in an Elizabethan play. Yet realism of another
sort was entirely possible—that is, in the description of the
physical sensations of the weary wayfarer, of his varying emo-
tions as he seeks some uncertain goal. But this, too, belongs
to a type of romance somewhat more highly developed than we
find in our group. It may be found in Chretien
and in Gawayn and the Grane Knight. There is also the journey
in which a variety of wonders (of the Mandeville sort) is
Suddene to Bretaigne. It seems unsafe to locate a country by
the direction of the wind which drives the voyager to or from it.

1. In the discussion of the treatment of time and place this
is further emphasized; cf. pp. 313 ff., 334 ff.

2. The clearness and careful motivation characteristic of
Chaucer are exceptional. Note, for example, the careful man-
er in which he tells how the "Sowdan of Surrye" learns of
the beauty of Constance in the Man of Law's Tale (Cant. Tales,
B vv. 134 ff.).

3. Note particularly the long search of the maiden messenger
for the Knight of the Lion in Ivain, vv. 4632 ff.).

713 ff.). The realism here is due largely to the author's
power to express vividly a strong feeling for nature; cf.
p. 326.
described to a more or less credulous audience which appears in late romances.

Let us turn now to transitions in the stricter sense of the word. Again Horn stands somewhat apart from the other three romances. In discussing the way in which incident is connected with incident this matter has already been touched upon. When the change was possible by contact of person with person, the transition, as was then noted, tends to become picturesque. In other cases the transition is abrupt and surprising. This abruptness is very effective in the change from the scene where Aylbrus utters the words of banishment in Rymenhild's bower to the scene of the saddling of the steed for departure. A very abrupt change occurs also in the first climax-scene. Horn had entered the hall and had seen Rymenhild weeping. Naturally he looked for his friend.

He lokede in eche halke,  
Ne sej he nowhate walte  
Aulf his felawe,  
†at he cuhe knowe (vv. 1087 ff.).

Then the author hastens to explain why the friend was not there.

Anylf was in fe ture  
Abute for to pure  
After his comynge,  
‡ef schup him wolde bringe.  
He se‡ fe se flowe  
& horn nowar rowe (vv. 1091 ff.).

Aulf laments Horn's absence, and, at the close of the lament, the narrative of the hall scene is resumed as if no interruption

1. Cf. the Alexander stories and the travels of Huon of Bordeaux. The journey to the Celtic Other-World has of course left its marks in the romans d'aventure--probably in the Ivain.

2. Cf. p. 146.
had occurred.

Rymenhild Ros of benche
Wyn for to schenche (vv. 1105 f.).

It is a very interesting and touching picture thus thrust into the narrative, but it comes at the critical moment when the hearer is intent upon the questions whether Rymenhild will recognize Horn. Its insertion at this point is due to chance association, and not to artistic design. Another abrupt and unsuccessful transition is due apparently to the failure of the author to keep his eye on the *dramatis personae*. Aylmar had gone hunting and Fikenhild had stolen to Rymenhild's bower, where he watched Horn and Rymenhild. The author then goes on to relate the conversation of the lovers, who are discussing Rymenhild's dream of the fish breaking the net. Then the scene changes abruptly and we hear Fikenhild talking to Aylmar by the river, although we had just left him, as we supposed, watching Horn and Rymenhild.

\[\text{Aylmar rod bi sture,}\
\text{& horn laim in bure.}\
\text{Fykenhild hadde enuye}\
\text{& sede ðes folye (vv. 685 ff.).}\]

Such abruptness is rare in the romances. It seems to show a lack of conscious art. It is nearer the ballad method. It is truly popular, and is an element in the evidence of the primitive character of the present form of the tale.

Other transitions are clever and fresh, when one part of the narrative is closed by a sentence which suggests the part to follow. Thus when Suddenne is captured by the Saracens, Godhilde withdraws to a rock and prays.
Euere heo bad for horn child
That Jesu crist him beo mild (vv. 79 f.).

The reader is reminded that Horn is in danger and is at once interested in his fortunes.

Horn was in paynes honde
With his feren of the londe (vv. 81 f.).

Rymenhild is introduced into the story as follows:

In the curt & ute
& elles al abute
Luuede men horn child,
And mest him louede Rymenhild,
Thy kynges ojene doster (vv. 345 ff.).

Twice the mention of joy introduces the hearer to a contrasting situation.

Murie was the feste
All of fairc gostes:
Ac Rymenhild nas nojt jer
& at hire quyte seue zere (vv. 531 ff.).

Murie lif he wrohte:
Rymenhild hit dere bozte (vv. 1887 f.).

Crude as is the art manifested in the transitions, even for the modern reader the essential thing—a quick, clear-cut movement from incident to incident—is present. To the medieval listener, uncritical, eager for the story, they must have been eminently satisfactory.

In Havelok the almost complete absence of synchronism and the entire simplicity of the narrative make unnecessary numerous clever transitions. The story runs along smoothly, a "quanne" or a "whanne" usually being sufficient for less important transitions. In fact, about one half of the verse paragraphs of the romance begin with one or the other of these words. They usually prevent a sense of abruptness of the kind noted in Horn. Even
in the exceptional case, when the story moves without notification from Denmark to England (vv. 2520 ff.)—and there is almost certainly an omission here—scarcely a ripple of surprise is raised in the mind of the casual reader. But of really apt transitions, springing directly from the narrative and connecting parts not immediately related there is scarcely one.

The transitions of Bevis include, as we shall see, a large number of the conventional phrases which were so convenient for the romance writer. Attention has already been called to the use of an occasional line which hints at what is going to happen later in the story. These usually occur at points of transition, and are a conventional device. The following is a typical example:

And whan he hadde swore so,
Beues let King Brademond go.
Allas, fat he nadde him slawe,
And ibrought of is lif dawe!
For sifte for al is faire be-heste
Mani dai a maked him feste,
In is prisoun a lai seuere,
Ase fe may nou foward here (Bevis, vv. 1061 ff.)

1. Vv. 1067 ff. furnish a slight exception.

2. That this device is not typically English is shown by the corresponding passage in the Boeve de Hamtone (vv. 349 ff.);
A dieus, quel danage, que il ne l'ut fet tuer!
Ke fus le fist Bradmund meint long jour juner;
En sa présoun fust VII aunz tut plener,
Issi com vus me òrrez ja endreit counter.

It is common enough in other French chansons de geste (not the earliest) and romances. Note the following example:
Seignor, oez un vers bon et scant
De fiere jeste, de la melz combatant,
Qui onques fu en cest siecle vivant;
Par quel engin quons Aymeris li blans
Reprist Nerbone sa fort cite vaillant
Qu'orent trai Sarrazin mescreant (La Mort Aymeri de Narbonne, (Sec. d.a.t.f.), vv. 2596 ff.).
Somewhat similar are the following:

His oder prowess who wil here,
Hende, herkne, and he mai here! (vv. 737 ff.).

Bevis has slain the boar:

So glad he was for is honting
hat heued a pouyte to Iosian bring:  
& er he com to hat maide fre,
Him com strikes so gret plente,
hat fain he was to weren is had
And saue him self fro he ded (vv. 831 ff.).

After Iosian is cristing
Beues dede a gret fiȝting,
Swich bataile dede neuer non
Cristene manoof fleisch ne bon
Of a dragoun fer be side
hat Beues slouȝ fer in hat tide (vv. 3597 ff.).

Of abruptness of the sort found in Horn—an abruptness which
seems almostto imply an omission—there is no case in Bevis:
Perhaps this will be emphasized by the citation of two or three
cases of abruptness such as does occasionally appear. Bevis
is preparing to regain his heritage from his traitorous step-
father and has sent

After gret cheualrie,
Of al þe londe þe stringeste kniȝte,
hat hii owher finde miȝte (vv. 3308 ff.).

Then follows without a break:

At emperur miȝ daide,
His wif comfortede him & saide:
'Sire,' he seide, 'doute þou nouȝt!' (vv. 3511 ff.).

Here something is needed to make the transition entirely clear,
but how little this is may be seen by looking at the group of
manuscripts where the reading is:

Syr Mourdour, moche sorowe made he,
When he sawe, Beuys had such a meyne (M 2965 ff.).
Cases of similar abruptness are vv. 3841 ff. and 378 ff. But this abruptness is not due so much to a break in the narrative as it is to a defect in style, due, no doubt, to the exactions of meter and rhyme. It is to be noted, however, that the author seems unwilling to lead up to his incidents, which makes the abruptness less astonishing.

In Guy we might expect something different, but we find in general the same conventional method. Of the reference to something about to happen use is not so freely made as in Bevis. The following, however, may be considered as parallel to the cases noticed:

Of an vnsele y may zow telle,  
& je wil a stownde duelle (vv. 1361 ff.).

Lordinges, listne to me now!  
Of a tresoun ichil telle zou! (vv. 8449 f.).

Herkne me, je fat ben in wille,  
Of a tresoun y schal zou telle  
that was swipe miche tresoun,  
& y-wrouȝt jurch þe douke Otoun (vv. 5515 ff.).

Only one case of surprising abruptness has been noted. Guy, after outstripping his companions in the pursuit of a boar, has finally slain the animal.

Alon he was, hin mizt agriis:  
Alto fer he was fram his kniȝt.  
But on him dinke god almizt.  
Sone he worȝ in a peril strong,  
Be it wiȝ riȝt, be it wiȝ wrong.  
Þo ðij hadde opened ðat swine snelle  
He gan to blowe as þou telle.  
'Bi Þ God!' quaȝ ðerl Florentin,  
'Who mai ðat be, for seyn martin,  
Þat ich here in mi forest blowe?'

1. Note the hint of what is to follow.
The abruptness arises from the fact that Erl Florentin has not been mentioned before. But this is an exceptional case. As was said of Bevis, abruptness does not characterize the narrative method.

Already the tendency for transitions to become stereotyped has been noticed. A few paragraphs will now be devoted to the collection and discussion of this stereotyped material. Some of these expressions may very well have been taken over from some other form of narrative. Some may be merely translations from the French. However, it will be evident that there is represented in this transitional material not merely conventional situations, but conventional phraseology as well.

From its frequent occurrence in Chaucer has become familiar the formal breaking away from one part of the narrative and beginning of another. One example will recall the method.

Now wol I stinten of the goddes aboue
Of Mars, and of Venus, goddes of love
And telle yow as pleynly as I kan
The gret effect for which that I bygan (Knight's Tale, Cant. Tales A vv. 8479 ff.).

This kind of transition is absent from King Horn, but occurs in the other three romances. There is but one example in Havelok. It occurs when the author drops the story of Goldborough to take up that of Havelok.

Of Goldeboro shul we nou laten,
Dat nouth ne blinmeth for to graten,
Dat sho liggeth in prisoun:
Iesu Crist, Dat Lazarun
To liue broucte fro dede bondes,
He lese hire witt his bondes;
And leue sho mo him y-se
Heye hangen on galewe tre,
Dat hire haued in sorwe brouth,

Of Mars, and of Venus, goddes of love,
And telle yow as pleynly as I kan
The gret effect for which that I bygan (Knight's Tale, Cant. Tales A vv. 8479 ff.).
So as sho ne misede mouth!
Say we nou forth in ure spelle!
In that time, so it befele... (vv. 328 ff.).

Here the author makes use of the breathing place to show his own feelings. There are numerous examples of this kind of transition in Bevis, but usually they are brief. Sometimes the name of the person of whom the author has been speaking is mentioned; sometimes he merely refers to the one who is to be the central figure of the part to follow. I give below a list of these transitions together with the parallel passages in the Anglo-Norman version.

Now scholle we of him mone, Of Beues, that was Gouis sone. (vv. 295 f.).

Terne we azen, Par we wer er, & speke we of is em Saber! (vv. 1263 f.).

Let we now ben is em Saber & speke of Beues, he maseger! (vv. 1345 f.).

Now is Beues at his potes grounde. God bringe him vp hol & sonde! Now speke we of Iosian, he maide (vv. 1481 ff.).

Now reste we her a lite wizt, & speke we scholle of Bradmund (vv. 1708 f.).

Lete we sore Beues phi anne & speke of Iosiane (vv. 3117 f.). Ore dirrum de josian la loe (v. 2051).

Now let me be phi Ascopard & speke of Beues (vv. 3614 f.). Los pautoners acoylent lur chimin. Boun li sire se is leve par matin (vv. 2674 f.).
Now let we be of Beues & of Terri (vv. 3709 f.).

Now let we be of King Yuore
And spoke we of Ermin, &e hore (vv. 4005 f.).

Now sire Beues let we gan
And to sire Saber wilt we tan (vv. 4039 f.).

Let we now Beues be,
& of e steward telle we (vv. 4323 f.).

(Story not the same.)

Orre lerrom de Yvori parler
& a Hermin devem retorner (vv. 3319 f.).

Ore vus lerrom de Boun parler,
Si en devum a Sabaoth retorner (vv. 3436 f.).

(This part of the story has no equivalent in the A.N. version.)

Although the Anglo-Norman version is not the direct source of the English Bevis, we may be sure from the above comparison that those formal transitional phrases are often translations; and there is no question that the particular case before us is typical of others1. There are several of these transitions in Guy. The author has been describing Felice:

He that all hir beaute write wolde,
To longe taryng make he sholde;
Now we shull leue of hir here,
And telle you forthe of our matiere.
Spoke we schull of the Stywarde (Caius MS., vv. 105 ff.).

Of Gij ichil lete now,
And more after y schal tel zyou;
Of Herhaud ichel telle astownde (vv. 1709 ff.).

Now wille wo of gij duelle,
& of his lyoun ichil zyou telle (vv. 4239 f.).

1. Many examples may be found in the French romances. Here is one selected at random:
Or repoons parler huimais
De guillaumes, quel vie il maine,
Ke cest avra en son demaine
Par tans la contesse et le conte (L'Escoufle, vv. 6158 ff.).

2. The need of hurrying on is frequently expressed at points of transition.
Leve we now of Gij be stille:
More ʒe schul here ʒif ʒe welle
Of ʒat maidon, hou sche was name (vv. 4789 ff.).

Now wende we oʒain to our spelle,
ʒat ʒe me herd er ʒan telle (vv. 4919 f.).

From these examples we see that there is greater variety in
Guy than in Bevis, but the expressions are in every case stereo-
typed.

We now come to those expressions which are, strictly speak-
ing, introductions to incidents. In these the conventionality
may be both of situation or setting and of phraseology, but
more essentially of situation or setting. The tendency to re-
fer to time in beginning an incident is instinctive. Sometimes
the references are extremely vague.

Hit was opon a someres day (Horn, v. 29).
It was opon a somers day (Guy, vv. 2451, 4939).
It bi-fel opon a somers day (Guy, st. 20, v. 7).
It was a king bi are dawes (Havelok, v. 27).
In that time so hit befelle (Havelok, v. 339).
In that tim al Engelond (Havelok, v. 999).

1. Cf. Schmirgel's list of stereotyped expressions in Kölbing's
edition of Bevis, p. L, for references to other romances. The
following from the Erl of Tolous (vv. 163 ff.) is very typical:
Leve we now ʒe emperour in thoght,
Game ne gle lyked hym noght,
So gretly can he gryll!,
And to the erle turne we agayn,
That ʒankyd god wyth all hys mayn,
That grace had send hym tylle.

2. The indication by a formal phrase of conventional setting
is a common transition. The present section and the discussion
of setting (cf. pp.320 ff) deal in part with the same material.
Consequently, the treatment here is made somewhat slight, and
it will be supplemented by the fuller discussion of time and place.

3. This is very common; cf. Hall's note to vv. 29,30 of Horn.
"On a dai" occurs so frequently in *Bevis*, in *Guy*, and elsewhere that instances are not necessary. Slightly more definite are references to the month of May.

On Mai in the formeste dai (*Bevis*, v. 175).

In May it was also ich wene
When floures sprede & springeth grene (*Guy*, vv. 4903 f.).

There are few instances in our group, but it is nevertheless a commonplace. Particularly it is likely to be connected with love adventures. With these may be placed many other expressions which tend to become definite:

Hit was at Cristesmasse (*Horn*, v. 799).

His ferste bataile, for so? to say
A dede a Cristes messe day (*Bevis*, vv. 506 f.).

In somer about Whit-suntide (*Bevis*, v. 3511).

It was open a Pentecost day yteld (*Guy*, v. 185).

It was at *fe* holy trinite (*Guy*, v. 705).  

The time of day is frequently referred to at the beginning of an incident, but almost always in a vague and conventional manner.

*fe* day began to springe (*Horn*, v. 495).

Amoreze *fo* *fe* day gan springe (*Horn*, v. 645).

*fe* king aros amoreze (*Horn*, v. 837).

Fikenhilde or *fe* dai gan springe
At niȝt he ferde to *fe* kinge (*Horn*, vv. 1427 f.).

Er *fat* ros *fe* sunne (*Horn*, v. 1454).

*fe* niȝt is gon, *fat* dai comen is (*Bevis*, v. 3175).

---

1. The treatment of time in romances is discussed pp 329 ff., and parallels to some of these expressions are there given.
A morwe þe lauerkes songe,
Whan þat þe lizte day was spronge (Bevis, vv. 3779 f.).
þe King luore him ros amorwe (Bevis, f. 4109).
An amorwe orliche
þemperour aros, sikorliche (Guy, vv. 3391 f.).
þemperour aros amorwe þo (Guy, v. 4109).
þemperour aros amorwe y-wis (Guy, st. 278).
Sone so it was lith of day (Havelok, v. 663).
On þe morwen hwan it was day (Havelok, v. 1020).

Reference to the night is also very frequent—sometimes connected with reference to the morning, as in one of the examples above.

On þe nith, als Goldeboru lay (Havelok, v. 1247).
þe firste nith he lay þrinne (Havelok, v. 2091).
Bevis lay in his bed anizt (Bevis, v. 751).

The conventional place is also a frequent starting point for a new incident. The bed, as in the line just quoted, is occasionally used.

In Mai, in þe formeste dai, 
þe leuedi in hire bedde lai (Bevis, vv. 175 f.).
Josian lai in hir bed (Bevis, v. 3225).
Saber at Hamtoun lai in is bed (Bevis, v. 3841).

This bed is often, as we shall see\(^1\), merely a conventional element of setting. It is not necessarily a mark of the beginning of an incident disconnected with the setting. More likely to mark a fresh start is the hunting trip. The first example given below does not specifically refer to hunting, but they probably belongs here.

\(^1\)Cf. p. 322.
Aylmar rod by sture (Horn, v. 685).

On a day ϕai went a riuere (Guy, v. 4257).

Frans hunting com ϕe King Yuore (Bevis, v. 2251).

On a day as hc cam fram hunting
A dromond he seye ariueng (Guy, vv. 2801 f.).

On a day, as ϕai com fram hunting (Guy, v. 490).

Gij cam on a day fram hunting (Guy, v. 6623).

On a day, wiϕotten lesing,
ϕerl him rode on dere hunting (Guy, st. 11, vv. 1 f.).

That this situation is purely conventional is shown by the fact that something else would have served the purpose as well. The meal is also a conventional starting place, familiar in many an Arthurian story. Thus in Horn when the pagan giant challenges the King of Ireland, we learn that it is at "none" (v. 801) while the king and knights are "at borde" (v. 827). Another example is:

Also hc seten, and sholde soupe
So comes a ladde in a ioupe (Havelok, vv. 1766 f.).

With these may be compared Bevis, vv. 3754 ff., and Guy, vv. 787 ff., which are more fully discussed elsewhere. The sight of some one through a window, a game of chess, or a reference to some one in a castle or on a tower is often the beginning of an incident. Other methods are the following:

(1) The coming of tidings:

Tiding com to King Ermyne (Bevis, v. 651).

Tidinge com to Potenhiϕe (Bevis, v. 4455).

When ϕe douk Loer herd ϕis tiding (Guy, v. 6587).

---

1. P. 322ff. The parallels noted there are also frequently used at points of transition.
2. Cf. p. 323.
The passing of time:
*tre per after /dat bataile (Bevis, v. 909).
*Bi /dat monde ende at eue (Guy, v. 1667).

This study of transitions is by no means exhaustive, but the accumulation of material would be wearisome and useless. It must be clear that there is seldom a really clever and artistic transition in the romances. Two or three in Horn, perhaps one in Havelok, almost make up the list. Rather the author was con-

1. The following citations, in parallel columns, of a few of the more stereotyped transitions of Bevis with their equivalents in the Anglo-Norman version may be instructive:

On Mai, in *e formeste dai
*e leuedi in hire bedde lai
(vv. 175 f.).

His ferste bataile, for so? to say,
A dede a Cristes messe day
(vv. 585 f.).

Beues lay in his bedde a mi?t
And *ou?te a wolde kep?n is mi?t
Vpon /dat swin him self one,
/dat noman scholde wi? him gone
(vv. 751 ff.).

Iosian lai in a castel (v. 889). La pusele levist, ke avoir cler levis (v. 483).
(This incident is not introduced in the A.N. version).

Boeufs oi parler sovent de ceo sangler (v. 425).
(However, the stories diverge somewhat here.)

On a dai, ase he was mad & feint, Un jour il comence issi a parler
To Iesu Crist he made is pleint
(vv. 1567 f.).

Fram honting com *e King Yuore
(v. 2251).
(The situation is not the same
in the A.N. version.)

These few examples indicate, what abundant examples in other places and of other kinds prove, that the formal elements are likely to be lost or replaced in the transmission of a story even when details of incidents are preserved.
tent with the conventional device—either the formal transition or the stereotyped setting material, whether of time or of place. However, it would be wrong to forget the circumstances under which these romances were presented to audiences—that they were recited, were often heard piecemeal, and that the auditors often were given not the complete life, but merely some adventure in the life of a well-known hero. This accounts, in part, for the lack of careful structure shown in the transitions and elsewhere. As for the formal transitional phrases, they probably grew in number at the hands of the minstrel-romancers as time passed. The tendency probably always existed. It naturally accompanies the use of conventional setting, which is a characteristic of the Chanson de Roland, and the naiveté and simplicity of the chanson de geste give to these formal phrases a genuine attractiveness. But they become a mechanical trick in their later appearance, taking the place of originality. The minstrel, too, adds his own remarks at the points of transition, marking a loss of simple objectivity. In the English romances, where inventiveness is least, this conventionality is most common and most unattractive.

1. Such lines as—

   Li emperedre est en un grant vergier
   Ensemb! od lui Rollanz et Oliviers—(Roland, vv. 103 f.)—
   are familiar as marking transitions in the chansons de geste.
   Cf. the Roland itself, vv. 11 ff., 501 f., etc.
Complication of Narrative.

Skillful complication of narrative is not to be found in the four romances which are here studied, with one exception. In Bevis and in Guy, as we have seen, there is so little plot that there is no thought of weaving together various threads of interest. Havelok has greater unity; there is a weaving together of two lines of interest; but even this can scarcely be called skillful complication. Horn, then, is the exception. We have already seen how the author elaborates important scenes by bringing together a number of motives, each with its own appeal. What remains to do here is to call attention to certain devices (if so mechanical a term will suit what seems so spontaneous a story) which the author of King Horn has employed to complicate his story or to emphasize a situation.

In treating the simultaneous development of the Horn story of hero and heroine and the Ryminhild story during the separation, synchronism appears. The way in which the drowned messenger is used to vitalize the emotional significance of the situation is discussed elsewhere. Horn has heard the message, sent the messenger back with a word of cheer and hope, then gathers his forces for the rescue, thinking Ryminhild feels secure in the knowledge that he will return. But the only message she receives is the body of the drowned messenger boy washed up to her door, and she is left in an agony of suspense. Thus the poignancy of the uncertainty is heightened, and consequently the joy of recognition,

1. P. 147.
when it occurs, is so much the more. And the glimpse of Æðulf, looking despairingly out to sea for the friend who is already in the castle is another touch of synchronism heightening the emotional appeal of the situation. Ignorance on the part of one character of what another is doing is used in the second rescue to provide emotional interest. Rymenhild has sent no messenger, so far as the hearer knows, to inform Horn of her difficulties, and at the very moment when Horn's ship stood under the tower

Rymenhild litel wene þ at horn ð ane alius beo (vv. 1439 f.).

There is a possibility that these lines are not genuine. But if they were omitted, the situation would have the same value.

Another device, very effectively used, is the substitution of Æðulf for Horn when Rymenhild is first seeking an interview with the hero. This complicates the action, gives the author opportunity to present the character of Rymenhild in an interesting light, and provides the difficulty which true love must overcome in order to give it romantic interest. Rymenhild's passionate anger at the deceit which has been practised on her is the counterpart and partial justification of her passionate love for Horn. An opportunity, which the author prizes highly, is also given for contrasting Horn with the most attractive of his fellows and emphasizing his superior beauty. When he finally enters the presence of Rymenhild,

Of his feire siþte
Al þe bur gan lizte (vv. 385 f.).
As has already been said, there is no significant synchronism in Havelok. It may be remarked, however, that the light which issues from the mouth of the hero, and which has already been referred to as being a unifying element, is used to emphasize important situations. This motive is used three times. On the first occasion it saves the life of the hero when Grim is on the point of drowning him (586 ff.); after Havelok's marriage, it is the light which brings him the appreciation and cooperation of Goldborough (1247 ff.); and, lastly, it brings about the discovery, on the part of Ubbe, that his guest is none less than his royal master (2090 ff.). On the first of these occasions, Havelok is gagged, and the light performs a service which the hero could not perform for himself. On the other occasions, however, there is no reason why the information might not have been imparted voluntarily by word of mouth. Evidently the author was pleased with the picturesque detail of the supernatural light, and seized the opportunity for its introduction a second and a third time.

Very little can be added in regard to Bevis to what was said under Objective Point. The command of the Patriarch that Bevis shall marry none but a virgin, which so easily might have become a complicating motive of a pretty plot, is made nothing of. There is, perhaps, a touch of cleverness in causing Bevis, Josian, and Arondel to die on the same day.

To his stable Beues gan fare;  
Arondel a fond far ded,

1. It should be remembered, however, that while in the English version the hero apparently knows the story of his birth, in the French versions he does not know it at the time of his marriage.
at euer hadde be gode at nede;
far fore him was swipe wo,
In to chaumber he gan go
& se; Iosian drawe to deede:
Him was wo a moste nede,
And er her body be-gin to colde,
In is armes he gan hire folde,
And far hii deide bofe ifere (vv. 4596 ff.).

In Guy there is greater plot complication than in Bevis. Likewise, as we shall see, there is some complication of character and setting. We have already seen how a little story is connected with each of the chief single combats in which Guy engages. But of synchronism, such as we found in Horn, there is none. The reader's eyes are too constantly on the hero for such complication. The conventional motives—the disguise, the recognition by means of a ring, the dream, and others—are present, but they are not related to each other so as to heighten interest.
B. Motives.

The stereotyped motives, incidents, and transitions of medieval romance have been pointed out again and again in editors' notes. Collections of stereotyped phrases have also been made, and furnish abundant evidence of the fact that medieval romance is a literature of convention to the smallest details. The romances here studied furnish no small portion of the material for parallels used by editors and for the collections of stereotyped phrases. It is not intended to attempt a reproduction of these studies, although they have been used. But it does seem worth while to make a brief catalogue of the chief motives of each romance, indicating parallels, especially in English romances, and referring to the places where the motives are more fully discussed. This collection will necessarily be very incomplete; but it will, I hope, serve to make somewhat clearer one side of medieval narrative art. In cataloguing the motives I shall treat each romance separately.

2. The work of Boje in collecting parallels to the Bevis motives has been very suggestive, and is much more complete than my purpose requires.
3. The plan of this study makes it impossible to include here many stereotyped features which might very well be called motives, but I believe that most of these are discussed elsewhere.
4. In general, parallels in English romances or ballads are placed in the text, parallels in French romance, folklore, etc., in the notes.
King Horn

1. Exile and return; Havelok, Bevis, Generides, Tristrem (in the last two in somewhat different form). The ballad of "The Lord of Lorn and the False Steward" has similar features.

1. For discussions of this widespread motive cf. A. Nutt, The Folk-Lore Record, IV (London, 1881); Hahn, Sagwissenschaftliche Studien (Jena, 1876), Beer, P. & B. Beiträge, XIII, pp. 35 ff.

2. Boje (Über den altfrz. Roman von Beuve de Hamtome), pp. 61 ff., points out numerous parallels in Old French. The general resemblance to the Goldener-Märchen is discussed by Panzer, Hilde-Gudrun (Halle, 1901), who thinks the märchen is the source. Deutschbein, p. 32, has pointed out the Apollonius story as the earliest medieval parallel. Investigators have no difficulty in finding historical examples of the exile and return, including reception at a foreign court and marriage with a princess, so that it is not easy to determine whether the motive in any particular romance does or does not represent an actual occurrence. For details of the entertainment of the exiled prince at the foreign court, cf. Boje, pp. 74 ff. Outside romances the motive may be found in the saga of Olaf Tryggvason (which has points very similar to the Havelok-story); in the story of Aurelius Ambrosius as told by Geoffrey of Monmouth in Books VI and VIII (cf. Deutschbein, pp. 123 ff.); in the Waldef saga; and in the Norse saga of Hroarr and Helgi (Deutschbein, p. 127).

A brief summary of the Apollonius story may be of some interest: Apollonius, having excited the hatred of Antiochus, King of Syria, is obliged to flee. A storm drives his ship to a strange country. He is entertained by the king of the country, whose daughter falls in love with the newcomer. The love is reciprocated. In the course of time the passion is avowed, the father's good-will is obtained, and the lovers are married. After the lapse of many years, Apollonius is restored to his country.
2. Exposure to the sea in a rudderless boat: Torrent of Portyngale; Emare; Eglamour of Artois; Chaucer's "Man of Law's Tale".

3. The false accusation of misconduct with the princess:


In Horn, vv. 1051 ff., this motive appears to be connected with the forgetful lover motive; cf. Guy No. 8.

---

1. Cf. Hall's note to vv. 105,106 of Horn, which contains an interesting discussion of the motive, with numerous parallels. Exposure in some form is an extremely widespread motive; cf. Boje, p. 65; Edith Rickert, "The Old English Offa Saga", in Mod. Phil. II, pp. 356 ff., and The Romance of Emare, Chicago, 1907, pp. xxxii ff.; Gough, Constance Saga, Berlin, 1901; Marian R. Cox, Cinderella, London, 1893, discusses kindred folk-tales. Cf. also Suchier, Oeuvres de Beaumanoir (Soc. d.a.t.f., 1884), I, pp. xxiii ff. Many of these stories are concerned with the persecuted woman; but the castaway boy is found occasionally. Hall (loc. cit.) refers to St. Gregory, who, according to the legend, was set adrift in a boat; also to a legend related by William of Malmesbury which is quite similar to Horn. Jordan, Uber Boeve de Honstone, pp. 36 ff., also discusses this motive.


3. Cf. Splettstösser, Der Heimkehrende Gatte und sein Weib in der Weltlitteratur (Berlin, 1899) -- devoted chiefly to the motive as it appears in modern literature. Deutschbein, pp. 40 ff., gives a full discussion of the motive so far as it concerns the Horn-story. The heimkehrende gatte story is, in brief, as follows: The husband is obliged to leave home for war or to make a pilgrimage. After a long absence he is warned that his wife is about to

marry again. The husband arrives home on the day set for the wedding. Recognition follows, usually by means of a ring which the wife has given her husband on his departure, and which he lets fall into a cup which she hands to him. Then follows, usually, the death of the would-be second husband.

The disguise motive is very common in romance and story. The resemblance of Hereward's disguise on one occasion to that of Horn has already been mentioned (p. 34). Disguise as a pilgrim is most common, but disguise as minstrel (*Horn*, vv. 1459 ff.) is not uncommon; cf. Boje, pp. 70 f. In "King Estmere" (Child, No. 60), the hero and his brother rescue the heroine from a forced marriage, securing entrance to the castle of the heroine's father disguised as harpers. In this case the undesired suitor is slain.

The disguise is, of course, a motive used in many connections. Josian protects herself when she is captured by Ascopard by using an herb which makes her appear as a leper (*Bevis*, vv. 3677 ff.). Cf. *Generides*, as cited above. Boje gives parallels, pp. 68 f.

† Cf. Hall's note to vv. 106 ff. of *Horn*; Child, I, pp. 194 ff.; Ward, I, p. 448. This motive is common in ballad and romance, especially German romance.

A few remarks in regard to the magical properties of rings may be added. The ring which Horn receives makes him invincible if he looks at it and thinks of his "lemman". In Horn Childe the ring has the property of revealing faithlessness. Eglamour (vv. 616 ff.) receives a ring which protects his life. Richard Coer de Lion (vv. 1629 ff.) receives two rings, one of which preserves from injury by water and the other from injury by fire. Gaumer, *L'Estorie des Engleis*, vv. 686 ff., tells of a ring which protects the wearer from water, fire, and weapons. A magic ring sometimes preserves virginity (*Bevis*, vv. 1467 ff.). The ring which renders the wearer invisible is also familiar; cf. Chretien's *Ivain*, vv. 1026 ff. Duke Frederick of Normandy (E. Thorstenberg, "Duke Frederick of Normandy, an Arthurian Romance", Mod. Phil., VII, pp. 395 ff.) receives a ring which, besides rendering invisible, protects against injury by sword, by water, or by fire. Köbling, in a note, refers to the discussion of magic rings by Winter, *Kleidung und Putz der Frau*, p. 54. In *Melusine*, p. 55, the heroine gives Raymondin two rings, one to protect him from stroke of weapon, the other to insure victory. See also, Clouston, *Magical Elements in Chaucer's Squire's Tale*, pp. 334 ff.
6. Parables of the net and of the hawk\(^1\): Horn, vv. 1133 ff.\(^3\)

There are no other examples in English romance.\(^2\)

**Havelok the Dane.**

1. Exile and return: See Horn No. 1.

2. The unfaithful guardian: **Havelok**, vv. 240 ff., 408 ff.\(^3\)

3. Prince as kitchen-boy\(^4\). The position of the exiled prince is usually humble, but in the other English romances he is not a kitchen-boy. Horn is the king's cupbearer, vv. 367 ff. In

---

1. The parable of the hawk does not appear in the English version, but it is closely connected with the parable of the net. Cf. Hall's very full note to vv. 1133-43; also Child, I, p. 191. The motive is found in the O. F. Jehan et Blonde, in the *Gesta Romanorum* (Oesterley's edition, p. 507), and in Campbell's *Tales of the West Highlands*, I, p. 281.

2. I venture to mention in a note certain distant parallels to the substitution of Gúlf for Horn (*Horn*, vv. 281 ff.). Precisely this motive does not appear elsewhere in English romance. However, substitution of a slightly different kind is not far to seek. Frequently remarkable heroes were begotten upon faithful wives by someone who appeared in the form of the husband; thus were Arthur and Sir Gowther begotten. The substitution of a maid for the bride in the bridal bed is familiar in the Tristram-story and elsewhere. Thus the substitution motive is a familiar one, but it received a new and pleasing adaptation for the Horn-story.

3. Common enough in history; cf. Deutschbein's discussion (pp. 106 ff.) of possible historical source. In the French version the unfaithful guardian of the princess is an uncle. In this connection may be remembered the uncle in the Hamlet-tale. Cf., also, *Vita Meriadoci*, and the remarks of its editor (*P.M.L.A.*, XV, pp. 332 ff.).

4. In the *goldener-märchen* the hero is sometimes a kitchen-boy (Deutschbein, pp. 149 ff.). Rainouart, in the *chanson de geste* Aliscans occupies, for a time, a position somewhat similar to that of Havelok at Winchester (Heyman, pp. 97 ff.). "The Kitchie-Boy" (Ballad No. 252)—"a modern adaptation" of Horn—has degraded the squire into a scullion; but this example has no place here, since the scullion is no prince. See Boje, p. 75.
the Continental French version, Bevis is made keeper of the horse Arondel. In Octavius (S.E. version, vv. 385 ff.), Floovent is a butcher’s boy. William of Palerne is a herdsman (W. of P., vv. 170 ff.); later at court he becomes the servant of the princess Melior. One is reminded of Arcite at the court of Theseus (Knight’s Tale, C.T., Group A, vv. 1399 ff.).

4. The flame as a sign of royalty: Havelok, vv. 591 ff.

5. The cross on the shoulder: Havelok, vv. 2139 ff.

6. The prophetic dream: Havelok (vv. 1235 ff.). More specifically, Havelok dreams that his arms are so long that he embraces all Denmark and that he takes all England in his hand. The nearest parallel is the dream of the queen in William of Palerne, vv. 2004 ff., that her arms grow until one reaches Rome and the other reaches Spain—a token of the future greatness of


2. Cf. Ward, I, p. 428; Heyman, pp. 101 ff. In the Servius Tullius legend (Livy) a flame plays around the head of the sleeping boy. The Germanic hero Deitrich of Bern breathes fire. A glowing face is a common sign of high birth. The bower of Rymenhild was lighted by the face of Horn (vv. 385 ff.). Hall’s note to these lines refers to several parallels. Cf. the bright locks of the hero of the goldener-märchen.

3. The family of Charlemagne had this sign. In Macaire (vv. 1337 ff.) Louis, the son of Charlemagne, is born with a white cross on his shoulder. Heyman, pp. 101 ff., refers to Richard li Daus and Lion de Bouges. In both of these cases the hero blows a magic horn, as does the hero of the French versions of the Havelok-story.
her children. The dream of Arthur in Layamon's Brut (vv. 14006 ff.) is somewhat similar.

Bevis of Hampton

1. Exile and return; See Horn No. 1.

2. Unexpected attack while on the chase: Bevis, vv. 337 ff.; Guy, vv. 2449 ff. (for special features cf. Guy No. 2);

"A Gest of Robyn Hode" (Child, No. 117, sts. 331 f.)

3. The unnatural mother: Bevis.

4. The false accusation: See Horn No. 3.

5. The Uriah-letter: Bevis, vv. 1227 ff.

6. Threatening or beating gods: Bevis, vv. 1349 ff.; King of Tars, vv. 612 ff.; Octavian, vv. 1303 ff.; Sowdone of Bab-

1. Heyman, p. 103. Dreams are very common and are likely to have conventional features. In the French versions, Argentille (=Goldborough) dreams that Havelok is attacked by a boar and foxes and is defended by dogs and boars. Animals frequently appear in these warning dreams; cf. Erol of Tolous, vv. 804 ff.; Amis and Amiloun, vv. 1009 ff.; Octavian, vv. 195 ff.; Chanson de Roland, vv. 2526 ff.; also R. Mentz, Die Träume in den alt-franz. Karls- und Artus-Epen, Marburg, 1928.

2. Boje, pp. 64 f., gives numerous parallels in Old French.

3. The Hamlet-story, in which the mother marries the murderer of her husband, is to be compared. The story of Generides has some details which are similar. For O.F. parallels, cf. Boje, p. 62; Jordan, p. 96.

4. Cf. Boje, p. 86, where parallels in O.F. may be found. With this motive may be compared the sending of some one as a messenger to a hostile king in the expectation that he will be unable to return (Guy, vv. 3727 ff.). In Prise de Pambelune Canelon sends a messenger to his death; cf. Canelon's rage when he is named by Roland as a messenger to Marsile (Roland, vv. 283 ff.). The Hamlet-story should also be remembered.
ylon, vv. 2103 ff.; 2427 ff.; 2497 ff.¹


8. Escape by crossing body of water: Bevis, vv. 1789 ff.; Alisaunder, vv. 4253 ff.; Forumbras, vv. 3944 ff. In the last case the hero is led by a milk-white hart.³

9. The vain pursuit: Bevis, vv. 4071 ff.; Guy, vv. 3943 ff.; Octavian (Camb. MS., vv. 1255 ff.); Morte Arthure, vv. 1346 ff. Compare the preceding motive. Usually, a messenger becomes involved in a quarrel with the foreign king, escapes by means of marvellous valor, is pursued, and is perhaps rescued by members of his own party who come to meet him⁴.

10. The returning hero is recognized by his horse: Bevis vv. 2157 ff.⁵.

¹ This motive was no doubt used for humorous effect. Cf. Boje, pp. 82 ff., 100 f. Compare, also, the beginning (in French, the English MS. being incomplete at this point) of The History of the Holy Grail, E.E.T.S., p. 99.

² The virginity of unprotected women is preserved in a variety of ways. In the Enfances Guillaume Thibaut is made to believe that he has actually enjoyed Orable (Gautier, Épopée, 2nd ed., IV, p. 301). In Ave d'Avignone a ring is introduced which has three stones, one of which is from the terrestrial paradise and protects virginity. Rings, drinks, philters, prayers, are all effective. Later in Bevis (vv. 3671 ff.), Josian saves herself by the herb which gives her the appearance of a leper. Boje, p. 107, cites numerous examples in Old French. Cf. Paris's Introduction to Orson, p. LVIII.


⁴ Cf. Boje, pp. 96 ff.

⁵ Cf. Boje, p. 108.

¹ Cf. Boje, pp. 114 f. The boar fight often is very much the same as the dragon fight. The boar of Guy (vv. 6714 ff.) is an ordinary animal, but in Bevis it has the fierceness of a dragon. It has eaten the flesh and drunk the blood of many men (cf. Eglamour, vv. 335 ff.; Avojrynge of Arthur, XII, 5 ff.). Bevis's spear bursts to pieces against its shoulder, for the "hyde was harde as eni flint." The battle "lasts "til Æ time of euesong." Finally Bevis cuts off the animal's tusks, and slays the boar by a thrust through the mouth to the heart (cf. Octavian, vv. 342 ff.). In Guy the boar is slain at the first blow. Bevis's fight with the dragon is more fully elaborated. The spear which strikes the side of the dragon bursts in pieces five, and leaps as "e hail vpon e ston." At noon the hero's horse is slain. Towards evening the dragon cleaves his shield with a stroke of his tail and wounds the knight. Bevis leaps into a well with magic properties, is restored, and begins the fight anew. But the venom of the monster poisons him, his helmet is struck in two pieces; but again he is restored by the magic well. Finally he "smot Æ dragoun to Æ herte" and "œ tonge karf of Æ dragoun." Some of the same features are present in Guy's fight with the dragon. The knight's spear flies in pieces and Guy and his horse are thrown by the dragon, which leaps at them. Finally a blow from the dragon's tail cleaves Guy's shield and three of Guy's ribs are broken by the grip of the dragon's tail. Guy succeeds in freeing himself by cutting off the dragon's tail, and finally pierces the beast beneath the wing. The head is carried to the king. It is to be remembered that the author of Bevis refers to the dragon slain by Guy in Northumberland, and there is very probably direct influence. However, the features of the fight are conventional. The dragon's skin usually can be pierced only at a certain place. The venom of the dragon of Bevis may be compared with the fiery breath of the Beowulf dragon.


**Guy of Warwick**

1. Lover performs great tasks for the sake of his lady: *Guy*. This is a commonplace; but the tasks are not, as a rule, set by the lady. Perhaps *Eger and Grine* furnishes the nearest parallel. Winglayne would not love anyone

   Without he would with swordes dent
   Win euery battell where he went (vv. 13 f.).

---

1. Cf. *Petit de Julleville*, I, p. 234, where attention is called to the magic fountains in the *Roman d'Alexander*. They are three in number—one to revive, one to render immortal, and one to rejuvenate.

2. Cf. *Boje*, pp. 90 f. In *Guy* an andiron is thrown. Throwing the knife seems to have been an exercise of the young men.

3. This motive is fully discussed by Gerould in his study of the Eustace legend (*P.M.L.A.*, XIX, pp. 335 ff.). Points of contact between the Eustace legend and the *Bevis* are there indicated. The man tried by fate loses his wife and usually twin children.

2. Unexpected attack while on the chase: Guy, vv. 2449 ff.; see Bevis No. 21.

3. The wounded messenger: Guy, vv. 1517 ff., 2281 ff., 3091 ff.; Alisaunder, vv. 3743 ff.; Four Sonnes of Aymon, p. 33; "Durham Field" (Child, No. 159, st. 28)2. The idea that the news of a defeat should be told by a wounded messenger is obvious enough, but it seems to have become an established convention. Frequently the messenger is the sole survivor.

But the were mett in a morning of May
With the commynaltye of litle England;
But thare scape never a man away,
Through th' might of Christes hand.

But all onely Iames Douglas;
In Durham in the field
An arrow stroke him in the thye;
Fast flinges he towards the King. ("Durham Field",
sts. 27 f.).

4. The false accusation: See Horn No. 3.

5. The messenger sent to his death: See Bevis No. 5.

6. The vain pursuit: See Bevis No. 9.

7. The forgetful lover: Guy, vv. 4167 ff.; Iwain and Gawain.

1. In Guy this motive has a form familiar in the chansons de geste. In Jehan de Lanson and in Girars de Viane the emperor goes hunting, finds himself surrounded by enemies, and is virtually a prisoner. However, his enemies, instead of using the opportunity for their advantage, beg for pardon, just as in Guy. In Morien King Arthur is captured while on the chase by the King of Saisnes (Hist. Litt., XXX, p. 250).

2. In the Brise de Pampelune Guion, a messenger, comes to the emperor mortally wounded. Guillaume, who alone survives the battle of Aliscans, goes to the emperor covered with wounds to ask for aid.
vv. 1499 ff. Also see Horn No. 41.


9. Fratres furati: Guy, vv. 4905 ff.; Eger and Grine; Amis and Amiloun; Iwain and Gawain. Horn and Aulf in King Horn may also be compared. Roland and Oliver should be remembered. This, of course, was a historical institution, and it has left abundant marks of itself in medieval literature.

10. The dragon fight: See Bevis No. 11.

11. Desertion of newly wedded wife to become a pilgrim; Guy, stts. 20 ff.; Legend of St. Alexius, vv. 55 ff.3

12. The interrupted chess game: Guy, stts. 56 ff. A quarrel arises in the course of the game, and one of the players slays the other with the chess board 4.

1. In Le Courronement Loos, Guillaume is on the point of marrying when messengers appear with news which takes him away (cf. Gautier, IV, p. 361); the interruption resembles somewhat the one in Guy, but for another reason. The forgetful lover in Chrétien's Ivain probably comes somewhat nearer to the lover in Guy.


3. This motive was perhaps borrowed from the Alexius legend, which had wide currency. Cf. Schneegans, Mod. Lang. Notes, III, pp. 247 ff., 307 ff.

4. This motive is familiar in the chansons de geste; cf. Voretzsch, Über die Sage von Ogier dem Dänen, Halle, 1891, pp. 67 ff., for a careful study. The participants are usually a son or nephew of Charlemagne and a visitor at the court. The son or nephew usually provokes a quarrel and is slain; cf. Gautier, Chivalry, pp. 111, 201.
Before drawing any conclusions from this list, a few paragraphs will be devoted to pointing out certain stereotyped features which do not properly belong under the title of Motives. These are chiefly connected with the life of the warrior.

The receiving of knighthood very often is presented with some detail\(^1\). It is frequently connected with the love affair. Thus Horn obtains knighthood through Rymenhild in order that he may feel himself worthy of her. Guy becomes a knight because Felice refuses to accept his love otherwise\(^2\). Bevis becomes a knight at the request of Josian so that he may defend her from Bradmond, who comes with an army to take her by force. The dubbing of some obscure squire at a moment of danger occurs repeatedly in medieval romance\(^3\). The hero's friends are knighted with him in Horn, in Guy, and in Havelok\(^4\). Gifts of armor and horse are usually mentioned. Horn receives a sword, spurs, and a white steed; and when he visits Rymenhild is presented with a ring. Bevis's Horse Arondel is the gift of Josian on this occasion (vv. 979 ff.). Guy was dubbed with

\(^1\) For education of the knight, see pp. 114 ff.

\(^2\) Cf. vv. 663 ff.

\(^3\) This is the case in Horn et Rimel. William of Palerne is knighted at his own request on the eve of battle.

\(^4\) Eighty were knighted with William of Palerne "for his sake" (v. 1100); cf. Hall's note to King Horn, vv. 499 f.
riche armour & gode stedes
the best that were in lond at nedes (vv. 713 f.)\(^1\).

There is sometimes a feast on the occasion. "Murie was the feste" when Horn was knighted (v. 521)\(^2\). The essential thing, however, is usually the adventure which immediately follows in which the new knight proves his worthiness\(^3\). Horn slays a band of Saracen single-handed; Havelok defeats Godard in battle; Bevis captures Bradmund; and Guy crosses the channel to win fame in the tournament at Rouen.

The tournament naturally is pretty well conventionalized\(^4\). The hero frequently merely happens to be there. Bevis and Terri were seated at supper in a "gret toun", when the former saw through the window that the streets were filled with steeds and arms, and upon inquiry he learned that there was to be a tourney the next day (vv. 3754 ff.). When Guy was at meat in Rouen, he questioned his host as to where there might be a tournament, and learned that there was one near at hand (vv. 787 ff.). The hand of the princess is frequently the prize of the tourney. The response to Bevis's question about the crowd in the street is;

\[\begin{align*}
\Phi ai & \text{ ben come for a tornement,} \\
\Phi at & \text{ is cride for a maide faire,} \\
\text{A king's doueter and is air.} \\
\text{Who } & \Phi at \text{ at } \Phi e \text{ beste kni}st \\
\text{And stire} & \Phi him stouteliche in } \Phi at fi}st, \\
\text{Ho schel haue } & \Phi at \text{ maide fre} \\
\text{And Aumbeforce, } & \Phi e \text{ faire contre' (vv. 3766 ff.).}
\end{align*}\]

---

1. On gifts at the occasion of receiving knighthood, cf. Hall's note to KingHorn, vv. 499 f.

2. Cf. Hall's note to v. 478.

3. Horn Childe (HCh vv. 427 ff.) won the prize in a tournament.

4. It is worth bearing in mind that there are no tournaments in
In the actual fight there are not many things which may happen. Schmirgel has collected numerous examples of the stereotyped expressions for the events of battle. The bursting of spears in five pieces, the giving way of girths, the breaking of swords, the cleaving of shields, or of heads, or of the entire body and the horse also, are commonplaces. The loss of a quarter of the helmet or of the shield is particularly frequent. What has not been so clearly pointed out, however, is that these stereotyped features are connected in a conventional way. The following are typical single combats:

King Grander and Bevis charge each other and burst their "on pises fieue". Then they draw their swords, and keep striking each other "be-twene midworwe & vndertide". Grander, angered at the stout resistance of Bevis, strikes a fierce blow on Bevis' shield.

A quarter fel in to the feld,
Hauberik, plate and aktoun,
In to Beues forter arsoun
Half a fot he karf doun rj:t (vv. 1760 ff.).

Bevis, aroused in turn, smites down the shield of Grander, whose left hand is cut off at the wrist. Grander then fights yet more fiercely, until Bevis cuts off his head (vv. 1771 ff.).

In two of the fights of Guy there is some resemblance to the combat of Bevis and Grander. After Guy and Amoraunt have broken their lances, they fight with swords. Amoraunt strikes a blow so fierce that the stones fall from Guy's helmet, and a foot and a half of his shield is carved out, and the saddle-
bow and steed's neck are cut in two. Another fierce blow from Amoraunt strikes the flowers from Guy's helmet, cleaves his shield, and brings him to his knees. Then Guy strikes a blow which damages the helmet of Amoraunt, carves his shield in two, and brings him to his knees. Amoraunt, getting thirsty, requests permission to drink, which is granted. A little later Guy becomes thirsty and makes the same request, which is denied; but Guy runs and leaps into the water and succeeds in getting out again without injury. The fight lasted "fro the morwe to the night." Finally Guy cuts off Amoraunt's right arm, with the sword. Amoraunt seizes the sword with his left hand, but it too is cut off; and Guy thereupon strikes off his enemy's head and takes it to King Triamour (st. 97 ff.)! Here, of course, are many features in addition to the ones noted in the fight of Bevis and Grander, but there is the same alternation of success and disadvantage (curiously enlarged), the same loss of a portion of the shield; the victor gains the upper hand in both cases by cutting off the hand of his enemy; and, finally, slays him by cutting off his head.

The fight of Guy and Colbrond may be compared with these. At the first encounter Guy's spear breaks in five pieces. Colbrond carries three spears, two of which do not strike Guy at all, but the third passes through his armor between the arm and the side. Guy's horse is soon slain, so that the two combatants are on an equal footing, Colbrond being so heavy that no horse can

1. In Lybeaus Desconus there is a parallel. Lybeaus is fighting with Maugys. He asks permission to drink; it is granted; but while he is drinking Maugys strikes him and he falls into the river (vv. 1336 ff.).
Guy strikes a blow which wounds his opponent in the shoulder. Colbrond, in turn, strikes Guy on the helmet,

\[ \text{fat his floures euerr-ichon} \\
\text{& his gode charbukel ston} \\
\text{Wel euen he carf atvo:} \\
\text{Euen ato he smot his sheld} \\
\text{fat it fleyse into pe feld (st. 262, vv. 4 ff.).} \]

Guy's return blow is equally severe.

\[ \text{he bondes of stiel he carf ichon,} \\
\text{& in-to he scheld a fot & half on} \\
\text{Wip his swerd he smot asunder (st. 263 vv. 7 ff.).} \]

But Guy's sword is broken, and Colbrond refuses to lend him a weapon. Nevertheless Guy seizes one of his antagonist's battle axes and strikes off his "ri3t arme wip alle pe hond." As Colbrond stoops to pick up his sword with the other hand, Guy strikes off his head (sts.259 ff.). Here, again, are the main features which we have already found in the desperate single combat. The breaking of the sword, which does not occur in the other fights just outlined, is perhaps the most stereotyped of all.\(^1\)

One very conventional feature of the single combat is the pause, which is filled up with dialogue on the part of the combatants, sometimes with important consequences. One example occurs in *King Horn*. The hero is fighting with a Saracen giant who has just landed on the shores of Ireland. When they pause for weariness the giant remarks that he has never suffered such heavy blows except from Murry. Enraged at learning that his

---

father's murderer is before him, Horn strikes him through the heart (vv. 859 ff.). In Guy there are several parallels. There are two pauses in the combat with Amoraunt, each time because of the thirst of one of the combatants. Each time there is dialogue; and in the second pause Amoraunt learns the identity of his antagonist (sts. 113 ff.). In the Berard combat, which lasts two days, there is the intermission of the night, during which Guy is thrown into the sea on his bed. This is not precisely parallel. More nearly so is the pause in the fight of Guy and Colbrond after the sword of the former breaks. Colbrond asks Guy to surrender and promises him the favor of the Danish king if he will do so. Debates and offers frequently filled the pauses of combats in the *chansons de geste*.

The fights in which the hero is opposed to great numbers occur frequently, and usually consist of a catalogue of the various ways in which men may be slain. In Havelok's fight with the sixty lads there is more variety because the weapons are unusual, and the effect is somewhat realistic. In Horn there is brevity, but no less conventionality on that account. The following is typical:

\[\begin{align*}
&\text{At euereche dente} \\
&\text{\&e heued of wente (vv. 609 ff.).}
\end{align*}\]

In Bevis there is some elaboration.

\[\begin{align*}
&\text{And fifti sarasins in \&at stonde} \\
&\text{\&ar wif a \&af hem dedli wonde,} \\
&\text{And sum he strok of \&e swire,} \\
&\text{\&at \&e heued fle\& in \&e riuere,} \\
&\text{And sum he clef euene asonder;}
\end{align*}\]

1. Cf. Hall's note to *Horn*, v. 659. If a knight desired to rest his opponent, it seems, as a gallant knight was under obligation to grant his request. Sir Triamore (vv. 1435 ff.) loses sword; is promised it if he will reveal his name. Cf. *Generides*, vv. 3403 ff.; *Sowdone of Babylone*, vv. 1219—Ferumbras learns the
Here hors is fet φai laine vnder (vv. 635 ff.).

Likewise in the fight with the steward's men:

An sum vpon φe helm a hitte,  
In to φe sadel he hem slitte,  
And sum kniȝt Beues so ofrauȝte,  
φe heued of'at φe ferste draȝte,  
So harde he gan to lein aboute  
Among φe heȝene kniȝtes stoute  
φat non ne pasede hom apliȝt;  
So φour? φe grace of god almiȝt  
φe kingsiȝt stiward a hitte so,  
φat is bodi a clef a to (vv. 865 ff.).

Guy is equally successful in fighting great numbers. Note his defence when he, with Herhaud, Torald and Urri, is attacked by Otous's treacherous knights.

Euerich φat day φat Gij oftoke,  
Sone anon his liif forsoke.  
Sum he smot opon φe ṭodడ,  
At φe bīrdel φe swerd astode;  
And sum he smot φurch φe side,  
φat miȝt he neuer go no ride.  
Was φer none φat miȝt astond  
Dint φat come of Gyes hond ( vv. 1395 ff.).

The hero's valor is also indicated by numbers slain, which may be indefinitely great. Horn slew a hundred (v. 616); Havelok, vv. with some aid, managed to kill sixty with a club (v. 1766 ff.).

Bevis, in the fight referred to above, slew fifty Saracens. Later in a fight with Bradmund's host, 60,000 were slain, half of whom were the victims of Morgelay, the trusty sword of Bevis (vv. 1011 ff.). Likewise, 60,000 of King Ivor's men were slain (v.  

name of his antagonist, Cliver, during this pause. In Aliscans in the pause of a combat between the Christian Renouart and the Saracen Walegrafe the combatants learn that they are brothers and attempt to convent one another. In the pause of the combat between Roland and Otuel (Otuel, vv. 417 ff.) the former offers his the king's daughter for wife if he will yield and become a Christian. Gautier, I, p. 246, refers to the religious discussions, sleep, etc., which fill in the pauses of combats of Christian and Saracen knights.
3984), but how many fell before the blows of Bevis we are not told. That his valor had not declined is shown in the London fight. With six knights Bevis in a little while brought down five hundred (v. 4394); a little later, the reader is informed, 5,000 of the strongest were slain (v. 4444); and when the battle was finally won, with the assistance of Bevis's sons,

So moche folk was slawe & dede,
Mat al Temse was blod red;
The nombre was, veraiment,
To and pretti posent (vv. 4519 ff.).

Guy's valor is not quite so prodigious. Ordinarily the author is satisfied to say that many were slain (vv. 3024 ff.), even when the hero has a great army at his back.

This collection of motives and stereotyped features shows that there is an absence of originality and of desire for originality which is strange to us. It shows that three of the romances—Horn, Bevis, and Guy—have in common some very important motives. The motives of Havelok stand somewhat apart. Much of the realistic detail of the romance is probably original. Some features seem to connect it pretty closely with saga and folklore. It is clearly more popular than the others. But even this romance has some of the conventional features of romance.

Horn, in some respects, is the hardest of all to understand. It is primitive. It shows resemblances to Germanic saga; it has motives which are genuinely romantic; it has some of the marks of the chanson de geste. The treatment is simpler, but the raw

1. Gautier, op. cit., IV, pp. 539 f., outlines a typical battle of the chanson de geste.

2. The bright cross on the shoulder was probably taken direct from the chansons de geste.
material which entered into it seems to have been much the same as that which entered into Bevis and Guy. The study shows, too, that Bevis and Guy stand pretty close together. The motives of Horn which appear in them are handled in a very different way. The parallels to the motives seem to show that these romances belong to the later and decadent chansons de geste. The motive of the disdainful lady¹ and the Alexius-motive distinguish Guy from Bevis. The former shows the influence of the roman d'aventure. The latter shows the influence of the church, as it found its way from legends into chansons de geste and romances. As we find the motive in Guy, it seems to have been romanticized. So in our four romances we see the merchandise brought by various streams. If one followed them all to their sources he would have explored a large part of the world of story.

¹ Cf. Guy No. 1, p. 204.
C. Miscellaneous Characteristics of Plot.

Movement.

The movement of King Horn is unusually rapid. It has already been noted how briefly the scenes are presented, and how quickly change is made from one to another. The transitions are never elaborate, and they may be entirely omitted. Even the episodes are quickly passed, and they also make a slight contribution to the main story in each case. When synchronism is present the transitions from element to element of the plot are so quickly and so frequently made that there is no delay for the author to untangle the threads of the (for the moment) neglected element.

Only in dialogue are there serious delays. Four times there are placed in the mouth of one of the characters a considerable number of lines which relate practically what the reader already knows. Horn, on his arrival in Westernesse, in twenty lines tells the king of the death of his father and of the exile of himself and his companions (vv. 175-94). Rymenhild's messenger, in sixteen lines, relates the misfortunes which have come to Rymenhild while Horn was in Ireland (vv. 943-58). When Horn and Aðulf, with their Irish followers, land in Suddenne, they meet Aðulf's father, who tells over again the story of Murry's death and Horn's banishment (vv. 1315-46). And, last, when Horn returns to rescue Rymenhild the second time, Arnoldin meets him with the story of Fikenhild's treachery and Rymenhild's capture (vv. 1447-58). In every case the reader was in possession of the essential facts. Thus the story of Murry's death and Horn's
banishment is told three times. Yet there is this justification: the recital in every case is brief and pointed; the retelling of the story from another point of view has a certain emotional and dramatic value which the minstrel doubtless made use of; and it permits comment on the part of the speaker. But most important perhaps is the primitive fondness for repetition and the need in sung or recited tales for summaries to keep the hearer in mind of the essential features of the story. In addition, there may have been a demand for realism. The dramatic necessity for the telling of the story was evident, and the hearer would perhaps have been dissatisfied with its omission. To the modern reader the interruptions are not at all distressing. They preserve naturally the swiftness and something of the picturesque-ness which characterize the romance as a whole.

The movement of Havelok, while not of the almost breathless rapidity of the movement of King Horn, is not altogether slow. There is a certain delay for describing character and life, or for comments by the author; there are some incidents which retard the story; but there is none of the absurd complication, or rather amassing, of adventures which carries stories like Guy of Warwick beyond the power of the mind to recollect or value.

There is a certain amount of delay due to dialogue, as in the case of Horn, and apparently without much justification. Thus Havelok takes no less than thirty-five lines (vv. 1400-34)

1. Cf. Ælfulf's father's passionate lament for the past and Arnoldin's regretful suggestion that Horn must surrender Rymenhild.
to tell the children of Grim the story of his life, although they must have been perfectly familiar with it. Strangely enough, it seems he had not considered it necessary to tell Goldborough, who was ignorant of the story and yet most vitally interested in it. Again, and for the third time in the romance, the story of Havelok's early years is told when the assembly of Danes is addressed by Ubbe (vv. 2203-51). Similarly the narrative of Havelok's fight with the sixty lads is told originally in 154 lines (vv. 1766-1919), and is immediately repeated in fifty-four lines (vv. 1954-2007) when Bernard relates the adventure to Ubbe. Thus in Havelok we find the same repetition noted in Horn. Is it surprising that the audiences which tolerated repetition of this sort did not rebel against the accumulation of conventional adventures which make up romances less striking than Horn and Havelok?

The movement of Bevis offers a contrast with the movement either of Horn or of Havelok. In this case the story is not getting anywhere in particular; it is a question of relating one incident and passing on to another. The incident is told and told quickly. Likewise, when the author is done with one incident, it scarcely takes an instant for him to dispose of his exhausted material and get another incident upon his stage. A glance at the transitions already quoted will show how seldom they are elaborated. Contrast with those the formal transition quoted from Havelok. But naturally this repeated hasty transi-

tion from one incident to another not even loosely connected with it means that regularity or ease of movement has no meaning for this romance. There are, however, practically no interruptions, whether for comment by the author, the description of states of mind or setting, or repetition of the narrative in dialogue.

In Guy the movement is more leisurely. The interest of the author goes beyond the mere incident. Such elements of narrative as the detailed account of emotions, the healing of wounds, a description of the beauties of nature may fill in the intervals between the clash of arms and the interviews of lovers. However, it is to be borne in mind that a very great deal happens within the limits of the romance, that the transitional material is usually handled rather briefly, and that the stereotyped verbal transitions are almost always short. There is very little repetition of narrative in dialogue. Four times narratives of considerable length are told by dramatis personae, but these hardly delay the narrative, since it has no definite course; and in every case they prepare for an adventure of the hero of the romance. The movement of Guy, so far as the term has meaning, is less rapid, is not so frequently broken as the movement of Bevis; but its course is tortuous to the last degree.

2. Vv. 1822 ff.; 4567 ff.; sts. 48 ff.; 147 ff.
Dialogue.

The part dialogue contributes to plot has been mentioned in the preceding section. A fuller statement is demanded, for its importance is very considerable in romance literature. Soliloquy and apostrophe, so far as they appear, will also receive attention under this head.

Dialogue is particularly important for King Horn. Nearly half of the lines (729 lines or part lines in a total of 1530) are quoted. These include Horn's apostrophe to the ship and Ælf's lament addressed to the absent Horn from the tower. These are the only soliloquies, if, indeed, Horn's speech, made probably in the presence of his companions, may be considered a soliloquy. Both have considerable dramatic value. The average length of the single unbroken speech is about nine lines. Only three are more than twenty lines, and the longest is thirty-two. These longer speeches, in addition to the four mentioned already, in which incidents already narrated are retold, are sometimes used as opportunity for some one of the dramatis personae to praise the hero. Thus Adramed to Horn (vv. 98-110); Ailmar to Horn and his companions (vv. 151-59, 206-18); Thurston to Berild (vv. 700-98). In the more dramatic portions, the dialogue is seldom very sprightly; there is no repartee, none of the verbal fencing and suggestiveness of polished conversation. The characters speak bluntly. Thus the dialogue has vigor, but no refinement. Rymenhild, enraged at Ælbrus, cries out:

"Hennes þu go, þu fule þeaf,
Ne wurstu me neure more leof
Went vt of my bur
Wif muchel mesawentur.
Schame mote þu fonge
& on hige rode anhonge" (vv. 323 ff.).
When Ailmar finds Horn in Rymenhild's arms he speaks in the same fashion.

"Awei vt," he sede, "fule þeof! Ne wurstu me neuremore leof. Wend vt of my bure Wif muchel messauneture. Wel sone bute Þu flitte, Wif swerdes ihec Þe anhitte. Wend vt of my londe Þer Þu schalt haue schonde" (vv. 707 ff.).

Dialogue, on the whole, plays a much less important part in Havelok than in Horn. While almost 800 lines are occupied with dialogue, not very much of this is vital or highly interesting. There is more soliloquy than in Horn, the total for about twelve occasions being approximately 120 lines\(^1\). It may also be added that there are two prayers of seventeen and twenty-six lines respectively. The soliloquies are valuable in furnishing motives and for keeping the hearer informed as to what is to be expected. Thus Æelwold tells of his anxiety about his daughter's future (vv. 117 ff.); Godard tells of his intention to make his son instead of Goldborough ruler of England (vv. 292 ff.); and later he tells of his design to marry Goldborough to Havelok in order to carry out his plan (vv. 1073 ff.). However, soliloquy is important for revealing character and mental states rather than as an element in plot. The average length of the single speech in dialogue is about ten lines, or slightly greater than in Horn. There are more long speeches which interrupt the narrative—eleven of twenty or more lines each, three of more than forty lines each. There is none of the give and take of lively

\(^1\) Exact figures are not given for the reason that in two or three cases it is not evident whether speeches are real soliloquies or not.
dialogue. There is a somewhat awkward mixture of direct and indirect discourse at least once. Havelok's reply to Godard's question as to why his sisters are crying is told thus:

"For us hungreth swithe sore:"—
"Seydon, he wolden hauen more:"—
"We ne haue to ete, ne we nehaue Herinne noyth er quaint ne knaue
Dat yeueth us drincken, ne no mete,
Haluendel Dat we moun ete" (vv. 455 ff.).

As has already been noticed, the story of Havelok's youth is twice repeated in dialogue.

For Bevis again dialogue plays a very important part. There are about 1600 lines quoted, nearly all of which are dialogue, although there are several brief soliloquies and prayers. The average length of the individual speech is only about five lines. The dialogue is fairly skillful. It is rarely sustained, and it is not easy to pick out passages of special merit. The following is fairly typical. Bevis is on his way to see Josian, then the queen of Ivor. Outside the town he meets a palmer:

"Palmer," a seide, "whar is de king?"
"Sire!" a seide, "an hunting
Wi† kinges fiftene:" "And whar," a seide, "is de quene?"
"Sire," a seide "in hire bour."
"Palmer," a seide, "paramour,
zem me dine wede
For min and for mi stede!"
"God yeue it," que† de palmare,
We hadde drive Dat chafare!" (vv. 2053 ff.).

As this indicates, the less important situations are often presented in dialogue; and the more significant incidents the conversation is essentially the same. Soliloquy, while not

1. *T.* under Character, pp. 278 f.
so important as in Havelok, is used effectively. Attention may be called to the lines which relate how Bevis overhears Josian lamenting his failure to come (vv. 2103 f.), or to those which give the information about the stone which should preserve the lady's virginity (vv. 1463 f.). The prayers are usually nothing but soliloquies addressed to God. Their value is usually emotional; and they are not important for plot. The merit of the dialogue of Bevis is that it is real dialogue with some spirit; that it is brief and pointed; that it does not degenerate into long speeches.

A yet larger proportion of the Guy is in dialogue—something more than 5000 lines of about 11,000 which make up the romance. This includes a few hundred lines which contain episodical narrative, but with these removed, the figures are very large. The average of the single speech is about eight and one half lines. The longest is 300 lines; but that contains extended narrative. Many speeches run some length; there are forty-four containing twenty lines or more. On the other hand, there are bits of dialogue here and there, made up perhaps of question and reply, which assist very materially in keeping down the average. Note the following:

"Mi nevou Hougoun, whar is he?"
"Quod &e douk òtous, "tel me rapo."
"Sir in òe sond he lixe, ëatis sceæ." 
"& &erl Lambard, ëat gode krixt?"
"Ded he lixe in ëat fiizt" (vv. 1540 ff.).

The dialogue is frequently of short bits as in Bevis; but again it may be of considerable length, and a situation may be developed by means of it. For instance, in the conversation in which Guy, Felice, and the maiden of Felice take parts, while not so
long (vv. 563-672) as a few other cases, the attitude of Felice towards her lover is changed from mere scorn to half-grudging encouragement; and in the change the maiden as well as Guy plays an important part. Outside the swooning of Guy, this is developed entirely by dialogue. Of lines devoted to soliloquy the proportion is not very great—about 200 lines altogether—but the individual soliloquies are of some importance. All in all, the dialogue of Guy is pretty highly developed.

Dialogue is as fully conventionalized as any other element of narrative. In the quotations from Horn already given it may be noted that King Ailmar repeats to Horn almost precisely a speech already spoken by Ryemnhild to Áelbrus (vv. 323 ff., 707 ff.). This conventionalization of dialogue was carried very far, and it will be possible here to discuss only a few of the more conspicuous examples.

There is something approaching a set method of greeting a stranger. Thus the King of Westernesse to Horn and his companions:

"Whannes boe ye faire gumes,
at her to lond be thicume.
Seie me what ye seche" (vv. 161 ff.).

Later he asks Horn's name (v. 197). And when Horn arrives in Ireland,

Berild gan him proie
Cat he scholde him seie,
What his name were
& what he wold þere (vv. 763 ff.).


2. A stylistic trick of Guy is the breaking of a speech extending beyond a few lines by a parenthetical "he seyd" or some equivalent.
When Murry found the Saracens at the seashore,

He axede what iso?te

0 er to londe bro?te (vv. 39 f.).

Horn greets the pagans at the time of his first fight with the same words (vv. 599 f.). Strangers of importance are very frequently met by these more or less formal questions, and, in turn, the replies are likely to be conventional.

"Childe," a seide, "what wer je bore?

What is je name? telle me fore!

"If ich it wiste, hit were me lef."

"For gode," a seide, "ich hatte Bef, Iboren ich was in Ingelonde," etc. (Bevis, vv. 139 ff.).

The king cloped sir Gyoun, & asked him at schort resoun,

"What is y name? tel me."

Sir Gij answerd to je king, "Youn," he said, "wip-outen lesing, Men cloped me in mi cuntre."

"What cuntre artow?"Je king sede, "Of Ingland, so god me rede: herin ich was y-bore" (Guy, st. 81, vv. 19 ff.).

In this connection it is well to bear in mind a passage in the Boke of Curtasy, to which Hall calls attention:

\[\text{Wip woso men bo}\text{e fer & negh,}\]
\[\text{The falle to go, loke }\frac{\text{you be slegh}}{
\text{To aske his name, and }\frac{\text{wesche he be,}}{
\text{Whedur he welle; kepe welle }\frac{\text{bes }\text{ree}}{(\text{Babees Book,}}
\text{308/299-302).}}}

This is a matter of convention, and probably is a convention of life as well as of literature.

The defiance and the rejoinder which precede the combat are another conventional device. It is very highly developed in the

\[1. \text{Numerous parallels are cited by Schmirgel, p. li. Cf. Gautier, Chivalry, p. 370, on the typical questions of the porter: Who are you? Whence come you?}\]
chanson de geste, to the influence of which its later appearance is no doubt to be attributed. In Horn there is nothing quite comparable to this defiance, although the boast of the enemy in reply to the stereotyped questions discussed in the preceding paragraph is twice given (vv. 43 ff., 603 ff.). In Havelok the typical dialogue which precedes the fight occurs in its complete form. Thus when Havelok and Godrich meet in battle, the former reproaches his enemy for his treachery, and offers pardon.

'Do nu wel with-uten fiht, 
Yeld hire e lond, for dat is riht. 
Wile ich forgiue fe e lathe, 
Al mi dode and al mi wraetho, 
For y se Jux art so wiht, 
And of fi bodi so god kniht.'

"Dat ne wile ich neuere mo,"
Quoth erl Godrich, "for ich shal slo fe, and hire for-henge heye. 
I shal frist ut fi rihte eye 
Dat ou lokes with on me, 
But a swise he'en fle."(vv. 2716 ff.)

In Bevis this convention is found in its most typical form repeatedly. When the Emperor of Almaine surprises Guy, the father of Bevis, in the forest, he first assails him with his tongue:

"Ayilt fe treitour! how olde dote! 
Flow schelt ben hanged by fe grote, 
In heued how schelt lase; 
Fe sone schel an-hanged be 
And fe wif, dat is so fre, 
To mi leman i chese!"

Erle answerde at dat sawe:
"Me feneke, how seist azen fe lawe, 
So god me amende! 
Me wif and child, dat was so fre, 
Zif how fenekest be-neme hem me, 
Ich schel hem defence!" (vv. 217 ff.).

The following dialogue precedes a fight between Bevis and the pagan King Grander. Grander speaks first:

1. Cf. Chanson de Roland, vv. 1188 ff., etc.
2. See, also, Robert's address to Godard, vv. 2389 ff.
"Ajilt ße," a seide, "ßow fox welp,
ße god schel ße noþing help,
For her ßow; min hondes one,
For soþe, ßow schelt ße lif for-gon!"
"So me helpe god!" que ße Beues ßo,
"Hit were no meistri me to slo,
For ßis is ße forþe dai agon,
Mete ne drinke ne bot i non;
Ac neþeleþ got it wot,
ßif ich alle nedes mot,
ßit ich wile asale,
A lite boxe ße to paie!" (vv. 1703 ff.)¹.

In Guy also this convention occurs several times. Thus Gwichard to Guy:

"Gij," quod he, "ßeld now ße!
It no may no noþer be:
On ße erme lye ßi scheld to-dreued,
Noußt o pece is ße, ßer bilueed,
ßine helme is al-to-hewe,
ßine hauberke to-rent ßat was newe;
ß wounded ßou art, ßou mißt well se,
ßong mißt two noußt oluues be.
To day ßichil ßeld ße to ße douk Otoun,
ßer-wïles ichaue mi swerd y-grounde,
ß mi bodi wiþouten wounde" (vv. 1431 ff.)².

A conventional situation involving a stereotyped bit of dialogue is the interview of hero and companions with their host at some town which they enter while traveling. Thus in Beues:

Beues at a wendowe lokede out
And so ße strete ful aboute
Of stedes wrien and armes briȝt;
A wonder him ßouȝte, what it be miȝt;
At here oþesse he askede ßere,
What al ße stoute stodes were.
"Sire," ßa seide, ßeveraïment,
ßai ben come for a tornement,
ßat is cride for a maide faire,
A kinges douȝt and is air.
Who ßat ßar ße beste kniȝt
And stirèþ him stouteliche in ßat fiȝt,
He schel haue ßat maide fre
And Aumbeforce, ße faire coutre."

¹. Cf., also, vv. 909 ff.; 1360 ff.; 2013 ff.; Gaius 2071 ff.; 3041 ff.
². Other instances in Bevis: vv. 1868 ff., 1517 ff.; 4324 ff.
With this compare the following from Guy:

In Ron Gij take his herberwe
Wie le riches man of le borwe;
Mete & drink iai hadde anou3,
Mus her non dat it wip-drou2.
Sir Gij his ost cleped him to,
& him bi-gan to frein ho;
& asked him wher he turnament schuld be,
So many scheldes ian seye he.
His ost seyd, "Sir, wite he nout
Of his turnament dat is biquert:"
"No," seyd Gij, "bi mine wite,
Y no herd fer-of meuer 3ete."
His ost him answerd sneifle,
"Of dat turnament y schal you telle:
It schal be for a maiden of pris,
Emperours douhter sche is", etc. (vv. 787 ff.).

When the host had finished his explanation,

Sir Gij seyd to his fere,
"In gode time come we here:
To morwe, so some so it is day,
We wil wenden in our way." (vv. 839 ff.)1.

These examples show the conventionalization of dialogue in conventional situations—both in substance and in phraseology. Other bits of conventional dialogue may be found in the meeting of hero and porter2; in the council of king and nobles at time of danger, when the hero breaks in with an offer of assistance; and in some of the romantic situations. They are by no means exceptional; rather they are the rule. We are dealing here not with individual but communal property. Even

1. Cf. under Setting, p. 323.
when we find no parallels in other romances we find the author repeating himself. Thus when the request is made that Horn be permitted to knight his companions Ailmar simply says,

"Do nu ȝat ȝi wille is" (v. 518).

Likewise Thurston, when Horn asks for aid for Rymenhild’s rescue, replies,

"Horn, haue nu ȝi wille" (v. 1000).

The presence of a large amount of dialogue doubtless gave opportunity for the display of the dramatic art of good minstrels. In Horn the tendency of the speeches to be at least several lines in length would suit lyrical expression. This might also account for the small amount of indirect discourse. The few examples which occur and the occasional brevity of speech, as in "Do nu ȝat ȝi wille is," reveal capacity for compression when it seems desirable. In the other romances the emotional vigor becomes less and the conventionalization more. But the general importance of dialogue for narrative remains the same. In Guy it has some importance for revealing states of mind; likewise in Havelok. As we should expect, soliloquy is more important in these romances. In Bevis, with its emphasis on action, soliloquy is somewhat less important, but as we have seen, dialogue is used constantly for presenting situations and incidents. It is to be noted, however, that subordinate situations and incidents are as clearly and fully outlined as the important ones.

Motivation.

Lack of motivation almost necessarily characterizes the medieval metrical romance. Spoken or chanted narrative does not demand any rigid observance of the law of cause and effect. Moreover, the method by which romances were constructed—by the massing of material already stereotyped—meant that inconsistencies might easily be overlooked and neglected. Thus in *King Horn* at the very beginning doubt remains as to why Horn and his companions (dangerous as they will be in case they live) are entrusted to the uncertain sea for execution rather than immediately and certainly disposed of, as were the other inhabitants of Suddenne who refused to give up their faith. Later the enmity of Fikenhild toward Horn becomes manifest, although no reason for it is suggested. Nor does one know whether his abduction of Rymenhild is due to hate for Horn or to passion for the girl. No adequate motive is assigned for Horn's long absence in Ireland and his apparently heedless neglect of the determined period of his exile. Somewhat less important are the author's failure to prepare for the opportune landing of the Saracens on the coast of Westernesse, the uncertainty as to what Felbrus hoped to accomplish by the substitution of Aulf for Horn, and the uncertainty as to whether it was through Fikenhild that Rymenhild's marriage to Modi was arranged. But in spite of any such questions

2. In *Horn et Rime* there is some kind of motivation in most of these cases. Horn and his companions are entrusted to the sea because the Saracen lord pitied them because of their beauty and is unwilling to have them slain in his presence. The enmity of Fikenhild seems to arise from Horn's refusal to give him a
in the mind of the reader, the motivation of Horn on the whole is remarkably good, for the reason that it is a closely knit story.

In Havelok there are inconsistencies somewhat similar to those of Horn. One is surprised at the escape of Havelok when the knife is at his throat because Godard, who had so pitilessly slain the two sisters,

Sum-del pigan him forto rewe (v. 497).

The author seems to recognize the difficulty when he adds the remark:

Pere was miracle fair and god (v. 500).

Surprise, to say the least, is felt when Havelok, returning to Grimsby, finds his foster brothers and sisters, whom he had left in poverty, rolling in wealth.

"We hauen, louerd, alle gode, 
Hors and neth, and ship on flode, 
Gold, and siluer, and michel auhte, 
Pat Grim ure fader us bitawhte" (vv. 1221 ff.).

Of course one is told how long Havelok had been away from Grimsby, but it does not seem to have been very long—perhaps only a few months. Certain other inconsistencies are discussed elsewhere. But it must be confessed that the balance inclines very much in the favor of the author, who has clearly presented

---

horse which he had already presented to Haderne. The sojourn in Ireland is placed on a somewhat different basis by the fact that Horn does not remain for the entire period of seven years. The landing of the Saracens had already occurred, and is known to Horn before he starts on his ride for adventure. And Fikenhild is clearly instrumental in bringing about the proposed marriage of Rimel and Moioun. In Horn Childe some of these incidents do not appear, but motivation is incomplete.

1. See under Character, p.
the motives of the characters and the basis of their actions—much more clearly than in any one of the other three romances here studied.

In Bevis one meets with a number of surprises. For instance, why did Bevis refuse to make himself known to Terri when they accidentally met, and even go so far as to tell a false story of his own death? (vv. 1299 ff.)¹. There was no purpose, apparently, and as we have it, Bevis's conduct is a piece of brutality pure and simple. We can only suppose that the author wished to introduced the stock motive of supposed death. Or, again, why did Bevis go to Mombraunt when Josian was queen there (vv. 2041 ff.), although it seems he had given up all expectation of winning Josian after the Patriarch told him he must marry only a maid? Perhaps it was for the horse Arondel. But there is not a word to make this clear. One may wonder, too, that Bevis, when he arrived at a place where he might learn of old friends and enemies, failed to inquire. Yet after Bevis's arrival at Cologne, we are told that "on a day" he asked about his stepfather; whereupon he hears also about his uncle Saber (vv. 2911 ff.)². One wonders, too, why Josian did not use the magic ring to protect herself from Miles instead of resorting to a more violent method (vv. 3179 ff.); how any pursuing party could overtake Saber when riding the matchless Arondel (vv. 4079 ff.); what castle Bevis's mother could have been leaning over when she saw her husband

¹The English versions do not agree as to Bevis's reply to Terri, but the Auch. MS. agrees with the A.N. version. In the continental French versions the pilgrim whom Bevis meets is not Terri, but a stranger (Boje, p. 31).

²This is not in the A. N. Probably confusion arose by the introduction of the dragon fight into the story.
perish, since she was a member of an attacking party (vv. 3459 ff.)

One can only say that the author has failed to properly connect his material. He was not ready, when Bevis arrived at Cologne, to introduce the English material, so he presents the hero as asking about his stepfather merely to give information to the reader and to start a new incident. The magic ring incident had been disposed of, and apparently the author never thought of the necessity likewise of disposing of the magic ring. When Saber is trying to escape with Arondel the author desires to introduce a battle, but he does not think it necessary to introduce an accident which would cause delay. It is a customary occurrence for ladies to watch battles from a castle-wall, and so he makes the mother of Bevis to overlook the battlefield, although a moment of reflection would have made it seem very improbable that there was a castle near at hand in which she might have been. One is left wondering why, after Bevis states that it is his intention to present the boar's head to Josian (v. 832), he actually presents it to the king (vv. 903 f.). And, most of all, one is surprised to find Josian presenting to Bevis a steed which he had apparently been riding for some time previously.

In Guy the difficulties are considerably less. Attention

---


2. Some of these inconsistencies are not in M and related MSS. Arondel is not mentioned until the time of his presentation to Josian. Likewise the line which states that Bevis intended to present the boar's head to Josian is peculiar to A and N. The M group is usually more consistent; cf., for instance, the discussion of Bevis's cruelty, p. 279. In the continental French version Bevis is given charge of Arondel, the King's steed,
has been called to the fact that in the Auchinleck MS. the King of Nubia has to suffer death twice.\footnote{\textit{Guy}, vv. 3506 ff., 3525 ff.} This is of course a scribal error. There are a few others very similar to it. Thus when we find the Emperor telling Guy news which we knew Guy already had and which we supposed the Emperor had not,

Anon he seyd to Gij his speche (A v. 3393),

we at once know that the Caius MS. has the correct reading:

To him seide Guy this speche (C v. 3393).

However, no serious errors were noted with which the author is to be credited. The forgetfulness of Guy which almost leads him into a marriage with the Emperor's daughter may be set beside the apparent forgetfulness of Horn as something inexplicable—but it is a stock motive and need not be examined too closely. We are somewhat surprised, too, that Guy seems to care so little about returning to Bellice when well started on his adventures, allowing himself to be diverted from his intention to return more than once (vv. 1795 ff., 4499 ff.). This is closely connected with the forgetfulness motive; and is simply due to the fact that the romancer wished to get all his incidents in and was not too careful to make them harmonize with the larger structure of the narrative.

The weakness of the motivation of the romances must be interpreted in the light of the conditions peculiar to them. It is difficult to emphasize too much that the structure of the
longer narratives—especially if so long as Guy, or even as Bevis—must have meant comparatively little to an audience of which few members were likely to hear the whole of the romance. Would such an audience match the various parts of the narrative? About all that could be expected by the audience would be general consistency of characterization, and consistency of the broad outlines of the story. The author would probably not rise far above the audience's demand. As we have seen, his material—half-shaped already—was under his hand; and he was not in the habit of taking the pains to reshape it with care; or to polish it for his particular purpose. Indeed, it might be said he seldom had a particular purpose, but rather only the general purpose of connecting interesting incidents with his hero. But not all romances are conglomerates. Havelok is not. Horn is not. And we should be thankful for the bits of well-constructed, well-motivated narrative which we find in them.

1. Cf. Bédier, Les Légendes Épiques, vol. I, pp. 305 ff., on inconsistencies of the chansons de geste. The following sentences indicate his position: "Il faut admettre qu'elles ne choquaient pas au XIIe et au XIIIe siècles comme elles choquent aujourd'hui. Comment cela est-il possible? Les exigences de la logique étaient-elles au XIIe siècle moindres qu'aujourd'hui? Elles étaient les mêmes, et la preuve en est que les romans courtis du XIIe siècle, Eneas, Erec ou Lancelot sont aussi rigoureusement composés que l'Adolphe de Benoîn Constant ou le Dominique de Fromentin; si l'on y remarque quelques inadvertences, elles sont du même ordre que dans un roman moderne. Les véritables incohérences sont propres aux chansons de geste. C'est que les chansons de geste, primitivement tout au moins, n'ont pas été faites pour être lues, mais pour être chantées ou déclamées en public, par des jongleurs forains devant des auditoires de fortune. C'est par fragments qu'on les débitait souvent" (p. 307). The entire discussion is very interesting.
D. Summary.

A few paragraphs are necessary to gather together the more important of the scattered observations which have been made upon the plot in our metrical romances.

In Horn we found brevity and unity. The plot consists of two distinguishable elements, and one of these elements is constructed by duplication of incident; but altogether the story is consistent and interesting. The formal introduction belongs to the type where the speaking minstrel is most evident. For the introduction in the larger sense we have the commonplace account of the glory and death of the father of the hero, and a few words as to the hero's companions and education. There is duplication of climax-scene. Both are characterized by detail, by elaboration, by imagination, and by emotional appeal. Moreover the climax is the logical outcome of the narrative which has preceded; but at the same time it is not entirely foreseen. The ending is conventional: the usual marriages, the blessing, the slightly religious touch. The incidents of King Horn seem less conventional than the average; they are usually briefly told, and elaboration is made by clustering of incidents rather than by description of setting or states of mind. The author shows visualizing power, a certain realism, and power to present dramatic situation with emotional content. This romance presents also a clear and interesting case of duplication of incident; and is almost unique in the skill with which this is done. The motives are stock material, for the most part. The connections of incidents are usually concrete,
but sometimes are absent, as in the simple ballad. Certain transitions, however, show freshness and skill. They are almost always rapid, yet clear. The use of the conventional time or place as the starting point of an incident may be noted in King Horn. The author, too, has shown a command of clever devices for elaboration of plot and heightening of interest. The movement is rapid and comparatively smooth. Dialogue is handled skillfully and is important for character as well as plot. The soliloquies are happy, but not very noteworthy. As a whole, the motivation of the romance is satisfactory, although a number of apparent inconsistencies would in less popular narrative require explanation. However, as a whole, King Horn, with all its simplicity and artlessness, comes nearer supplying the demands of structure, nearer satisfying our demands for beauty of incident as well as of atmosphere and for a vitally interesting story than any of the romances of the group here studied, and, with perhaps two or three exceptions, than any Middle English romance.

Havelok the Dane in some respects connects itself with King Horn. Less brief and less unified, it has a distinct story which is easily followed. It, too, has duplication of incident, with loose but sufficient union. The introduction is of the same type as the one in Horn; and the familiarity of its tone is an added indication that the romance was intended for the lowly. The story of the father of the hero belongs to the general type of exile-and-return story. The romance has less structure; the objective points are less important; and there
is a correspondingly greater importance of episodes or subordinate incidents. The ending of *Havelok* is of the most common type, but here is the feature of a brief summary of the story, which did not appear in *Horn*. The incidents of *Havelok* distinguish themselves from those of other romances by the fact that they frequently deal with humble life. They are not quite so briefly told as those of *Horn*, are not quite so picturesque, although there are realistic touches here and there. But there is little evidence of power to bring dramatic situations into the narrative. Some of the motives are of the stock romantic material; but here again the romance stands somewhat apart from the others. There is less need for clever transitions than in *Horn*. There is one quite long formal transition. There is little attempt to complicate the plot by means of romantic devices. However, the use of the supernatural light to identify the royal prince should not be forgotten. The dialogue is rather crude. However, the soliloquies are of some importance for the revelation of motive and character. The motivation of such a story does not make a great demand upon the author, and it is fairly well done. While the story is less interesting than *King Horn*, is less vivid, less exciting, less emotional, it makes a strong appeal by the realistic presentation of life familiar to the folk of provincial England—such as the scene in the cottage of Grim when the fisherman and his wife bend over the unhappy boy from whose mouth issues the strange light, or the one when Grim, regretfully sending the boy away to make his own way in the world, clothes him with an old sail, or the one when Havelok engages for the first time in the sport of putting the stone
with the result that the others remark that they have remained too long.

With Bevis we have arrived at a romance which stands far apart from Horn and Havelok. There is no longer any real unity; we have a great collection of separate adventures. The formal introduction shows the minstrel addressing his audience. The general introduction, likewise, belongs to the same type as those of Horn and Havelok: the hero's father is slain, and the son, the true heir, is banished. In such a romance there could not be a genuine climax; there are only a number of objective points. However, we noticed a certain climactic effect in the three incidents which compose the story of vengeance. The ending of the romance shows the religious element in the reference to the house of religion founded for the dead. The incidents are taken from the storehouse of romance, and are thoroughly conventional. They are treated very briefly, and are never elaborated. The practice is usually to present action only. There is no evidence of visualizing power, or of observation of real life. There is no duplication of incident, although some of the general situations are repeated. The transitions are thoroughly stereotyped; are usually merely convenient starting points for new incidents. They are always brief. There is a lack of complication of plot, since there is not sufficient unity of story to invite the use of complicating details. What complicating elements are introduced are crudely managed. There is a considerable amount of dialogue, which is useful for plot as well as for character. It is more interesting and sometimes more vivid than is often the case with romances. There is also much convention. There are
few soliloquies; and the only ones of importance are placed in
the mouth of the heroine. The motivation is not satisfactory,
and little attempt has been made to avoid inconsistency. The
appeal of Bevis seems to lie in the astonishing succession of
striking adventures, each told quickly, each full of action, each
of tried popularity.

**Guy** is yet farther removed from the simple type of narrat-
tive which we found in Horn. It is nearer the true romance. Here
again the enveloping plot is of minor importance; and within it
are contained a number of disconnected stories. The formal
introduction now seems, for the larger part, to come from the
author. The general introduction describes in detail the educa-
tion of hero and heroine, and adds many details which seem foreign
to the character of the other romances here studied. There is
no real climax—only objective points. However, some of the
included stories show a certain amount of elaboration, and some-
thing of the development, climax, and fall of a real story. The
ending has more than ever the religious element in the supernat-
ural odor arising from the body of the dead hero. The incidents
are almost all familiar and commonplace. There is a certain
amount of elaboration—particularly in the direction of added
detail and repetition, and also in the direction of character
and mental states. There is scarcely a trace of original and
concrete imagination. Pretty clearly one sees evidence of a
tendency on the part of the author to use the same material more
than once. The transitions do not vary considerably from those
of Bevis. There is not much use of conventional devices for
complication of plot. The movement is not so rapid as that of
Bevis. The dialogue is exceedingly important; likewise the soliloquies; but these are chiefly a matter of character and mental states. The motivation is much better than that of Bevis. The romance shows strong signs of sophistication; it has romantic motives; one feels here the influence of the romances made primarily to read.
CHAPTER III

Character.

Character stands in a peculiar relation to the other narrative elements of the metrical romance. It is, of course, never emphasized. Yet when romance after romance has been read, and a host of incidents have been forgotten, characteristic personalities stand out, which, modern English literature proves, have been of abiding interest. The more distinguished names--Gawain, Kay, Lancelot, Tristram, Isoult--were the fruit of a romance-activity which stands in strong contrast with the more popular art of Horn and Havelok. Yet the heroes of this seemingly more primitive group typify, I think, ideals of permanent interest. Appearing, as they do, in situations and relations thoroughly stereotyped, they are perhaps more interesting for that reason, have more of the medieval flavor, gain in representative quality. If they are deficient in subtlety, they are not deficient in a crude strength of character and will perennially attractive.

For these reasons it will be seen that characterization, to an unusual degree, perhaps, is bound up with plot on the one hand, and with the broad background of medieval life on the other, and it will be necessary, in discussing it, to trespass somewhat upon these other fields.
The Group 1

The well-known tendency of the *dramatis personae* of medieval romance to fall into certain conventional relations is well illustrated by a group of characters which appears, with certain variations, in *Horn*, in *Bevis*, and in *Guy*. This group seems to belong naturally to stories of the exile-and-return type, but it is not restricted to them, as it appears very clearly in the *Guy*. Nor is it essential to the exile-and-return type, since it does not appear, unless faintly, in *Havelok*. The following table shows the correspondence:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Character</th>
<th><em>Horn</em></th>
<th><em>Bevis</em></th>
<th><em>Guy</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The father</td>
<td>Murri</td>
<td>Guy</td>
<td>(Syward)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The hero</td>
<td>Horn</td>
<td>Bovis</td>
<td>Guy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The old friend</td>
<td>Avelbrus</td>
<td>Saber</td>
<td>Horhaud</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The young friend</td>
<td>Aulf</td>
<td>Terri</td>
<td>Tirri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The foreign king</td>
<td>Aylmar</td>
<td>Ermin</td>
<td>Ernis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The foreign king's daughter</td>
<td>Rymenhild</td>
<td>Josian</td>
<td>Clarice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The defamer</td>
<td>Fikenhild</td>
<td>Two knights</td>
<td>Morgadour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The second lady</td>
<td>Reynild</td>
<td>King of Aum-beforce's daughter</td>
<td>(Oisel)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These lists might be paralleled, in part, with another from *Havelok*, as well as from romances far removed from this group, but as the relations of the *dramatis personae* are not so clearly the same in these other cases, I have not thought it worth while to insist on the parallel. However, the possibility of making the

---

1. This section is perhaps as closely connected with plot as with character, and will view from another angle certain facts which have already been noted.
table which here appears is not without significance, and a very fundamental resemblance will, I think, appear on closer investigation.

In respect to the hero's father the resemblance is incomplete. *Guy of Warwick* is not a story of the exile-and-return type, and Guy's father plays a comparatively unimportant part in the story. In Horn and in Bevis, the resemblance is clear. In both cases the father is of very high rank, Murri being King of Suddenne and Guy the Earl of South Hampton, of noble character, and approved prowess. Both are slain at the opening of the story, being overpowered by numbers, and their possessions, in both cases, are seized by those who have slain them—in the one case by the Saracens, and in the other by Devoun, Emperor of Almaine. Both leave young heirs who are helpless to protect their dominions. Birkabein, father of Havelok, and King of Denmark, occupies an analogous position. He dies leaving his young heir in the power of a traitor, who seizes the kingdom. This situation is repeated in the same poem in the death of Aelwold, leaving his daughter and the Kingdom of England in the care of a traitor. Thus in each of the three romances of the exile-and-return type there is a king who dies, leaving a young son in the hands of enemies.

The children of these three fathers too early dead experience a similar fortune. Horn, sent out in a boat to find a

1. Jordan, pp. 41 f., gives a list of *dramatis personae* in French exile stories which is not quite the same as the one above. However, it is interesting as showing that practically this same group of characters appears in a number of *chansons de geste*.

2. Not counting Aelwold, the father of a heroine.
grave in the sea, luckily reaches the coast of Westernesse. Bevis, narrowly escaping death at the hands of his own mother, is sold into slavery and borne across the seas to Armenia. Havelok, after heart-breaking sufferings, likewise crosses the sea in a boat to find a home at Grimsby. Guy had no such experiences in his earlier days, but gained manhood at his own home. It is his later career which brings him into the company of Horn and Bevis, as will appear in the discussion of the other typical characters.

Curiously enough, Horn, Bevis, and Guy each have for teacher a kind, brave man who remains a steadfast friend. Ajelbrus taught Horn the craft of wood and river, as well as harping, carving, and serving the cup (vv. 229 ff.). Later he assists in the love affair of Horn and Rymenhild; and finally he is rewarded with a kingdom (vv. 1507 ff.). However, the resemblance between Guy and Bevis, here as elsewhere, is much stronger. Saber is the "meister" of Bevis. After keeping Bevis concealed as long as he can, he is obliged to see him banished, but later sends his son to seek the lad; and he himself accompanies Bevis in some of his adventures. Almost the same thing happens in the case of Herhaud.

Gij a forster fader hadde,
4atte him lerd & him radde
Of wodes & riuer & oper game;
Herhaud of Ardern was his name (vv. 169 ff.).

Herhaud, too, is a fellow-soldier of his friend, and himself seeks Guy when lost. Herhaud is also tutor to Guy's son Reinbrun, seeks him through many lands when he is stolen away, and in general stands in the same relation to the son that he did to the father. Like Saber, Herhaud has a warlike son who plays a part in the
Romance. Like him, too, he is warned in dreams when the hero is in need of assistance. Grim has certain points of contact with these characters, particularly with Saber. Both Grim and Saber are instructed to slay their charges, and both represent that they have done so. Thus in each of these romances there is an old friend who guards the early years of the hero; and in three cases he is the tutor; and in the fourth case he stands in the general relation of guide and instructor, teaching, however, not knightly accomplishments, but the meaner duties of labor.

In three of the romances there is a young friend who is the faithful helper of his superior. In the fourth romance, Havelok, there is only the semblance of an equivalent in the three sons of Grim. But Afulf, in Horn, Terri, in Bevis, and Tirri in Guy, occupy corresponding positions. In two of the cases the friend is presented with a bride and territory by the hero. Thus Reynild is given to Afulf, and the daughter of the King of Aumbeforce agrees to become the wife of Terri when she learns that Bevis is beyond her reach. Guy also plays an important, though not similar, part in securing Oisel for Tirri. In the case of Terri and Bevis and of Tirri and Guy the friendship lasts through many battles in which the comrades fight side by side.

The term foreign king refers in Horn and in Bevis to the father of the heroine. The Emperor of Constantinople, in Guy, occupies a somewhat analogous position. Bevis and Horn are welcomed at the courts of the foreign kings. Each is granted honors, but later is the victim of a false friend (two in Bevis), who

misrepresents the relations existing between the hero and the king's daughter. This, so far, is true of Guy at Constantinople also. But the Emperor of Constantinople is not misled, while both the King of Westernesse and the King of Armenia trust the informers, and as a consequence the hero in one case is banished (Bevis, vv. 1229 ff.) and in the other is sent on a mission which is intended to result in his death (Guy, vv. 3727 ff.). Thus in the portions of the stories connected respectively with the foreign kings the three romances show strikingly similar characteristics.

The term defamer indicates sufficiently well the characteristic quality common to one of the conventional enemies of the hero in these romances. Thus Fikenhild tells Ailmar that Horn

"1p in bure
Vnder couerture
By Rymenhild 2i dopter" (vv. 695 ff.).

Similarly, the false knights whom Bevis had preserved in battle said of Bevis to the Emperor that

"he dou-ter he ha now for-lain" (v. 1209).

In Guy it is the steward Morgadour who accuses the hero of having dishonored the Emperor's daughter.

"Into his bour wi strenghe he zede
& bi 1 douhter his wille he dede" (vv. 3227 f.).

In these cases the resemblance between the villains lies chiefly in the identity of the charges which they make.

It is to be noted that the hero in each case has a love affair with the king's daughter. Clarice, it is true, does not become the wife of Guy; but the account of her relations with him
has the characteristics of a romantic story, leading up almost to the marriage altar, when the hero recollects Felice in time. In the other cases the love results in marriage, and both Rymenhild and Josian take the initiative in the wooing. In both cases separation occurs as the result of the treachery of defamers, but the later fortunes of the heroines show wide divergence. However, so far as the general relations go, we again find strong similarity.

The last character of the group, the one I have called the second lady, is of slighter importance, and its presence here may be questioned. I mean by this Reynild in Horn and the King of Aumbeorce's daughter in Bevis, each of whom loves the hero, but later becomes the wife of the hero's friend. Oisel, whose name I have placed in brackets in the table, can scarcely be included, except that it is through Guy's victories over Tirri's enemies that she becomes the wife of the hero's friend.

In this connection it is not without interest to make comparison with one other romance somewhat removed from the group under attention. In Generides there is a situation similar in many respects to the one around which some of the characters we have been studying are grouped. Generides, under the care of an older man, Natanell, has gone to the court of the Sultan of Persia. He is well received, and Clarionas, the Sultan's daughter, loves him, and makes advances through her maid, with the result

1. In King Horn it is not actually stated that Reynild loves Horn, though marriage is suggested to Horn by her father. However, in Horn et Rimal and Horn Childe, the love of Lentours and Acula (corresponding to Reynild) is a prominent feature.
that the princess and the hero meet often secretly. However, a knight "called ser Malichias" dislikes Generides, spies upon the lovers ¹ and tells the Sultan "to hir dishonour all that he cowde say." Generides, consequently, is thrown in prison. In other words, here is a group of characters, the members of which stand in almost precisely the same relation to one another as is the case with the group in Horn, in Bevis, and in Guy.

Of course I do not mean to say that there is the slightest direct connection between Generides and the earlier group. Neither do I think there is sufficient ground for thinking that any one of the romances of the earlier group is derived directly or indirectly from any other ². But it does seem to me that there was a common narrative fund which every one felt at liberty to draw upon, which indeed was common property since no one knew precisely whence it came. If we wish to know where it existed, it is not too vague to say that it existed in the stories already familiar, in the conventional incidents and characters which were found there, and which were being more and more conventionalized as they appeared again and again. Perhaps some elements were conventionalized out of existence; but one must think, from the state of the romantic literature which has been preserved, that the number of such was small.

It has been noted, no doubt, in discussing this group of

---

2. Nevertheless, cf. Hoyt, P.M.L.A., 1902, pp. 237 ff., who thinks the resemblance between Bevis and Horn sufficient to indicate that the former is derived from the latter.
dramatis personae that nothing has actually been said about character. Rather has it not been plot, and are not the dramatis personae (so viewed) merely the pegs to which the plot is tied? This question must be answered with a modified affirmative.

What has been indicated thus far is that when a situation is used for a second or hundredth time in a romance, there is a strong tendency to place the new pegs about where the old ones were. Character, in the stricter sense, is then indicated only by the general relations of dramatis personae to the plot. This of course does not sum up character; and a study of the characters as such will, I believe, add some confirming evidence of the existence of this recurring group.

Stock dramatis personae.

Before going on to discuss characters as distinguished from dramatis personae, it is worth pointing out that there are in the romances, as indeed in fiction of a later date, stock figures who are of little or no value as characters, but who do mean something to the plot. Thus in Horn and in Bevis there is the conventional porter. The only function which he serves is to delay the action by supplying occasion for an altercation at the entrance to the castle. Thus in Horn:

He com to þe gateward,  
þat him answerede hard.  
Horn bad undo softe,  
Mani tyme and ofte.  
Me miȝte he awynne  
þat he come þerinne.  
Horn gan to þe þate tunne  
And þat wiket vnspurne.  
þe boye hit scholde abugge;
Horn freu him ouer the brigge,
at his ribbes him to brake;
And surfe com in atte gate" (vv. 1057 ff.).

In Bevis the account is still more detailed. The hero, seven years of age, addresses the porter:

"Porter!" a sede, "let me in rekel!
A lite qing ich aue to speke
Wip the emperor."

"Go hom, truant," je porter sede,
"scherewe hourse sone, y fe rede,
Fro fe gate:
Boute row go hennes also swipfe,
Hit schel fe rewe fele site,
Row come pe ate! (vv. 394 ff.).

The boy is ready with his answer:

"For gode," que Beues, "nachtles,
An hourse sone for sof ich wès,
Wel ich it wot.
Y nam no truant, be godes grace!"
Wip dat a lefte vp is mace
Anon fot hot.

Beues wip oute fe gate stod
And smot fe porter on fe hod,
Dat he gan falle;
His heued he gan al to cleue
And for a went wip dat leue
In to fe halle (vv. 409 ff.).

The porter, it seems, nearly always stands at the gate to refuse admittance and to suffer for his refusal.

1. In HCh the porter's shoulder bone was broken (HCh vv. 958 ff.).

2. In John de Reeue (Percy Folio II), vv. 719 ff., is a similar dispute between hero and porter, with the result that John "hitt the porter upon the crowne,
With that stroke he fell downe,
Forsooth as I you tell."

In Sir Cleges the hero gains admission to the king by agreeing to give the porter one third of the gift he shall receive, and asks that the gift be twelve strokes, of which the porter gets his share in due time (vv. 247 ff.). Cf. Kölbing's note to Bevis A l. 419. Also see Hall's note to Horn vv. 1067,8; Tristrem, vv. 619 ff.; Gautier, Chivalry, pp.369 ff.; Boje, pp. 71 f. The porter sometimes plays a different part; cf. Gawain and the Grene Knyght, vv. 91 ff. and Floris and Blancheflor, vv. 749 ff.
The suggestion that the minstrel is taking revenge for rebuffs suffered by his class is perhaps not altogether without foundation. The aim seems to be to make the porter a ridiculous figure. The humorous intention is sometimes marked. Perhaps the porter in Macbeth is distantly akin to the porter of romance.

More intimately connected with the plot, and more important for the revelation of character in others, is the maid of the heroine. The fact that she does not appear in Horn, Havelok, or Bevis is a slight indication of the fact that they are not true romances of chivalry. Rymenhild may have sent a maid for Aelbrus to summon him for the first interview, but, if so, there is no indication of the fact. When Josian desires to communicate with Bevis, she sends a man. The absence of the romantic element in Havelok of course almost precludes the possibility of such a character appearing. In Guy there is a hint of this personage. Guy has just made a declaration to Felice, and swoons from the violence of his emotions. Felice bids a maid to lift him, which she does weeping.

"Bi god of heuen," sche seyd,
& ich wer as feir a mayd,
& as riche kingês douhter were
As ani in ðis warld here,
& he of mi loue vnder-nome were
As he is of þine in strong manere;
& he wald me so o louz ʒerne,
Me þenke y no myzt it him noþt werne" (vv. 609 ff.)

1. As in Sir Cleges; cf.: note preceding.
2. Cf. Generides, vv. 4630 ff., where the maid takes the part of knight against the reproaches of her mistress.
But Felice rebukes her for commiserating Guy. One need only
glance at the French Horn et Rimel to note a marked contrast
with the maid of Guy. Here Herselote is the natural messenger
of Rimel; she tells in the bower of what is going on in the hall;
she receives her mistress's confidences, comforts her when dis-
tressed, praises the lover, and is on hand to assist in emergen-
cies. This is the conventional part of the maid. It is to be
found repeatedly. Lunete plays the part in Chrétien's Ivasin.
In William of Palerne, Alexandrine is not only a confidante; she
plays almost the part of a fairy in bringing William and Melior
together, having power to cause dreams. Iseult's maid is perhaps
the most distinguished of all, performing more than one important
service for her mistress. Playing a part of far greater import-
ance than the porter, she has a more developed personality. She
is faithful as a matter of course, loyal to lover as well as to
mistress, resourceful, self-sacrificing, brave. But she belongs
essentially to the chivalrous romance; she has no place in the
very different type of romance to which the exile-and-return group
belongs.

If the maid is a kind of good fairy in the romances, the
steward is almost always a malevolent agency. Unlike the maid,
he is well represented in our group. It is he frequently who
envies the hero because of the favor bestowed upon him by the
king, or because of his superior knightly qualities.

1. From these instances it is evident that the maid plays in
medieval romantic literature the same part which maid or attendant
so often plays in the later dramatic literature.
A steward was with King Ermin
\( \text{hat hadde tizt to sle hat swin;} \)
To Beues a bar gret envie
For \( \text{hat he hadde fe meistrie} \) (Bevis, vv. 837 ff.).

The steward of the King of England also hates the hero. Bevis visits the king:

And alle fe barouns, \( \text{hat fer were,} \)
On Beues made glade chere,
Boute fe steward of fe halle
He was fe worste frend of alle (vv. 4303 ff.).

He later tries to slay Bevis and, like the steward of Armenia, pays for his treachery with his life. In Guy there are several stewards. The most typical, Morgadour, did his best to discredit Guy with the Emperor.

Traytouer he was, and full of envy (v. 2962).

He too lost his life at the hands of the object of his envy. The steward of Duke Otous (vv. 4753 ff.) is slain by Guy while trying to lead away the wounded Tirri. After the death of Otous, his kinsman Berard becomes the Emperor's steward (v. 6497); persecutes Guy's friend Tirri; shows his lack of honor by wearing two coats of mail in his combat with Guy (st.208) and by trying to rid himself of his dangerous antagonist by casting him in the sea with the bed on which he is sleeping; but finally he, too, succumbs to the hero's valor (sts. 208 ff.). Again, the steward of Earl Florentin attacks Guy while a guest in his master's castle, and his head is cleaved with an axe (vv. 6399 ff.). Thus in the romances of Bevis and Guy alone the appearance again and again of a treacherous, envious steward is striking. He appears very frequently elsewhere. The chief villain of Generides, Amalok,
is the steward of Auferius, King of India. He adds adultery with the Queen to treason against his lord. In Sir Cleges the steward commits the same offense and suffers the same punishment as did the porter. The envious character of "Kay the seneschal", while not quite so offensive as that of most stewards, is perhaps due to the association of his position. The typical steward, however, is treacherous as well as envious; not a coward (for cowards are rare in medieval romance), yet with the manners, the sneakingness, so often associated with cowardice.

1. Referred to above, p. 251.

2. For Kay at his worst, cf. the French romance Ider, in which he is guilty of the use of poison. See, too, G. Paris, in Hist. Litt., XXXI, p. 160, a propos of Kay in the Escanor of Girard d'Amiens: "Il parait avoir pris surtout le type du seneschal dans les romans de Chrétien où, comme ici, sa mauvaise langue est le plus grave de ses défauts."


4. Of course there are good stewards now and then, as is the case with Guy's father. However, the association of steward with self-seeking and an ugly disposition seems widespread. In this connection it is interesting to compare No. LXII of the Fables of Marie de France,"De Aquila et Accipitre et Columbis":

Li aigles est des oisels reis,
pur ceo qu'il est pruz e curteis,
e li esturs sis seneschals,
și n'est il mie tuz leials.
Li aigles sist par un grant chalt
sur la branche d'un chesne en'halt.
Li esturs sist plus bas de lui,
Guarda a val, si ot ennui
des coluns, ki desuz voloënt,
jus a la terre, entre els jucënt.
"Vus juez," fet il, "desuz moi;
veez ci l'aigle, nostre rei
S'il se fust de ci remuëz
Other lay figures are palmer, merchant, beggar. The palmer or beggar is frequently the hero disguised. But he may be merely the bearer of news. A palmer tells Guy of the war between the Emperor of Almaine and Duke Segyn (vv. 1803 ff.). It is from a palmer that Horn hears of the wedding preparations when he lands in Westernesse with his Irish force (vv. 1027 ff.). No doubt the palmer was a natural bearer of news. Thus the false news which Bevis, disguised as a palmer, tells Yvor is instantly accepted and acted upon. Bevis asks a palmer where to find King Yvor and his Queen, Josian, when he approaches Mombraunt (vv. 2049 ff.)¹. Beggar are necessary to show the hospitality of lord or lady and to furnish an opportunity for the disguised hero to slip in with the crowd. The number thirteen, so frequently mentioned, springs from the custom of inviting thirteen beggars to appear at wedding and other feasts. Thus Guy is one of thirteen beggars fed by Felice when he finally returns home after his long pilgrimage (sts. 278 ff.). In Ponthus and Sidone the mother of Ponthus is discovered by him among the thirteen beggars at the feast celebrating the regaining of his kingdom (pp. 119 f.). In Horn et Rime it is a beggar instead of a palmer whom Horn meets on his return to his beloved. Merchants, 

¹. For cases in French medieval narrative where there is an exchange of clothing with a palmer, cf. Boje, p. 70.
too, may be messengers. Guy learns from Greek merchants of the war between the Emperor of Constantinople and the Sultan (vv. 2801 ff.). Merchants are also used for taking away children. Bevis is sold to merchants (vv. 505 ff.), and Reinbrun is stolen by merchants who pass through the country (Guy, C. vv. 8680 ff.)¹. A large number of subordinate *dramatis personae* of various sorts is naturally characteristic of the *roman d'aventure*, in which the social life is more complicated than in the *chanson de geste*.²

**Typical Characters and Medieval Life.**

Looking again at this list of *dramatis personae*, not this time as elements of the story, but as figures typical of medieval life, one sees at least four stand out as significant: (1) the king; (2) the knight; (3) the lady; (4) the vassal. These are not entirely exclusive of each other, as the knight may be king, and the vassal is of course usually a knight. However, the characteristic king is usually the father of the hero, or some lord under whom the hero takes service; the hero is nearly always an ideal knight; the hero's beloved is almost invariably represented as an ideal lady; and it is usually in a friend of the hero that faithful service to one's lord is best exemplified.

---

¹. Cf. Prologue to "Man of Law's Tale" (*Cant. Tales*, B, vv. 127 ff.), where merchants are apostrophized:
   
   Ye seken lord and see for yowre wynnynges;
   As wise folk ye knowen al thestaat
   Of regnes; ye been fadres of tidynges
   And tales, bothe of pees and of debaat.
   I were right now of tales desolaunt,
   Nere that a marchant—goon is many a yeere—
   Me taughte a tale, which that ye shal heere.

². Two giants, brothers, whom the hero meets at different times and slays, seem a convention; cf. in Bevis Grander and his brother (vv. 1721 ff.; 1859 ff.); Eglamore, vv. 300 ff., 513 ff.;
So, for practical purposes, there is little or no confusion, and some light may be thrown, too, on the phase or phases of society for which the romances were produced, and also perhaps on the society in which they have enacted their subsequent history.

From the tremendous host of kings in medieval literature, two great figures stand out—Charlemagne and Arthur—the one, at his best, the king of the *chanson de geste*, and the other, at his best, the king of chivalric romance; the one leading his hosts against the enemies of his country and fighting at their head; the other, for most part at least, loosely controlling a band of knights errant, incessantly engaged in adventures for the sake of honor or for the sake of the "fair lady". In the so-called romance of Germanic origin, there is of course nothing to approach the splendor of either of these figures. But in these romances the kings are certainly more nearly related to Charlemagne than to Arthur. They are kings of national war. Murri, father of Horn, was such a man, although the primitive conditions which seem to underlie the story would make him little more than a tribal chief. With two knights he awaits the onset of the Saracens, and loses his life defending his territories. Nothing is said in the way of characterization, save that he was "gode king" (v. 33), as were also Ailmar of Westernesse (v. 219) and Furston of Ireland (v. 782)\(^1\). Aelfwold, the father of Goldborough, was

---

\(^1\) This suggests the "se waes god cyning" of Beowulf, although the term "good" is perhaps even more conventional in the romances.
also a bold warrior.

He was þe beste kniht at mede
þat euere mihte riden on stede,
Or wepne wagge, or folc vt lede;
Of kniht ne hauede he neuere drede,
þat he ne sprong forth so sparke of glede,
And lete him knawe of his hand-dede (vv. 87 ff.).

In Horn Childe King Haþeolf is a bold warrior, fighting against
the enemies of his country—the Danes and the Irish—a prodigious
fighter. In Guy Aþelstan is represented as leading the English
forces in their struggle with the Danes. In other words, the
kings in this group of romances are fighters, usually defending
their country against invaders. The king who, like Arthur and
Alexander, conquers the world, belongs to a different type of
romance.

Of exceptional interest is the account of King Aþelwold in
Havelok, because there is nothing precisely comparable to it
elsewhere in the romances. Here is a king who is not merely a
leader of warriors, but a lawgiver and a strong executive. We
certainly have here a picture of an ideal king as seen by the
eyes of the middle and lower classes, by those who desired, not
glory, but comfort and peace. The very enumeration of the classes
who loved him is suggestive.

It was a king bi are dawes,
þat in his time were gode lawes
He dede maken, an ful wel holden;
Hym louede yung, him louede holde,
Erl and barun, dreng and kayn,
Knict, bordeman, and swain,
Wydues, maydnes, prestes and clerkes,
And al for his gode werknes (vv. 27 ff.).

He loved God and holy church; he hated robbers and hung out-
laws. Chapman might go throughout England with their wares fear-
lessly.

Anne was Engelond at ayse (v. 59).

Moreover he was friendly to the fatherless (vv. 75 ff.) and

Hauede he neure so god brede,
Ne on his bord non so god shrede,
Pat he ne wolde forwith fede
Pour fpat on fote yede" (vv. 98 ff.).

Here surely, if anywhere, we get the ideal king of merchant
and laborer1.

The heroes are more likely to be individualized than other
characters. Nevertheless the greater part of their traits are
thoroughly typical. The ideal knight of this group is one of
great personal beauty and strength, who hates infidels, loves
battle, is a faithful lover of one woman. He is often rude,
sometimes cruel, always pure. He stands opposed to the chival-

1. W.W. Comfort, "The Character Types in the Old French Chansons
de Geste", P.M.L.A., XXI, pp. 279 ff., distinguishes three treat-
ments of the king in the chanson de geste. He is represented
(1) as grandiose and epic, less only than God; (2) as weak, old,
sometimes cowardly; (3) as a mere political necessity--this last
under the influence of the Breton cycle where the king is only
"a fixed point of support, on which the leading characters in the
story are made to lean". The noble king of Havelok seems
English. However, the weakness of the kings in Horn, Bevis, and
Guy seems to relate them to class (2). The Emperor of Almaine
(in Guy) is clearly of this class; we have already noted his
capture while on the chase as an incident connecting him with
stories of Charlemagne.

It may be worth while to note here that both Bevis and Guy
had fathers who were good stewards. They furnish the nearest
parallels to the account of Aftelwold. Bevis's father Guy "kept
well Englond in his days".

He set peas and stabelud the laws,
Pat no man was no hardye,
To do another velanye (M. MS. vv. 43 ff.; passage
missing from one set of Bevis MSS.).

In Guy, Syward was a steward of similar virtues.
Pei a man bar an hundred pounde,
Opon him, of gold y-grounde.
rous, gentle, often immoral knight typified in Lancelot.

In these romances little is said, for the most part, regarding the personal appearance of the *dramatis personae*. This is not so likely to be the case with the hero. Thus of Horn the author says at the beginning:

Fairest ne miste none beo born
Ne no rein vpon birine,
Ne sumne vpon bischine:
Fairest his non he was.
He was bryght so glas,
He was whité so flur,
Rose red was his colur.
In none kinge riche
Nas non his iliche (vv. 10 ff.)\(^1\).

His physical beauty continues to receive attention. He is the "faireste" (v. 173); Ailmar admires his "fairnesse" (v. 213); Afulf says "he is fairer by one rib than an enj man fat libbe" (vv. 315 ff.); when he visits Rymenhild the bower is lighted "of his feire siȝte" (v. 385)\(^2\); Beril has never seen so fair a knight come to Ireland (v. 778); King Purston speaks of his "fairhede" (v. 796); and at the close the author says:

Her ende fat tale of horn,
Fat fair was & noȝt vnorn (vv. 1525 f.).

\[\begin{align*}
\text{Her nas man in al dislonde} \\
\text{Fat durst him do schame no schonde} \\
\text{Fat bireft him wor} & \text{ of a slo,} \\
\text{So gode pais} & \text{her was } \phi o \text{ (vv. 137 ff.).}
\end{align*}\]

If one thinks of Chrétien's romances, one recognizes how incongruous similar lines would appear if found in them. The same is equally true of nearly all of the super-refined chivalric romances. Compare, too, the Alexander romances. Generosity, not justice, is the chief virtue of the chivalric king.

\(^1\) For numerous parallels, see Hall's notes. Medieval romancers were inclined to insist, as here, that their heroes were the most beautiful in the world; cf. *William of Palerne*, vv. 4437 f.

\(^2\) The shining face is common, but more frequently belongs to women. In Chrétien's *Cligès* the hero and Fenice are so beautiful
Havelok likewise is very beautiful (v. 2133) and well-shaped (v. 1647). Bevis was a "feire child", and King Ermis said of him:

"Be Mahoun, dat sit an hi,  
A fairer child neuer i ne si,  
Neither a lengthe ne on brade,  
No hon, so faire limes hadde!" (vv. 535 ff.).

In Guy, too, not much is said of the personal appearance of the hero, not nearly so much as in Horn. There is nothing especially distinctive about what traces of description one finds, as they are the commonplaces.

The hero's strength and valor are of great prominence in all romances, but there are certain variations of greater interest than are found in descriptions of personal appearance. In Horn the hero's strength is frequently the object of direct praise from the dramatis personae. The Admirad says to him, "pu art gret & strong" (v. 93), and adds that if he lived, in time he "scholde slen us alle" (v. 100); Ailmar says the strength of his hand shall become famous (vv. 215 ff.). The author of Havelok also takes great delight in his hero's physical prowess, and speaks directly to the audience:

For pane he weren alle samen  
At Lincolne, at pe gamen,  
And pe erles men weren alle fore,  
Was Hauelok bi pe shuldren more  
Pan pe meste pat per kan:  
In armes him noman ne nam  
Pat he doune sone ne caste;  
Hauelok stod ouer hem als a mast.  
Als he was heie, so he was strong,  
He was bope stark and long;

that they make the palace shine (vv. 2755 ff.).
In Engelond was non hise per
Of strenge fat euere kam him nere (vv. 979 ff.).

Again and again this brute strength is brought out. Havelok eats more than Grim and his five children (vv. 793 f.); at Lincoln he upsets "sixtene laddes gode" and carries "wel a cart lode" of fish; Ubbe admires his strength, and thinks he should be a knight (v. 1650); he slays three men with one blow of a "dore-tre" (v. 1806); he puts the stone at the first throw so far that all competitors depart (vv. 1052 ff.). There is on the part of the author a certain simplicity of delight in the overwhelming strength of his hero that is almost unique, and diverges from Horn. In the rapid succession of incidents in Bevis there is little time for commenting on the hero. However, there is a word at the beginning of his fighting career.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Be fat he was fiftene yer olde,} \\
\text{Knist ne swain far nas so bolde,} \\
\text{Fat him dorste azenes ride} \\
\text{Ne wip wreple him abide (vv. 531 ff.).}
\end{align*}
\]

In Guy we have gone so far toward the romance of chivalry that the emphasis, so far as direct description goes, is on something else than strength, which is left to be inferred from many a deed of valor.¹

On the other hand, the mental character and accomplishments of the hero are emphasized in Guy, especially on the knightly side, and in Havelok on the homely side, while in Bevis and in Horn

¹. It is worth noticing here that something is said in regard to Guy's dress apart from karmour; when he first calls on Felice he was arrayed in a "silken kirtell" that was so "well setting" that there was no need to amend it (vv. 211 ff.).
They are neglected. Indeed, scarcely anything is said of Horn's mental or moral characteristics. He was "of wit pe beste" (v. 174), "wel kene" (v. 91). His teachableness and good nature are indicated.

\[\begin{align*}
\text{Horn in his herte la\text{\vspace{0.5em}}te} \\
\text{Al \text{\vspace{0.5em}}at he him ta\text{\vspace{0.5em}}te.} \\
\text{In \text{\vspace{0.5em}}e curt \& ute} \\
& \text{elles al abute} \\
\text{Luuede men horn child (vv. 243 ff.).}
\end{align*}\]

In Havelok again there is the unique quality which was noted in the account of the physical characteristics, but even more marked. The author probably had in mind that Havelok would make a good king like A\text{\vspace{0.5em}}elwold, but he had made him seem more like a strong, rather slow-witted, but happy peasant. His life at Winchester, which is described most fully, makes him seem to be a powerful, mild-tempered boy.

\[\begin{align*}
\text{Of alle men was he mest meke,} \\
\text{Lauhwinde ay, and blippe of speke;} \\
\text{Euere he was glad and blippe,} \\
\text{His sorwe he coupe ful wel mi\text{\vspace{0.5em}}pe.} \\
\text{It ne was non so litel knaue, ...} \\
\text{For to leyken, ne forto playe,} \\
\text{\text{\vspace{0.5em}}at he ne wolde with him playe:} \\
\text{\text{\vspace{0.5em}}e children that yeden in pe weie} \\
\text{Of him he deden al her wille,} \\
\text{And with him leykedan here fille (vv. 945 ff.).}
\end{align*}\]

Not only is his kindness shown by his playing with the children; it is shown in the care he later takes of his foster brothers and sisters and in the mercy offered to Godrich. He is as observant of law as A\text{\vspace{0.5em}}elwold. Only after due trial may Godard and Godrich be executed.

Thus does the author intend for us to see him—strong, cheerful, merciful, fearless, law-abiding. It may be questioned
whether he intended that he should appear lacking in initiative, but such he surely was. It is Goldborough who arouses in him the ambition, or at least stirs it to the acting point, to regain his kingdom. It is Ubbe who collects the friends of Havelok in Denmark. Havelok would have been a happy peasant. He is a true member of the lowly classes—strong in body in mind, wholehearted, loving peace better than war, but fearless when called upon to fight, rather than a fiery king, full of aggressive ambition, or a luxurious, generous monarch such as the nobility admired.

But Guy is a hero of chivalry—not of the Lancelot type, nor of the Galahad type, although approaching the latter in the religious devotion of his later years. He stands somewhere between Horn and Bevis, on the one hand, and Lancelot and Galahad, on the other. He has the knightly education which Horn had. He knows the craft

Of wode, of Ryuer, of all game (C. v. 171).

He is generous. He gives rich gifts to parsons and poor knights,

And to other oft jeue he wolde
Palfrey or stede, siluer and golde,
Euery man after his good dede
Of Guy vnderfangeth his mede (C. vv. 181 ff.).

Moreover he became ill from loving too well, and fought long years merely for the sake of a woman. Guy stands in fairly strong contrast with the heroes of King Horn, of Bevis, and of Havelok, and approaches the heroes of another type of romance.¹

¹. Cf. W. W. Comfort, P.M.L.A., XXI, pp. 307 ff. on the Hero in the chansons de geste. See p. 325 for distinction between hero of earlier and later chansons de geste: "If any differen-
Somewhat less need be said about the heroine in these romances. The part played by Goldemborough is so small that she may be dismissed almost with a word. She is seen as a great lady, resenting her forced marriage to one apparently far beneath her in rank, and later urging her husband to regain his crown—a figure of strength, described as "swipe fayr" (v. 111), the "faireste woman on liue" (v. 281), as bright (v. 2131), as chaste (v. 288), and

Of alle fewes was she wis that gode weren, and of pris (vv. 282 f.).

The absence of a love element prevents the development of her character. She is queen rather than woman.

The character of Rymenhild, on the other hand, is that of a woman, individual in some respects, yet typical of a class, of

**tiation** were attempted between the heroes of the earlier and those of the later poems, it would consist in this: the heroes of the later poems are less passionate, less fiery, less implacable; they feel the softening influence of woman and of many of the principles of Christian charity which the later Middle Age included in the terms chevalerie and courtoisie." A comparison in these respects of Bevis with Guy is suggestive. But even in the latest chansons de geste, according to Comfort, there remains in the hero "an unmistakable trace of his genealogical connection with the paladins of Charlemagne. In spite of his love adventures, and the lorn maidens, and the kind fairies, his mind harks back to his old-time foe, the Saracens, and to his duty to God. If we are not mistaken, this undercurrent of sturdy faith, this seriousness of purpose, was just the quality which was sought by a portion of the public as contrasted to the more imaginative, fantastic, and vain heroes of the Breton cycle."
which Josian, in Bevis of Hamtoun, is a member. Her individuality may be said to lie largely in the very prominence of certain typical characteristics. Her appearance is passed almost without comment. She is "Rymenhild þe briȝte" (vv. 382, 390) or "Rymenhild þe zonge" (v. 566). It is decidedly by her actions that she is interesting. It is a primitive, undisciplined nature. In love and in hate she is uncontrolled. She loved Horn "at neȝ heo gan wexe wild" (v. 252). There is no reserve in her wooing. When Æulf enters her bower she at once takes him in her arms. When she finds she has been deceived by Æpelbrus she is as unrestrained in her rage.

"Schame mote þu fonge
& on hize rode anhonge...
Wip muchel schame mote þu deie" (vv. 327 ff.).

When Horn refuses to plight his troth to Rymenhild, she swoons. She is all in tears over her dream of the net (v. 654). When she thinks Horn lost forever, she is ready to slay herself.

Heo feol on hir bedde,
þer heo knif hudde,
To sle wiȝ king loȝe
& hure selue boȝe,
In þat vlke niȝte,
If horn come ne miȝte,
To herte knif heo sette,
Ac horn anone hire kepte (vv. 1195 ff.).

She is as faithful as passionate. When she knows that she is about to be forced into a hateful marriage, she sends a messenger to seek Horn (vv. 933 ff.). She watches the sea for her absent lover (vv. 975 ff.). Even to the last, she has Æulf on the tower with his eyes searching the great expanse of water. Altogether she is a willful, passionate creature of uncontrolled impulses,
yet constant in love. The author does not think her worthy of
direct description. Yet he has created a striking figure.  

As stated, Josian belongs to the same type. The account
of her beauty is made somewhat more striking by the use of a
figure of speech.

So fair she was & brigt of mod,
Ase snow opon þe rede blōc (vv. 521 f.).

She was also "hende" and "wel itauȝt", although she knew nothing
of Christian law (vv. 525 f.). Like Rymenhild she loves passion-
ately, and it is her persistence and willingness to change her
faith which win her lover. Perhaps it is the same persistent
courage which gives her the strength to slay her undesired hus-
band. A strong woman, equal to emergencies, faithful to lover
and husband—less attractive than Rymenhild, but by no means
unworthy—is the heroine of Bevis of Hamtoun.

1. As an instructive contrast, an examination of this same char-
acter elsewhere is valuable. In HCh and HR she has lost her
primitive traits. She is not wholly passionate; she devises
plans. In HCh

þe miri maiden hir bithouȝt
In what maner þat sche mouȝt
Trewe love for to ginne (vv. 364 ff.).

She wins Horn's favor first by costly gifts. Even more striking
is the equanimity with which she learns of the deceit which the
steward has practised in substituting Ha erof for Horn (vv.
349 ff.). The heroine of HR is also a highly developed char-
acter, eager, it is true, but not merely impulsive.

2. Apparently of the same time, but interesting as tending away
from it, is Melior, the heroine of William of Palerne. After
falling in love with William, who apparently is somewhat mildly
attached to her, she analyzes her feelings in a fashion which
Josian and Rymenhild would never dream of. Yet she is the really
active one of the pair; is the pursuer rather than the pursued
indeed, acting, however, through her maid Alexandrine. William's
love, it seems, becomes really passionate as the result of a
dream which Alexandrine, by some magic power, introduces into
But in Felice we have a lady of the romance of chivalry. Fifteen lines at the outset and more elsewhere are devoted to her beauty. After the author has remarked:

_Hyr grete beaute y can not dyscryue (v. 60),_

he goes on to say, attempting to belie his own words:

_With a faire visage louely in sighte,_
_Hir skymme was white of brighte colour;_
_Bodied wele and of grete valour;_
_Large tresses, and wele bee-comyng,_
_Brows bent and nose well setting._
_The mouthe so wele sittynge ywis,_
_To kisse it ofte it was grete blys;_
_With grey eyen and nekke white,_
_Hir to see it was grete delite.

Her accomplishments were equally remarkable.

_All the vii artis she kouthe well,_
_Noon better that euere man herde tell._
_His maisters were thider come_
_Out of Tholouse all and some;_
_White and hoore all they were,_
_Bisy they were that mayden to lere;_
_And they hir lerned of astronomye,_
_Of Ars-meotrik, and of geometrye_
_Of Sophistrye she was also witty,_
_Of Rethoric, and of other clergye;_
_Lerned she was in musyke;_
_Of clergie was his noon like (C. vv. 61 ff.)_

his mind while he sleeps. Even then he merely stops eating, makes no effort to win the beloved; who comes to him while he is asleep in a garden. This figure is so much sophisticated as to seem considerably removed from Rymenbildung and Josian. Yet she is not much farther removed from the type than is Rimel of Horn et Rimel.

2. In the Celtic romances elaborate descriptions of dress as well as personal beauty are found. Cf. Libeaus Descomus, vv. 868 ff.; Launfal, vv. 926 ff. The brightness of the woman's face is characteristic. In Richard Coer de Lion a lady is "bryght as the sunne thorugh the glas" (v. 76). Cf. Legend of Good Women. Prologue B, vv. 232 f., Le Bone Florence of Rome, vv. 184 ff.; also the ballad "Lamkin" (Child No. 93), in which the head of a murdered woman, hung in the kitchen, makes the hall shine. On the personal appearance of women of chansons de geste, cf. Gautier, Chivalry, pp. 306 ff.

2. Josian was educated in
In love she is as reserved and cruel as Rymenhild is unrestrained and generous, promising her lover favor repeatedly only to withdraw it, until he has become the most famous knight in the world. After that her conduct shows a marked change. She seems a very mild and dutiful wife. When Guy becomes a pilgrim, she feeds the poor and prays for her absent lord, so that there is no better woman in the world (St. 279). As with Guy there is in her traces of the ascetic ideal. The best woman, as well as the best man, is one withdrawn from the common life.

Here again we find the Guy far removed from the other romances. Josian and Rymenhild are passionate, primitive creatures, willing to do all and suffer all for their lovers. Felice is a woman more cultivated, more self-contained, more selfish, more of a "lady", and her later piety and devotion but emphasize the fact that she is a member of a class. Yet she in turn is far removed from the Guinevere type, and farther still from the heroine of so many of the later French romances—a married woman who devotes her life to intrigues with a lover¹.

"fysik and sirgerie" and "knew erbes mani and falld", by the use of one of which she was able to make herself undesirable. This accomplishment is hardly comparable to the learning of Felice. The manner of its introduction is also significant, as it is told merely to account for Josian's ability to pick out the right herb. Knowledge of herbs, however, was not an unusual accomplishment and seems connected with skill in leechcraft. Acula, in HCh (vv. 790 ff.), Guermain in Tristram (vv. 1200 ff.) are instances. This accomplishment is in no sense characteristic of the romance of chivalry, but is rather a popular element which survives in the romances.

While the type which I have called the *vassal* shows less variety, it is extremely interesting. In *Aulf*, in Grim, in Saber, in Herhaud, as well as in other characters, one sees the relation of lord and follower at its best. *Aulf*, appearing only for an instant now and then in the story of *Horn*, leaves a vivid impression. There is never a hint of self-seeking. Not for an instant will he take advantage of *Aelbrus*’s deception, when Rymenhild, thinking him Horn, declares her love. During Horn’s long absence, he remains in Westernesse to guard the mistress for her lover. Herhaud, Grim, and Saber, likewise, are always willing to sacrifice all for their respective lords. Here is a glimpse of the more beautiful side of chivalry. However, it needs no emphasis here, as it is one of the most evident of the attractive features common to the whole range of medieval romance.

**Minor characters.**

There are in the romances, as in all narrative, figures which flash for an instant before us, then pass away; perhaps to return, and appear and disappear as before; perhaps to be seen no more. Some of these we have already noted as stock figures. Others do not seem to be of that character. Whatever they are, it is interesting to know who they are, what value they have for the stories in which they are introduced, and what

---

interest the author has succeeded in attaching to them. Most are beyond the pale of characterization. Some of them are merely speaking persons, who appear unexpectedly, tell their stories, and disappear. In Horn there are two of these—Aulf's father, who greets Horn and his companions when they land in Denmark, and tells them what has been going on in their absence (vv. 1301 ff.), and Arnoldin, who appears to tell Horn where Rymenhild has been taken by Fikenhild (vv. 1443 ff.). Again, there may be characters who are never named. Of this class are nine of the twelve companions of Horn—ornamental personages, who are dropped without remark. Other characters may be talked about and never actually get on the stage. Reynild is the sole member of this class in Horn. Others still may merely add a touch of pathos, as does Horn's mother. Lastly may be mentioned Harild and Berild who, after performing one or two insignificant acts, perish almost without rippling the surface of the narrative.

Thus Horn, considering the brevity of the story, has a fairly full background of dramatis personae. If the English version represents the earlier form of the story, it is worth while to notice, in passing, how they appear in such a developed, sophisticated romance as Horn et Rimel. A number of the parts so insignificant have become really important. Lemburc, who plays the part of Reynild, and her brothers, Egfer and Guffer, appear repeatedly in a series of highly elaborated incidents. The account of Horn's father, told in epic fashion by the son in the body of the romance, is fairly full. A considerable addition to the stock of characters is made to fill up the enlarged stage. Herselote
has already been mentioned. A nurse is introduced by means of whom Rimel discovers that she is making love to another than Horn. Rimel has attendants, unnamed, ready to amuse the one who might disturb a tête-à-tête. In the Irish part of the story, Gudburc and Sudburc, mother and sister of Lenburc, and Eglaf, the chessplayer and athlete, are additions. Even the Irish kings are named. The divergence is extremely interesting, for this elaborate treatment of so many minor dramatis personae marks as well as anything else the long distance which must have been traveled by one or both of these romances from the source common to both.

In Horn the lesser characters seem to spring, for the most part, from a natural development of the plot. This, I think, is less true of Havelok, Guy, and Bevis. There may be, however, other sources of interest. In Havelok the two sisters of the hero, after playing an important part in the realistic scene in Grim's "cleue", is never referred to again. Her brutality to the unknown boy, like that of Grim, leaves a blot on the family, if not on the story.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Vp she stirte, and nouht ne sat,} \\
\text{And caste \( \Phi \)e kngue so hard adoune,} \\
\text{\( \Phi \)at he crakede \( \Phi \)er his croune} \\
\text{Ageyn a gret ston, \( \Phi \)er it lay? (vv. 566 ff.).}
\end{align*}
\]

Grim's children and Ubbe play conventional parts. Bernard Brun is an innkeeper with a name. His chief part is a repetition of

---

1. However, the companions of Horn are not named. In HCh, where less is made of minor characters than in HR, the companions are named and carefully disposed of. The twelve companions may be faintly reminiscent of the twelve peers of Charlemagne, who, in turn, go back to the twelve apostles; cf. Gautier, Les Épopées (1st ed.), I, pp. 173 ff.
the story of the fight between Havelok and the sixty lads, which might very well have been dispensed with. The cook, Bertram, is merely a friendly helper. The Earl of Chester, and the Earl of Lincoln furnish historical background, and the former, in addition, becomes husband of Gunild, Grim's daughter. It is interesting to note that every one of these persons has a name, from Leue, the wife of Grim, to Bernard Brun, the innkeeper, and Bertram, the cook. Most of the minor characters, too, it will be noted, are of humble rank, and are an item in the popular character of the story. The prominence given to the family of Grim is probably due to the fact that it is essentially a romance in celebration of a particular place. If the minor dramatis personae of Havelok are less intimately connected with plot than those of Horn, they show greater realism and broader range.

In Bevis and Guy the greater part of the minor characters are principals in the incidents in which they appear. In these romances the story is a succession of adventures, each with its little plot. In Bevis these are usually brief and very slightly elaborated, three or four dramatis personae being sufficient for each incident. Many persons appear only to be slain by the hero. Most of these are too colorless to be characterized. In general, it may be said that there is an absence of pathetic and ornamental figures. There is a fairly large number—including two messengers, two porters, two stewards, a Palmer, and a giant—bearing no names. There is a concentration upon incidents. One figure, Ascopard, stands out somewhat, being intended, it seems,
to produce a comic effect. As comedy is rather rare in the romances, it seems worth while to enter into this feature in somewhat greater detail. Perhaps the chief comic scene in the romance is the one of the baptism of Ascopard.

For Ascopard was mad a koue;  
Whan āæ beschop him scholde in schous,  
A lep anon vpon āæ bonche  
And seide: "Prest, wiltow me drenche?  
āæ deuil āæe āæ helle pine,  
Icham to þech þe to be cristine!" (vv. 2591 ff.)

The incident of the dragon fight has also its comic opportunity. Bevis and Ascopard arrive in the neighborhood of the dragon, when

Ascopard swore, be sein Ion  
A fote ne dorst he forther gon.  
Beues answerde and seide āæ:  
"Ascopard, whi seistow so?  
Whi schelt þow afered be  
Of þing þat þow mizt nout þen?"  
A swor, alse he moste þen  
He molde him neiþer hire ne sen;  
"Icham weri, ich mot haue reste;  
Go now forþ and do þe beste!" (vv. 2747 ff.).

The "Icham weri, ich mot haue reste", coming from the mouth of the giant who carried the horse Arondel in his arm (v. 2564), in itself no doubt amusing to the medieval audience, must surely have raised a laugh. Thus, slightly as the character of Ascopard is developed on the humorous side, and dangerous as he proved to

---

1. A comic baptismal scene is not peculiar to Bevis. Kölbing, in his note to this passage, calls attention to the baptism of Balan in Ferumbras. A huge vat has been prepared.

    Wan þay bygume ys clðys ofdo, Myche strif made þe  
    Amerel tho,  
    And tornde & wende faste,  
    Ac Roland and Olyuer hulde hym so, That whether he  
    wolde ofþer no,  
    Ys clðys of thay caste (vv. 5715 ff.).

Balan still refuses to be baptized, and smashes the vessel, but finally yields to the entreaties of his son Ferumbras. Another comic baptismal scene occurs in the chanson de geste Aliscans. It takes eleven men to get Rainouart into the font (vv. 7885 ff.).
be, here is a clear case of the introduction of a character with
whom amusing incidents may naturally be connected.1

Much of what was said about Bevis at the beginning of the
preceding paragraph applies to Guy as well. The latter romance
is much longer than the former; the incidents are told with great-
er detail; but there is the same succession of lifeless figures,
among whom the hero displays his prowess. There is, moreover,
no comic person to be placed beside Ascopard. The reference to
the various ladies surrounding Felice is another element asso-
ciating it with the courtly type of romance. There is, too, the
account of the gathering of people at Warwick at Pentecost--

There were Erles, barons, and knyghtes,
   And many a man of grete myghtes;
Ladies and maydens of grete renown,
The grettest desired ther to bee bown (vv. 189 ff.)--

which furnishes a courtly setting. With the twelve companions
of Horn may be compared the twenty sons of good barons who were
dubbed knights with Guy. The list of dramatis personae is very
great. Limiting the number to those introduced as individuals,
there are almost a hundred, of whom about seventy are named2. In

1. Comic characters like Ascopard are found in a highly developed
section entitled "Bourgeois and Vilain", pp. 279 ff.

2. That the scribes did not keep the dramatis personae clearly
in mind is evidenced by curious blunders. Thus Clarice, the
daughter of the Emperor of Constantinople, is called "Blaunche-
flour" in both the Auchinleck and Caius MSS. at one point
(v. 4497). Again, in a battle with the Saracens, the King of
Nubia, after being struck down by Guy, immediately afterward is
summoned by the Sultan to attack the Christians (v. 3506 ff.).
This is only in the Auchinleck MS.; in the Caius MS. it is the
King of Armenia whom the Sultan sends against the Christians,
which no doubt is the correct reading.
Bevis there are forty, of whom about twenty-five are named. In Havelok there are twenty-two, all named; in Horn twenty, of whom fifteen are named.

Dialogue and character.

Dialogue plays an interesting and important part in displaying character, and the manner of the dialogue goes far toward being the manner of the romance. In Horn, for instance, there is great bluntness of speech. There is no hesitation about using rough words. Rymenhild, as well as Ailmar, can descend to "fule ȝeof". In the love scenes dialogue is of most importance. At the first meeting of Horn and Rymenhild (vv. 381 ff.) there are shown the impetuosity of the girl, the reserve of the hero. Her speech is unrestrained, his almost measured. At the same time the dialogue is intended to present the situation or to advance the narrative, rather than to portray character. Fikenhild speaks only once in the entire romance, and then when he betrays Horn. Afelbrus, at the time of the Rymenhild intrigue, moves about almost silently. Only the conversation of important personages appears in the narrative with detail.

In Havelok dialogue means much less for character, inasmuch as dramatic situation is not emphasized. Conversation is never sustained, and falls into long speeches. Perhaps the interview of Havelok and Godrich at Lincoln is the best in its display of the cautious, mild nature of the hero. Godrich sends for Havelok, and says,

"Mayster, wiltu wif?"
"Nay," quoth Havelok, "bi my lif!
Hwat sholde ich with wiue do?"
I ne may hire fede, ne clope, ne sho.
Hwider sholde ich wimman bringe?
I ne haue none kinnes/pinge.
I ne haue hus, y ne haue cote,
I ne haue stikke, y ne haue sprote,
I ne haue neuer bred ne sowel,
Ne cloth, but of an old whit couel.
This clopes, pat ich onne haue,
Aren pe kokes, and ich his knaue." (1135 ff.).

In Bevis again there is gain in dialogue, due, however, to
the fact that the author has a sense of situation. It is a mat-
ter of plot primarily, but it leaves its impress on character.
The vivid impression left by the mother of Bevis is largely due
to dialogue in which the messengers (vv. 73 ff., 283 ff.), or
Saber and Bevis, furnish the responses. The same is true of
Bevis himself. His interview with the porter (vv. 394 ff.), with
the Emperor (vv. 421 ff.), with his mother are examples. The
last deserves quotation as exhibiting very clearly the characters
of three persons. After Bevis had bearded the Emperor, his
mother pursued him to the house of Saber.

"Saber," he seide, "whar is Bef,
pat wike treitout, pat fulc pef?"
"Dame," a seide, "ich dede him of dawe
Be pe red and be pe sawe;
I is be his clope, how fer sixt."
Pe leuedi seide: "Saber, how lixt!
Boule how me to him take,
How schelt abegge for is sake."2
Beues herde his meister prette;
To hire a spak wid hertte grete
And seide: "Lo me her be name
Do me meister for me no schame!
3if how me sext, lo, whar ich amhere!"

This dialogue is valuable for plot, but, with its brevity and
passion, it is valuable for character too. Presenting a less
pleasing side of Bevis's character is the conversation with
Josian at the time of the fight with the lions. Yet no doubt the proud confidence of the hero was pleasing to the medieval auditor. Josian, magically protected, desired to hold one of the lions, but Bevis rejected her offer with scorn.

"Dame, forsooth, y-wys,
I myst yelp of lytel prys,
There y had a lyon quelde,
Ye while a woman a nother helde!
How shalt neuer vmbraide me,
When y ou comest book to my contre:
But y ou let hem go both twoo,
Haue g good day, fro pe y goo!"

Again and again appear the brief touches of dialogue, with something of give and take in them, which tend to make character as well as situation vivid. It is of chief value for plot; there is no subtlety of characterization back of it; yet it makes for clear, strong character outline.

In Guy dialogue is again of considerable value for character. The speeches, it is true, often become long-winded and filled with a certain conventional declamation. Of this kind is the love-declaration of Guy and likewise the haughty response of Felice. However, dialogue is much more sustained here than in Bevis, and feelings are entered into with great detail. Thus the second interview of Guy and Felice fills one hundred lines, and there is real progression, giving a fairly clear view of the characters of the principal actors. That this romance has more leisure for dialogue is illustrated by the account of Guy's second leave-taking. Guy tells his parents that he must fare over the sea. Fathor and mother both endeavor to dissuade him, but he persists. This is general enough, but it has truth and
human feeling back of it. Similar to this and much more moving is the debate of Guy and Felice as to how he shall do penance for his sins, he insisting that he must depart, she insisting that there must be another way. Then comes the little touch of suspicion and jealousy.

"Leman," she seyd, "what is ^i wille? Y-wis, ^i speche wil me spille:
Y not what y may don.
Y wot ^ou hast in sum cunte
Spoused and ^or woman ^an me,
^at ou wilt to hir ^on
& now ^ou wilt from me fare,
Allas, allas, now come ^ mi care:
For sorwe ichil me slon (st. 27).

Here is real feeling and real human nature, too.

Thus we see that dialogue is a very important element in the romance in illustrating character. This is true likewise of soliloquy. From the study thus far, it is not surprising to learn that in Horn and Bevis there is little soliloquy. In Horn indeed there is no real soliloquy at all. Horn's apostrophe to the ship has something noble, high-spirited, even poetical, about it. Likewise the words of Apulf on the tower, talking to the absent Horn, are full of emotional significance. But of real soliloquy, to reveal intention or character, there is none.

In Havelok, on the contrary, soliloquy is employed. An excel-

1. Of course our romances did not realize the full possibilities of dialogue. The alliterative poets show a command of it which is unknown here; cf. the dialogues between God and Jonah in Patience, vv. 412 ff., and the works of the Gawain poet and his school. Dialogue in Middle English probably reaches its highest point in Chaucer's Troilus and Criseyde.

Example is the soliloquy of Havelok at Grimsby.

Thouhte he, "ich am nou no grome;
Ich am wel waxen, and wel may eten
More fan euere Grim may geten.
Ich ete more, bi God on liue,
fan Grim and hise children fiue!
It ne may nouht ben jus longe,
Goddot! y wile with hem gange,
For to leren sum god to gete;
Swinken ich wolde for mi mete.
It is no shame forto swinken;
Pe man fat may wel eten and drinken
far nouht ne haue but on swink long;
To liggen at hom it is ful strong.
God yeilde him, fer i ne may,
fat haueth me fed unto his day!
Gladlike in wile pe paniers bres;
Ich wot, ne shal it me nouht dere,
Jay fer be inne a birfene gret
Al so heui als a net.
Shal ich neuere lengere dwelle,
To-morwen shal ich forth pelle" (vv. 790 ff.).

This gives a good view of the honest, peasant mind of Havelok—a worker, not an idler. It must have been pleasing to the audience of laborers who heard the recital; it certainly could have had little appeal for a courtly audience. Again, we learn from Godrich his cunning and unscrupulous nature. When he hears about Havelok, he thinks

"foru his knaue
Shal ich Engelond al haue,
And mi sone after me;
For so i wile fat it be.
King Helwald me dide swere
Upon al pe messe-gere,
at y shulde his douther yeue
pe hexte man fat mihte liue,
pe beste, pe fairest, pe strangest ok;
at gart he me sweren on pe bok.
Hwere mihte i finden ani so hey
So Hauelok is, or so sley?
Phouh y souhte hefen in-to Ynde,
So fayr, so strong, ne mihte Y finde.
Hauelok is fat ilke knaue
fat shal Goldeborw haue." (vv. 1073 ff.).
There is something very human in the desire of Godrich to keep the letter of his oath. Altogether there are 137 lines in the poem which are of the nature of soliloquy, including the prayer of Havelok at Grimsby (vv. 1359 ff.).

In Bevis there are seven soliloquies, one of which, however, is overheard. They are much shorter than those of Havelok and Guy, and occur entirely in the first half of the romance. Only two or three have any significance for character. One of these is the soliloquy of Bevis's mother, lamenting that she had not taken a young knight for husband who would "cleppen and kissen wip al is mist" (vv. 58 ff.). Then there are five soliloquies spoken by Josian. The first and second are merely confessions of passionate love (vv. 766 ff., 891 ff.). The fourth is valuable chiefly for plot, revealing the fact that Josian has a ring which will protect her from her husband (vv. 1463 ff.). The one soliloquy of Bevis (vv. 1821 ff.) is a somewhat emphatic declaration of hunger. The soliloquies of this romance, therefore, and the same thing may be said of the numerous brief prayers (cf. 385 ff., 1579 ff., 1797 ff., 2839 ff., 3051 ff., etc.), are of very slight importance for character.

Guy again shows the characteristics of the chivalric romance. The soliloquies, if not numerous, are both long and im-

1. Lines 1447 f., which constitute the third of Josian's soliloquies, are insignificant.
Portant; they betray interest in character, emotion, and states of mind. If somewhat conventional, what was said of the dialogue of Guy does not fail to apply here: they have much genuine feeling in them. The significant soliloquies are of course those connected with the emotional crises of the hero's life—first, when he has fallen in love beyond all recovery with one whom he cannot hope to win; and, second, when, after having gained the prize to love, he feels called upon to relinquish it and do penance for his sins. The first soliloquy is fairly typical of the conventional lover. There is the regret that he had the beautiful tormentor, with

hir eyzen gray,
Hir gray eyzen, hir nebbes schene (vv. 281 f.).

He wishes to tell her of his love, but remembers that she is his lord's daughter, and his master would burn him, or smite off his head, or hang him high, or "all to-hewe him with swerdes tene", so at the end he can only say:

"Allas, y wreche! what may y do?
I loue hir that is my foo." (C. vv. 307 f.).

The hero's despair is even greater when the lady has repelled his first advances. The second soliloquy of forty lines (vv. 425-64) is a pitiful one. Even death would be welcome. When from his window he sees the castle which contains his mistress he wishes that the tower were overthrown that he might see his love. These are, of course, the ravings of the conventional lover, but

1. It is scarcely necessary to call attention to Tristram, Ivain, and a host of others, such as those whose stories are told in Malory, as well as the chivalric theory of love; cf. Neilson, Court of Love.
they betray an interest in mental states considerably above that found in *Havelok, Horn, and Bevis*. It is very difficult to know exactly how Horn or Bevis, and sometimes Havelok, feels about a certain situation in the story. There is no such uncertainty here. Perhaps less conventional, and interesting as revealing the warm affection which Guy holds for his companions in arms, is his lament for Urri and Toreld, slain in battle, and for Herhaud, whom he thinks has shared their fate. He recalls that it is because of the love of Felice that they have perished, and remarks somewhat naively:

"Ac for *you* art a wiman,
Y no can nouȝt blame *he* for*than*;
For *he* last no wor? *y* nouȝt
Dat wimen han to *grounde* y-*brouȝt*.
Ac alle *yer* may bi me,
"if *ai* wil, *y*-warned be" (vv. 1561 ff.).

There may be a touch from the author here, but there is something more than this in the recollection that Rohaud and his father had advised him not to go.

"Alas! alas! Rohaut, mi lord,
Dat y no hadde leued *i* word!
Dat anȝ hadde *y* nouȝt *y*-passed *he* se.
Dat yuel nere me *nouȝt* bifalle,
Y no hadde nouȝt *lorh* min felawes alle.
Who so nil nouȝt do bi his faders rede,
Oft-siȝes it falle?him qued" (vv. 1583 ff.).

Most interesting of all, perhaps, is the account of the sudden determination of Guy to expiate his sins. As the setting is a somewhat important element, two stanzas deserve quotation:

To a turet sir Gij is went,
& biheld *dat* firmament,
*dat* thicke *wiȝ* steres stode.
On Iesu omnipotent,
*dat* alle his honour hadde him lent,
He *houȝt* *wiȝ* dreri mode
Hou he hadde euer ben strong werrour,
For Iesu loue, our saueour,
Neuer no dede he gode.
Mani man he hadde slayn wi wrong.
"Allas, allas!" it was his song;
For sorwe he yede ner wode.

"Allas," he seyd, "at y was born;
Bodi & soule icham forlorn.
Of blis icham al bare.
For neuer in al mi liif biforn
For him at bar fe crowne of born
Gode dede dide y nare;
But war & wo ichaue wrouzt
& mani a man to grounde y-brouzt;
AT rewes me ful sare.
To bote min sinnes ichil wende
Barfot to mi liues ende,
To bid mi mete wi care. (sts.21 f.).

From the quotations here made I think it is evident that the
soliloquies alone give a pretty clear and complete impression of
the character of Guy—ardent, faithful, simple, sympathetic,
pious; without the soliloquies the impression made by him would
be weakened not a little¹.

Interest in mental states.

In reading this section much that has already been said
should be kept in mind. The discussion of the individual charac-
ters, of dialogue, and of soliloquy includes much which might be
treated here. But to avoid needless repetition, the attempt will
be made to view the material already familiar from another angle,
only adding something to make the outlook sufficiently broad.
The term "interest in mental states" is employed here loosely.

¹. Soliloquy naturally plays a considerable part in the interest
in states of mind of chivalric romances. For soliloquy of
forlorn lover, cf. Chrétien's Ivain, vv. 1428 ff.; for lament
for one dead see Morte Arthure, vv. 3956 ff.
The manner in which emotion is manifested by the *dramatis personae*, the degree to which the author delights in analyzing mental states, even the extent of the emotional appeal to the auditor, and the way in which it is produced, will come under review.

*King Horn*, which is the most ballad-like of all genuine English romances, has, like the ballad, emotional value apart from any overt interest on the part of the author in character or mental states. The dialogue has frequently this emotional appeal. But of real interest in states of mind as such there is none. In the most dramatic scenes the auditor may be left without a hint of the emotions of the *dramatis personae* (e.g., the banishment of Horn, vv. 705 ff.)\(^2\). In *Havelok* the situation is almost reversed. There is a certain amount of interest in mental states as such, but none of the ballad-like appeal to feelings.

---


2. With *King Horn* should be compared *Horn et Rimel*, the author of which shows decided interest in mental states. As has been stated, Herselote's importance lies in her part as Rimel's confidante. Rodmund can hardly decide on the fate of Horn and his companions. Rimel's impatience and anxiety to obtain an interview with Horn appear when she sends for the seneschal.

   *Ele demaunde souvent dan Herlant quant vendra* (v. 529).

She gazes in her mirror and inquires anxiously as to her appearance (vv. 526 ff.). Herlant's mental distress at Rimel's request to see Horn, his sleeplessness, his arguments with himself, are related in detail (vv. 662 ff.). The scene in Rimel's chamber when Ha erof is trying to convince Rimel that he is not Horn but is unable to do so, presents an interesting psychological situation. This interest in emotional states is prominent throughout the romance, and the length of this redaction is largely due to this characteristic.
by poignant situations such as we found in Horn. The author takes pleasure in reminding the hearers that Godrich is deceived and plotting his own ruin when he plans to marry Goldborough and Havelok.

For he wende, Hauelok wore
Sum cherles sone, and no more;
Me shulde he hauen of Engellond
Onlepi forw in his hond
With hire, Hauelok wer a pral,
Per-foru he wende hauen al
In Engelond, a hire riht was (vv. 1091 ff.).

We are told in some detail how the characters thought over situations. Thus Aafelwold considers at length what best to do to protect his daughter's interests after his death. Havelok considers carefully before returning to Grimsby with his bride.

In fact there is a good deal of downright thinking going on. For Bevis what was said about Horn in large measure applies. The situations in themselves are often moving, but the author does not dwell on the emotions of his characters, nor does he seem to insist on the emotional appeal to the reader. He is in too much of a hurry to get on. However, the dialogue is often characteristic enough to reveal the feelings of the characters. But the reader is left in doubt as to Bevis's feelings for Josian up to the time when she became a Christian. In the love affair it is only the heroine's feelings which are revealed. Scarcely anything is made of the loss of wife and children, when Ascopard carries Josian away and the two boys are left in the care of strangers. Whatever emotional appeal there is springs entirely from the imaginative sympathy of the audience with the situation.
It need scarcely be said that there is far greater interest in emotional states of mind in Guy. So far as the hero's love and repentance are concerned, this was made clear in discussing the soliloquies. One may note, also, the accounts of the reunion of comrades after long separation (vv. 1749 ff.; sts. 142 ff.); the story of Guy's parting from father and mother (vv. 1217 ff.); the story of Oisel and Tirri, the story of Jonas. There is not so much analysis as in many French romances, but there is a decided interest in emotional states, a too-marked insistence on them often, which sets Guy far apart from Horn, Havelok, and Bevis.

When one looks at the actual manner of manifesting emotion in the romances, he is at once in the midst of stock material. However, I believe that differences in the treatment of this stock material will appear. The expression of grief is most important. Wringing of the hands is, of course, a commonplace, and is not limited by age or sex.

\[\text{The children hi brozte to stronge} \]
\[\text{Wringende here honde (Horn, vv. 111 ff.).}\]

When Rymenhild found her messenger drowned,

\[\text{Hire fingres he gan wringe (ibid., v. 980).}\]

Likewise of the child Bevis:

\[\text{7eme a wep, is hondes wrong (Bevis, v. 298).}\]

1. It may be noted that little is said about the heroine's feelings, as contrasted with Horn et Rimel, for instance, where there is a pretty thorough study made of the feelings of Rimel, much more subtle indeed than the study of the lover's feelings in Guy.
Swooning is even more common. Rymenhild falls (presumably in a faint) three times: on Horn's refusal of her love "adun he feol iswoʒe" (v. 428); at Horn's departure for Ireland she "feol to grunde" (v. 740); and again she "feol iswoʒe" when Horn approached Fikenhild's castle singing (v. 1479). Swooning does not occur in Havelok, and in Bevis occurs but twice—curiously enough a man being the victim in each case. Thus Terri, when he was told that Guy was dead,

"fel þer doun and swouʒ,
His her, his cloþes he al to-drouʒ(vv. 1309 f.).

And Bevis, when he finds his two newborn children, but no mother

fel þar doun and swouʒ (v. 3717).

Lovers were of course expected to faint, and Guy is a perfect lover. At the end of a confession of love,

Adoune he felle swoune with that (v. 598).

Later in the story, what with bleeding wounds and sorrow for his slain friends, "adoun he fel aswon". Herhaud swoons from the shock of surprise and joy in meeting Guy (v. 1762), and again he fel "in swowe" upon his bedde"¹ because of anxiety for Guy who was absent on a dangerous mission (v. 3990) Oisel faints over her wounded lover (v. 4896), and again when she sees him in bonds (v. 5903). Both Guy and Felice swoon when he announces his intention to become a pilgrim (st. 32, v. 11). Tirri swoons when he learns that the unknown pilgrim who had slain his enemy Berard is in truth his old comrade Guy (st. 226, v. 3). Lastly,

¹. Caius MS. only, v. 4013.
Felice swoons when she comes to the hermitage where her husband lies dead.

Weeping is too common an occurrence for anything like a full list here. While more often it is the manifestation of a woman's grief, it is not at all regarded as unworthy of heroes. In Horn there are the following examples:

Heo sat on the sunne
With tires al birunne (vv. 653 ff.).

Aelf weop wiþ iþe
& al þat him læþe (vv. 755 ff.).

Horn iherd with his ires
A spak with bidere teres (vv. 887 ff.).

Ne miþte heo adrie
þat heo (Rymenhild) ne weop wiþ iþe (vv. 1035 ff.).

The bride wepeþ sore (v. 1049).

She was "sore wepinge & þerne" when Horn entered the hall where the wedding feast was being prepared; she wept "teres of blode" when imprisoned by Fikenhild (v. 1406). Aþulf, watching for Horn, says "for soreþe nu y wepe" (v. 1104). In Havelok there are only two or three examples. The lords whom Aþelwold summoned when he was at the point of death

Greten, and gouladen, and gouen hem ille (v. 164). Havelok and his sisters, shut up in a castle, wept for hunger and cold (v. 416). Likewise, there is little weeping in Bevis. When the boy hero learned of his father's death, "þerne a wep" (v. 298). Josian weeps right sorely (1111, 1190) and Bevis hears her weeping and crying in the castle of Yvor (v. 2101). Guy, true lover that he is, weeps as well as faints from the violence of his passion (vv. 247, 261, 568). He weeps too over his fallen
comrades (v. 1554). The kissing of men is associated with weeping sometimes, either for joy or for sorrow. Once when Herhaud and his fellows rescue Guy pursued by Saracens,

\[\text{\$e most hepe (\$ep?; wepen for blis; \$ai kisten Gij'alle for blis (vv. 4072 f.).}\]

When Guy and Tirri part,

\[\text{To gider \$ai kisten \$o,}
\quad \text{At her departing \$ai wepen bo (vv. 7111 f.).}\]

And at another parting they

\[\text{kist hem wi\$ e}\$e wepeing (st. 232).}\]

Weeping with both eyes seems intended to imply violent weeping (v. 4455, sts. 138, 226, 294).

The more violent tearing of hair and clothes is also a convention of romances. There are no cases in Horn or in Havelok. In Bevis there is the instance quoted above when Terri swooned and, apparently at the same time,

\[\text{His her, his clothes he al todrou\$ (v. 1310).}\]

In Guy the expression is common. Of Guy in love it is said

\[\text{His clothes he rende, his heer he drough (v. 420).}\]

The Sultan, enraged at his defeat, rends his clothes (Caius V. 3692). Earl Jonas, when Guy meets him, is rending his clothes and tearing his hair (st. 46).

Other ways of expressing grief may be mentioned. "Hise heorte began to childe" (Horn, v. 1148) has numerous parallels.

In Bevis there is

\[\text{\$e childe's herte was wel colde (v. 511)}\]

---

1. See Hall's note to this line, Breul's note to Gowther, v. and Schmirgel, p. xlvii.
and

\[fe\ \text{kinges\ herte\ wex\ wel\ cold\ (v.\ 553).}\]

Less conventional is the account of Josian's woe when she thinks Bevis is leaving her:

\[Hire\ \text{\&}\ \text{tour\ wolde\ on\ hir\ falle\ (v.\ 1140)}^1.\]

Guy complains that, because of love, he cannot sit nor stand, rest nor sleep, eat nor drink (vv. 315 ff.). There is also in Guy an abundance of making "mone" and sighing "sore".

The expression of joy is also unrestrained. Kissing is often a token of joy.

\[\text{Hi\ custe\ hem\ mid\ ywisse}\]
\[\&\ \text{makeden\ muchel\ blisse\ (Horn, vv.\ 1209 f.).}\]

When Terri discovered his father Sabel in the palmer, he took him in his arms

\[\&\ \text{gonne\ cleppen\ and\ to\ kisse}\]
\[\text{And\ made\ meche\ ioie\ \&\\ blisse\ (vv.\ \text{3944 f.).}}\]

Almost the identical lines occur at another place (vv. 3057 f.). In Guy the meeting of old friends is accompanied by kissing.

\[\text{To\ kissen\ Herhaud\ \&\ ai\ hem\ do,}\]
\[\text{Wel\ gret\ ioie\ \&\ ai\ made\ \&\ to\ (vv.\ \text{6655 f.})}^2.\]

Swooning or falling down for joy is restricted to Guy. Herhaud swooning (v. 1762) has been mentioned. When Oisal, forcibly held by Otous, saw Guy unexpectedly,

\[\text{For\ blisse\ sche\ fel\ xmaswon\ adown\ (v.\ 6297).}\]

---

1. Kölbing says no parallels found.
2. See Schmirgel for additional parallels, p. xlv.
She swoons again when she meets Tirri:

For iole scie swoned omong hem (v. 6533).

Unrestrained expression of emotion on the part of dramatis personae is a characteristic pretty general in metrical romance. In the group here studied, Havelok, which is the least romantic, is least emotional, and Guy, which is most romantic, is most emotional. The means of expressing feeling are thoroughly conventional, as the brief review here made clearly shows. Horn, Bevis, and Guy represent types of literature which originally stood far apart. Yet we find them side by side on English soil, drawing from the same stock of literary material. The sentimentialism of Guy brings with it a freer use of the extreme forms of expressing emotion. In Bevis, where sentiment plays a small

1. Sir Cleges (v. 90 of the romance so named) swoons from thinking of his misfortunes. In William of Palerne the Emperor swoons six times "for sorwe & for schame" when William elopes with Melior (v. 2098); in Chaucer’s Legend of Good Women (v. 1342) Dido swoons twenty times (but this is hardly meant to be exact). Charlemagne and his hundred thousand followers faint for grief at the death of Roland (Chanson de Roland, v. 2916); in Renaud de Montauban the four sons of Aymon faint on seeing their paternal castle after an absence (Gautier, 1st ed., II, p. 192).

2. Additional proof of conventionality of these and many other expressions may be obtained by consulting Schmirgel, Zielke, (as cited), as well as the notes to Köbling’s Davis, Zupitza’s Guy of Warwick, Hall’s Horn, etc.

3. Painting, weeping, and tearking of the hair apparently run through medieval narrative literature. In the roman d’aventure the most violent grief is for unsuccessful love, in the chanson de geste for loss of comrades, although exceptions to this rule may be found. Sickness resulting from love is of course a strictly romantic feature. With Guy's illness may be compared the "fever" of Troilus in Troilus and Criseyde, v. 491. Painting
part, we find these stock expressions here and there, almost un-
expectedly. In Horn, which is more truly romantic, the expression
of joy, less unrestrained than in Guy, is more appropriate than in Bevis. But the strong resemblance of these metrical stories is
due, largely at least, to the recasting at the hands of Englishmen
who did not distinguish types; who were familiar with stock romantic
material, the well-known poses, rhyme phrases, etc., and in trans-
lating threw them in where convenient.

To show that this is true I shall give below, side by side
with the English expressions of emotion, the equivalents in the
Old French Boeve de Haumontone, which represents pretty closely
the version which the English translator had before him.

Bevis of Hamtoun

"Erne a wep, is hondes wrong,
For his fader a seide among.
"Allas! allas!" (vv. 298 ff.)

Boeve de Haumontone

Si durement plure le enfant,
à poi ke il chauncele (v. 213).

"Je childes hertte was wel colde,
For frat he was so fer isolde
(vv. 511 ff.).

No exact equivalent; the statement
is made that Boeve
de plurer ne fine;
pur la mort son pere ou dolour
entfine (vv.

"Jhe fel adoun & wep wel sore
(v. 1190).

La pucele le entent si comence
a plorer,
de cler lerm ke plurt fet sa
face muiler (vv. 762 f.).

seems to have been almost a necessary part of romantic courtship.
In the French Amadas & Ydoine (cf. Hist. Litt., XXII, p. 761)
the scornful lady is won by the hero's fainting in her presence.
In the chanson the fainting is more likely to be on the lady's
side. In Enfances Guillaume when Orable, the Saracen maiden, is
hearing from her brother an account of the beauty of Guillaume, w
whom she has never seen, she says she will faint if he says
another word (Gautier, 2nd ed., IV, p. 297).
This list, if extended so as to include every example in the poems, would not present an appearance essentially different. The expressions representing emotion are for the most part stock material, English material indeed, although no doubt French romance assisted in its creation. Perhaps there was a tendency in this respect to confuse types of narrative—that is, in the use of these stock emotional expressions—which brings the English romances nearer together than their sources.

The human relations.

It is perfectly clear, even to him who reads running, that the medieval romances by no means deal in anything like a complete way with the various relations which make up human life. The
name romance perhaps cuts out a certain portion of these; but modern romance has looked upon and cultivated great areas of life which medieval romance never dreamed about. To determine a little more clearly what are the human limits of the metrical romances, particularly the four now under examination, is the purpose of this section.

Love, as in all romance, is, next to war, the greatest interest. This means, of course, the love of the sexes. Other forms of love—of parent and child, of brother and sister, or brother and brother—are almost crowded out. War of course means comradeship, and the love of comrades for each other—sometimes of follower for lord—plays its expected part. But affections other than the love of man and woman, of warrior and warrior are of insignificant interest.

In these four romances there are two types of love represented, the passionate and the chivalrous. The latter is of course the type at once associated with medieval romance—with Lancelot and with Tristram. In greater refinement it is represented by the love stories of Dante and Petrarch. It is the love of Arthur's court and of the court of love, of Chrétien at the beginning and Malory at the end of a literary period. This type of love is represented in Guy, imperfectly perhaps, yet not unattractively. The passionate type is represented in Horn and Bevis.

Curiously enough, in the passionate type it is the woman who wooes. This is a situation appearing in William of Palerne,
in Amis and Amiloun,¹ as well as in Horn and in Bevis. There seems to be a greater popularity in the kind of love here represented. It is attractive by its simplicity, its frankness, its faithfulness, its healthy, unspoiled, primitive human nature. Sometimes there seems to be a certain disregard of the legal bond of marriage. Apparently Rymenhild cared little for it (vv. 531 ff.); we are not sure that Josian did (vv. 1093 ff.). William of Palorne's love for Melior had, at first, no legal sanction. Yet it is the type of faithfulness which we associate with the marriage tie. It is the unmoral attitude of the ballads.

This passionate type of love is characteristic of the chanson de geste (cf. Gautier, I, p. 207). It is the lady who makes the advances, sometimes in a disgustingly bold manner². Frequently it is a Saracen girl who shows this frank, sometimes brutal passion, which may not scruple at parricide to attain its end³. How-

---

¹ The love in William of Palorne is not quite of the chanson de geste type. But in Amis and Amiloun it very clearly is. Belisaunt threatens Amis with death if he does not accept her love (Am. and Amiloun, vv. 625 ff.). Octavian (S. Eng. version), vv. 1201 ff., tells of a Saracen maid loving a Christian knight, who makes advances to him and finally becomes a Christian.

² More than twenty girls go to the beds of knights in chansons de geste, according to Gautier, 1st ed., I, p. 478.

³ Cf. the English Sir Ferumbras, vv. 5763 ff. In this case Floripas, who has been converted, seems fired with religious zeal.
ever, the general traits of female character seem much the same in Christian as in Saracen\(^1\). Prejudice against Saracen women who become Christians is not a trait of the *chansons de geste*\(^2\). Orable, the wife of *Guillaume de Orange*, is perhaps the most attractive of the heroines of the *chansons de geste*. This typical woman was never a common person in real life; but she probably does represent an earlier stage when women were of less importance socially, and when distinctively feminine traits were not held in the esteem which was felt by the society implied by the roman d'amour.

In *Guy* it is the man who wooes. The lady is unsusceptible, disdainful even. The hero must remain afar off, must wait for many years; and when he wins his love he is scarcely permitted to enjoy it. There is a strong undercurrent of asceticism. The love of woman leads to strife; many men have been and will be "to gronde y-brouzt" by women (vv. 1503 ff.); it is after renunciation that the noblest character is developed both in *Guy* and in *Felice* (st. 279). Even pure and chivalrous love is unworthy

---


2. Usually sexual relations with an unconverted Saracen woman were strongly condemned. Cf. *Merline* (Percy Folio, I), vv. 410 ff. King Anguis had verament
a daughter that was faire & gent,
that was heathen Sarazen;
& Vortiger for love fine
vndertooke her for his wiffe,
& liued in cursing all his liffe.
in the presence of religious asceticism.

It is well to bear in mind that there was an ideal of love in medieval literature, and life too, perhaps, which insisted that the ideal relation was between a married woman and an unmarried man. At its best this ideal is beautiful, if unpractical and ultimately immoral. It sprang from a desire to preserve the first bright glow of young love before desire had darkened it. To do this meant to love the unattainable and unapproachable—a married woman. This of course is the love of Dante for Beatrice. It is the love which dictated the rules of the court of love.

But in many of the French romances, as well as in their English analogues, we see the ideal breaking down, and another taking its place. The beloved is still a married woman, but not quite unapproachable, not quite unattainable. Here of course stand Lancelot and Guinevere, Tristram and Iseult, human and attractive, but sinners who must suffer. Later still come the romances in which illicit love is represented not again, perhaps not involving evil consequences, or, if so, only accidentally as any pure love might. Under a slight varnish there is often all the grossness of the fabliau. Yet the author will say that these were perfect lovers. It is interesting to note that these grosser romances had no vogue in English. No doubt they were repugnant

1. Good summaries of several romances of this type may be found in Langlois, Société Française au XIIIe Siècle D'Après dix Romans d'Aventure (Paris, 1904); cf. Le Chatelaine de Gucci, for example.
to medieval English moral standards, at least of the public which read the English romances, low as they often are. Contemporary with these immoral romances, with their ideal of courtly, illicit love, were romances in which love seems so primitive as in Horn and Bevis, and so pure as in Guy. The English were using the less fashionable of contemporary literary material.

More important is war—involving the emotions of hatred and envy, as well as hope of glory and joy of victory. Here we are concerned primarily with the human side—with the emotions concerned. These are implied rather than expressed. In Horn and in Bevis there is the opposition of Christian and Saracen; in Havelok of the loyal and the traitorous; in Guy of Warwick of national and foreign. In addition, we find in our romances hostility because of the appearance of an undesired suitor for the heroine's hand, or because some one has been dispossessed of his property, or because some one has been worsted in a tournament. On the whole it may be said that these hostile relations are dwelt upon only sufficiently to bring about the fascinating scenes when lances break and swords clash. To see more clearly how the human elements enter into war it will be sufficient to discuss vengeance, cruelty, and the emotions of the fight.

The emotions of the fight are anger and fear. In Horn and Havelok these scarcely appear. In the fight with his father's slayer

Horn him gan agrise,  
& his blod arise (vv. 868 ff.).

And Godard when captured "rorede als a bole" (Hav. v. 2438).
In Bevis, however, there are numerous expressions to indicate the state of mind of combatants, especially of the hero. These are chiefly about physical sufferings. He is injured

\[ \text{at he miȝte sofre namore (} \text{Bevis. v. 630).} \]

When he got to his chamber, he

\[ \text{leide him deueling on } \frac{f}{e} \text{ grounde} \]
\[ \text{To kolen is hertte in } \frac{f}{at} \text{ stounde (vv. 649 f.).} \]

He became weary in his fight with the boar (v. 2799). In the fight with the dragon "him \ouȝte his herte to-brast" (v. 1792), and in his fight with the London crowd he was "wo be-gon" because of his wounds. In Guy combatants suffer for water (sts. 113, 120). When wounded, Amoraunt's "hert was full of Ire and care" (v. 8541). Colbrond, when wounded "was sore aschame" (st. 262). Guy in the same fight was sore dismayed and sore aghast when his sword broke. These are but a few of the cases in Bevis and Guy in which something is said about the emotions and physical sufferings of combatants. The simpler romances of Horn and Havelok have less fighting and therefore less material of this kind. Perhaps the most striking feature to be observed is the absence of fear.

Vengeance has an important part to play in many romances—and in three of this group, Horn, Havelok, Bevis. But the feeling of bitterness from which deeds of bitterness spring is almost absent. It is true that vengeance is secured. The Saracen enemies of Horn are slain; Godard and Godrich pay for their treachery with their lives; and the mother and stepfather of Bevis likewise perish. But of real hatred there is none except in the case of Bevis. Even in his case there is nothing to compare with the
vengeance of Elizabethan drama. It is in the background of the story.

Of cruelty there is probably no more than medieval life would justify. In Horn there is mutual slaughter of Saracens and Christians, non-combatants as well as combatants (vv. 63 ff., 1377 ff.). But mortal enmity between Christians and infidels is merely part of the setting of much of medieval literature. Even the Saracens did not have the cruelty to slay Horn and his companions outright. Fikenhild, after his death at Horn's hands, was drawn, but that was the customary fate of traitors. The same remark applies to the tortures undergone by Godrich and Godard. They are condemned by their peers, and no one might do Godrich shame before trial (Havelok, vv. 1762 ff.). But there is no shrinking from legal cruelty. When Godard had been sentenced and shriven,

Sket cam a ladde with a knif,
And bigan riht at he to
For to ritte, and for to flo
So it were grim or gore (vv. 2493 ff.).

With like severity Godrich was bound to a stake and burned (vv. 2831 ff.). The cruelty of Bevis is of a much fiercer quality. When Bevis was told that his half-brother had been unintentionally slain by his father he

louʒ and hadde gode game (v. 3116).

1. Even in war there was less consideration for Saracens than for Christian enemies; a twelfth century church council forbade the use of the cross-bow against Christian enemies.

2. Fikenhild hi dude todraʒe (Horn, v. 1492).

3. Possibly stepbrother?
When his stepfather was captured, he had him put to death by being thrown into a kettle of lead, and when his mother, beholding her husband thus perish, falls from the castle and breaks her neck,

Alse glad he was of hire,  
Of his damme, ase of is step sire (vv. 3463 f.).

Such brutality as this is entirely absent from Guy. Here is another instance of the distance by which this romance is removed from the others, particularly from Bevis, which in structure it so much resembles.

As has been said, not much is made of the family relations. The relation of husband and wife seems to be an exception, as it is a source of interest in Havelok, Bevis, and Guy. Yet not much is made of it. In Bevis it is only the wife who seems much affected by the long separation. In Guy there is the tacit approval of the departure of the husband at a time when he is aware that he is to be a father. Scarcely anything is made of the relationship of mother and son. The meeting of Horn and Godhild, furnishing such a splendid chance for pathos, is barely mentioned (v. 1383)\(^1\). In Bevis the mother's attitude is entirely unnatural. The mother of Havelok is not mentioned; and the mother of Guy is neglected after the beginning of the romance. The relation of father and son is of greater importance. It is necessary that the hero's father should be a man of rank and

\(^1\) It is interesting to note that in Ponthus and Sidone the reunion of mother and son is elaborated and made the basis of pathetic appeal.
might as an assurance of the hero's qualifications. The death of the father may introduce the motive of quest for vengeance (Horn, Bevis); the hero may take pride in his father (Bevis, vv. 613 ff.). But scarcely anything is made of filial affection. Much less is made of fraternal affection. As a rule the hero of romance is an only child, at least of both father and mother; so Guy, Horn, Bevis. The sisters of Havelok perish too early to play a significant part. It is true of romance literature in general that the fraternal relation is unimportant. The relation of subject and lord is, as has already been indicated, one of importance. But when the most is made of all this, one need only think of Chaucer to realize that the appeal of these early metrical romances is to a limited range of emotion.

Summary.

In order to see clearly what each of these romances has contributed to medieval character writing, it is necessary to consider them separately, summarizing, for the most part, the conclusions already stated.

King Horn. - In this romance the characterization seems to harmonize perfectly with the rough, uncouth background of first life and nature. Horn is a fighter and a lover second. Indeed

1. The relation of father and son is more important in some romances; cf. Generides, Perceval, Libeaus Desconus.

2. Numerous references to the relationship are of course found; cf. Oliver and Aude, Percevale and his sister. But it is not made the basis of emotional appeal to any great extent.
as a lover, while faithful, he is not ardent. His long sojourn in Ireland does not seem sufficiently motivated if he is greatly in love. He does not absolutely refuse the Irish princess. He hesitates to accept Rymenhild's love when offered. His caution and self-command are almost too great. He is more anxious to receive knighthood and to become a warrior than to be the accepted lover of the royal princess. Yet he is a simple, manly, engaging figure. Rymenhild is equally simple, but her simplicity is that of primitive passion. Passionate love and passionate anger seem to bound her emotional range. The minor characters are barely sketched. Perhaps there is a touch of character contrast in the presentation of Fikenhild and Aulf, both Horn's companions and subjects, both bound to him by ties of friendship, both receiving knighthood at his hands, but Fikenhild throughout the type of the unfaithful as Aulf is the type of the faithful vassal. Other characters are merely conventional figures—the porter, the palmer, Arnoldin, King Modi.

In presenting character, emotion, states of mind, use has been made of dialogue and action. A little is said of personal appearance, there is a hint here and there as to the feelings of the dramatis personae, but these are comparatively unimportant. The dialogue reveals the progress of the love affair. The abundant action of course often reveals mood and attitude. Elsewhere all is left to the imagination of reader or hearer—the intention, the state of mind, even the character. The simplicity of character and emotion is emphasized by the sketchy
presentation.

Of the human relations involved, only one is treated elaborately—namely, love. This is a human, popular, primitive passion, careless of fashion, free from coquetry, faithful, but without adoration. The woman woos; the man somewhat passively accepts the offered love. The love of comrades, manifested in Horn and Alpulf, while not developed, furnishes an additional interest, opposing the "envy" of Fikenhild, that scarcely understood hatred of the hero which apparently arouses very little resentment on the part of the one who suffers from it. The Saracens, however, arouse fiercer passions, although these are barely suggested. The darker passions remain unelaborated.

Havelok.—In Havelok the atmosphere has changed. Not knights, but the folk fill the stage. Havelok is a good servant, can put the stone beyond the farthest, and can break heads with a door-tree. He is good-natured, cautious, simple. There is no hint of passionate love or keen thirst for glory. Grim is a sturdy, loyal fisherman. The more vivid minor characters are fishermen (Grim's children), a cook, an innkeeper. Goldborough is scarcely the sketch of a queenly figure. Alfelwald, a character of some importance, is an ideal king from the point of view of the peaceful, law-abiding middle class. Godrich and Godard, almost indistinguishable, are typical traitors. There is greater interest in states of mind than in Horn. There is greater individuality of character. This seems to be due to a changed point of view, as if the writer were not a minstrel seeing life
through the spectacles of a courtly nobility, or even a crude, rough nobility, but some one—a priest, perhaps—who sees life with the eyes of the laborer or tradespeople of provincial England.

Here the author has more to say about his characters—Apelwold, Havelok, Godard, and others. The soliloquies reveal both character and intention. With less dramatic situation, the dialogue is comparatively unimportant. Action of course is important for revealing character, especially as purpose and mood, out of which action arises, is made clear. On the other hand, there is far less passion than in Horn, since the situations are so much less vivid and emotionally significant. Character apparently is more consciously in the mind of the author, and is emphasized by the more obvious means—soliloquy, general narrative, and direct statement—but the emotions springing from dramatic situation are neglected.

The field of human relations is again comparatively narrow. Love is almost absent. The relation of subject and king is perhaps most important, exemplified by Grim, Ubbe, and Grim's children, and, negatively, by Godard and Godrich. There is a national outlook absent from Horn, not present to an equal degree in Bevis and Guy. The relation of parent and child is intimately connected with the deaths of Apelwold and Birkabein. There is a glimpse, too, of the relation of servant and master. However, there is not the dramatic tension of strong passions which makes human relations of great significance for the story. The interest
centers largely in the interaction of the hero and his environment—his conduct when famine reduces Grim to poverty, his conduct as the cook's servant, his success in the game of putting the stone, or of breaking heads. The chief emotion of the poem is the sense of triumph felt by the audience as it sympathetically followed the progress of the hero.

Bevis.—In Bevis, as in Horn, character has little interest for the author. He does not stop to describe character, and seldom to indicate mental states. Yet the main *dramatis personae* are not unimpressive. We seem somehow to be again in the presence of fierce, primitive people and emotions. Bevis is a fighter, who joys in battle more than in love. He is fierce and even cruel—a stern, irresistible, brutal warrior, whose claim to admiration is unmeasured valor. Josian loves as Rymenhild loved—violently. She does not shrink from inflicting death on a persecutor. Other characters have an equal fierceness, without the redeeming faithfulness. Bevis's mother, the Emperor of Almaine, Ascopard, and most of the Saracens are people to inspire terror. There is not much said of states of mind, but so far as they are not purely conventional, romantic material, due to the translator, they have the same fierceness and primitive quality that mark the entire romance.

Character is presented by means of situation and dialogue. Not much is made of soliloquy. Scarcely anything is said in the way of direct characterization, and not much in regard to emotions. However, the dialogue is sharp and characteristic, and
the situations swiftly succeeding one another have a cumulative
effect, especially in connection with the impression made by
the hero. It may be noted that there is a slightly humorous
character in Ascopard.

What was said about human relations in Horn may almost be re-
peated here. There is the unrestrained love of the heroine,
faithful and heroic; and there is too the lukewarmness of the
hero. There is the development of the friendship of fellows-in-
arms. There is the same background of Saracens versus Christians,
as a basis for hatred and war. There is, however, greater
fierceness and cruelty than in Horn. We are moving in the
atmosphere of unrefined knighthood, of untempered fanaticism,
and unbridled brutality, relieved somewhat by faithful love in
wife and comrade.

Guy of Warwick.— Guy is a long step from Bevis. Here
chivalry has softened warrior and war. Guy is an irresistible
warrior like Bevis, but he is an adoring lover, and becomes a
devoted palmer, doing penance for his sins. His character is
less simple; he feels the conflict of love and religion; he suf-
fers as well as triumphs. Felice is no Rymenhild, who invites
her favorite to her bower that she may throw herself into his
arms; she is to be won only after years of ardent seeking and
repeated rebuffs. The stage is full of dramatis personae. There
is the maiden who plays the foil to Felice. Father and mother of
Guy appear, playing natural, human parts. In addition, there
is almost a host of dramatis personae who are the conventional
knights and kings and giants of romance. A greater elaboration
distinguishes the character-material of Guy from that of Bevis, Horn, and Havelok.

Likewise more care and more time are devoted to the exposition of character and mental states. There are long soliloquies. Dialogue is sustained. There are definite statements from the author in regard to states of mind. At least one character—the maiden of Felice—is introduced to make feeling and attitude vivid by contrast. The action is very often significant of character. In the attention to character this romance is allied to Havelok.

But Guy differs very widely from Havelok in the field of human life from which character and emotion spring. Love is again of great interest—the love of knight for lady—an adoring, chivalrous love. This love conflicts with the relation of man and the church, or of man and God, and succumbs to the exalted desire for penitential sacrifice. Thus there is an elevation above the normal emotions of Horn, Bevis, and Havelok. There is here, again, the same or greater emphasis on love of comrades. There is a new touch of filial affection. There is a current of patriotism found in Havelok, but not in Horn and Bevis. Thus there is in Guy a broadening and heightening of character and feeling.

What remains to be said is merely this. In these four romances there are striking differences and striking resemblances in the treatment of character and emotion. The differences seem to indicate great variation of type. Horn is the representative
of an undeveloped, unsophisticated, warlike society, and might well be at base a metrical version of a popular tale which had absorbed romantic motives. *Havelok* is written for and about provincial, lowly or middle class Englishmen. *Bevis* is essentially a *chanson de geste*. *Guy* is a *chanson de geste* made over into a romance of chivalry. Yet in the very structure of three of these metrical stories is the exile-and-return motive, with the *dramatis personae* which it implies. Corresponding *dramatis personae* appear in *Guy*, but belong less closely to the main structure of the romance. Nevertheless, this resemblance of the four romances in respect to *dramatis personae* and the structure which they imply should not be made too much of in searching for the conditions from which the tales originally sprang. If they once were very similar, they became dissimilar. At least *Bevis* and *Guy* were worked over if not created by Frenchmen and developed into metrical tales of widely different type. But in the English dress in which we are examining them there is no evidence that the English redactors felt very keenly the distinction of types. Stock romantic material is found throughout, especially in *Horn*, in *Bevis*, and in *Guy*. There are the same stock *dramatis personae*; there are the same stereotyped ways of expressing emotion; there are the same stereotyped phrases in the mouths of *dramatis personae*, and in the mouths of the authors talking about the *dramatis personae*. At least the stereotyped phrases are in a large measure the property of English romance, and the freedom with which they are employed everywhere seems to indicate that they were regarded as appropriate for any kind of
story, that there was no distinction made between romantic and epic tale. What in France was intended for diverse audiences came in England into the hands of one set of minstrels reciting to one popular and undiscriminating audience, which welcomed a hodge-podge of narrative material that must have been very foreign to their natural interests. I must modify this statement by saying that in Havelok we seem to have a truly popular hero, not entirely created in the image of crude or chivalrous knighthood. But he is the exception that proves the rule. It is certainly not in the dramatis personae of English metrical romances that we are to look for a clear image of medieval English life.
CHAPTER IV

Setting¹

The treatment of setting in medieval romance does not bear comparison with the treatment of setting in the modern novel or short story. In a sense there is no setting. Places and occasions are indicated, not described. It is incident which is of supreme importance to the hearers of the romance, and to the author as well. Yet the incidents do actually happen in time and place, and concrete time and place cannot be quite without character; there is a certain enveloping society, or, at least, there are enveloping human conditions, social in a greater or less degree; there is resulting narrative atmosphere; and medieval stories cannot be understood until the significance of these things is made clear. The difference between King Horn and Guy of Warwick, for instance, is brought out at no point better than at this one of setting.

The larger geographical outline of King Horn is exceedingly vague. Of the place names, Ireland is the only one definitely known to us. It is improbable that the other names continued through several centuries to have any meaning for hosts of hearers of the romance. The directions mentioned are confined to "weste" and "este". They are not always consistent in any of the

¹. The term setting is employed in its largest signification to cover the background of time, place, and human relations.
Manuscripts. Murri was king "biweste" (v. 5). King Ailmar says of Horn and his companions that never had he seen a "swihc fair verade...bi westene lond" (v. 168). When Horn departs from Westernesse for the first time he takes ship that will land him "in westene londe" (v. 754). On arrival in Ireland he tells Berild that he is "wel feor fram biweste" (v. 769). Rymenhild's messenger says,

"Iseche fram biweste
Horn of Westernesse" (vv. 945 f.).

Horn tells Rymenhild at the beginning of the recognition scene that he is "wel feor icome bi este" (v. 1135). Later he tells her:

"Ich habbe go mani Mile,
Wel feor bizonde weste" (vv. 1176 f.).

Last of all, Aelfulf's father speaks of Horn as one who "wuni bieste" (v. 1325). There is evidently almost hopeless confusion in these directions. This confusion is probably due to the scribes. The other manuscripts show variations. L and 0 both have "westnesse lond" for "westene lond" (C v. 168). In L and 0 Horn hired a good ship

ϕ at him shulde passe (wisse in 0)
Out of Westnesse (L vv. 759 f.).

In L and 0 the messenger says:

"Ich seke fram Westnesse
Horn knyt of Estnesse" (0 vv. 988 f.).

In the same manuscript Horn tells Rymenhild first that he is from "by weste" (v. 1170), which agrees with his later statement that he has gone many a mile "wel fer her by weste" (0 v. 1216).
And in the place of the "bieste" of C (v. 1325) the other manuscripts agree in saying "by weste" (O v. 1325; L v. 1335).

It would be an easy matter for a scribe to write "bi este" for "bi weste" or vice versa. Probably there was no real inconsistency in the original manuscript of this version. Yet the inconsistencies found in the manuscripts show how uncritically listeners, as well as scribes, heard expressions indicating direction, and how conventionalized they were for author and audience, merely a "there" and a convenient rhyme.

There is nothing to indicate that Sudden, Westernesse, and Irlond meant more than strips of land along the coast where little groups of fighting men had homes. The court of the king of Westernesse was but a "mile" or a little more from the seashore (v. 596), and Murri and Furston lived near the sea. These kingdoms must have been exceedingly primitive in character.

It may also be noted that the author does not hurry to give names to his localities. Not until v. 138 do we know what the kingdom of Horn and Murri is called. The name Westernesse is not mentioned at Horn's landing, but only when King Ailmar appears. Ireland is described as "westene lond" up to the time when knights are sent for who are to assist Horn. It is evident that geographical verisimilitude was not sought by the poet and was not demanded by minstrel or audience.

Contrary to Horn we find in Havelok a fairly definite historical background. The geographical mist which rendered Horn so confusing is somewhat dissipated. Life is much less primitive.

1. For the use of "bi west" as vaguely indicating place, cf. "Gest of Robyn Hode" (Child, No. 117), st. 7.
tive. Therefore, there is less difficulty for us to find our way, and greater ease in understanding and interpreting.

The geographical names (except Denmark) are all English. Not a single town in Denmark is named, although possibly the missing leaf may have contained the name of the port where Havelok landed on his arrival in his native land. The English geography is simple, but clear. The story centers about towns in north central England—Chester, Lincoln, Grimsby. It seems not unlikely that the story grew up in celebration of the town of Grimsby. The dialect furnishes corroborating evidence supporting this surmise. Winchester is mentioned at the beginning of the poem as the place to which Aelwold summoned his lords. Havelok is crowned at London. Twice Roxburgh and Dover are mentioned as the limits of England (vv. 139, 265). Dover is the place where Goldborough is forcibly detained. Historical verisimilitude is given by the introduction of such historical names as the Archbishop of York, the Earl of Cornwall, the Earl of Chester. The Earl of Chester, so the story says, got provisions from Cornwall (v. 384). Distance and direction are mentioned but once.

Fro londe weren hi bote a mile
Ne were it neuere but ane hwhile,
That it ne gan a wind to rise
Out of þe north, men calleth "bise",
And drof hem intil Engelond (vv. 721 ff.).

If "bise" means north wind, it is evident that it was not entire-

1. Probably not, since it is mentioned in no other version.

2. See Wohlfeil, pp. 60 f.; Schmidt, pp. 81 f.
ly favorable for the voyage to Grimsby. However, exactness in such matters is not to be thought of seriously.

The geographical relations of Bevis, fairly clear at first view, offer some peculiarities which show vagueness if not actual confusion. Moreover, this vagueness if characteristic of the other versions of the story; and this vagueness and possible confusion have led to the surmise that the story has been transposed. Almaine seems undoubtedly to be the name for Germany; and there is in the English version a word about the sea voyage from Hamtoun to Almaine; but in none of the versions is anything said, elsewhere, about a sea voyage. At times it seems doubtful if Hamtoun is a seaport. This is made clear in the Anglo-Norman, in which we are told that Bevis, on the Isle of Wight, mounts his steed

\[ e \text{ va envers coloyrie tot le chimin plener (v. 2098). } \]

So on the journey from Cologne to Saber's castle,

\[ \text{de ci ke a le chastel ne vont demorer (v. 2184). } \]

However, in the English version we have the explanatory addition:

\[ \text{a\'i wente to schip anon ri\'te} \\
\text{And sailede for\' in to wizte (vv. 3301 f.).} \]

In the English version perhaps the greatest surprise is at the fact that when the Emperor attacks the castle of Saber, nothing is said of the passage of the sea.

\[ \text{For}\ a\'i wenten ase snel,} \\
\text{Til a\'i come to \text{\&e castel} } \\
\text{\&er Saber and Beues weren inne (vv. 3353 ff.).} \]

2. See p. 81.
At any rate the author or redactor did not have very clearly and definitely in mind the geographical situation. However, the English version is usually more definite than the Anglo-Norman. Thus in the Anglo-Norman Saber says to Bevis that he will send him to another country and when he is fifteen or sixteen years old he shall return. In the English version Saber says:

In to another londe I schel þe sende
    Per be soufe,
To a riche erl, þat schel þe gie
    And teche þe of corteisie
    In þe soufe.
And whan þow art of swich elde,
    þat þow miþ þe self welde,
    And eþt of age,
Jonne sometime come into Engelonde,
    Wip werre winne in to þu honde
    In eritage (vv. 362 ff.).

Other geographical features to be noted are that Babylon is represented as being tributary to Mombraunt; that Mombraunt is represented as being only a few hours' ride from Armenia (vv. 4079 ff., 4109), although on another occasion the distance seems to have been considerably greater (v. 1293). What is interesting for us at this point is to note that even in a story which is not precisely primitive we have no attempt at consistency.

The geography of Guy does not present the problems which

2. In the A.N. version the journey was at least four days in length; cf. v. 322
3. In the A. N. Hermin is King of Egypt.
the geography of *Bevis* presents, but it has the same characteristic vagueness. The few places in England offer no difficulties. On the continent, however, a great many places are mentioned, and these seem often to be connected at random. Guy on his first journey visits Normandy, Spaine, and Almaine. On the second journey he goes to Normandy, Spaine, Almaine, and Lombardy. The order seems to have no significance, and was perhaps determined by the rhyme. Among the countries and cities connected with Almaine are Lorrain, Gormoise, Pavia, Apulia, Saxony, St. Omer, Arrascour. Guy's later adventures take him to Constantinople, Antioch, Alexandria, Spires, Jerusalem, Genoa. Herhaud, when searching for Guy; goes through Normandy, Spain, France, and Brittany. At no time does there seem to be a sense of comparative distance.

The setting, taking the word in its stricter sense, is almost always a matter of convention. The extent to which this is true has hardly been recognized. Already in discussing transitions we have seen that certain places have become natural starting places for incidents. Here we shall bring together some of this conventional material, and discuss afterwards whatever peculiarities

1. Caius MS. has another order:
   In Almaigne and in Lombardie,
   In Fraunce and in Normandie (vv. 1065 ff.).
2. There is nothing to indicate how the journey is made.
3. The lists of geographical names were conventions like tree-lists, and evidently had none of the significance for medieval audiences which they have for modern map-familiar readers; cf. the list of countries conquered by Alexander for typical geographical list:
   He hath y-wonne Grece and Lumbardye,
   Akaye, Romele, and Romanye,
   Gene, Provence, Burgoyne acoste,
   And Saveye, al to ost:
   Theo marche of Fraunse, and of Spayne,
   And Tolouse, and eke Almayne;
   And Egipte, and eke Barbarie (*Alisaunder*, vv. 3015 ff.).
the separate romances seem to show.

Something is likely to happen while one is hunting, or returning from a hunt, or riding along a river. Ailmar was riding by the "stoure" (Horn, v. 685) when Fikenhild falsely accused Horn to him. Horn was hunting in the wood when Rymenhild's messenger found him (vv. 937 ff.). Bevis's father was slain while hunting a boar in the "hare forest be side be se" (Bevis, vv. 88 ff.). Bevis was attacked by the steward while returning from a boar-hunt (vv. 837 ff.). Compare also:

On a day ai wente a riuere;
Par come ride a mesagere
& euer he asked fer & ner
After the hende knyt Saber (vv. 4257 ff.).

The Emperor of Almaine was hunting a boar in the forest when Guy surprised him and led him to Duke Segyn (Guy, vv. 2509 ff.). The chase of a boar into Brittany led Guy into an adventure with Earl Florentin (vv. 6747 ff.). Guy is returning from hunting when he meets the messengers who tell him of the siege of Constantinople:

To pleyn hem ai went bi riuere
Pat of wilde foule ful were;
To her wille an hunting hij gos,
To chace the hert & the ros.
On a day as he cam fram hunting
A dromond he sey ariuiseing*, etc. (vv. 1797 ff.).

The Emperor had gone hawking when the steward Morgadour attempted to betray Guy (vv. 3153 ff.)

---

1. Cf. under Transitions, p. 188.

2. In Amis and Amiloun (vv. 492 ff., 721 ff.) the princess approaches Sir Amis while her father is away hunting. The first time Amis remains at home because of sickness; cf. Horn Childe vv. 484 ff.).
the birds when he meets the wounded Tirri (vv. 5503 ff.),
after which he rescues Oisel. It is while hunting that Earl
Rohaud first learns of Guy's love for his daughter (sts. 11 ff.)¹.

There are other out-door conventionalities which have no
connection with particular sorts of adventure, but have a hint
of picturesqueness in them. Horn and his companions went to
town "bi dales and bi dune" (v. 154). "Bi dales & bi dune" oc-
curs again at v. 210; "bi dales and bi hulle" at v. 208. Bevis
rode "ouer dale & doun" (v. 1829); likewise Herhaud and his men
rode "ouer ϕε dounes & dales snell (Guy, v. 4038). This is of
course a stereotyped alliterative phrase. Other commonplaces
are: forest, field, strand, wood, fen, meadow, stream, ford, orchard²; hill.

A conventional place for a single combat was an island.
Thus the fight of Guy and Amoraunt was on an island in a river,
and they reached it by means of a boat (sts. 06 ff.). Bevis's
fight with Ivor took place "in an yle vnder ϕat cite" (v.4141)³.
Fights are often seen by ladies who are looking over the castle
wall. So Josian sees Bevis's fight with the steward; and Bevis's
mother while on a castle wall sees her husband slain (vv. 3459)₄.

¹. In Sir Eglamour of Artois the hero asks for Crystabelle when
he and her father are returning from the river (vv. 205 ff.).
². Orchards are familiar in chansons de geste; cf. Roland, v. 11.
See Gautier, Chivalry, pp. 389 ff.⁵.
³. Examples of the island fight are numerous in saga, chanson
de geste, and romance. See in Saxo Grammaticus (Elton's ed.),
pp. 104 ff., 142, 198. The famous fight of Roland and Oliver
took place on an island in the Rhone River (Gerars de Viane).
Island combats occur in Meraugis de Portlesquez (Hist. Litt.
XXX, p. 226); Vita Meriadoci (P.M.L.A. XV, pp. 410 ff.); Torrent
of Portyngale, vv. 1248 ff.; Four Sonnes of Aymon, pp. 551 ff.
Indoors is treated much as outdoors. The king in hall surrounded by his knights is a commonplace;

\[
\text{The kyn com in to halle}
\]

\[
\text{Among his kny\text{\textendash}tes alle (Horn, vv. 223 f.; 393 f.}}\]

In Havelok:

\[
\text{Anne hi were comen alle}
\]

\[
\text{Bifor \the \king \into \the \halle (vv. 156 f.).}
\]

The bower is commonly the place for interviews with the heroine. The principal interviews of Rymenhild take place in the bower. A bower is given to Havelok and Goldborough in the castle of Ubbe (v. 2072). In Bevis, however, the word "chamber" or "inn" is used for the apartments of men and women. Thus Josian's declaration of love is made in her own "inn", where "\the lai hire selue anizt" (vv. 1084 f.). The furnishings of the chamber are scarcely mentioned. In Horn the bed and "pelle" appear. In Bevis hero and heroine sit on the maiden's bed. The meal is of course a bit of setting extremely conventional. Sometimes King Arthur would not eat until he had met with some adventure; but when he learned of some stranger approaching would go to table and thus receive him. Without the vow, this convention occurs a number


2. This is thoroughly stereotyped; cf. Hall's note to 11. 393 f. for parallels.

3. Cf. the following from Malory (Globe ed.), p. 128: "And so Sir Gawaine, a little tofore noon of the day of Pentecost, espied at a window three men upon horseback, and a dwarf on foot. And so the three men alight and the dwarf kept their horses, and one of
of times in our romances. The King of Ireland is at table when a giant comes in with the challenge of the Saracens (Horn, vv. 799 ff.). Fikenhild is at table when Horn slays him (vv. 1485 ff.); it was as Havelok and his companions "seten and sholde soupe" that the sixty thieves came to attack Bernard Brun's house (vv. 1766 ff.). Compare also the following. Bevis and Terri rode to a great toun:

\[
\begin{align*}
\& \text{at a faire in} \, \text{ai li}^3\text{te}, \\
\& \text{riche soper} \, \text{ai gonne hem di}^3\text{te}. \\
\text{Beues at a wendowe lokedoe out} \\
\text{And se} \, \text{be strete ful aboute} \\
\text{Of stedes wri}^e\text{yn armes bri}^7 \text{t (vv. 3757 ff.).}
\end{align*}
\]

This is of course the beginning of an adventure:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Beues at} \, \text{he mete sat,} \\
\text{He be-held and under-} \, \text{at} \\
\text{Al is fon,} \, \text{at were} \, \text{per oute;} \\
\text{He was afered of} \, \text{at route.} \\
\text{He askede at} \, \text{he tauarmere,} \\
\text{at armede fulk, what it were (vv. 4353 ff.).}
\end{align*}
\]

In Ron Gij take\$ his berberwe 
Wi\$ the richest man of \$e borwe; 
Mete & drink \$ai hadade anou$, 
Nas \$er non \$at it wi$-drou$, 
Sir Gij his ost cleped him to, 
& him bigan to frein \$, 
& asked him wher \$e turnament schuld be 
So mani scheldes \$an seye he (Guy, vv. 787 ff.).

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Whan} \, \text{an ben to toun y-come,} \\
\text{Her in} \, \text{ai han sone y-nome.} \\
\text{To a windowe Sir Gij is go,} \\
\text{In-} \, \text{be strete he loked} \$, \\
\text{A palmer he se}^e \text{e cominge (vv. 1799 ff.).}
\end{align*}
\]

the three men was higher than the other twain by a foot and a half. Then Sir Gawaine went unto the king and said, Sir, go to your meat, for here at the hand come strange adventures." This delaying of the dinner seems to have been a regular occurrence on feast-days.
The palmer of course bears news which leads to new adventures. When Bevis visits King Bradmond with the fatal letter, "the king sat at þe mete" (v. 1360). Likewise Guy, bearing a message to the Sultan, found

Alle atte mete þat þer was
At þe heye bord e ten kinges ten
þat alle were Gyes fomen (vv. 3885 ff.).

The window sometimes appears without the meal. For instance:

Guy out at a window lay.
To Timri he spac of her fare.
Of her were & of her care.
With þat com priking anon ri t
A kniȝt (vv. 4940 ff.).

The knight of course bears news. From a "fenestre" the lover Guy beheld the castle and tower of Felice (v. 455); but here the window is very appropriate.

The garden or the arbor is frequently employed in romance as an appropriate meeting place for lovers. Thus one of Guy's interviews with Felice is in an "erber" (vv. 563 ff.). It may as well be stated here that the meeting of lovers occurs at set places, usually. Accidental meetings in unexpected places were not a familiar feature of medieval romance.

1 A messenger or chance visitor seems almost always to arrive at the time the king or lord is eating. Cf. Gawayn and the Grene Knight, vv. 130 ff.; Arthur, vv. 191 ff.; Morte Arthur, vv. 78 ff.; William of Palerne, vv. 1416 ff.; Percevale, vv. 485 ff.; Alisaunter, vv. 1778; Richard Coer de Lion, vv. 1773 ff.; Sir Cleges, vv. 250 ff.; Lay le Fraine, v. 44. An interrupted chess game is not infrequent. See Guy, vv. 2381 ff.

2 Love scenes are often described as in garden or arbor. Cf. Amis and Amilour, vv. 510 ff.; William of Palerne, vv. 816 ff.; Sir Orfeo, vv. 63 ff.
Of appreciation of natural beauty there is of course little expressed. However, there was probably more actual appreciation than we are inclined to credit to the literature of earlier periods. Surely there is imaginative sympathy with the sea as well as with the wave-rider in Horn’s address to the ship, part of which may be quoted again:

"Schup, bi e se flode
Daies have u gode;
Bi e se brinke
No water e nadrinke (vv. 137 ff.).

The nature-reference in a prayer of the author of Havelok to—

Ihesu Criste, that makede mone
On e mirke nith to shine (vv. 403 f.)—
seems to indicate a touch of feeling. More typical is the following from Guy:

In May it was also ich wene,
Whan flouris sprede & springe grene,
Into a forest Sir Gij is go
Neye a cite, nount fer fer-fro.

An seyd Gij to his meyney:
"Wende swi wel an heye,
Mine in to nim in fe cite;
Ich wil a while here pleye me
For to here fe foules singe."

Per-in was fo his likinge.
His folk he do fram him go,
Alon bileft Sir Gij to.

Hadde he noif knaue no grome,
Seriaunt no squier non.
Selcou ef it was for to here:
In pride stede stode Gij ehere;
So michel he herd fo foules singe,
At him Jouft he was in gret longing.

So mani singes he of Jouft,
At out of his riht way him broujt (vv. 4503 ff.).

However conventional this may be, there is a pretty strong ele-

1. We have already noticed the fondness for May. Compare Chaucer’s Prologue to Legend of Good Women. April, also, is a favorite month; cf. Alexander, Part I, ch. 2.
ment of romantic pleasure in the forest in this little story of how the hero was so intent on the song of the birds that he lost his way. Place beside this the scene of Guy's repentance:

At nayt, in tale as it is told,
To bedde went ye bernes bold
Bi time, to rest yat tide.

To a turret sir Gijs is went,
& biheld yat firmament,
vat thick wic stores stode.
On Iesu omnipotent,
yat alle his honour hadde him lent,
He yot wic dreri mode (st. 20, v. 10 ff.).

Is there not the implication that it was the sight of the stars which made the hero think of "Jesus omnipotent" and of his obligation to this supreme sovereign? In Bevis there is little evidence of similar appreciation, although we have the mention of the "hare forest" (v. 191), the "heir orn" (v. 773); the "faire medle tre" (v. 1287); the "wilde brok" (v. 1817)\(^1\); the "grene mede" (v. 1949). All in all, there is sufficient reason for believing that the medieval romancer was not indifferent to the various aspects of nature.\(^2\)

---

1. There is a touch of realism here. Bevis's horse had been swimming with him a day and a night:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{When he com of yat wilde brok} \\
\text{His gode stede him resede & schok,} \\
\text{And Beues, for honger in yat stounde,} \\
\text{\`e hors yrew him down to grounde.}
\end{align*}
\]

2. Gawain and the Grene Knyght furnishes perhaps the most conspicuous example of nature description in Middle English romance. For discussion of nature in the romances see F. W. Moorman, The Interpretation of Nature in English Poetry (O. & F., XCV, Strassburg).\(^3\) Also the remarks in O. Dolch's The Love of Nature in the Early English Poetry, Programm der Annen-Realschule zu Dresden (März 1882), pp. 12 ff.

The green fields and singing birds of the month of May are a commonplace in chansons de geste and in romances. It is
A word may be said here about the wonderful wells and springs which frequently play a part in romances. Very frequently they have magic properties. Thus Bevis is preserved from the dragon by a well in which he fell:

\[
\begin{align*}
&\text{He welle was of swich vertu:} \\
&\text{A virgine wonede in at londe,} \\
&\text{Hadde ba\%ede %er in, ich vnderstonde;} \\
&\text{at water was so holi,} \\
&\text{at e dragoun, sikerli,} \\
&\text{Ne dorste ne/e e welle aboute} \\
&\text{Bi fourti fote, soun doute (vv. 1804 ff.)}^1.
\end{align*}
\]

With this compare the river into which Guy leaped for refreshment during his fight with Amoraunt (Guy, sts. 127 ff.), although here there is no suggestion of magical properties.

We have already noted that the treatment of nature in the romances is not always the same. There are touches of description here and there which are not sufficiently described by calling them conventional, although there may be conventional details. In Horn the lines on Fikenhild's castle are perhaps the most definite piece of description, and this is made for the purpose of showing how difficult a task Horn had in the rescue of Rymenhild.

---

probable that this convention goes back to the old "fêtes de mai" (cf. G. Paris, *Origins de la Poésie Lyrique en France*). The early lyrics constantly refer to spring and may. "Ce qui dans les chansons de mai n'était qu'une invocation est devenu, dans les chants qui en sont dérivés et même dans la poésie courtoise, une description plus ou moins longue, formant le début obligatoire de la pièce" (Jeanroy, in P. de Julleville, I, p. 364).

1. The magic well in Spenser's *Faerie Queene*, I, 11, sts.29 ff., is derived from the well in *Bevis*. See Kölbing's note to vv. 2793 ff.
Stronge castel he let sette,
Mid see him biflette.
Jer he miste li\te
Bute fogle wi\te flitte.
Bute whanne he se wi\dro e
Mi\te come men ynone' (vv. 1395 ff.).

Beside this may be placed the lines about the sea:

\se\ se began to flow
\& horn child to rowe;
\se\ se - at schup fasste droyf
\se\ children dradde \nerof (vv. 117 ff.).

Perhaps there is more real imagination contained in two lines of Horn's address to the ship, quoted above:

\Bi\se\ se brinke
No water\se\e nadrinke (vv. 141 f.).

Horn's way of telling his companions that they are nearing land has perhaps something of the "conventional prettiness" which has been said to be a characteristic of King Horn, and may be quoted here as somewhat typical of the romance:

"Feren" qua\se\ he "jonge,
Ihc telle you t\ijinge,
Ihc here fogle\se\les singe
\& at gras him springe (vv. 127 ff.)^1.

The homely character of Havelok results in the introduction of a number of stage articles which are not frequently found elsewhere. Otherwise the features of the setting are conventional enough. The less usual things are the "poke, ful and blac" in which Grim bears Havelok home to his wife; the "gret ston" in the "cleue" of Grim against which Havelok cracked his crown when Dame Leue cast him down; the "fayre firrene wowes" (v. 1077) which separates the bower of Havelok and Goldborough from that of their host in the castle of Ubbe. There is a bit of realism in the scene where Ubbe goes to see what the light in Havelok's

^1; "Se" is of course implied in the fourth line.
bower means:

He stod, and totede in at a bord (v. 2106).

As a bit of picturesque description I quote here the lines telling what the light revealed after Havelok's fight at the inn.

On þe morwen, hwan it was day,
Ilc on other wirwed lay,
Als it were dogges þat weren henged,
And summe leye in dikes slenget,
And summe in gripes bi þe her
Drawen were, and laten ther (vv. 1920 ff.).

Here again are indications of the popular character of the romance of Havelok.

In Bevis convention almost crowds out originality. Perhaps the account of the loathfulness of Bevis's prison at Mombraunt is the most effective bit:

Vnder þer twenti teise (v. 1417).

There Bevis sat

Til þe her on is heued greu to is fet;
Snakes and euetes & oades fale,
How mani, can i nouȝt telle in tale,
Pat in þe prisoun were wið him (vv. 1537 ff.).

The detail of the "faire modle tre" (v. 1287) under which Bevis and Terri meet is a convention, but it is interesting that the special kind of tree is only mentioned in the Auchinleck MS.

The setting of Guy differs from that of Bevis in the greater number of romantic details. These details, however, are thoroughly conventional. Though arbor, hermitage, orchard, lodge do not occur in other romances of our group, they are common enough elsewhere. The following may be regarded as typical of Guy as distinguished from the other three:

So long is Tirri for þə y gon
To the Mounteyn he com anon;
A casteler was fair wi^alle,
And strong cite beloken wi^walle;
Faire halles& toures also
In que cite were mani & mo.
In que at on half orn je riuer,
In que at over half forest wi^wilde dere (vv. 6335 ff.).

It is conventional romantic material which we here find.

What is most evident from this brief review of the character of setting in our romances is the absence of many features familiar to readers of later fiction. To be noted here is the absence of description of indoor furnishings or arrangement. There is never a deliberate and systematic attempt to assist the imagination by a detailed description of setting. It is difficult to gain a picture of the externals of medieval life—houses, inns, castles, bowers -- from the references which we have. One feels, of course, that the inn, which is met in Havelok, Guy, and Bevis would be incongruous in Horn; that romantic nature would be foreign to Havelok; that luxurious interiors would be foreign to any one of these romances except Guy. That is, setting is appropriate, but it is merely incidental.

The notion of time is of equal or greater vagueness than the notion of place. The time-setting tends to become merely conventional, as noted in some of the transitional phrases already studied. The passage of time is not felt, or, if indicated, we have merely a conventional number of days or years. Our chief task here, therefore, is to point out the other conventions.

Some of the conventions of time are naturally associated
with conventions of place. Thus with the conventional meal goes apparently either midday or noon.

&fer cam in at none
A geaunt supe sone (Horn, vv. 901 f.).

It was "aboute f e time of middai" (Bev. v. 1349) when Bevis threw the heathen gods in the fen, and the news was brought to the castle "ase f e king sat at f e mete." With these may be placed:

After mete in sale (Horn, v. 1107).
Betwene middai & nown (Bevis, v. 2090).

f o fai fouzte, alse i row sai,
Til it was hiz noun of f e dai (Bevis, vv. 1775 f.);

A hiz midday f e King Iuore
To Beues he smot a dent ful sore (Bevis, vv. 4173 f.).

f us togider gan fai play,
Til it was f e heyne midday (Guy, st. 207, vv.10 f.).

The time of day or night is frequently indicated in a somewhat vague way. The following shows the range in the four romances here studied:

So lay f at child to middel nichert (Havelok, v. 575).
Ac it was about mid nigt (Bevis, v. 1654).

On f e nith, als Goldeboro lay (Havelok, v. 1247).
Beues lay in is bedde a nigt (Bevis, v. 751).

In slepe as Gij lay anijt (Guy, st. 284).

Fikenhild, appropriately, intends to wed Rymenhild by night (Horn, v. 1430); and the wedding feast begins before sunrise (vv. 1433 ff). Horn arrives in Westernesse from Ireland before

1. The significance of noon at this period is somewhat questionable. "High noon" probably meant midday; but cf. "high undern". See N.E.D. under "high" and "noon".
sunrise, so that his boat is not perceived (vv. 1015 f.). Again, he arrived "tofore þe sunne vpriste" when he returned from Sud- denne (vv. 1435 f.). This is of course conventional, but it is appropriate.

The early morning is constantly referred to as the time of the beginning of some adventure. The following are some of the more familiar expressions for the earlier part of the day:

Sone so it was lith of day (Havelok, v. 663).
Amorwe þo þe day gan springe (Horn, v. 645).
On the morwen, hwan day was sprungen (Hav., v. 1131).
Sone it was day, sone he him clædde (Hav., v. 1354).
On þe morwen, hwan it was day (Hav., v. 1970).
On þe morwen, hwan it was liht (Hav., v. 2190).
A morwe, what hit was dai cler (Bevis, v. 755).
Erliche amorwe, what it was dai (Bevis, v. 1973).
Þe nijt is gon, Þat dai comen is (Bevis, v. 3175).
Day is comen in alle wise (Bevis, v. 3227).

Amorwe þe lauerkes songe
When Þat þe lihte day was sponge (Bevis, vv. 3779 f.)¹

Amorwe, so sone so it was day (Guy, v. 4173).

Thus we see that there are only slight variations of phrase, with an occasional attempt at conventional poetic diction. The following will suffice to show the more familiar phrases indicating time of day other than early morning: "Prime tide" (Bevis, v. 849); "time of euesong" (Bevis, v. 798; cf. also vv. 4452 f.); "Til Þat þe sonne set in þe west" (Bevis, v. 1016); "Fram prime

¹ Cf. Otuel, vv. 387 f.: On morwe þo þe day, And þe larke bigan here songe. See Ferumbras, v. 1498; Sowdone of Babylone, v. 2391.
til underne gan to ringe" (Bevis, v. 4168); "it was aboute ye under tide" (Bevis, v. 4437); "fro the morwe to ye niht" (Guy, st.192, v. 8).

So far as dates in the modern sense of the word are concerned, there are very few examples in medieval romance. The only real exception in our group is the "17th of March" in Havelok (v. 2559), on which day Godrich summoned his followers to meet him at Lincoln. The year of course is not mentioned. The 1st of May is mentioned in Bevis (vv. 91 f., 175), but the 1st of May as well as the month of May is conventional. References to holidays and saints' days are frequent:

Hit was at Cristesmasse (Horn, v. 799).

His ferste bataile, for so to say,
A déde a Cristes messe day (Bevis, vv. 585 f.).

In somer, about Whitsontide (Bevis, v. 3511).

On Witsondays called Bentecoste (Guy, v. 185).

It was at ye holy trinite (Guy, v. 705).

On a day befor ye natuuite (Guy
Of seyn Ion, ye master fre (Guy, st. 106, vv. 7 f.)².

The month is frequently mentioned. May is the favorite.

In Mai, whan lef & gras ging springe (Bevis,
And ye foules meri to singe (Bevis, vv. 3327 f.).

In May it was also ich wene,
When floutes sprede & springe grene (Guy, vv. 4503 f.).


2. The use of feast-days for specifying time was common in more serious documents than romances. Cf. chronicles and even legal Documents. Gautier, Chivalry, pp. 217 f., points out that knighthood was likely to be received on feast-days—Christmas, Easter, Ascension Day, Whitsunday, and Saint John's Day. They were favorite dates to which events of all sorts might be attached.
The reference to the season, particularly summer, is a commonplace: "Hit was upon a someres day" (Horn, v. 29); see Guy, v. 4939); "hit befel opon a somers day (Guy, st. 20, v. 7); "þe weder was hot in somers tide (Bevis, v. 4502). "On a day" is very frequently sufficient. Other vague expressions are "bi are dawes" (Havelok, v. 27), which introduces the story of Alwal, and "hwilom" (Horn Childe, v. 6). With all these expressions for time we know very little about the season of the year, about heat or cold, storm or sunshine.

Duration of time is equally vague. Even consistency is not always observed. Thus the first voyage of Horn and his companions from Suddenne to Westernesse occupies "al þe dai and al þe niȝt" (v. 123); the return trip occupies "daies fiue" (v. 1295), although "þe wind him bleu lude"(v. 1294). The second journey of Horn from Suddenne to Westernesse was apparently made in a single night. This, it seems was accomplished in response

---

Cf. Chestre's Sir Launfal: "Wytson day" (v. 50); "Pentecost" (v. 132); "day of the trinite" (v. 181); "Seynt Jonnys masse" (v. 619).

1. Other favorite months are April and June. Cf. Alisaunder and the lyrical passages therein, such as:
   Averil is meory, and longith the day;
   Ladies loven solas, and play;
   Swayne, justes; knyghtis, turnay;
   Syngith the nyghtynagale, gredeth theo jay;
   The hote surne chongeth the clay,
   As ye well y-seen may (vv. 139 ff.).

We have "Mury is in June" (v. 1884); "Mery time it is in May (v. 5210); "In tyme of heruest mery it is ynough" (v. 5754). On the May morning in the ballads, cf. Schütte, Die Liebe in den Englischen und Schottischen Volksballaden (Halle, 1906), p. 11.
to Horn's prayer:

"Crist for his wundes fiue
To niȝt me ȝuder driue" (vv. 1423 f.).

However, the difference between "al Þe dai and al Þe niȝt" and "daies fiue" seems too great not to be due to the careless use of these conventional expressions. In Havelok the inconsistencies may perhaps be attributed to the scribe. Havelok and his sisters, we are told in one place (v. 417), suffered abuse at the hands of Godard before they were three years old; and in another place (v. 2455) before they were twelve years old.

Long periods of time are likely to be seven years. Horn is absent from Rûmenhild seven years. Arondel was tied in stable seven years (Bevis, v. 1528). Saber and Josian seek Terri and Bevis seven years (v. 3897). References to seven years occur also in Bevis, vv. 1319, 2645, 3835. When Guy is returning to England to wed Felice he tells Tirri that it is "seuen zer & mor" (Guy, v. 7047) since he has been in England. Horn is told before his exposure that he has seven years yet to grow (Horn, vv. 95 f.). In such cases the seven years usually has no very definite signification.

1. Three is doubtless correct. We are told that Grim labored at Grimsby "wel twelf winter oper more" (v. 787). If Havelok were three on his departure from Denmark, this would make Havelok's age at the time he began work fifteen.

2. Cf. Horn v. 524. This indicates the conventional character of seven years. "A long time" would mean almost as much.

3. Cf. Squire of Low Degree, in which the hero served the king seven years (v. 6), and was required by his mistress to seek adventure for seven years (v. 186).
A respite is likely to be a year, or a year and some days. In Guy of Warwick Jonas has a period of one year and forty days in which to find a champion (st. 65); Terri has one year (st. 157). In Sir Launfal (v. 819) there is a respite of twelve months and a fortnight. It may be remembered that Ivain, on leaving his wife, has permission to be absent about a year (Chretien’s Ivain, vv. 2750 ff.).

Very frequently there is no indication as to period of time. There is nothing said as to the length of time that Horn was in Westernesse under the care of Avelbrus; as to how long Guy wandered about as a pilgrim; as to the length of time that Havelok was the cook’s servant at Lincoln. If time is indicated, it seems to be due to chance. Very seldom is there any indication of the age of the dramatis personae after childhood. Fifteen, the age at which boys are knighted or begin their careers as warriors, appears here. As indicated above, Havelok was probably fifteen when he began his career at Lincoln. Of Bevis we are told that

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Be } & \at \text{ he was fiftene yer olde} \\
\text{Knist me swain } & \text{ her nas so bolde} \\
\text{At } & \text{ him dorste a\'e\'es ride} \\
\text{Me wi } & \text{ wre\'pe him abide (vv. 581 ff.\textsuperscript{2}).}
\end{align*}
\]

Nothing is said in regard to the ages of the heroines, except

\begin{enumerate}
\item Education of children apparently began with the seventh year; cf. Schultz, Das Höfische Leben, I, p. 155.
\item In H\textsuperscript{11}h we find:
\begin{align*}
\text{Je word of Horn wide sprong,} \\
\text{Hou he was bo\'e michel & long} \\
\text{Wi\' in fiftene yer } & \text{ere (vv. 189 ff.)— which probably means that he was fifteen years old. Cf. Sir Gowther, vv. 139 f.}
\end{align*}
\end{enumerate}
Goldborough. Godrich swore to care for Goldborough

Til she were twelve winter hold (Hav. v. 192).

Later we are told that the Earl possessed England

Til the kinge's dowter were Tventi winter hold, and more (vv. 258 f.).

There is no necessary contradiction here, but twenty is a very mature age for a medieval heroine, and if our conjecture in regard to Havelok's age be correct, the disparity of ages seems too great. Twelve is much more nearly the proper age for a heroine. After youth is passed, there is as a rule no indication of the passing of years until one is old; and then the number of years is seldom mentioned. Nor is very much consistency to be expected. Guy is an old man when he meets Colbrond; yet Saber, who must be many years older, is apparently traveling and fighting with the energy of youth. The father of Bevis is referred to as an old man to account for the infidelity of his wife. These are the exceptions. Usually we know little of the ages of the dramatis personae, little of the passing of years which changes youth into age. There is little sense of duration."

1. Of course disparity of ages must not be taken too seriously. Compare examples where a hero is on the point of marrying his own mother, as in Sir Eglamour. On the other hand, girls were actually married very frequently at that time when mere children, as were boys also. Richard II was barely fifteen when married, his bride, Anne of Bohemia, being about the same age.

2. In Bevis the critical reader may be troubled by the apparent shortness of time in which the hero's children become old enough to be valiant warriors. The forester was to keep Guy seven years (v. 3740); it seems that the separation of Bevis and Josian after the birth of the children was about seven years. But the boys are apparently young men at the time of the reunion.

Feasts, illnesses, fasts seem naturally to fall into
conventional periods of time. A feast or illness usually lasts a fortnight, sometimes forty days:

Æe feste fourti dawes sat \( \text{Hay} \cdot 2344 \).  
Æe feste of his coruning (lasted)  
Fourti dawes, & sumdel mo (\( \text{Hay} \), vv. 2948 f.).

Bevis and his friends went to London,

& helde a feste fourtene ni\( ð \)t (\( \text{Bevis} \), v. 4537).

At the marriage of Miles and King Edgar's daughter,

Æe feste leste fourtene ni\( ð \)t  
To al\( ð \) at ever come, spli\( ð \)t! (vv. 4567 f.).

At the marriage of Guy,

Æe fest lasted a fourteni\( ð \)t (st. 16, v. 2.).

Guy lay ill a fortnight after his narrow escape from marriage with Clarice (v. 4236). A fortnight comes up frequently in other situations. Felice dies on the fifteenth day after Guy's death. The messenger from Bevis's mother to the Emperor of Almaine is promised knighthood "withinne his fourtene ni\( ð \)t" (v. 154). Two days seems to represent an ordinary fast, three days one more serious. When Havelok went to Lincoln to seek a living "two dayes fer fastin\( d \)e he \( z \)ede" (\( \text{Havelok} \), v. 665).

When Bevis made his ill-fated journey to Mombraunt he rode two days fasting without changing clothes (vv. 1293 f.). More serious was the fast which followed the death of Bevis's jailors:

---

1. In HCh Horn is dubbed knight within a fourntnight after his interview with Rimneled, instead of on the following day, as in KH. There are thirty day feasts in \( \text{Sir Launfal} \), v. 632; \( \text{Libeaus Desconus} \), vv. 931 f.; \( \text{Squire of Low Degree} \), vv. 1113 f. A fourteen day feast occurs in \( \text{Florence of Rome} \), v. 2158.
...re daies after he ne et ne drong (v. 1638).

When Guy came to the rescue of Tirri in the prison of Duke Otous he found that his friend had eaten nothing for three days (Guy, v. 6207). Whatever one may think of the period of a fast, duration is nearly always indicated by the conventional expression.

The extreme of vagueness is found sometimes when definiteness might be expected:

So longe so hit laste (Horn, v. 6).

Horn rode in a while
More than a mile (Horn, vv. 595 f.).

Fro londe worn he bote a mile,
Ne were neuere but ane hwile (Hav. vv. 721 f.).

These last seem almost entirely without meaning. They are rhyming lines and no more. In the treatment of time in our romances, we may say in general, there is neither art nor realism—merely confusion and convention.

1. Cf. Sir Launfal, vv. 196 f.:
   Three dayes ther ben agon
   Mete ne drynke eet y non.

2. The stereotyped expression "so long so hit laste" occurs in Layamon, Robert of Gloucester's Chronicle, etc. See Hall's note to Horn, v. 6.

3. There are exceptions to this statement if it is extended to include English romances in general, of which Horn Childe is one. In the treatment of time this romance approaches the realism of the chronicle, especially in the earlier portion, and it is suited to a larger human environment than KH. The gathering of a force required a fortnight (vv. 61 ff.); after a battle with the Danes, Hæwolf remains on the field nine days (vv. 85 f.); on another occasion he sojourns nine months (vv. 145 f.); news of the approach of the Irish is received on Whitsunday (v. 155); in eleven days preparations are made to repel them (v. 171). Thus more time is given for events to occur than in KH. Likewise, in HCh Horn is dubbed knight within a fortnight after Rimmeld's
In the matter of the general background of social relations we find greater differences. If there are differences in the social circumstances out of which the stories sprang, or of the social groups responsible for their development, they should reveal themselves here. But they are not so conspicuous as differences in the treatment of time and place, since they are not so likely to be reduced to conventional phraseology.

In Horn the general background of human relations is simple, even primitive. The world is divided into Christians and Saracens. The Christian kings are chieftains living on the sea, surrounded by a few personal followers, and subject to Saracen attacks. There is no highly involved machinery of state, apparently no law but the king's will. The twelve companions who accompany Horn illustrate the personal nature of the relation of king and subject. Their presence serves to give dignity to the hero, but they play no important part in the story. The training which Horn receives indicates the simplicity of the social conditions. Ailmar says to Aipelbrus:

[declaration. A tournament lasts seven days (vv. 664 ff.); a feast five days (v. 1117). All in all, there is a rather careful treatment of time. Whitsunday (v. 155) of course was a popular day.]

In Horn et Rimel the treatment of time is not far from the vagueness of KH. It may be noted that in HR there is no great significance in the seven years which Horn may be absent, as he returns to Rimel at the end of five years. It seems likely that there has been a modification in this version.
"Stiward, tak nu here
Mi fundlyng for to lere
Of mine mestere,
of wude & of rivere;
& tech him to harpe
Wi his mayles scharpe,
Biuore me to kerue
& of te cupe serue;
& tech him of al te liste
at te eure of wiste" (vv. 227 ff.)

The background of social relations in Havelok stands in marked contrast with that in King Horn. In the former there is a highly organized society and the characters range from king to thrall. Moreover, there is throughout the romance a certain rev-

1. Here too an interesting comparison with HCh may be made. Not only must Harlaund teach the craft of wood and river, but also

"e ri t forto se,
e lawes bothe eld & newe
Al maner gamen & glewe" (vv. 273 ff.).
Horn also learned to read romances (v. 186). The author must have belonged to a more sophisticated and a more highly organised society than the author of KH. England was a great kingdom opposed to other great kingdoms. Great armies were put in the field, armored, and supplied with provisions. Booty was carefully distributed. Horn's companions were invested with the lands of their slain fathers and swore formal allegiance to Horn. In the battle of Irish and English "sexti thousand were laid to grounde" (v. 186). Horn returned to England from Ireland with a hundred knights. His force occupied "ships", not a ship.

The society of HR is likewise comparatively highly developed. The battles are between armies rather than between individuals, and are won by strategy as well as by strength. The courts are truly royal. Ceremony is carefully observed. The princess has many women and splendid apartments. The garments are described.

Ghascun aueit uester bliaut ynde v Purprin
Ehor eit couriet dupaile aleandrin (vv. 12 f.).

Deskarlete out vester gu nele bien tailee (v. 486).
Splendid gifts are described in great detail (vv. 559 ff.).
erence demanded for this organization. Justice is not vengeance, but the formal execution of legal sentence. The king must rule in the interests of his subjects; and the first duty of subjects is to the king. Aelwold is the ideal king; Grim the loyal subject. Grim, ready to slay the unknown boy, is willing to sacrifice his own children, if necessary, for this same lad when he knows him to be his lawful sovereign. At the time of the famine

Of his children was him nought,  
On hauelok was al his outh (vv. 837 f.).

That the story is of medieval England is indicated not only by the summoning of Parliament, but as well by the transfer of the offices of greyue (v. 1771) and of justice (v. 2202) to Denmark. Perhaps most interesting, however, is the presentation of lowly life. Grim is a thrall and a fisherman; and his manner of life is related in detail. The usual of the double name is interesting—William Wendut, Bernard Brun, Huwe Rauen. The feasts are made up of what must have been a mixture of things familiar and strange to the auditors:

Kranes, swannes, ueneysun,  
Lax, lampreys, and god sturgiun,  
Pyment to drinke, and god clare,  
Win hwit and red, ful god plente (vv. 1726 ff.).

The breadth of the social background is indicated by the list of classes of people summoned by Ubbe to offer homage to Havelok:

Erles, banouns, drenges, theynes,  
Klerkes, knihtes, burgeys, sweynes (vv. 2194 f.)—  
as members of nearly all of them appear as dramatis personae in the romance. While the society of Horn is so primitive that it seems not far removed from that of Beowulf, the society of Havelok is that of medieval England.
In Bevis there seems to be in the social background a considerable portion of primitive passion and primitive cruelty. The general situation is that of the chanson de geste. The essential thing is the enmity of Christian and Saracen. The scorn with which Bevis receives the advances of Josian prior to her conversion represents the actual medieval attitude toward sexual relations with unbelievers. The far-away Sultan of Babylon is vassal of the King of Mombraunt. The Saracens are not marauding parties, as in Horn; they are great and organized armies, representing many countries. Brademond had thirty admirals and ten kings at his command to fight with Bevis and Saber (Bevis, v. 4112); and at his parliament

Erles, barouns, lasse & more,
& fiftene kinges wer samned more (vv. 1715 f.).

So far as the situation in England is concerned, we are confronted first of all with the fact that a war is carried on without a word said about the King of England. If the localities of the story have been changed, we have a means of accounting for this. However, after Bevis has won his territory he is at pains to go to London and ask the King for it (vv. 3496 ff.). The power of the King seems very much limited, however. When Arondel had killed the King's son while he was attempting to steal the steed,

\[ e \text{ king swor, for } \hat{\text{at wronge}}, \]
\[ \hat{\text{at Beues scholde ben an-honge}} \]
\[ \& \text{to-drawe wi} \hat{\text{p wild foole}}. \]
\[ \hat{\text{e barnage it nolde nou} \hat{\text{t Gole}}} \]

1. Cf. the relations of the Emir of Babylon and the Saracen King Marsile in Chanson de Roland.
& seide, hii miȝte do him no wors,  
Boute lete hongen is hors (vv. 3507 ff.).

But ultimately horse and man get off with their lives, although compelled to leave the country. Likewise when King Edgar proposed that Bevis's son Miles should marry the princess, the consent of his lords seems to have been necessary (v. 4551). On the whole, the political circumstances of the romance are not essentially different from those of Havelok, although more confused.

In Guy the larger social environment is not dissimilar to that of Bevis. Europe is a vessel boiling with wars of emperors against dukes, of Christians against Saracens. The emperor is surrounded by counselors, whose advice he asks frequently and usually acts upon. However, the prevalence of the knightly ideal is felt throughout, while little is said about the education and accomplishments of the hero and heroine of Bevis, many lines are devoted to the education received by Guy and Felice. The training of Guy is very similar to that of Horn, with a greater emphasis on courtesy and liberality (Guy, vv. 169 ff.). But the marked difference is in the account of the accomplishments of Felice, trained by teachers from abroad, learned in the seven arts. In Guy the medieval exaltation of woman is very distinctly seen; nothing corresponding is to be found in Horn, Havelok, or Bevis.

To sum up then, one may say that in Horn the setting of time,

place, and human relations is suggested or indicated rather than described. Much of the story occurs in the open—in the woods, on the seashore. But as near as one gets to interest in nature for its own sake is in the half-lyrical utterance of Horn,

"Hoc here foæles singe
& igitur græf him springe" (vv. 129 f.).

Indoor setting is scanty. There is a bed in Rymenhild's bower upon which Ægel and Horn sit. The latter, we are told, was placed on "æ pelle", or covering of the bed. Even descriptions of gifts, so common in romances, do not appear here. Animals play a small part. A white horse and a black horse are mentioned. Time and place are treated simply and conventionally.

The atmosphere seems very primitive. It is a stirring, unsophisticated period. The adornments of life are not yet all-important. There is little aesthetic interest. The human attitude is active and not contemplative. Religion itself is more closely connected with war than peace. There is something very real about the world. There is a slight supernatural element, but not enough to change the tone. And the passions are too primitive, too simple, too direct, for the atmosphere which later times associate with the word romance.

Much of what is said of Horn applies to the other romances. Yet there are differences, and very considerable differences—at least in degrees—which are more easily felt than stated. In Havelok there is more description than in Horn. More of the action is in-doors; it is more closely connected with the town; and it is more closely connected with the common folk. The set-
ting is tamer, more commonplace; has less suggestion of the natural wildness of romance. The atmosphere is no longer primitive; we are breathing an air we know. We are living with people who, on the whole, love peace and order, are faithful to the church, and condemn oppression and lawlessness. If there is a wilder element in society, it is not the attractive outlaw, but the usurper, or the criminal. There is simplicity, but it rather it is not a simplicity of individual passion, is of loyalty to society¹.

In Bevis we approach in some respects Horn. The society, it is true, is more highly developed, more organized. There is more geographical and political sense. There is more of the atmosphere of town and inn. But there is here the exhibition of unrestrained passion which we found in Horn. There is no lack of brutality in the hero himself. The open is important--forest, sea, cave--and this open seems more truly to belong to the romance. But we are farther removed from life than in either Horn or Havelok. We are in the presence of the marvelous and ring miraculous. Magic plays an important part--in gininx, in spring, in potion—but these are not quite so much at home in the story as the ring is at home in Horn. We meet with marvelous giants and dragons; the hero makes a miraculous passage of the sea on a horse; his fetters break as he prays. We are in

¹. There are traces of brutality, but they seem foreign to the general atmosphere. The supernatural barely appears.
the presence of extravagant and romantic details, but the modern reader does not breathe the atmosphere of enchantment—it is the atmosphere of primitive passion and brutality.

In Guy we are in yet another air. There is a sense of the vague fullness of a general geography of which we had a suggestion in Bevis. But we are, to a greater degree than in Bevis, in the presence of a romantic Europe--of towers, of monasteries, of tournaments, of elaborate courts. In-doors and out-doors are far removed from the in-doors and out-doors of Horn. The lady is surrounded by maids. Despite the lack of definite details there is the suggestion of luxury. The outside setting is made up of May forests of singing birds, ringing with the hunter's horn. The atmosphere is the atmosphere of chivalry. The passion of love is not a natural and irresistible impulse; it is formed upon the model laid down by the court of love. But it is more spiritual, too; perhaps the sophistication implies as much. Likewise, religion is no longer the feudal obedience of vassal to his superior—whether conceived as church or God: it has an inward quality; and it may transform the inner life and purpose. This is not fully worked out. We may often forget Guy the pilgrim in Guy the warrior; but the final impression made by Guy is profoundly modified by the religious element. The romance may well be a working over by some religiously inclined man of a tale in which the atmosphere and passion might compare with the atmosphere and passion of Horn, but the change has been effectually made. It is possible only to repeat what
has been said before. The setting of Guy is that of the romanticized chanson de geste.
CHAPTER V

Author, Minstrel, and Audience.

This chapter is in part based on the portion of the study which precedes, and possibly characteristics already pointed out will here be partially explained. Yet I fear that little may be said which is not conjectural. Our knowledge of medieval conditions of literary production and distribution is very slight; and the scattered hints which medieval literature furnishes have not yet been carefully enough scrutinized and compared. This fact may furnish some excuse for the vagueness of this chapter. Another source of confusion is the difficulty of distinguishing between minstrel and author\(^1\), or between author and audience. Beyond a certain point the distinctions are meaningless. However, as a rough classification, the features to be treated in this chapter will be discussed under Author, Minstrel, and Audience.

Author.

The personality of the author is practically absent from King Horn. By the relative emphasis one may judge that the author was interested in the romantic part of the story, in the splendid figure of his hero, and in the romantic incidents as

---

\(^1\) No attempt is made to distinguish between original author and later redactors. The poem in each case is considered as it is, and not as it may have been in an earlier redaction.
abstracted from character or setting. The purpose of the author was to present an interesting, popular story, fitted for the use of the minstrel. If it was written by a minstrel, as has been guessed, he has made good use of his practical knowledge of the needs of his profession. It seems best to suppose that the author was not of high social rank. There is nothing to indicate knowledge on his part of courtly conditions. On the other hand, there is no evidence that he closely represents the lower classes. Perhaps the detached tone agrees fairly well with the supposition that we have here the work of a talented minstrel of perhaps the twelfth century. The moral attitude of the author is not at all striking. The dividing line between good and evil is as clear as in melodrama. But the author seldom indicates any preference. His disapproval of Fikenhild and approval of Æðulf are indicated when these companions of the hero are introduced:

Æðulf was ðe beste
& Fikenhylde ðe werste (vv. 27 f.).

Elsewhere once or twice, as has been noted, the author has a word to say in disapproval of Fikenhild. For the most part, however, his attitude is not expressed. There is no question of moral conduct introduced which is not implicit in the story. There is nothing of the "swa sceal" of Beowulf in King Horn. There is a lack of the epic leisure which would naturally invite such a digression as even a word of comment would require.

---

1. See vv. 647 f.
The author of *Havelok* must have lived very close to the common people. The abundant detail of humble life, the interest in good government, the respect for law, as well as the familiar tone of the address to the audience placed in the minstrel's mouth, strengthen the impression of homely atmosphere and humble interests. The bits of Latin in the text and the strong moral feeling displayed suggest that the author may have been a priest of modest rank. The following interruptions of the narrative for curse or comment will prove with how much interest the author followed his *dramatis personae*, and how much the moral aspects of his story impressed him:

Michel was svich a king to preyse,
Dat held so Engelond in grith! (vv. 60 f.).

Yanne Godard was sikerlike
Vnder God ye moste swike,
Dat eure in eure shaped was,
With-uten on, ye wike Judas.
Haue he ye malisun to-day
Of alle Dat eure spoken may!
Of patriarke, and of pope,
And of prest with loken kope,
Of monekes and hermites bothe!
And of ye leue holi rode
War God him-selue ran on blode!
Crist him warie with his mouth!
Waried wurthe he of norw and suth!
Of alle men, Dat spoken kunne,
Of Crist, Dat made mone and sunne! (vv. 423 ff.).

Iesu Crist, Dat makede go
Ye halte, and ye doumbe speke,
Hauelok, Ye of Godard wreke! (vv. 542 ff.).

2. See pp. 107 ff.
3. The Latin expressions are common enough: *Benedicamus domino* (v. 20); *"In manus tuas"* (v. 228).
Havelok is the most democratic of the romances. Others which were familiar to the same ears as those which heard the Havelok-story represent merely the changed and degraded narratives of audiences of higher rank. But here the author seems to have made himself one with the audience to which he is making his appeal.

It is scarcely worth while to attempt to say anything about the author of Bevis. Almost anybody might have made such a collection of incidents as makes up this romance. Even the occasional comment is conventional. The reference to a source—so common in the English romances—has no value except to fill up the line and to indicate that the translator is faithful to his original. "seife boke" and "as it is tolde in Frenche tale" and "as he romounce tellef" give a faint hint as to the source.

There are also a few moral judgments:

And moche azen he right he wrought (v. 56).

Fals a was, fat pautener (v. 30).

In the anticipations which occur here and there there is sometimes an expression of feeling:

1. The figures of speech are for most part conventional, but a few homely ones may be significant:
   
   Al engelond was of him adrad
   So his fe beste fro fe gad (vv. 278 f.).
   So brouke i euere mi blake swire (v. 311).
   Was it nouth worth a fir sticke (v. 966).
   He folwede hem so hund dos hare (v. 1994).
   Fat he roredo als a bale (v. 2438).
   And beten on him so dot fe smith
   With fe hammer on fe stith (vv. 1876 f.).
   He maden here backes al-so bloute
   Als here wombes, and made hem rowte (vv. 1910 ff.).

2. Cf. p. 113: Als he weren kradelbarnes: So dos fe child at moder-barnes
Alias, fat he nadde be war
Of is fomen, fat weren fat
Him forte schende (vv. 205 ff.).

Alias, fat he nadde him sloaw (v. 1063).

Him hadde be better, he hadde hem slein (v. 1204).

Prayers and curses appear occasionally:

Helpe him god, fat alle thing wroujt (v. 846).

In helle mote fat ai hongen heie (v. 1212).

Have he cristes kurs and min (v. 1223).

Now is Beues at his pites grounde:
God brinkh him up hol and sonde!(vv. 1431 f.).

Wende his saule, whider it wende! (v. 3458: spoken of Devoun).

There are also some proverbs and general statements:

Wimmanes bolt is some schote (v. 1192).

Man's bondes make light work (v. 3352).

Man when he falled into elde
Feble he wexe und unbelde (vv. 46 f.).

Wikked fele fele wimmen to fonde (v. 548).

Delire a ef fro e galwe,
He e hate after be alle halwe! (vv. 1217 ff).

For, hwan a man is in pouerte falle,
He ha fewe frendes wi alle (vv. 3593 ff.).

1. Cf. Stimming's Boeve, p. cxxxii: "was die Zusätze betrifft, so hat E (English version) zwar, wie wir gesehen, mehrfach subjektive Wendungen unterdrückt, aber andererseits auch solche eingefügt." A list follows.

2. The proverbs are usually found in the mouths of the dramatis personae.
There is no evidence of refinement or culture. The religion is of a very uncompromising type. The author evidently approves of the slaughter of the Mohammedan priest by his hero (vv. 1353 ff); the kingdom of Armenia is Christianized by force\(^1\); Bevis regards Josian's proffered love with profound contempt until she is converted (vv. 1089 ff.). The general crudity and cruelty of the hero, with so many other indications, seem to point to an author of small culture.

The authorship of *Guy* presents something of a problem because the romance joins together the adventurous and the religious in an unexpected fashion. This fact has led to the suggestion that the first part of the romance is the work of an ordinary romance writer, while the last part—that concerning the adventures of Guy the pilgrim—is the work of a cleric. Yet the differences are not great enough to make this certain. In both parts the author is interested in something beyond mere incident, and both the courtly love interest and the religious interest associate the author with a more refined, sophisticated type of literature than we find elsewhere in our group. The comments on the action and the general statements are very much as in *Bevis*, but less in number. Compare the following general statements:

1. *Al þe londe of Ermony*  
   *Hii make cristen wiþ dent of swerd,*  
   *þong and elde, lewed and lered* (vv. 4018 ff.).
(Guy remarks:)

"For the last no won yet noyt
at wimen han to gronde y-brouyt" (vv. 1563 f.).

"Who yet nil noyt leue his fader,
Heeschel leue his steffader" (vv. 1593 f.).

The comments of the author do not indicate much as to moral at-
titude. There may be a curse or a prayer, in the manner of the
author of Havelok:

Have he cristes malisoun (v. 3882).

Bot god of him have pite (v. 5776).

Some feeling is also shown in the following:

Wold god of heuen, yet made man
Yet he hadde his brond keruing (vv. 5772 f.).

Allas yet reuyc & yet sorwe
Yet he no hadde his bodi foracome (vv. 5291 f.).

Yet he no hadde, alas, alas,
ouen him swich another (vv. 5365 f.).

There are a few reference to God's guidance of men's affairs. When Guy seemed on the point of being struck through the body, the author remarks

God would not suffer it (v. 5784).

And when Guy once escaped from a treacherous snare of Otous, the author says:

Now to tel of Gij ichaue y-souyt
Hou god him hafr fram de bi-y-brouyt (vv. 5953 f.).

One can hardly draw conclusions from a few remarks of this kind. More striking are the repentance of the hero and his desertion of his bride, which connect the story with the Alexius-legend.1

1. See p. 206.
This is evidently regarded as an act above criticism. The acts of charity, the visits to churches, even the vision (just before Guy's death) are not uncommon enough to indicate more than a normal amount of piety. Our conclusion, then, is merely what is implied in the differences between Guy and the other romances. This poem has come from the hand of a man familiar with courtly romance and pious legend, but not one who belonged to the class of poets who wrote primarily for nobles and princes.

It is not surprising that our romances are anonymous. Only Havelok seems to need an author. Bevis and Guy were put together for the use of minstrels; they are hack work, probably by minstrels. The interruptions to which attention has been called are stereotyped. Our group of romances (in their English form) may all be the work of minstrels dependent upon a popular audience.

1. The utterance of proverbs and generalizations are common:
   Game is good whil hit lastes (Alisaunder, v. 236).
   Soth hit is, in al thyng, of eovel lif comuth eovel endyng! (Ibid, vv. 752 f.).
   Falshode wyl have a foule end (Torrent of Portyngale, v. 2153).

General statements on the shortcomings of women are frequently met. For the interrupting prayer, curse, or blessing, compare the following:
   God, as je are muchel of myt,
   Save syre Degrivaunt the knyt,
   And lene hym grace in that fy;
   Wel for to spede (DegreVant, vv. 1527 ff.).
   Y-blesed mot he be! (Ibid., v. 1836).
   Blessed mot suche wemen bee! (Sir Amadas, v. 334).
   Ah! wo worth wicked treason! (Sir Triamore, v. 358).

The interrupting exclamation is common in chansons de geste;
cf. Roland, v. 716;
   Deus! quel dolor que li Franceis nel sevont!
**Minstrel**

Attention has incidentally been called to the fact that the conditions under which minstrels presented their romances were sometimes far from favorable. Sometimes it was necessary to raise the voice in an appeal for silence which would be heard above the din of mirth which followed the feast. Disturbances must have been common; interruptions must have occurred. At the inn or fair there would be a changing audience. It would be necessary to tell a story of which the thread could easily be picked up by the newcomer. Either the story must be short, or structure could have no value. As all of our four romances were intended, one can scarcely doubt, for recitation rather than for reading, the conditions which the minstrel had to meet are an important consideration.

First of all, who was the minstrel? Often he was none other

---


2. Cf. Seven Sages, vv. 1 f.: Lordynges, that here likes to dwell, Laues your speche and heres this spell.

3. See remarks on romance introductions, pp. 107 ff.
than the author; that is, he manufactured the wares which he sold. Sometimes, probably, an organization of minstrels had old stories worked over for the use of its members. It is true that there are minstrels who are well-known French poets, and who had high social position. They were sometimes attached to the court of a prince, and composed according to the tastes of a courtly audience. Most of the better romans d'aventure were written by or for minstrels of this stationary class. But the wandering minstrel, whose living depended on the pleasure of the multitude, would naturally use older, more popular material; would work it up with less care for exactitude of detail, with less care for rich setting or complicated emotions. His work was more naturally a continuation of the chanson de geste.

In England conditions were somewhat different from those in France. The courtly minstrels naturally were those using the

---

1. "Au moyen âge, dans l'usage de la langue et dans l'opinion publique, trouvères, conteurs de fabliaux, danseurs, acrobates, joueurs de couteaux, prestigiateurs, dresseurs de marmotes, menestrels, c'est tout un" (Bedier, Fabliaux, p. 407). The following lines from Sir Orfeo give a hint of the troubles of the wandering minstrel:

"And, sir, it is the maner of ous
To seche mani a lordes hous;
For we nouȝt wâlcom no be,
Zete we mot proferi for our gle." (vv. 429 ff.).

2. See Freymond, Jongleurs und Menestrels.

3. Cf. Bedier, Les Légendes Epiques, I, pp. 305 ff. The lack of coherence and consistency in the chansons de geste is due to the fact that they were chanted or recited before "auditoires de fortune". The romance (in the stricter sense) was "meant mainly for aristocratic hearers or readers" (Gummere, art. on "Romances" in Universal Cyclopedia and Atlas.)
the French language. The English minstrels depended, for the most part, on more popular audiences. If they received the fashionable romance of the court minstrel, they made it over into a more popular poem, and were likely to degrade it. The more popular foreign stories—of the *chansons de geste*—were without appeal to the Englishman of Saxon blood. If given a local setting—as in the *Bevis* and the *Guy*—it is the *chanson de geste* which is most popular, but in a late and unworthy dress. The English minstrel did not have the fixed social position which would encourage original and meritorious work.

Given such a minstrel, what were the circumstances under which he recited his romance, and what was his attitude toward his audience? There are hints in our four romances which are of some interest. We have already noticed the friendly introductory appeal of the minstrel in *Havelok*. There cannot be the slightest doubt as to the general character of an audience which is addressed as

\[
gode men, Wiues, maydnes, and alle men (vv. 1 f.).\]

1. A long list of minstrels is mentioned in the roll of payments made at a Whitsuntide feast in London in 1306. Nearly all have French names, particularly those who are well paid; cf. Chamber's *Mediaeval Stage*, I, p. 47; also vol. II, Appendix C.

2. Minstrels were employed by municipal corporations from the beginning of the fifteenth century (Chambers, I, p. 51). The alliterative romances seem the product of a minstrelsy in the north and west which had a favorable environment; was neither out at the elbow, nor dependent on the bourgeoisie. Some of the alliterative romances may have been the work of a minstrel at the Scottish court.
The "fill up the cup" is a frequent request of the minstrel.  

Ac er ḟ an we beginne & fe nit,  
Ful us ge koppe anon riȝtē! (Bevis, vv. 4107 f.).

At points in the story, there may be a few words addressed to the audience—perhaps a reference to something to follow?

His ojer prowesse who wile lere,  
Hende, herkne, and ye mai here! (Bevis, vv. 737 f.).

Herkne now a wonder cas! (Bevis, v. 1792).

Ye, at wile a stounde dwelle,  
Of his stringe ye i mai now telle (vv. 1679 f.).

On an vnsele y may you telle  
& ye wil a stoundedwelle (Guy, vv. 1267 f.).

Lordinges, listene to me now! (Guy, v. 2449).

suggestions as to the need of brevity turn up occasionally:

Of ṟat feste nel ich namor telle (Bevis, v. 1483).  
Wharto schuld ich you telle more (Guy, v. 3567)³.  
Wharto schuld ich held long tale (Guy, v. 5345).

There are also assurances of the truth of the story:

What helpe hit to make fable? (Bevis, vv. 2147, 3557).  
Whar-to schuld y fer-of lye? (Guy, v. 5157).

The references to the source— the book, the romance, the French—

1. See introduction to Havelok, quoted p. 108.
2. Cf. discussion of anticipatory remarks, pp. 177 ff.
3. See also Guy, vv. 3593, 3625, 4140, 4783.
4. See above, p. 352.
are probably assurances of accuracy. The hints which such lines as the above furnish are slight enough, but they show clearly the presence of the minstrel before an audience with which he is on easy terms.

The question as to just how the romances were presented is made somewhat difficult by variety of length. All of Horn could very well be presented at one time. Even Havelok might be completed in the course, say, of a single evening. But Bevis and Guy are too long for presentation at one time. The amount which would be presented at a given time would no doubt depend upon the requirements of the occasion. Probably the song of Colbrond which was sung at Winchester in 1338 before an audience of monks was an extract from the romance. Gautier suggests that about

1. The source suggested is usually literary. Such a statement as—

As I com by an waie
Hof on ich herde saie (Dame Siriz, vv. 1 f.)—
is unusual in romances, though natural enough for fabliau. But compare Sir Tristrem, 1 ff.!
I was at Erceeldoun,
With Tomas spak y here, etc.
See also the beginning of Ballad 115:
I herde a carping of a clerk.

2. Suggestions of generosity might be made. Cf. Sir Cleges, vv. 49 ff.:

Mynstrellys, when the fest was don,
Wyouthen yfftes schuld not gon,
And that bothe rache and good:
Hors, robis and reche ryng,
Gold, siluer and othyr thynge,
To mend wyth her modde.

Cf. the close of Sir Eglamour. Occasionally the minstrel had the courage to ask his hearers how they liked the story:
Here endyth the furst fit.
How say ye? Will ye any more of hit? (Sir Degrevant, following v. 352 '.').

two thousand verses made up one performance of the reciter of the
chansons de geste\textsuperscript{1}. It seems that the minstrel sometimes had
closing lines, perhaps with an appeal for a reward, which he
added at the end of his recital, no matter whether he had com-
pleted a romance or merely an incident in a romance\textsuperscript{2}.

The conditions were no doubt much the same in England as
in France. We have, then, a partial explanation of the conglom-
erate character of the long romances. They were collections of
stories about one hero, and were recognized as such. The weaving
together of diverse motives and incidents into a complicated yet
consistent plot would have been a positive disadvantage to the
minstrel. And the lesser graces of careful motivation and
consistency of detail were not of much practical value.

\textsuperscript{1} Les Épopées Françaises, I, pp. 408 ff.

\textsuperscript{2} Gautier, loc. cit. Cf., also, Suchier, pp. 23 f.
Audience.

We may be sure that the audience of most of the English romances was not a select one. The author of the French roman d'aventure might desire only kings and counts for readers, but the English author or minstrel could have no such haughty wish. His appeal was primarily to those who did not understand French. Not before the time of Chaucer was there a courtly audience for poetry in English. Not infrequently English authors and translators expressly state that they write for those who do not know French.

Attention has been called to the occasional familiar address of minstrel to audience. This would indicate a popular audience. We have also noted the familiar tone of the introduction of Hav- elok and the mixed character of the audience to which the minstrel appealed. Usually, however, the terms in which the audiences are addressed are too vague to throw much light on their character. Such expressions as "lordes", "lordinges", "hende", "gentlemen of freeborn blood" are apparently titles of vague respect.

2. Cf. William of Palerne, vv. 5527 ff. This romance, much less popular than any in our group, was translated at the command of the Earl of Hereford for hem at knowe no frenscche neuer vnderston.
6. Ballad No. 117 (Child).
If we examine the character of the stories we are again likely to be troubled to pick out the kind of audience for which they were intended. This is true of *King Horn*. It has few distinctly popular elements. The *dramatis personae* are all of the knightly class. The ideals presented are knightly, not democratic. No hint is given as to the relation of king and common subject. In fact, the existence of such subjects is passed over without mention. On the other hand, the story is very simple. It has none of the courtliness which a contemporary or earlier French romance, intended for the nobility, would have. Its appeal could not have been to a sophisticated audience. To be kept in mind also is the possible age of the romance. Its primitive elements have been noted. Before the Norman Conquest even the higher classes were not especially cultivated; and after the Conquest the obscure Saxons of the higher classes retained their primitive mode of life. In such a social group as this the romance might have taken earliest shape, and the popular audience of inn and tavern would, as time passed, have listened eagerly to the story for its intrinsic interest, perhaps too as a tale of olden times. The common people have always been interested in the stories of the great. It is not safe to judge from the subject matter of the tale the audience for which it was originally intended.¹

Fortunately, *Havelok* presents no difficulty here. The most picturesque and most interesting portions of the story are

¹ One need only recall the *dramatis personae* of many folk-tales and ballads.
concerned with humble life. Ideals, atmosphere, *dramatis personae*, incidents *evidently* belong to people of very modest rank. The entire absence of courtly love removes the romance far from the literature which the aristocratic classes cared for.

*Bevis* and *Guy* have nothing popular about them so far as *dramatis personae* and motives are concerned. *Bevis*, however, is very popular in its atmosphere, in the crude, fierce human nature, and in the absence of refinement of manner or feeling. *Guy* has been influenced by courtly romance; there is romantic situation and romantic emotion. But it has not the genuine love of rich setting, of finely-analyzed emotions which characterizes the true *roman d'aventure*.

The metrical forms of the romances are suggestive. The meter of Horn seems to be in line of descent from the Old English verse; that is, the dominant influence is native and not foreign¹. *Bevis* and *Guy* are both, in part, in the tail-rhyme strophe. While this meter has a foreign origin ², it became, because of its *catchy* swing, an extremely popular one; is used in many of the most popular romances; and is an important metrical form of the miracle plays³. The fact that it is not used by the better-known poets

---


of the fourteenth century, except in Chaucer's rollicking burlesque, is no doubt sufficiently indicative of the attitude of the cultured classes towards it. The couplet was used by all classes; but the general freedom or laxity of the couplet in our romances indicates sufficiently well the absence of a highly charged literary atmosphere.

What can one conclude in regard to the attitude toward life of this audience, so far as one can judge from the romances which they were pleased to hear? We surely see the king the common people loved in Aþelwold. In the romance of Havelok, too, we see their love of games, their respect for honest labor, their submission to the laws which protected property and life, their reverence for their legitimate sovereign, their local pride. This attitude cannot be inferred from the other three romances. But from all we get the idea of rather unrefined natures. There is no drawing back from cruelty to traitor or Saracen. There is real delight in the torture of an enemy. Religion (except in Guy) is the rough and ready loyalty of a subject to a king. A crude morality may be inferred from the popular proverbs and general reflections which have already been discussed.

1. Attention may again be called to the fact that our group of romances—particularly Bevis and Guy—are great storehouses of conventional phrase; Cf. Schmirgel's list. There is more than a hint in this as to the probable literary standing of the authors, at least of the translators.


The humor which these audiences appreciated was of the crudest sort. The beating of the Saracen gods[1] was one of the familiar bits of humor. Then there was the old joke about making priests and monks. When Guy had given the sultan a blow which carved helm and flesh, he taunts his foe thus:

"ou hast a croun sbhauen to e bon;
Tomorwe ou mi t sing anon.
Wele ou ou test to ben a prest,
When ou of swich a bischop order berst!" (vv. 3651 ff.).

When Grander's brother asked Bevis where he stole Trenchefis,

"Grander," que Beues, " weary hod,
And made him a kroune brod;
So he was next under me fest,
Wele y wom, ich made him prest,
And hi dekne ich wil make e,
Er ich fuer fro e te!" (vv. 1869 ff.).

Guy, in one of his fights with Duke Otous, carved away a quarter of his opponent's helm

and made him a croun brod ere
As a monke at orderd were (vz. 5287 f.).

We have already seen comic features in the character of Ascopard in Bevis. But in spite of these instances, one may say that humor scarcely exists. What hints of it there are seem to show

1. See p. 201.

2. Cf. Kolbing's note to Bevis, vv. 1869 ff.; also to Ipomedon, vv. 6927 ff.
that the audiences who heard the romances were the same in temperament as those who laughed at the cries of pain in the miracle plays. A really fine and delicate bit of humor would be out of place in these romances.

As to the finer, if somewhat uncertain, morals of sexual relationship which the French romances inculcated, we find little in the English romances. The later adulterous roman d'aventure apparently gained little foothold in the English language, although the manuscripts of the French poems of this type found in England indicate that this type of story was pretty widely read by those who knew the language in which they were written. But the code of the court of love evidently did not soak through to the strata of society which enjoyed the Havelok and the Guy. At the same time, there are signs which indicate that high moral standards were not required. As in the ballads, love must be faithful, but not necessarily legalized by marriage\(^1\). In our ro-

\(^1\) Cf. Hart, Ballad and Epic, p. 10.
mances the sexual relations are on a comparatively high plane. In other romances they sometimes descend to the level of the fabliau. But there is no evidence that the artificial moral code of the later French roman d'aventure had any significance for the ordinary reader of English romances.

The average culture of the members of our audience was not great. Their standards—intellectual, moral, religious, social—were not much influenced by the changing fashions of courtly circles. Like their fathers, they loved stories, and stories of all sorts. The most obvious place for obtaining them was from the supply which was prepared for the higher classes. Many minstrels were bilingual; naturally they adapted the material of the French narrative literature. If native material was worked up into romance, the model was foreign. And the romances which could stand the process of transplanting were naturally those of which the chief interest lay in incidents—not in atmosphere, style, character.

* * * * * *

Taking all these things into consideration, we may be sure that the ridicule which Chaucer lavished upon the romances was fully appreciated by the aristocratic circle to which he made his primary appeal. He was merely giving expression to the common sentiment of the more polished society of his time, which

looked with contempt upon the more or less slovenly productions which entertained the inferior classes. It was not at all difficult for Chaucer's friends to see the joke of his burlesque romance. Therefore, we must look upon our earlier romances not as the amusement of the idle hours of the more cultured, but as the entertainment of the bourgeoisie or the folk.
CHAPTER VI

Conclusion

"The romance was meant mainly for aristocratic hearers or readers, and along with its exaggerated adventures of chivalry it struck the new note of sentimental love. Incident is the main consideration, but ideals of character, types rather than individuals, are developed in such figures as Launcelot and the courteous Gawain. Romances differ from the older chansons de geste in this echo of chivalry, in a greater range of invention and in a disposition to avoid the local and the popular."

If one should test Horn, Havelok, Bevis, and Guy by the characteristics which Professor Gummere in these remarks assigns to the romance, he would find himself obliged to reject them from that category. They might be romantic; they would not be romances. Havelok certainly was not "meant mainly for aristocratic hearers or readers"; Bevis was not; Horn and Guy probably were not; and I think the statement holds true for French as well as English versions. "Sentimental love" appears only in Guy. It is true that "incident is the main consideration," and perhaps there "is a disposition to avoid the local and the popular", but even these characteristics do not apply to Havelok.

If ideals of character are developed, they certainly are not aristocratic ideals.

Yet Professor Gummere, in thus distinguishing the romance as a type from other literary forms—particularly from the chanson de geste—is entirely accurate. Romance, then, is practically synonymous with what in the Introduction was termed roman d'aventure. Chretien's works are clearly romances; the Roland is clearly a chanson de geste; epic and romance are kept distinct. The epic is popular; the romance is aristocratic. The epic is primarily for chant or recitation; the romance is primarily for reading. The author of the epic can write a narrative of naked simplicity, because voice and music will add emotion and charm. The romancer must supply the place of voice and music with elaboration of setting, with detailed analysis of emotion, with an appeal to feelings that are personal rather than communal.

There may be some question as to the accuracy of so sharply distinguishing between romance and chanson de geste, even in their purest forms. However this may be, as time passed the distinction became less. In the chanson de geste one may find elaboration of setting, sentimental love, an atmosphere of chivalry. A romantic theme may be adapted to the dramatis personae and social circumstances of the chanson de geste. In other words, the types become confused; and in the English literature all this material passes under the name of romance.

But has this confusion in the use of the word romance in any way biased our judgments of English medieval literature? I
believe that it has. It is true that our literary histories distinguish between the "matter of France" and the "matter of Britain", and that we all recognize roughly the differences of literary types which the distinction implies. However, I think we are less confident in our estimation of the "matter of England", that is, of our four romances.

The misconceptions which I wish to clear away spring, it seems to me, from the custom of loosely lumping these four romances together as representing the same conditions, literary and historical, and from a tendency to overemphasize the specifically English features in them. In Chapter XIV of the first volume of The Cambridge History of English Literature, where these romances are discussed, I find these misconceptions so clearly present that they may very well lead to a misunderstanding of the place of the so-called "matter of England" in literary history. Consequently, I shall quote and comment upon those statements which seem most to need modification and correction.

"The romances which spring directly from English soil are animated by essentially different motives and reflect a different society from that of the French group. In Havelok and Horn, in Guy of Warwick and Beves of Hamtoun there exists primarily the viking atmosphere of tenth century England, though the sagas, in their actual form, have acquired, through alien handling, a certain crusade colouring. In Horn, for instance, Saracens are substituted for vikings in plain disregard of historical verisimilitude; and again, in Guy of Warwick, the English legend has
been invested with fresh motives and relentlessly expanded with adventures in Paynim. After removing such excrescences, however, we shall find something of earlier English conditions.\(^1\)

After summarizing the stories, Professor Atkins goes on thus: "In attempting to estimate the contribution made by these four works to Middle English romance, it must be remembered that, although they originate ultimately from the England of the vikings, of Aethelstan and Edgar, they have all been touched with later foreign influences. In them may be perceived, however, an undeveloped chivalry, as well as reminiscences of Old English life and thought. The code of chivalry is as yet unformulated. In Havelok we see the simple ideal of righting the wrong. In Horn and Guy of Warwick is perceptible a refinement of love which makes for asceticism; but the love details are not, in general, elaborated in accordance with later chivalrous ideals. Rymenhild and Josian both woo and are wooed; but they lack the violence of Carolingian heroines. In Felice alone do we find traces of that scrupulous niceness encouraged in the era of the courts of love. With regard to the existence of earlier English reminiscences, in both Horn and Havelok can be seen the joy in descriptions of the sea characteristic of Old English verse. Both Guy and Bevás, again, have their dragons to encounter after the fashion of Beowulf. The marvellous, which, to some extent, appears in Havelok, is of the kind found in Germanic folk-lore; it is distinct in its essence from the product of Celtic fancy\(^2\). The plebeian

\(^1\) Cambr. Hist., I, p. 337.

\(^2\) This statement seems to me both true and important.
elements in the same work, which embody a detailed description of humble life, and which are in striking contrast to the monotonous aristocratic colouring of the romance elsewhere, witness, undoubtedly, to a primitive pre-Conquest community. And, last, Guy's great fight with Colbrand breathes the motive of patriotism—the motive of Byrthnoth—rather than the religious zeal which fired crusading heroes in their single combats."

Back of this criticism lies, of course, the identification of the incidents and circumstances of our romances with historical events and circumstances of pre-Conquest days. In the introductory chapter we saw that this identification has not proved to be certainly true or of special significance—that the resemblances between romance and history, when they exist, are practically restricted to names or commonplace occurrences. Whether or not there is any historical basis for certain incidents in one or two or all of these romances, the critic is fundamentally wrong, it seems to me, who claims that in these romances "there exists primarily the viking atmosphere of tenth century England!" I think the analysis made in this study has shown clearly that we cannot dispose of our romances with such a simple statement. We found that the atmosphere of each romance differed from the atmosphere of every other. The differences in motive and in society between Horn and Guy of Warwick are much greater than between Guy of Warwick and the "French group" which is here so emphatically set apart from the English group. The French group goes back to
the *chansons de geste*, and we found in *Guy* motives and situations familiar to the same type of narrative. And as for *Bevis*, it is, in its French form, usually classified as a *chanson de geste*. Only in *Horn* do I find anything that would suggest the term "viking atmosphere". In *Horn* there is the breath of the sea; there are suggestions of sudden ocean raids; there is an absence of refinement and courtliness; there is life unadorned. One feels then a temptation to look back of the thirteenth century to a time when the sea was more important, when society was cruder and life rougher. However, one cannot be sure, even in this case, that the story goes back to the days of the *vikings*; although the surmise does not seem impossible.

But after breathing the air of *Horn* one will never recognize the same air in *Havelok*, in *Bevis*, or in *Guy*. I cannot find "the joy in the description of the sea" which is said to characterize *Havelok*. The ship is described in a realistic fashion, but the nearest to description of the sea that I have noted is the lines:

> Fro londe worn he bote a mile,  
> Ne were it neuer but ane hwhile,  
> at it ne gan a wind to rise  
> Out of e north, men calleth "bise,"  
> And drof hem intil Engelond (*Havelok*, vv. 721 ff.).

So far as *Bevis* and *Guy* are concerned, there is not the slightest indication of familiarity with the sea.

But perhaps in connection with the battles there may be found traces of the pre-Conquest life. We are told of *Horn* that "the alighting of the king and his companions to fight on
foot is a primitive touch and in keeping with the English custom before the conquest."¹ There is also the lack of the detail which is so abundant in other romances. As for Guy's fight with Colbrond, we have already seen that it has the general combat features which are found in Bevis and the chansons de geste. In both Bevis and Guy we found the island fight familiar in French narrative poetry. As for Havelok, the characteristic fight is the one in which heads are broken with a wooden bar.

In regard to character and emotion, I can only direct attention again to the impossibility of grouping the romances together. It is true that we found a group of dramatis personae appearing in three of the romances—but this in itself is an indication of the fabulous nature of the tales². Havelok, the popular hero, is no viking. Bevis is fierce enough for anything, but there is plenty of precedent for brutality in romance as well as in chanson de geste. And Guy is a chivalrous knight. Love, in Horn and in Bevis, we have seen to have the characteristics of the love of chanson de geste. Professor Atkins has grouped Guy and Horn together as showing "a refinement of love which makes for asceticism". I cannot understand this remark as applied to Horn; and think our discussion of the love of Rymenhild³ proves

1. Hall's note to v. 47.

2. It is worth remembering, too, that Jordan finds almost this same group in the French poems; see p. 244 above.

that this description is not applicable. I agree that it fits the Guy. It also seems to me that Professor Atkins is wrong in trying to make the love-making of Rymenhild and Josian different in kind from that of the Carolingian heroines. It is true there is not the brutality of passion which is sometimes found in chansons de geste; but there certainly are forwardness and violence. Besides, Josian plays a part resembling that of other Saracen heroines.

But Professor Atkins declares that there are in these romances "reminiscences of Old English life and thought"; and that there is an "undeveloped chivalry", which, I presume, is an indication of pre-Conquest origin. These remarks, again, seem to me to be really intelligible only as applied to Horn, and in the case of Horn it is hard to point out definite lines which really go to prove this "pre-Conquest origin". What, for instance, are the reminiscences of Old English thought? We are told that the "plebeian elements" in Havelok, "which are in striking contrast to the monotonous aristocratic coloring elsewhere, witness, undoubtedly, to a primitive pre-Conquest community." We are also told that Guy's "fight with Colbrand breathes the motive of patriotism--the motive of Byrhtnote--rather than the religious zeal which fired crusading heroes in their single combats." As for Havelok, the local references seem to indicate that the romance is to be dated near the end of the twelfth century, and the rich details of humble life apply just as well to life among simple folk of the twelfth century as of the tenth. These de-
tails are not of the sort which would survive oral transmission through two centuries, and they are not of the sort that we find in Anglo-Saxon literature. And as for the patriotism of the Colbrond fight, is that essentially different from the love for "sweet France" which inspired the heroes of the chansons de geste? Surely there is nothing here distinctly reminiscent of Old English life and thought. The historical event faintly remembered may be old, but the patriotism is not.

It is scarcely necessary to repeat the oft-told fact that we cannot connect our metrical romances with the Anglo-Saxon narrative poetry. The delight in the sea which is one of the most attractive features of Anglo-Saxon poetry is not to be found at all in our group—except in Horn, and there not very distinctly. There is nothing in the manner of expressing attitude toward nature comparable with the manner of Beowulf. As for the dragon fights which are common to Guy, Bevis, and the Old English epic, what can be concluded from the presence of such a wide-spread incident? The narrative conventions, whether of motive, setting or character, are not the outcome of Anglo-Saxon tradition.

It is perfectly clear, I hope, that I am speaking primarily of narrative characteristics, and that if a certain amount of Anglo-Saxon tradition filtered through the centuries into these romances, it would not change my conclusion that as pieces of

literature our romances must be interpreted by the human environment and literary types of the Middle English period. The absence of the chivalric features of the highly developed romand'aventure is to be explained, not as due to a survival of primitive elements, but as due to the audiences to which the romances made their appeal—audiences not courtly, nor sophisticated, nor analytical.

Looking at our romances merely as examples of medieval story, a question might naturally be raised as to their place in the evolution of narrative art. Professor Hart, in his Ballad and Epic, has analyzed the narrative features of different types of ballads and of the famous Old English and Old French epics, and has pointed out a possible genetic sequence indicated by the differences in degree and kind of the characteristics which he finds. Would it be possible to relate the narrative art of our romances to Professor Hart's scheme, or to any other conceivable outline of the development of narrative? I do not feel capable of performing this task, and I question the value of it if done. In the first place our romances are too diversified; each would have to be considered alone. Only Horn can profitably be compared with the ballad. Havelok is probably related to the Breton lay. Bevis and Guy are descendants of the chanson de geste, the latter showing a mixture with the roman d'aventure. The realistic element of Havelok is interesting, but it has no evident connection with realism of the Chaucerian type. And Bevis and Guy are not in the main current
of narrative advance; they represent a backward eddy which loses itself in the sands. The Arthurian romance carried over medieval influence into modern times. The decadent chanson de geste sank lower and lower until all dignity was lost; they continued to live down well into modern times, and in some countries do yet live, but in a sad state of degeneracy. Our romances made little or no contribution to the development of narrative art.

But the lost cause has its fascination and charm—even if only the lost cause of a group of romances. They failed to survive; they have somehow lost the power to grip our imagination. Horn and Havelok, for us the most interesting, were not the most popular. Bevis and Guy are so long, so formless, so monotonous, that the reading of them is often a dreary task. Yet they are the things which our ancestors chose to hear in the brief hours when their minds might be stimulated by stories of a life not their own. They might have heard better stories; sometimes they did hear better stories; but these were the favorites. Therefore it is for us to try to understand the basis of the appeal which these romances made and the circumstances of life and culture which make them possible and gave them meaning. There is romantic charm in the search for the secret of the spell which they cast upon the imagination of the common folk six hundred years ago.
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