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A TEXTUAL NOTE

In this dissertation, non-English words, phrases, sentences, and extended passages are printed in italic type. Within words, etc., so printed, roman type is used to indicate the expansion of suspensions and abbreviations found in the French, e.g. "gectoyent," in which the presence of the "n" is indicated by a macron over the second "e" in the original. Conversely, in roman-type citations from English sources, italic type is used to indicate expansions, e.g. "a byg man and a valyant." Abbreviations indicated in the sources by macrons or by special (i.e. non-alphabetical) symbols, e.g. Ⓞ for "sir" and its variants, are consistently expanded. Those involving superscript letters, e.g. "yor" and "w↑," are left unaltered. Underlining is used to indicate material omitted by Lord Berners from the French or material added by Berners to his English translation. The relevant significance of the underline will be clear from the context in each instance.

The 1513 French Huon, the text against which Berners' translation is compared, features two columns of
text on each page. Parenthetical references to this text will indicate in which column on the page the lines cited are to be found. References to the French text and to a small number of the English sources cited will also contain either an "r." to indicate "recto" or "v." to indicate "verso." Hence a typical reference to the French Huon will have the following form: (Huon f. clvii, v. A/4-5), to be understood to indicate the French Huon, folio 157, verso, column one, lines four and five.

References to S. L. Lee's E. E. T. S. edition of Berners' English translation of Huon, are, on the other hand, much more concise: (Berners 39/4-5).¹
Much has been written on the definition of the words culture and civilization, and it seems clear that, from a very general point of view, culture includes an overall conception of the world and of life, and the means for expressing it, that is to say, language and the arts. Precisely, language is the foremost of the arts, the art of speaking well, writing well, and of expressing thought well. Thus, language is always the symbol of a culture, and it shows the level of a culture.

Jean Leclercq, O.S.B.: *The Love of Learning and the Desire for God*
Lord Berners’ early sixteenth-century English translation of the mid-fifteenth-century French prose romance, *Huon de Bordeaulx*, is in several ways a conservative work. The moral and sociopolitical values it embodies are conveyed in a literary vehicle which employs the conventional characters, actions, and rhetoric of the medieval romance. Berners preserves for his readers a world in which prudence in personal and public behavior is rewarded, rashness and immorality are punished, and prayer receives immediate, unambiguous response from a God who is actively involved in His creation, often through the agency of His representatives, both religious and secular. The belief in a morally ordered universe is not in and of itself conservative, and insofar as romance and chivalric literature partook of the basic values of religion, e.g. honesty and charity toward one’s fellows, such literature could in theory still be appreciated by beneficiaries of the New Learning. By the reign of Henry VIII, however, when Berners produces his *Huon* and his other translations of chivalric literature and history,
the belief in a static social system in which a knightly class existed merely as defenders and enforcers of order and peace became harder to accept. A class for whom fame in battle was still among the highest of earthly goals became harder to maintain in the face of brutal realities of contemporary warfare and of the acknowledged abilities of a new, non-aristocratic, administrative class. As the sixteenth century progressed, the needs and interests of literate English society expanded, and the conventions of earlier literature, indeed the language itself, were found to be not always adequate. Before the end of Berners' literary career in 1533, literature and language began to develop beyond the interests and abilities of such as Lord Berners.

Lord Berners' translation of *Huon* provides insight into the often neglected chivalric aspect of the complex literary culture and society of England during the early years of the reign of Henry VIII, a period in which several important English writers, among them Sir Thomas More, Sir Thomas Elyot, John Skelton, and Berners himself, were creating some of their best-known works. The English *Huon* reminds the reader that literate members of the Tudor aristocracy saw in the works of their medieval forbears modes of behavior and social and religious values worth preserving and promoting among contemporary English readers of various social classes, and that these modes
and values were significant parts of the culture in which developed English humanism. Later and greater works, including Sidney's *Arcadia*, Spenser's *Faerie Queene*, and Shakespeare's *A Midsummer Night's Dream* (in which Shakespeare borrows and embroiders upon the character of Oberon from *Huon*), demonstrate the continued influence of Berners' *Huon* and works like it during the sixteenth century. Also influential upon sixteenth-century English historians and through them upon dramatists of the Elizabethan Renaissance was Berners' translation of Jean Froissart's *Cronycles*. The reader who understands Berners' acceptance and preservation of the rhetorical conventions characteristic of *Huon* and of the *Cronycles*—the use of proverbs and of stock similes and the attribution of actions to Providence—has a fuller appreciation of the meanings and the functions of literature and history for Tudor writers and audiences. This appreciation is deepened by the study of the ways in which Berners, a careful, thoughtful reader and translator, draws the reader's attention to the moral and sociopolitical themes in *Huon*.

Berners renders the French *Huon* into English prose which is clear, easily comprehensible, and (as, for example, when he introduces alliteration into the text) rhetorically effective. He modifies *Huon* in ways which minimize (but do not entirely eliminate) the violent
aspects of chivalric culture and refines the focus on the romance's Christian values. He reduces in Huon the amount of hyperbole inherent in the romance genre, the exaggeration which, in his preface to his translation of Arthur of Lytell Brytayne, he recognizes as a potential obstruction to the acceptance of the romance as a model of knightly valor and courteous behavior for its readers. This role was often claimed for romances and chronicles such as Froissart's by writers and translators such as Berners' older contemporary, William Caxton, as well as by Continental writers. Chivalric values were still associated by Englishmen of the early Tudor era with the Court of Burgundy, to which the English upper class looked for inspiration (Ferguson, Chivalric Tradition 21), and with France in general, toward which the English maintained active interest and military aspirations, as demonstrated in young Henry VIII's early (1513) aggressions against France—activities in which Berners took part. Henry's interest and aspirations continued throughout his reign, at great social and financial cost to England.

Henry VII and Henry VIII, as well as members of the upper aristocracy such as the 2nd Duke of Norfolk, did much to perpetuate English interest in French language and culture during the late fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries. Henry VII's mother, Margaret Beaufort, was "an
accomplished French scholar" and a translator, according to Kathleen Lambley (68), and Henry himself, who had spent years in France (in Brittany since 1471) before assuming the English throne in 1485, fostered by his own example the use of the French language at the English court and the reading of French literature. Henry's Poet Laureate was the Frenchman Bernard André, who also tutored Henry's sons.

Henry VIII, was also much influenced by French culture, spoke French with ease, and wrote French (and even composed lyrics in French) reasonably well, though one "gather[s] from Henry's spelling of French," notes Lambley (69), "that he had learnt the language chiefly by ear." Although his Spanish wife, Katherine, may not have approved, Henry VIII continued the tradition established by his father of encouraging by example the learning and the use of French. French was one of the principal studies of Henry VIII's children (Lambley 72). Henry even sought (after his aggressions of 1513) to promote friendly relations between England and France by marrying his sister Mary to the old French King, Louis XII, in 1514, and at the head of her entourage Henry sent Thomas Howard, 2nd Duke of Norfolk, accompanied by his step-son, Berners, who was Princess Mary's Chamberlain, as well as by the royal physician and noted Greek scholar Thomas Linacre (Dowling 18).
Norfolk's own continued interest in the French language is demonstrated by his sponsorship of what may be the earliest French grammar, Alexander Barclay's *Introductory to Wryte and Pronounce Frenche*, printed in 1521 by Robert Coplande. Thomas Howard had been favorably impressed by Barclay's 1509 verse translation of Sebastian Brant's *Narrenschrift* (available by 1509 in Latin and French as well as in the German original; Barclay was competent in all three languages as well as in English), which had also impressed More and Colet (Nugent, "Brant" 40; "Barclay" 135). Norfolk desired the compilation of the language manual, said Barclay, "for the commonweal and pleasure of all Englishmen, as well gentlemen merchants as other common people" (137), indicating the desire on the part of England's nobility to extend its French literacy and culture throughout the Tudor realm. For this purpose Barclay produced a brief and only moderately systematic treatise, drawing carelessly upon medieval sources in several dialects, providing a minimum of language rules, and including bilingual word-lists (Lambley 77-80). Following Barclay, John Palsgrave produced *Lesclarcissement de la Langue Francoyse* (1530), a far fuller, much more systematic, and for its time more up-to-date grammar manual than Barclay's. Unlike Barclay, says Lambley, Palsgrave wanted "to place [French] on a level with the 'three perfect tongues'—Latin, Greek, and Hebrew—and to
make it a fourth and classical tongue, by drawing up 'absolute' rules for its use" (76).

Yet in spite of the vogue for French language and culture among the nobility of England during the first three decades of the sixteenth century (an affected vogue, it must be said: French language was far less natural to the Tudor court than it was to those of English kings up to the beginning of the fifteenth century), and for all the efforts of some sixteenth-century grammarians to demonstrate that French is more natural and logical in its word-order than Latin—and so implicitly "better" than Latin (Clifford 381)—it is clear that humanistic studies, in Latin and to a far lesser extent in Greek, form the core of the new education developed during the Tudor era. Instruction in Latin continued unabated from earlier times, and was strengthened during the early Tudor years by the linguistic efforts of Erasmus, John Colet, Linacre, and William Lily. While the artistic benefits to the English language of works such as Erasmus' *Copia* (1511: a guide to abundance of words and abundance of thoughts by means of figures and tropes) may be debatable, Lily's *Rudiments of Grammar* (n.d.: printed 1527), fostered by Colet, exerted a long and visible influence upon elementary education in England (Pafort 109). Having been the language of learning throughout the Middle Ages, Latin long remained the international language of
diplomacy and scholarship.

By the 1520's, Latin linguistic scholarship, with its concerns (exemplified in its debates about the merits of Ciceronian prose) for exacting, purely Latin vocabulary and the rhythms of classical sentences structures, began to influence the development of style in English prose, as writers such as Sir Thomas Elyot and later Roger Ascham attempted to expand the capabilities of their native tongue and sought a satisfactory standard for secular expository prose. By the time of Lord Berners' death in 1533, secular English narrative prose as it had developed since the early fifteenth century—notable for the essentially paratactic style employed by Malory, popularized by Caxton, and continued by Berners—seemed inadequate for the purposes of the humanist thinkers and writers.

Berners, not directly influenced by humanist concerns, develops an English narrative prose style which is primarily the creation of fifteenth-century English writers and translators. Vernacular English prose had of course been written since the days of Alfred the Great, well before vernacular prose developed on the Continent. Expository and persuasive prose in Old English developed distinctive sentence patterns based on the rhythms of spoken language, and could also employ artfully balanced sentence structures and devices such as alliteration,
borrowed from OE poetry. The consciously crafted prose of Wulfstan and Aelfric was religious prose, homiletic and devotional, designed to move, instruct and explicate. In spite of the use of *exempla* in this and in later English prose influenced by it, the religious prose was not designed for extended narration, nor was the chronicle prose which developed during the same period. (The later French prose *Quest of the Holy Grail* bore traces of its religious origins in its pattern of alternating narrative and explication, but this structure did not find approval with fifteenth-century English writers: Malory omits the explication from his translation.) During the three centuries following the Norman Conquest, English prose remained primarily instructional and devotional. The *Ancrene Wisse* (ca. 1225) is the most important example of such prose in Middle English.

English vernacular romances, however, were composed primarily in verse during the Middle English period. Secular narrative verse was an English tradition which also predated the Conquest, and the continued composition of romance in vernacular verse was probably strengthened in Plantagenet England by the influential example of Chretien de Troyes' twelfth-century Arthurian verse romances. Already by about 1225 the romance *King Horn* began to show some influence of French verse forms. In native English romances such as the alliterative *Morte*
Arthur and Sir Gawain and the Green Knight conventions (such as the association of alliteration with battle) were employed which influenced later English translators of French romance such as Berners. By the end of the fourteenth century, when English had reasserted itself as a rich and effective literary medium in the hands of Chaucer and the Gawain-Poet, both popular and courtly romances continued to be written in various kinds of English verse, though Chaucer's humorous demolition of the English verse romance in "The Squire's Tale" indicates that tolerance for the genre among literate Londoners of the late fourteenth century had nearly been exhausted.

A century before that time, French writers had already begun to weave the Arthurian legends into the Prose Vulgate Cycle, which would in the fifteenth century become the source of much of Malory's Le Morte Darthur. From the thirteenth century on, prose continued to be an acceptable medium for vernacular romance in France. In the year 1454, for example, and anonymous French writers assembled the original twelfth-century chanson de geste of Huon de Bordeaux and four of its successive continuations from verse into prose for three gentlemen of the court of Charles VII (1422-61).

It was not until the fifteenth century that English vernacular prose became an acceptable medium for romances, at a time when English was becoming the accepted means of
legal, commercial, and official communication and
documentation. Trevisa notes in his English translation
(1385) of Higden's *Polychronicon* (1330) that English
children were then being taught in English, whereas French
was the instructional medium in Higden's day. Trevisa's
translation and Chaucer's "Tale of Melibee" and "Parson's
Tale," and to a lesser extent his *Boece* and *Treatise
on the Astrolabe*, increased the prestige of English as a
literary medium. While French remained fashionable among
the English aristocracy for political and social reasons
(it was the language of choice for English kings up to and
including Richard II, and Henry V, also fluent in French,
waged successful [and therefore popular] war in the early
fifteenth century to make good his claims to the English
throne--an example not lost on Henry VIII), English prose
in the fifteenth century began to assume a number of the
functions previously filled by Latin and French. English
became the preferred medium among many influential
Englishmen, and in their society, for reasons not entirely
literary, romances and other works began to be translated
from French into English prose.

Among the most successful translations made during the
fifteenth century is Malory's *Le Morte Darthur*,
published by Caxton in 1485. Even R. W. Chambers, who in
his now-outmoded essay *On the Continuity of English
Prose* demonstrated a preference for Middle English prose
works which show little French influence in sentence structure or vocabulary, was not immune to the charm of the structural simplicity of Malory's writing: still, he mitigated his appreciation of Malory by placing him outside the main line of the development of English prose, which Chambers believed depended solely upon instructional and devotional prose. Ignoring Caxton, Berners, and others, Chambers stated that Malory "stands in much greater isolation" than More and his circle. However, had Chambers written his noteworthy essay after the publication of the Winchester manuscript of Malory's works, it is possible that he might better have appreciated Malory's efforts, especially his attempt to forge a "rough alliterative line" (as he appreciated More's efforts in this direction: cxxxviii) into contemporary English prose in the "Arthur and Lucius" section of *Le Morte Darthur*, because the Winchester manuscript revealed that in the received version of Malory's works, Caxton had somewhat moderated the effect of the alliteration in this section.

One of the most notable features of Malory's prose style is the paratactic structure of many of his characteristically short (one- to three-clause) sentences. Malory "prefers to proceed," observes E. K. Chambers, "both in narrative and in dialogue, by a succession of simple sentences, each introduced with
'And', 'But', 'So', 'Then', 'For', 'Wherefore', or the like, and to obtain his rhythm by balancing these with longer ones" (199). Malory's favorite connective is "and": his longer sentences are frequently coordinate main clauses, though some subordination does occur.

Seeing in Malory little trace of the influence of classical rhetoric, P. J. C. Field posits that Malory employs only "the rhetoric of popular speech," which Field elsewhere finds in the private correspondence of Malory's contemporaries (72; cf. Byrne, "Introduction" 107 ff.). The following passage demonstrates the aforementioned qualities and is typical of much of Malory's writing:

Thenne kyng Arthur made redy his hoost in x batails and Nero was redy in the felde afore the castel Tarabil with a grete hoost/ & he had x batails with many mo peple than Arthur had/ Thenne Nero had the vaward with the moost party of his peple/ & merlyn cam to kyng lot of the yle of Orkeney/ and helde hym with a tale of prophecy til Nero and his peple were destroyed/ and ther sir kay the sencyal dyddyd passyngly wel that dayes of his lyf the worship went never from hym & sir hervys de revel did merveillous dedes with kynge Arthur/ and kynge Arthur slewe that daye xx knyghtes & maymed xl/ (Le Morte dii, v./30-8, diii, r./1-2)

Among the clauses which make up this paragraph there are just two clearly subordinate clauses, those beginning "til Nero" and "that dayes." The string of single, declarative sentences marches forward in an easily comprehensible, if spare line (it should be noted that in his edition of Malory's book, Caxton edited out a pleonastic relative "that" after "revel"). As Malory condensed his wealth of
material and reduced the bulk of his sources, he usually simplified the narrative line to present his story with a "matter-of-factness," rendering the events of the romance of Arthur in a language which imbued them with an aura of historicity (Field 37), which may have increased the value of *Le Morte Darthur* as a repository of models of chivalrous deeds and behavior. One effect of Malory's omission of abundant descriptive physical detail is that values are emphasized, not physicality, suggests Field. He perceives in Malory a "constant moral tone." Without commenting on Berners' "moral tone," Field contrasts Berners' style with Malory's and remarks on Berners' "consistently more pictorial narrative" in *Arthur of Lytell Brytayne*, wherein "detail brings a physically consistent world vividly to life" (86, 101, 90). Field's remarks about Berners ought to be viewed cautiously, for Berners also frequently refines the moral focus of his sources, as will be shown in upcoming chapters.

Another notable feature of Malory's style is his relatively un-Gallicized vocabulary as a translator. In the paragraph quoted above, less than 15% of the vocabulary is of French origin, in spite of the French source of the passage. Many of the French-derived words that do appear here and elsewhere in Malory's writing had appeared in English vernacular writing much before Malory's time (Field 62; cf. R. E. Chambers 199).
William Caxton undoubtedly contributed to the unity of tone in *Le Morte Darthur* by markedly moderating the effect of alliteration in what became Book V in his edition. Interestingly, in his preface (1485) to Malory's work, Caxton considered the morality of the book rather than its style:

```
humbly bysechyng al noble lordes and ladyes wyth al other estates of what estate or degree they been of, that shal see and rede in this sayd book and werke that they take the good and honest actes in their remembraunce, and to folowe the same. . . . Do after the good and leve the evyl and it shal brynge you to good fame and renommee. (xv/8-12, 17-18)
```

But it is clear from Caxton's prologues to other works, especially to those he himself translated, that he gave serious thought to prose style and to what Field terms "alternative ranges" of diction (27). In fact, for Caxton, notions of style and of word-choice were often inseparable.

Caxton, as a professional translator and printer during the last two decades of his life, had to consider (as Malory did not need to consider) the various audiences to which his productions would be distributed, and he was sensitive to the views of his public. In a well known passage from his prologue to *Eneydos* (ca. 1490), he described his predicament:

```
whan I sawe the fayr and straunge termes [in the translation of *Eneydos*] I doubted that it sholde not please some gentylmen which late blamed me sayeng that in my translacyons I had
```
over-curious termes whiche coude not be understande of comyn peple and desired me to use olde and homely termes. . . . and so to doo [I] toke an olde boke and redde therin: and certainly the Englysshe was so rude and brood I coude not well understand it.

(79/26-34)

Caxton was aware that the English language had changed from what it had been years before, and was conscious that "olde and homely termes" in fact baffle contemporary understanding as the vocabulary evolves. He also recognized that different levels of society employ different registers of diction. English comprehensible to "some gentylmen" or to "comyn peple" might be inappropriate for learned clerks or an educated aristocracy. Later in the same prologue Caxton noted that English also varied from region to region around England. Even his own English, learned in Kent and modified by wide reading as well as by long years of residence on the continent, was not the English he heard spoken as he lived and worked in London. Simply put, Caxton was troubled by the lack of a standard of English prose to guide him as he translated himself or edited the translations of others.³

However, in attempting to remedy the inadequacy of the language, Caxton risked creating what A. D. Hall describes as "an artificial language that has no roots in spoken usage and hence is a fundamental violation of the cultural and intellectual coherence a standard is supposed to express" (280). Caxton, like John Lydgate, John Skelton,
Berners, and numerous lesser writers during the generations after Chaucer, desired to augment his native tongue with "polysched and ornate termes" such as one might gather from the writings of Virgil, Ovid, and Cicero (Caxton, "Prologue [to Eneydos]" 80). The frequency with which Caxton actually coined words is still not settled (Blake, "Introduction" 36), but his use of coupled or tripled synonyms—a rhetorical device absorbed from his French sources but present in English vernacular writing before and after Caxton's (E. K. Chambers 198)—encouraged the use of "over-curious termes," some simply taken unchanged from the source language (Bennett, Chaucer 218).

Malory, "helped," asserts Field, "only by the traditions of the spoken language" (36) did not multiply his nouns and adjectives to the extent that Caxton did, and was less likely to reproduce the complex sentence structures of his French sources than was Caxton (E. K. Chambers 199). Of course Caxton dealt with sources more diverse in subject and style than Malory's. Yet Caxton's prose shares several elemental syntactic characteristics with Malory's narrative style. The word "and" appears frequently in Caxton's writing, both to connect coordinate clauses and to begin sentences. Sentences may also start with relative pronouns or participles. "Which" and "what" are often interchangeable and sometimes redundant (Blake, "Introduction" 42-3). Caxton, however, as he tried to
incorporate more subordinate clauses into his longer sentences, more often opened himself to charges of weak control of syntax and criticisms such as H. S. Bennett's charge that he imitated the length of French sentences without appreciating the logical structures necessary to support such length (*Chaucer* 211). N. F. Blake, Caxton's most sympathetic recent critic, defends Caxton's ability to control structure and meaning, but even he must admit that one's understanding of the sense of Caxton's prose can be foiled by Caxton's own "confusing, perfunctory and misleading" punctuation ("Introduction" 37).

Malory, the dependable writer of simple, clear, narrative prose, and Caxton, the more adventurous though less sure purveyor of a greater variety of English prose, are linked by A. D. Greenwood with Berners as members of a triumvirate collectively responsible for the foundation of Tudor prose (Greenwood 383). Reflecting on this far-reaching assertion, one does well to remember R. W. Chambers' cautionary note that the development of English prose style owes at least as much to the movement among all classes of Englishmen toward a nearly exclusive use of their native tongue (in whatever dialect) as it does to the conscious efforts of individual (and Chambers would add "isolated") writers (cxiv), as well as to recall Ian Gordon's modification of Chambers' view to emphasize the
importance of spoken English as an element of continuity (86). If Malory the knight-prisoner might possibly be regarded as an isolated phenomenon, the same view cannot be taken of Caxton, who was both in his world and of it. If, as H. S. Bennett claims (though surely he overstates his case), Caxton "makes little attempt to educate or lead public taste" (*English Books* 17), still the printer-translator's livelihood depended on his keen awareness that public taste was not monolithic. And so he catered to many readers' interests: he sold popular religious works and instructional manuals; he printed English classics by Chaucer, Gower, and Lydgate (the classics of antiquity being left mostly to continental printers who already controlled that market); he edited and printed English histories such as Trevisa's translation of Higden's *Polychronicon* (which he also updated); and he produced popular romances such as *Le Morte Darthur*, *Godfrey of Boulogne*, *Blanchardyn and Eglantine*, and *Paris and Vienne*.

Caxton's knowledge of the tastes of his potential public is attested to by the fact that some of the books listed in John Howard's library (see below, Ch. 2, n. 2) ca. 1480--including histories, tales, and romances--appear within a few years printed and/or translated by Caxton (e.g. *The Recuyell of the Histoyes of Troyes* [1473?], *Paris and Vienne* [1485], and *The Game and Play of Chess*
He depended upon men of Howard's social stature to sponsor his printing efforts as he further sounded out his market. The public for his translation of the Charlemagne romance, *Charles the Grete* (1485), included not only his "good synguler lordes" but also his "specyal maysters and frendes," indicating that the taste for romance was not limited to the ranks of the aristocracy, but extended even to members of Caxton's own merchant and professional class (Caxton, "Prologue [to *Charles the Grete*]" 67). Four years after the publication of *Charles the Grete*, Caxton offered his readers a second Charlemagne romance, *The Four Sons of Aymon* (1489); and within two decades, a third, the very popular *Valentine and Orson* (1502?), was printed by Caxton's successor, Wynkyn de Worde, who continued to publish romances until his death in 1534. As the interest in things French continued in the courts of the early Tudors, so interest in the romances of previous generations continued among English readers.4

While it is easy enough to view Berners as the literary heir of Caxton, it is rather more difficult to place the Baron among the literary luminaries of his own generation and of those following. Berners' associations with contemporary Tudor thinkers and writers remain to be proven. Among the more than thirty letters in his own hand which survive in the British Library and the Public
Record Office, not one refers to another major writer or literary work (whereas, for example, literary correspondence between Sir Thomas More and Erasmus does survive). Berners does in one letter mention the now-little-known humanist Sir Brian Tuke, but only in an official capacity. He does not exhibit an acquaintance with classical languages and literature common to the English humanists, in spite of demonstrated ability in Latin (as when he translates a preface by Diodorus Siculus for much of the preface of his first volume of Froissart [Workman 252]). Nor does he, in his writing, exhibit a classically influenced interest in matters of education, good government, and religion as humanists tended to consider these topics. From his listening post in Calais early in 1521, as was his political duty, Berners notifies his administrative superior, Wolsey, of the new Emperor Charles V's activities regarding the Diet of Worms, but the religious controversy which engaged humanist writers both in England and on the continent—for example More, Erasmus, and Melancthon—has left no record of any effect on him. Though it might be argued that Berners' histories and romances contain memorable examples of good and bad kingship, Berners is by no means a theorist on governance on the order of More or Elyot.

It is possible that Berners was acquainted with John Skelton, who in his play Magnyfycence, develops themes
of interest to Berners in his translation of *Huon*. Skelton was an early adherent of the Howard household and perhaps the recipient of patronage from Berners' own mother, Lady Elizabeth Howard (Tucker 74). Skelton's acquaintance with the works of classical writers, for which he received Caxton's praise, offers at least one reason for associating the poet with the humanists. Skelton, like Caxton, was conscious of English as fluid and changing. In "Phyllyp Sparowe," writing in character, he remarked that "Our naturall tong is rude,/ And hard to be enneude/ With pullysshed termes lusty" (91/774-6). Like Berners (in his prefaces at least), Skelton made the effort to "ennew." Skelton and Berners also read some of the same books. Skelton, Caxton, and Berners all translated he prologue to Diodorus Siculus' *Library of History*. The three versions appear to be independent of one another (Workman 252-8). Skelton's work was more nearly straight translation than that of the other men, who adapted the prologue to serve their own similar ends.

But the feisty, witty Skelton seems temperamentally ill-matched with the grave, prosaic Berners, in whose writings flashes of humor are rare, save for the *litotes* of the romances. Berners might more naturally have associated with Sir Thomas More (in the latter's serious moments), whose "singular dear friend" (Roper 26), Thomas Howard, 3rd Duke of Norfolk, was Berners'
half-brother through Berners' mother Elizabeth, and in whose company various efforts have been made (by biographers of More, it should be noted) to place him. J. A. Guy identifies Berners along with Colet, Tunstall and others among the "many humanists of More's circle [who] were . . . Henry VIII's sworn councillors" (19). E. E. Reynolds speculates that More was likely to have come into contact with Berners early in Berners' first term as Deputy of Calais, when More came to the continent and spent several weeks in the autumn of 1521 in the entourage of Cardinal Wolsey. Berners had by then begun the first volume of his translation of Froissart's *Cronycles*, and an interest in historiography may well have drawn the two men together (Reynolds 147, 122). More had long since begun his *History of King Richard III* in English, only to lay it down uncompleted. Whereas Berners looks to the chivalrous fourteenth-century Frenchman Froissart as his source, More, as a new humanist, instead looks to the historians of ancient Greece and Rome, to writers such as Thucydides and Sallust (Berners' step-father Norfolk's protege, Alexander Barclay, translated Sallust). More's dramatic flair imparts great immediacy to his history:

What quod the protectour thou seruest me I wene w't iffes & with andes, I tel the thei haue so done, & that I will make good on thy body traitour. And therw't as in a great anger, he clapped his fist vpon y's borde a great rappe. At which token giuen, one cried treason without the cambre [sic]. Therewith a dore
clapped, and in come there rushing men in harneys as many as ye chambre might hold. And anon the protectour sayd to the lorde Hastings: I arest the traitour. What me my Lorde quod he. Yea the traitour, quod the protectour. And another let flee at the Lorde Standley which shronke at the stroke & fell vnder the table, or els his hed had ben ciefte to the tethe: for as shortly as he shranke, yet ranne the blood about hys eares.

(Richard III 49/24-31, 49/1-5)

In this passage (also cited, in modern spelling, by Gordon [14], who notes that 91% of the vocabulary derives from native stock) one catches the lively tone of the English vernacular drama of More's era, of Everyman and Mankind. In More's history there is a realistic terseness in the dialogue quite unlike the prolixity frequent in romance dialogues, which usually sound like set, conventional speeches. Generally there is less economy of expression in romances than in Middle English drama, perhaps owing to the fact that the dramas were still being composed in verse. That More's important writings, including the Latin Utopia (1516) and the English Dialogue of Comfort Against Tribulation (1534) are written in dialogue form (recalling Platonic dialectic) suggests also that the drama is a literary form amenable to More for other reasons.

Berners shares the interest of Skelton and More in drama (as late as 1529/30, records of Thetford note "Item, sol' Locatoribus domini Barneys cum Auxilio conuento" [Galloway and Wasson 112]), and the influence
of vernacular drama may be evinced in certain passages interpolated by Berners into the "Judas" chapter in his translation of Huon. Berners is credited (Bale 184) with the authorship of a now-lost comedy or interlude entitled Ite in Vineam Meam, or "The Parable of the Vineyard," said by à Wood to have been "[u]sually acted in the great church at Calais after vespers" (73). Given Berners' early acquaintance with what must have been religious drama in the Howard household, that he should have composed a religious interlude, perhaps even as he worked on the translation of Froissart's Cronycles at Calais, seems a little more likely to us than it might to those who know Berners only through his prose.

It is still impossible to demonstrate direct links between Berners and other well-known contemporary writers. Berners may have known Skelton, but other contemporary writers besides these two were considering political and economic themes early in the reign of Henry VIII (see below, ch. 4), so a similarity in theme does not guarantee association. Connections between Berners and More are tantalizing but even more difficult to establish. Whether or not the two men knew each other, neither influenced the other's writing. Berners' writing does not in fact reveal the influence of any contemporary English writer. His reading, as will be suggested in the next chapter, consisted primarily of the works of previous generations.
The first term of Berners' deputyship ended in 1526, and he seems to have spent the next five years mostly in England (aside from the aforementioned record from Thetford, evidence includes a letter of Berners' dated from his home, Ashwellthorpe, 1529 [Letters and Papers 4, pt. 3, 2402]) before returning to Calais as deputy in March 1531. It is during this hiatus from royal service that Berners is supposed (by McDill [336]) to have come under the influence of the humanists then rising to prominence as artists, scholars, and fellow administrators. Again, direct contacts are difficult to document, except in the case of Berners' nephew Sir Francis Bryan, an admired poet in his time, sometime friend of Sir Thomas Wyatt, and arguably a humanist, though hardly so significant to the development of humanistic thought as More or Elyot. Bryan is said (by Lee [DNB 2: 921]) to have directed his uncle's attention toward the then-fashionable writings of the Spaniard Guevara, whose Golden Boke, essentially a manual of courtly behavior, Berners translated with his usual fidelity in a style characterized by more balanced sentence structures and a more augmented vocabulary than he had previously employed (see below, Ch. 6), though some of his earlier prefaces might be held to look forward to this style.

At this time—the late 1520's—as the controversy over the translation of the Bible into vernacular tongues
heated up, the eloquence and utility of the English language was the subject of serious consideration for humanist thinkers. Some, like More, considered the native language adequate for the purposes of humanist translators:

that our tongue is called barbarous, is but a fantasy, for so is, as every learned man knoweth, every strange language to other. And if they would call it barren of words, there is no doubt but it is plenteous enough to express our minds in anything whereof one man hath used to speak with another.

("Dialogue" 422/10-15)

Generally speaking, Roger Ascham would later agree with More on this point. Sir Thomas Elyot, though he eventually arrived at something like this view as he gained experience as a writer (his works, excepting one unfinished piece, are in English), approached More's position from an unlikely direction. As Elyot considered his writing of *The Castle of Health* (1534), he thought it reasonable to compose in English a work he hoped would prove beneficial to his countrymen. After all, he noted, "the Greeks wrote in Greek, the Romans in Latin, Avicenna, and the others in Arabic, which were their own proper and maternal tongues" ("Proheme" 294). That which is useful ought to be presented in a familiar tongue, as clearly and precisely as possible. But Elyot's desire for precision at first steers him away from More's course. In order to augment an inadequate and inelegant language, Elyot resorted to borrowing and neologizing. Like his
predecessors, Caxton and Berners, Elyot sometimes introduced neologisms paired with familiar native synonyms. Unlike the older writers, though, Elyot also inserted definitions of unfamiliar words into his text as he wrote: a useful technique for teaching vocabulary, but not likely to produce a smoothly flowing prose style (Jones 79). Even so, C. S. Lewis assures the reader that Elyot's "sentences do not simply happen, they are built. He keeps a firm hold of his construction, he is nearly always lucid, and his rhythm is generally sound" (English Literature 276). A passage from The Boke Named the Gouernour (1531) will demonstrate Elyot's clarity and his desire for precision:

For intelligence whiche commeth of Intelligentia is the perceyuyng of that whiche is fyrst conceyued by understanding called Intellectus. Also intelligence is nowe vsed for an elegant worde/ where there is mutuall treaties or appoyntementes/ eyther by letters or message specially concernynge warres/ or like other great affaires betwene princes or noble men. Wherfore I will vse this worde understanding for Intellectus/ untyll some other more proper englysshe worde may be founden and brought into custome.

(f. 240 v/2-14)

The distinction Elyot made between "perceive" and "conceive" as well as that between "intelligence" and "understanding" is characteristic of Elyot's concern for exactitude in language (Major 16). The passage quoted also indicates that Elyot, like Caxton before him, was conscious of alternative sociopolitical ranges of the
language. Evidently aware, however, that too much
neologizing could perplex the non-classicists among his
readers, Elyot replaced some of his Latinate, polysyllabic
words with more familiar English equivalents in a second
edition (1537) of Gouernour (Major 20, noting Holmes
352-63). Thus Elyot, having compiled a Latin-English
Dictionary in the mid-1530's, came to accept, as did
More, Ascham and other humanists, the applicability of the
native tongue to a broad range of serious discussion.

Berners, however, if he ever participated in such
discussions with his "fellow humanists," left little
record of his thoughts on subjects of interest to his
humanist contemporaries. He is not given to abstract
speculation. His achievement is a solid but largely
retrospective one. Although by the end of his life he
discovers a fashionable prose style similar to that with
which he had experimented in prologues written a decade
earlier, the majority of his prose is written in the
style, and promotes the social values, not so much of his
contemporaries as of those represented by Caxton. The
literature Berners has left for posterity is firmly rooted
in that popular, chivalric, vernacular literature produced
on the continent and in England during the generations
preceding his birth. To express his chivalric vision
Berners chooses the language not so much of his contempo-
raries as of his predecessors, which he renders
idiomatically (more so than Caxton, for example) as he refines the verbal expressions of his French original. An examination of Berners' *Huon* reveals that the translator appreciates the themes of the romance, is aware of rhetorical opportunities offered by the narrative, and makes conscious rhetorical choices which increase his reader's understanding of the romance. Berners emerges as a conscious English prose stylist, though a careful and generally conservative one.
A BRIEF LIFE OF LORD BERNERS

Sir John Bourchier, 2nd Baron Berners, was an active member of the governments of Henry VII and Henry VIII, a capable soldier and a moderately successful administrator. Consequently, it has long been possible to narrate the events of his military and political life in some detail. But had Lord Berners been only a useful Tudor government functionary, there would be little cause to remember him today. It is rather as the translator of Froissart's "Cronycles", of the romances "Arthur of Lytell Brytayne" and "Huon of Burdeux", and of the courtly "Golden Boke of Marcus Aurelius" and "The Castell of Loue" that Berners is known. And yet, while it is often suggested that Berners' career as a soldier readied him to translate vividly the chivalric romances and histories on which his fame rests, little has been discovered about his life which might more reasonably be expected to have prepared him for a career as a man of letters.

However, by examining fifteenth- and sixteenth-century public and private documents not heretofore considered by students of Berners, one may draw up a more revealing biography of the translator, one more meaningful for the
scholar interested in examining the works of Berners in their literary context than, for example, Sir Sidney Lee's article on Berners in the *Dictionary of National Biography*.

The family into which Berners was born could trace Plantagenet roots to Thomas of Woodstock, seventh son of Edward III, created Duke of Gloucester by Richard II, and murdered in Calais in 1397 (an event precipitating the overthrow of Richard, and thus one among several causes of the Wars of the Roses). Several of Woodstock's grandsons achieved distinction during the middle years of the fifteenth century. Thomas Bourchier, Archbishop of Canterbury, helped to conclude the English dynastic wars of the fifteenth century by crowning the Earl of Richmond Henry VII and then marrying him to Elizabeth of York (Taylor 2). The Archbishop's brother, Henry, Earl of Essex, was Treasurer under Edward IV and was the head of a household with a demonstrated interest in literature. Henry's wife, Isabella, was a patron of John Lydgate, as was Henry's mother, Anne, Countess of Stafford (Lander 145). Henry is recognized by William Caxton as the patron of Benet Burgh, who "translated into Englysshe" *Caton* "in balade ryal for the erudicion of my Lord Bousher, sone and heyr at that tyme to my lord, the Erle of Etsex" ("Prologue [to *Caton]*" 63). Furthermore, according to J. P. Collier, Henry "is entitled to be considered the
first English nobleman who had a company of theatrical servants in his pay and under his patronage" (xxiii). Although Collier probably overstated his case, Henry was certainly an early patron, and the evidence suggests a taste, if not a preference, for English vernacular literature in the family of Berners' great-uncle Henry.

John, the youngest brother of the Archbishop and the Earl, became the second husband of Margery Berners Fereby, by virtue of which marriage he was created the first Baron Berners in 1455 (Lee, DNB 2: 920). Humphrey, the son of John and Margery, was made a Knight of the Bath in 1461 at the coronation of Edward IV (À Wood 72 n.). Sir Humphrey was killed a decade later, fighting for his king at the battle of Barnet, leaving his widow, Elizabeth Tilney, with two daughters (one of whom, Margaret, would become the mother of Henry VIII's "Vicar of Hell," Francis Bryan) and a son, who upon his grandfather's death in 1474 became the 2nd Baron Berners. The young Baron himself became a Knight of the Bath at about the age of 10, in 1477, when his distant cousin, Anne Mowbray, was married to young Edward, Duke of York (Taylor 3).

By the early 1470's, the Bourchiers were a politically powerful, attractively wealthy family. Humphrey's father had married well, and Humphrey's widow, Elizabeth, was wealthy, having manors in Norfolk and Suffolk and lands in Lincoln, York, Stafford and Cambridge. John Paston, Sir
John Paston's younger brother, realized Elizabeth's attractions, but his plans were disappointed when Elizabeth instead married Thomas Howard, heir to John, Lord Howard (Tucker 31). In the 1470's the Howards already had court connections. John, Lord Howard, was quite friendly with Richard, the young Duke of Gloucester, who as Richard III would confer on him the Dukedom of Norfolk (Tucker 39 ff.). Nevertheless, Thomas Howard married Elizabeth Tilney "for political advantage," writes M. J. Tucker, "when the Howards were just becoming politically important in Suffolk" (74). Thomas wasted no time in his suit: he wed Elizabeth little more than a year after the death of Humphrey (the first child of Thomas and Elizabeth, also Thomas, would become 3rd Duke of Norfolk on his father's death in 1524).

Elizabeth's new father-in-law, John Howard, became the guardian of the 2nd Baron Berners four years later, in 1476. Within another half-dozen years the Bourchier-Howard connections were further consolidated as Berners was wedded to Katherine, the only child of John Howard's second marriage and so half-sister to Berners' step-father Thomas. For nearly a decade, from the mid-1470's until 1485, Berners was brought up as one of the Howards' own children and participated in the activities of the family (Collier xix).
In joining the Howards, Berners became a member of a distinctively literate household. The very tapestries on the walls of the Howard manors suggest an interest in literature: among the subjects depicted there were the stories of patient Griselda and of Susanna and the Elders (Collier 288, 476). The Howards were regular patrons of actors as well as of musicians, and early in January 1482 "Lord Barneys\(^2\) . . . and her Ladyschip" could have enjoyed the dramatic efforts of "the plaiers of Esterforde," and a couple of days later, those of the "Lord of Essex men, plaiers": that is, the theatrical servants of Berners' great-uncle, Henry Bourchier. The performances of these two troupes had been preceded by a performance on the day after Christmas by "the Plaiers of Kokesale [Coggeshall]" (Collier 148, 149, 145). Dramatic presentations were regular events in the Howard household, especially during the Christmas-Epiphany season, though records also indicate performances at Easter and one at the end of August. The Howards shared their interest in drama with their friends, one of whom, Richard of Gloucester ("a liberal encourager and patron . . . of music and the stage," notes Collier [xxiii]), caused four of his players to perform before the Howards "on Crystemas day" 1482 (Collier 336). It was into such literate circles that young Berners might have been introduced when he accompanied his father-in-law to London when John
Howard "was attending to his place in Parliament," and both Berners and his wife "were in the metropolis during the important period of the assumption of the royal dignity by Richard III" (xx).

It is known that years before Berners' entry into the family (i.e. before the 1470's), "'The Resurrection' was represented before Lord Howard on 'Easter-day'," but otherwise the names of the plays seen by the Howard household do not appear among the family records (Collier xxiv). However, Collier notes that during the period of "The Resurrection," "mention is made of an 'Yenglyshe boke, calyd Dives et Pauper'" among the Howard possessions. Elsewhere among the Howard papers there appears a fuller account of the Howard library. A list of books, apparently compiled in 1480 and written in the hand of the Howard's secretary, Dalamar, contained fourteen titles, all in French, "a language with which it is unquestionable his Lordship [John Howard] was well acquainted," claims Collier (xxvii). J. R. Lander further observes that "[t]o have spent money for books on the scale which Howard's library implies, even allowing for the possibility that he bought his books for prestige purposes, must show an ability to read easily or that he enjoyed being read to" (145). Collier speculates that, given the location of the booklist among Howard's papers, it may record only a portion of Howard's library, selected
as a travelling library for Howard's use during a naval expedition to Scotland. It is possible that all of the books listed were manuscript copies, although by 1480 two had already been printed on the continent (Collier 227).

The library of Berners' father-in-law contained just the sort of literature likely to have been read by the youth who would in his maturity translate romances, chronicles, and handbooks of courtly behavior from French (and Spanish) into English, though it must be admitted that the library did not include the French versions of the titles later associated with Berners. One does find such popular late-medieval works as *Le Recueil des histories troianes*, *Le Jeu des eches*, *Les Dits des sages*, and *Paris et Vienne*, English versions of which Caxton prints during the 1470's and '80's. One also finds more romances and tales, including *Pontius* and *Sir Baudin, conte de Flandres*, as well as *La Destructon de Troye*, identified by Collier as "the old French dramatic performance on the siege and sacking of Troy" (xxviii): not a surprising inclusion when one considers Howard's fondness for drama.

The Howard Household Books clearly indicate that Berners was raised in a literate culture. Lacking the insight the *Books* provide, previous biographers of Berners have been at a loss to explain Berners' seemingly
sudden turn to literature after a career of administrative and military service. Most, following [albeit skeptically] Anthony à Wood, tentatively identify Berners as a university man, possibly of Oxford's Balliol College, for "the sons of divers of the English nobility [were] educated in academical literature at Baliol coll., wherein, as 'tis probable, [Berners] was instructed also" (72). The source of à Wood's supposition is unknown, and no university record exists showing Berners to have studied at either Oxford or Cambridge (Emden, Oxford 1: 230; Cambridge 81-2). Although Berners would have been of an age (fourteen years to twenty-three years) to have attended a university during the years covered by the Books, no payments were recorded for a university education for the young baron. The Howards were scrupulous ledger-keepers, to the extent of recording even apparently minor expenses such as that "for my Lord Barneis hosen," or, more intriguing, "to my Lord Barneis for to sporte him" (Collier 163, 95). The Books do show that John Howard was generous in providing for the education of several deserving youths at Cambridge during the early 1480's. Consequently, the accumulated negative evidence suggests strongly that Berners was not, in fact, university educated. Pace à Wood, this would not have been unusual at the time for someone of Berners' social standing. Possibly Berners was the beneficiary of
private education, as were others of his contemporaries and near-contemporaries, such as the children of Henry VII. If so, the name of the tutor remains undisclosed among the Books.

Nor do the Books yield support for à Wood's further assertion that Berners subsequently "travelled into divers countries, and returned a master of several languages and a compleat gentleman" (72). John Bale, in the sixteenth century, in his Index, listed Ex lingua Italica as one among several titles of Berners' writings (183), and Fuller, in the seventeenth century, declared Berners to have been a "far traveller and a great linguist [who had] translated many books out of French, Spanish and Italian" (235). Neither Bale nor Fuller was likely to have confused the Latin language, which there is some evidence of Berners' having known, with the Italian, for which there is no such evidence; but if any translation of Berners' from the Italian ever existed, it has not survived.

Of Berners' literary life from the mid-1480's until the early 1520's it is still impossible to speak with certainty. The Books become less detailed after the summer of 1485, when John Howard was killed at Bosworth Field, fighting in the van for his friend and patron, Richard Plantagenet. Thomas Howard, then the Earl of Surrey, also fought for Richard III, but survived the
battle to be attainted by Henry VII's parliament and so deprived of all lands and titles, most of which he regained during the following decade as Henry VII freed him from the Tower in 1489 and gradually restored to him his former possessions as a sign of Tudor trust and favor (Tucker 47). However, Thomas did not become 2nd Duke of Norfolk until created so by Henry VIII after Thomas commanded the English troops in the victory at Flodden in 1513. Berners maintained close ties with the Howards throughout his life, but he does not seem to have suffered at the hands of the Tudors after Bosworth, perhaps because his heritage offered no threat to the Tudor dynasty, or perhaps because of the influence of his great-uncle, Thomas, Archbishop of Canterbury. In any case, Berners makes his last appearance in the Books, in 1492, as being responsible "to fynd and purvey for" four men to travel "into the North Contre" on behalf of Henry VII (Collier 493). In 1497, at about the age of 30, Berners became active in the service of the Tudors as he helped to put down the Perkin Warbeck rebellion, and he would remain in their service for the rest of his days as a Member of Parliament, a Commissioner of the Peace, ambassador, administrator, Chancellor of the Exchequer (as of 1516), and finally Lord Deputy of Calais.

In the autumn of 1514, at about the age of 47, Berners traveled to France in the entourage of Henry VIII's sister
Mary as her chamberlain when she was wedded to King Louis XII of France (9 October 1514: see above, 4). He might at that time have obtained a copy of *Les Prouesses et faitz merveilleux du noble Huon de Bordeaux per de France/ duc de Guyenne*, which Michel Le Noir had published in Paris on 26 November 1513 from a mid-fifteenth century prose redaction of the much older *chanson de geste* of *Huon* and four of its successive continuations. Two textual peculiarities in the 1513 edition support the suggestion that the 1513 edition (rather than Le Noir's second edition of 1516, of which no copy now survives in British or American collections) was in fact Berners' source. Recent research by Katharine F. Pantzer indicates that the first edition of Berners' *Huon* (the unique copy of which contains neither frontpiece nor colophon) may have been printed as early as 1515 by Julian Notary (active dates 1496-1520): the type and woodcuts in the first edition are known to have been owned by him and used in other works certainly printed by Notary at the time. The likelihood that Berners used the 1513 edition as his source would support Pantzer's date of 1515 for the English *editio princeps*, which seems on stylistic grounds more reasonable than the traditional dating of *Huon* as a product of Berners' last years in Calais.
The records of Berners' early years and of the social and cultural environment in which he grew to maturity help the reader to understand his later achievements as a translator in their appropriate literary context. They make clear that Berners, though he might seem a unique and isolated phenomenon if one thinks of early Tudor literature primarily in terms of the works of writers such as More, is in fact heir to a rich and diverse late Medieval literary culture in which his family was active as patrons of writers and of dramatic players. The library of the Howard family in which Berners was raised is known to have contained the kind of chivalric French literature popular with the fifteenth-century English aristocracy and with rising non-aristocratic families such as the Pastons—the kind of literature which Caxton translated, edited and printed. On the other hand, there is no evidence in Berners' published prose or in his letters to suggest that he was familiar with Middle English devotional and instructional prose, in spite of indications (e.g. in his letters and in the Judas-section of his Huon) of his entirely conventional pre-Reformation Christian piety. His literary heritage is that of popular vernacular prose, both French and English, and it is this heritage which shapes the prose not only of his letters but also of his translations.
The reader analyzing Lord Berners' English prose style must keep in mind that this style is known only through early printed texts of works which are almost entirely translations from French sources or French intermediaries of Spanish sources. One must therefore take into account the extent to which the style reflects the grammatical and rhetorical structures of the sources, and must also recognize the possibility that some aspects of the printed prose, such as the spelling and, more importantly, the punctuation, may be susceptible to the discretion of printers, and so may not accurately convey the writer's stylistic intentions. The former consideration, in Berners' case, may be dealt with in part by comparing the translations with the several identifiable sources. However, the latter recognition is more difficult to act upon, because Berners' manuscripts of his published prose, whether or not in his own hand, no longer exist. Consequently, only the first editions, contaminated as they might be by the vicissitudes of early sixteenth-century printing practices in England, may be regarded as texts in any way authoritative. Of these, only the
Cronycles of Froissart are known unquestionably to have been printed in Berners' lifetime.

Yet there exists a resource by means of which the reader may come to know certain accidental and substantive characteristics of Berners' style directly, unaffected by either source or intermediary. That resource is the body of Berners' letters, all written in English, which survives in the archives of the Public Record Office and the British Library. Some of these letters--safe-conduct requests and committee reports, for example--appear merely to have been signed by Berners, but there remain well over two dozen letters, varying in length from a half-page to three full pages, written "w/ the rude hand" of the translator himself, in the free secretary hand common, by 1525, among Englishmen not writing specifically for Chancery, Exchequer, or some other department of Court (Dawson 8-9).²

There exist holograph letters of Berners' from the final two decades of his life, but the majority of these letters date from the Baron's two tenures as Henry VIII's Deputy in Calais, from late 1520 through October 1526 and again from 1531 until Berners' death in 1533. During these same periods Berners is supposed to have produced most or all of his prefaces and translations. Most of the letters are addressed to Cardinal Wolsey, whose household was, in the 1520's, "the effective centre of national
government" (Scarisbrick 228), and two later letters are addressed to Wolsey's administrative successor, Thomas Cromwell. A few are written to the king himself. Henry maintained visions of reclaiming continental lands England had lost during the fifteenth century and Wolsey's ambitions for his king and for himself were rather more complex, but both men, looking toward France, appreciated the strategic importance of Calais as a position from which to observe continental political and military maneuvering. "Calais," writes Muriel St. Clare Byrne, "was an important post, and a difficult one: it required a man of varied experience, preferably as soldier and as civil administrator; a man of good social standing, accustomed to command . . . ("1533" 421).

It was evidently not necessary that the Lord Deputy be a notable belletrist, only that he be a good observer and a writer of clear and detailed reports. Berners' letters are, consequently, largely formal documents, each relaying the same sort of information (however the details may vary) according to established formulae. Though formulaic, the letters demonstrate little if any of the influence of the medieval *artes dictaminis*: the letters are not organized as formal orations, nor are they filled with decorative tropes and figures. They are even free, for the most part, from the doublings and triplings of nouns and verbs which in the printed works seem to
embody Berners' notion of "the facondyous arte of rethoryke" (*Arthur* i, v. B/19-20). Even so, Berners' official letters (and these letters survive because they are official, not private) must not be thought of as everywhere stylistically and rhetorically neutral. Berners is clearly aware of different "stylistic registers" which are affected by considerations of subject and audience.

If style may be regarded as involving choice, as variation from a norm, it would be useful first to understand what Berners' vernacular norm might be in these letters. Because of the deputy's duty to relate to his administrative superiors news and rumors obtained from a retinue of paid spies, the structural formula of reported speech or indirect discourse frames many of Berners' epistolary sentences. Most of the letters commence with some version of the clause, "plies yt yor grase to be advertesyde"—an introduction employed by others of Wolsey's correspondents (Wyld 381)—and numerous sentences begin with such clauses as "Also he seyth that," and "j had word that."

In the letters' longer sentences, clauses indicating indirect discourse are typically followed by two or more relative clauses subordinate to the main clause but often coordinate in relation to one another, as in the following sentence which begins a letter written in early 1524:
pies yt yo\textsuperscript{r} grase to be aduertesyde
that as on the iiij\textsuperscript{d} day off thys present
moneth off ffebruary
ther was a fflemynge a prisoner
that cam ffro depe
& he was kept ther jn a house
wher as j haue a servant off myn lyuynge ther
as a prisoner
& he wroth a letter to me priuely by the seyd
fflemynge off such newes as he knowt ther
& the seyd fflemynge affermyth the sam to be trew/
(Berners 3 Feb. 1524: 1-6)

An analysis of this typical sentence by constituent

clauses produces the following scheme:

I. main clause (indicating indirect discourse)
   A. substantive relative clause with embedded
      adverbial temporal phrase & concluding
      appositive phrase
         1. attributive relative clause modifying
            appos.
   B. subst. rel. cl.
      concluded by adverbial phrase
         1. attr. rel. cl. modifying object of adv.
            phrase, concluded by present participial
            phrase
   C. subst. cl. followed by three
      prepositional phrases
      1. attrib. rel. cl. modifying obj. of prep.
   D. subst. cl.

The organization of information here is clear enough and
serviceable, and the relationships of the relative clauses
to their antecedents are easily perceived. However, it
must seem special pleading to argue that such a sentence
exemplifies the structural strategy hypotaxis, even
allowing that clauses B, C and D be regarded as governed
by the initial clause. The subordination which Berners
employs in this sentence hardly suggests subtle relation­
ships of ideas. The effect here is similar to that
produced by several narrative vignettes among the letters, tales related in strings of coordinate clauses or in strings of simple sentences lacking well-defined grammatical relationships:

& by the way iiiij ffrench schypes chast the john baptyst/ then the barke off sandwych mad to them & ffortune odyr iij schypes off fflanders cam after them/ then the ffrench schypes fled to bolloyn/the barke off sandwych bordyd on off them . . . .

(Berners 29 Jan. 1523: 4-8)

Certain descriptive passages, too, employ a paratactic structure: "sche ys mett ffor thys haune [haven]/ sche drawt nott past a ffadom of water/ & sche shuld be sold at the uttermost sche ys nott worth a C mark"

(Berners 29 Jan. 1523). The overall impression derived from the letters is of a succession of pieces of information roughly equivalent in importance, presented in clauses roughly equal in length and complexity.

This is not to say that Berners is incapable of employing subtler subordination. In an early letter he describes a military maneuver in such a way that the conjunctions and subordinating adverbs permit the reader easily to follow the sequence of events:

Also he seyth that a v or vj M1 men off the rebelles jn spaynye whent to a castell off ffontesecas (temporal adv.cl.) syns he departyd out off spaynye & gaue assault therto But the capeteyn wē jn be ffor had ffyllyde parte off the dykkes wē faggotys & goun powder (coord. cl. with embedded result adv. cls.) so that jn the cheff off ther assault by a
trayn outt off the castell all fell a ffyer. . . .  
(Berners 25 Jan. 1521: 9-15)

And in recommending English naval protection against
French harassment, Berners expresses cause and effect
reasoning by means of conditional adverbial clauses
subordinated to independent clauses:

>yff our ffyschers shuld be troublyde on the see
yt shuld be a grett hurt to thys town ffor the
prouysyon ther off/ Nor also yff the passengers
shuld be troublyde they cary jn & outt the
bogettys w' the kynges letters to all parteys
yff they shuld be taken & dysclossyde j know nott
what incomuenyentys myght com ther by
(Berners 13 March 1522: 16-22)

Again, however, the effect is one of coordination rather
than subordination, despite the conditional adverbial
"yff's," or rather, because of the anaphoric use of
"yff." In the letters, then, Berners ordinarily conveys
information in coordinate sentences, often compound but
occasionally complex as well, and he depends upon
conventional grammatical signals--adverbs and relative
pronouns--to direct his reader's comprehension. Such
subordination as Berners uses best serves narrative rather
than expository prose.

Recognizing this dependence, one may attribute it
partly to what Walter J. Ong describes as an "oral residue
in Tudor prose style," acknowledging as does Father Ong
the evolution of the style out of earlier styles perpetu-
ated in manuscript traditions (149). Although the medie-
val writer had at his disposal for punctuation, according
to Paul Arakelian, "dots [to] indicate a short pause, inverted semicolons a medium pause and semicolons a full stop" (615), as well as virgules, which might serve any of these functions, there continued in Middle English verse and prose, as David Burnley observes, the practice of using grammatical signals either in place of or in addition to punctuation in order to guide the reader's understanding (89-99). Arakelian concisely summarizes Ong's discussion of such signal-use in a manner especially relevant to Berners' style: "The technique of adding one clause after another into a series not only reflected oral tendencies, but depended upon formulaic traditions to provide order and progression" (616).

By the early sixteenth century, as Hilary Jenkinson observes, "the comma, semicolon, colon, full-stop [elsewhere called the punctum or period] and note of interrogation," as well as parentheses, are employed by English writers, especially by those writing in an official capacity for the government (155). Yet Berners takes small advantage of the variety of punctuation, instead relying almost completely upon the oblique mark, or virgule. Twice or thrice in 21 letters, a mere period indicates the end of a sentence. Fewer than half-a-dozen times, this function is performed by a period followed by a virgule. But a virgule by itself serves as a period 68 times: no great number, among some 220 sentences.
Occasionally, there is at most an extra space between the end of one sentence and the beginning of the next. The virgule also operates as a comma 38 times, usually setting off relative clauses or linking coordinate clauses. But again, such clauses occur without the comma-virgule. As a semicolon the virgule is used 18 times by Berners, usually before causal adverbial clauses (particularly those beginning with "ffor") and coordinate conjunctions (e.g. "But"). Finally, Berners also uses the virgule—actually a double-virgule—as a hyphen in a word split between lines ("blew//mantell"), a use also seen in contemporary texts such as Huon ("af//ter"). But in the same letter containing the hyphenated word, the double-virgule also functions as a full stop: "yor grase shall be aduertesyde//by the grase of jesu . . . ." (Berners 13 March 1522).

Ordinarily, Berners' use of the virgule corresponds to the logic of modern grammar. However, in one early letter, it seems that there is a virgule after nearly every clause, whether or not one is demanded by later standards of punctuation. In fact, of the 27 virgules employed in the letter, a dozen fulfill no clear function. Yet another letter of the same date (1 May 1522) to the same recipient, Wolsey, a letter not much shorter than the first one, contains a mere three virgules. This remarkable difference in density of
punctuation might be attributable to the nature of the letters. In the first letter, Berners explains to Wolsey that he is deserving of certain lands and sums of money which the king has agreed to restore to him, and in the explanation he employs a number of conditional and result-clauses. The rhetoric of this letter is the rhetoric of persuasion. In the second letter, Berners simply reports troop movements and other received information, in a style depending mostly on additive conjunction, narrative presentation in which the most sophisticated hypotactic conjunction is the temporal adverb. Unfortunately, the implications of this difference in density of punctuation cannot be supported by reference to the rest of the letters, which fail to demonstrate a consistent use of the virgule for one type of adverbial clause and not for another. In considering variations from Berners' normal use of the virgule, one should observe that among the shorter letters there are half-a-dozen, each an average length of five complex or compound sentences, which contain no virgule at all. In the prose of such letters, as in that of the underpunctuated sentences occurring in the other letters, the reader must depend upon grammatical rather than punctuative signals. Grammatical signals also occur in the text of Berners' *Huon*, as for example in instances of direct discourse (though the more modern punctuation
supplied in the E. E. T. S. edition of the 1880's obscures their purpose). Both Berners and the writer of his source still depend to some degree upon grammatical signals rather than upon punctuation, and this dependence affects their prose styles to a limited extent (see Ch. 5, below).

Capitalization, considered as punctuation, is not always consistent and therefore not especially helpful as a guide to sense. In the few early letters which are organized into paragraphs, the initial letter of each paragraph is capitalized. But in nearly all of the later letters, paragraphs, at least as distinctive visual units, do not occur, possibly, as Byrne suggests about the letters of Berners' successor at Calais, Lord Lisle, to prevent tampering with official documents ("Introduction" 123). Individual sentences often begin with capital letters, but more frequently they do not. Thirty-three sentences begin with a capital letter not preceded by a period-virgule, and among the 68 instances of the period virgule, the sentences following these marks do not regularly begin with capital letters. So, to take the virgule and the capital letter together, such punctuation is present for fewer than half the sentences in Berners' letters. Capital letters also occur in unexpected places, as at the beginning of a mid-sentence adverb, or at the head of the first word at the top of the second page of a letter, no matter what the word or its place within a
sentence. Regularity in Berners' use of capitalization would be easier to determine if one could be certain whether forms of certain letters—"ff," "j," "p," and long "s"—are to be regarded as capitals or smaller forms. Berners frequently employs standard secretary-hand capital forms, such as "A," "B," "C," "M," "N," and "R." But in circumstances which seem to require capital letters, Berners' "ff," "j," "p," and long "s" are indistinguishable from smaller forms. The ligature "ff" represents the letter "f" in nearly all circumstances, both as a capital (an accepted secretary-hand usage) and as a small letter. Appearing initially and medially, "s" is in all situations the undifferentiated long "s": the short "s" always appears terminally. Capitalization of the first letter of proper nouns is rare, the only examples from among the letters being the names of places, "Roune" and "Aulanson," and the title of "the lady Regent of ffrance." Otherwise the names of locations and of people are regularly uncapitalized. Such small consistency as there is in Berners' capitalization is no sure guide to the recognition of names or sentence boundaries in the letters. Capitalization is likewise irregular in Berners' Huon: not every proper noun is indicated by an initial capital, but capital letters occur at the beginnings of words in unexpected circumstances.
A brief word might here be said about Berners' spelling habits. In the letters, Berners' spelling is consistent and rarely confounds the reader, except the one attempting to account for the presence of the completely functionless "e" at the end of many words or the absence of a functional terminal "e" to indicate vowel length on other words: "mad," for "made" and "rud" for "rude." This randomness of "e" is a characteristic of Tudor writers (Dawson 17), but otherwise Berners observes his own consistency of spelling. Some consonants are doubled to indicate length in a preceding vowel; but just as often, the same consonants following the same vowels seem to indicate shortness: "lattly/att," "ffett/lett," "tyllynge/ffyllyd," and "bott/nott." So the doubling of consonants ought not to be regarded as conclusive evidence of pronunciation: Berners simply regularly doubles the consonants "s" (medially), "f" (initially, medially, terminally), and "l" and "t" (medially and terminally). In Huon, "s" is doubled before "h." A few other spelling characteristics of Berners' seem to call for comment: Berners has not settled upon either "w" or "wh" to represent the glide [w]: "whent" appears twice for "went," both "were" and "where" appear as both "wer" and "wher," and "when" appears as "wen" and "when." In a few instances the text of Huon also demonstrates this inconsistency. "Abundant" appears as "haboundant," a form not
unusual in Berners' day, resulting from a mistaken
etymology, a descent from Latin *habere* (*CEOED* 1: 11). More employs the spelling "habundaunce" (*Martz* xxxv). The modern medial [ʒ] is always represented by "d" when the subsequent vowel is followed by an "r": "odyr," "nodyr," and "thedyr," although the *Oxford English Dictionary* notes the forms "others," "nother," and "thyther" (*CEOED* 1: 2017; 1: 1947; 2: 3296) all in Berners' Froissart. In *Huon*, this medial sound is more normally represented by "th," though the medial "d" does occur. And in a letter to the king, Berners spells "ask" as "ax": "yor grase knowt ryght well that men jn thys town woll speke & ax no man no leve" (Berners 29 Jan. 1523: 2/1-2). *Huon* features both the spellings "ask" and "ax."

The formulae of indirect discourse govern the structure of sentences in the letters to the extent that even direct quotation is organized according to the clause structure employed for reported speech:

```
[he] seyd j dar nott as now speke mych wt you/ But j wold ye shuld schew to my lord yo' master that j send hym word & consell hym to send to the kynge hys master that in eney wise he cause good hede to be taken to all hys haunes jn jnglonde
```

(Berners 6 Feb. 1522: 14-19)

Such a sentence might support the view that Berners' letters normally depict patterns of actual speech. But on this point a word of caution is needed. Lambert, noting
P. J. C. Field's assertion that Malory is "helped only by the traditions of the spoken language," observes that some of the so-called traditions were also literary conventions in some of Malory's French sources (Lambert 40 n.). Evidently Berners is also aware of such conventions.

A rhetorical device characteristic of Tudor prose, and one freely employed in the French *Huon* and Berners' translation, is that described by Byrne as "the free use of colloquial and proverbial turns of speech," in both letters and public compositions ("Introduction" 72). Such turns of phrase occur in Berners’ letters only in the two letters written to Thomas Cromwell during the last year of Berners’ life, which date may suggest the influence of the pre-Euphuistic style of Antonio de Guevara, whose works Berners translated late in life. On the other hand they may indicate the influence of current rhetorical theory which fosters the use of the commonplace, a practice recommended by Erasmus in his *Adagia* (1500) and *De utraque verborum ac rerum copia* (1512). In either case, Berners’ passages exhibit a discreteness and conciseness which set them off from the surrounding floods of longer complex and compound sentences:

> wen j com to london j haue neuer a house to put jn my heede/
> (Berners 10 March 1532)
ye haue Both wrytyn to me & seyd how j shall be
no lossere & j desyr to be no wynner
(Berners 7 Aug. 1532: 8-9)

j ensure you what so euer j shall haue yt
woll do me more goode now then twyse as mych at a
lenger leyser
(Berners 7 Aug. 1532: 11-12)

This last sentence recalls the Latin proverb "Bis das si
cito das," a sentence probably familiar to educated
Tudor writers since their school days, while the first
recalls a New Testament phrase: "but the Son of Man has
nowhere to lay his head" (Matt. 8:20; cf. Tilley
314.H520. Tilley records a close analogue from 1616: "He
hath not an house to put his head in.").

Berners has, however, more than current speech
patterns available to him. In some of his later letters,
less purely official, more personal and self-involved, he
can rise to respectable command of effective rhetorical
structures. The most notable example of such ability
occurs in a letter, again of 1532, in which Berners asks
Henry VIII's Master Secretary Thomas Cromwell to intercede
for him with the King in certain financial dealings. In
order to impress upon Cromwell the onerousness of the
financial obligations of the Deputy of Calais, Berners
presents his correspondent with a catalogue of maintenance
expenses:

& as ffor the house the somer be ffor j cam
thense the pyllynge & warffynge round a boutt the
house & mendynge off the brygge & glassynge &
tyllynge off the house round a boutt & makynge
off new wyndows & a new seller coueryd
wt lede & mendynge off lede gutters &
ressyngle off the hall floure & plankynge ther off
& panynge off the kechyn & buttrey & dyuers
odyr thynges cost me ffar be yond a C [pounds]/
(Berners 10 March 1532: 21-7)

This, the only sentence which among the many in the
letters may be called periodic, is Ciceronian neither in
tone nor content; but its piling-up of gerund phrases
before the delayed verb clearly is meant to weigh down
Cromwell with the onerous charges to which Berners has
been put as lord deputy. Following as it does a series of
shorter sentences, the periodic sentence gains effect from
its context.

In his preface to his translation of Froissart,
Berners indulges in another rhetorical technique, that of
doubling or even tripling nouns and verbs. The preface
dates from the same time as the letters, yet the letters
rarely display this technique, and so contain none of the
"inkhorn terms" usually occasioned by its use. A few such
phrases in the letters sound like stock phrases: "wynd &
wedyr" and "cost & charge." But some of the doublets--
ever triplets--demonstrate the pairing of a native
English word with a Romance or Latinate word: "bey [i.e.
"buy"] & a gre" and "save & deffende." Berners, as well
as his contemporaries More and Elyot, employs this device
especially in his original public prose (insofar as his
prefaces are original) as a means of augmenting the
English vocabulary. In the letters, not facing the problem of rendering into English ideas for which there are no English words, and perhaps sensing the inappropriateness of the doublet device in private, official prose directed specifically to his superiors, Berners employs doublets sparingly. As has been observed, the evidence suggests that he recognizes the existence of different stylistic levels determined by purpose and audience.

As for Berners' own vocabulary, it is, in the letters, remarkably English and surprisingly free of loan words for a writer fluent in French and acquainted with both Latin and Spanish. Less than 20% of Berners' epistolary vocabulary consists of loan words, even taking into account the names of various French people and places he mentions. Many of the borrowings Berners does employ are words previously used in English for hundreds of years. One such borrowing, which has survived into modern use only in some dialects of English, is "bogettys," or "budgets," leather bags or wallets used, among other purposes, to carry official documents. The OED records that Berners employs "boget" in this same sense in Arthur of Lytell Brytayne (CEOED 1: 289). Interestingly, two of the three citations for this word, "bouget," in the Middle English Dictionary (A-B: 1088) come from mid-fifteenth-century accounts of the Howard family, into
which Berners was early adopted and later married.

Neologisms do not occur in the letters. It is probably fair to say of Berners, as N. F. Blake says of Caxton, that "when left to his own resources [his] vocabulary was not large" ("Introduction" 36).

Just as there is great regularity among the sentence structures which Berners uses, so also is there regularity in his treatment of the elements of the sentence: the parts of speech. Nouns are most often pluralized by the addition of the suffix "-es." The suffix "-ys" occurs less frequently and is often represented by the symbol "f" adapted from the medieval Latin manuscript abbreviation for "-is." The suffix "-is" itself does not appear in the letters. Specific suffixes attach to specific words: interchange (handes/handys) is rare. In the letters "[t]he suffix of the [plural] often loses its vowel when the noun ends in -n" or -r" ("comons," "gardens," "ffyers," waters"; but also "crownes" and "enbassedores") as it does also, according to Wyld (118), in Berners' Froissart. Units of measure are generally uninflected, as in the phrases "ffyffty pound," "an viij yer past," "a C mark," and "a xxvt tonne"; but "xvj monethes" and "xv leges" also occur, and within two lines of each other one finds both "iiij ffott" and "ij ffett." The word "ffysch" appears uninflected in the plural. The word "newes," appearing frequently in the letters, is always construed
by Berners as plural: "thes newes." The OED notes that "news" is a word in common use after 1500, but records its first use as a singular noun in 1566 (CEOED 1: 1920).

The suffixes "-es," "-ys," the symbol "f" and "-s" under the conditions described above all are used to indicate possessive forms: "the kynges grasses plesure," "the comons handes," "a letter off my servant." This last construction, the "of-adjunct" which indicates the possessive, is used regularly by Berners: "londys off the dukes," "a castell off ffontesecas." The group possessive construction, "the kynge off hongreys doughter," appears in an early letter. The older possessive construction, in which the first noun of the group is inflected, does not occur in the letters. It does, however, appear twice in Huon.

Berners' use of pronouns is quite regular; it is normal for the pronouns to have clear antecedents and to agree with these in person and number. On rare occasions a pronoun might be dropped: "As ffor my lord sandys woll obbey yor commandment/" (Berners 26 Feb. 1525); or it might appear redundant: "ffor whom yt hath plessyd yor grase to wrytt ffor hym to me/" (Berners 29 Jan. 1523). Such repetitions are known to appear in Tudor prose, though usually in longer sentences in which a subject might be distanced from its verb by several
intervening clauses. In their forms, Berners' pronouns are consistent. Berners carefully maintains distinctions between subject and object cases: "j" and "me," "ye" and "you" (the former always with a "yogh," as indeed for all other initial velar spirants ("yer," "yett," "yesterday") except "you" and "your"), and "he," "sche," and "yt."

Wyld notes that the case distinction between "ye" and "you" was largely lost after Berners' and More's use of it, even in literary prose such as Ascham's (330). In the letters, Berners never employs the forms "thee" and "thou," not in reporting verbatim the speech of his underlings nor in addressing Cromwell, who, though a member of the King's Council and technically Berners' administrative superior after Wolsey, was a "new man" and certainly not the baron's social equal.

The plural personal pronoun forms are also distinguished: "we" and "us," "they" and "them." The possessive pronouns are normally "my," "your" ("yor"), "hys," and "hyr" in the singular, though "my" becomes "myn" before words beginning with vowels ("myn own"), but not before those beginning with "h." The form "ys" occurs only once for "hys," probably a slip indicating haste rather than an aspect of pronunciation (a few lines later in the same letter one finds the form "hyt" for "yt," another unique example). "Our" and "ther" occur as plural possessive pronouns. As post-postional adjectives, "off
"myn," "off yours," "off hys," and "off thers" are used frequently.

Among the relative pronouns, only "who" is capable of inflection, to "whom" as an object and to "whos" as a possessive. "That" is the most frequently used relative pronoun, though "wych" (often "the wych") also occurs. "That" also functions as the usual demonstrative pronoun, becoming "thos" in the plural. The reflexive intensifier "selff" remains the same in singular and plural use, always spaced apart from its governing pronoun: "hym selff," "them selff."

Adjectives are not frequent in the letters, except for repeated collocations ("rud hand," "noble grase," "blyssyde trenete") and are normally placed before the nouns they modify. However, one also sees the constructions "a schype . . . meruelusley well dekkyd & mannyd," and "grett wyndes & contrerey." Comparatives and superlatives ("as jll or worse," "lenger leyser," and "most humble wyse") are similarly uncommon. The superlative "least" occurs a few times, always as a substantive: "at the lest." Nouns are modified by appositives ("don fferdenando the emperours brother"), by "of-adjuncts" ("cete off wormes," "ij schypes off fflanders"), and by attributive (relative) clauses ("a prisoner that cam ffro depe"). The structure "odyr i j schypes" occurs along with "a x odyr good
schypes." From the relative scarcity of adjectives, one
gathers that Berners is not concerned to recreate for the
mind's eye the physical, sensory details of Calais and the
continent.

The definite article "the" is invariable in form and
is never elided with nouns beginning with vowels or
"h's": "the emperours," "the acres," "the holley
trynyte". Elision does occur in Huon, e.g.
"themperor," "thystory."

Berners' treatment of his verbs is also regular,
 systematic. Concord between subject and verb is normal,
though in the periphrastic construction beginning "ther
ys" or "ther ar," the writer sometimes places a singular
verb before a plural subject. As in Berners' Froissart,
the suffix "-th" is regularly affixed to verbs in the
third person singular present tense indicative: "he
seyth," "god knowt" "yt restyth mych." Normally the
"-th" suffix also is affixed to third person plural
present tense indicative verbs: "offecers hath," "sum
dyeth." This plural form is described by Wyld as a
lingering southern form (119). Present participles and
past participles ("besechyn,
"taken") are usually
regular in form, though the form "gett" once appears where
"gotten" would be the more likely form. Present
participial phrases occasionally begin sentences.
Auxiliary verbs are frequent in the letters. The auxiliary "have" always retains this form and is never reduced to a mere "a" (as happens in Huon) even when unstressed. "Shall" and "woll" (occasionally "wyll") occur in clauses in the indicative mood, but there is distinction of "obligation/volition" made between them. "Shuld" and "wold" regularly indicate a verb in the subjunctive mood (as does, less frequently, "myght") in relative clauses expressing the idea of possibility or following a negative main clause: "yff our ffyschers shuld be troublyde"; "yff yt wold ples"; "j can nott se But that they be jn danger" (Berners 13 March 1522). Verbs in the subjunctive mood are also employed by Berners after verbs of doubting, uncertainty, or estimation: "j thynke they be in the cambre" (Berners 26 Feb. 1525): "ar" is the form of the verb "to be" normally used by Berners for the third person plural indicative. The writer also employs the subjunctive mood in main clauses followed by--or following--hypothetical subordinate clauses: "yff our ffyschers shuld be troublyde . . . yt shuld be a grett hurt . . . ." (Berners 24 Jan. 1523). The auxiliaries "woll" and "shall" are also used to indicate future tense: "the chanseler . . . wyll be here tomorow" (Berners 14 Jan. 1525); "wedyr all shall pase ouer wt hym" (Berners 24 Feb. 1525).
Berners employs adverbs as modifiers far more frequently than adjectives in the letters. Adverbs used singly are normally post-positional. Berners is more flexible in the placement of adverbial phrases and clauses, though a slight preference is demonstrated for the post-position. Adverbial clauses may begin sentences, but are more usually embedded within them. Berners favors temporal adverbs, which help establish a proper sequence of events in narratives: "after," "be ffor," "daylly," "styll," and "tyll." Adverbs of place are also commonly used, though these are often the same "hedyr" and "thedyr." Adverbs of manner exhibit greater variety: "priuely," "playnly," "sodenly," "veryly," and even once "incontenent," an adverb ubiquitous in Huon. Adverbial intensifiers are not used by Berners. Berners' main purpose in using modifiers is to make clear to readers where and when, and to a lesser degree how people are acting and events are proceeding.

A closer look at a couple of Berners' letters in their entirety will serve to place some of the preceding abstractions into their proper contexts:

pies yt yor grase to be aduertesyde that as on thys saterday j resseyuyde a letter ffro the capeteyn off bulloyn wher by j perseyue that the chanseler off aulanson that ys at boloyyn wyll be her to morow ffor he makyth such dylygense that he woll tary ther no lenger j wrott a letter to yo grase as yesterday what order we hade taken wt hym how be yt j thynke yo grase
shall resseyue thys letter as son as the fformer
ffor the wyndes hath been so extrem her &
contrerey that nodyr schype nor bott koud
pase ouer to jnglonde & j thynke veryly he
woll make as grett hast hense to pase ouer as
he came & sir we haue non occasyion wher by to
retarde hys passage w'outt we knew the
kynges plesure & yours further then we do
yff we dyd yt (superscript)
shuld be acomplyschyde by the grase off
jesu who preserve yo'r noble grase
wrytyn at caleys the xiiiijth day off january
wt the hande
Off yo'r humble servaunt
John Berners

Berners' letter to Wolsey of 14 January 1525 is
typical of most of Berners' surviving letters from that
year: short and completely without punctuation other than
tittles indicating abbreviations or contractions. It
contains six sentences of various lengths and complexity.
The first, ending at the word "lenger," runs to 50 words
in a sequence of clearly indicated relative and adverbial
vary in length and form. None contains more than four
clauses, and each begins with an independent clause to
which dependent clauses are added. The ampersand here, as
in Berners' *Huon*, does not always have the force of a
conjunction. Consequently, the sentences should be
regarded as relatively brief units rather than as rambling
paratactic structures.

Grammatically the letter contains few surprises.
Berners carefully observes sequence of tenses, as usual.
Third person singular and plural verbs end in "-th," and agreement between subjects and verbs is normal. However, the compound subjective complement, "so extrem her & contrerey," is unusual in the letters; the closest structural parallel occurs in the past participial construction, "a schype . . . meruelusly well dekkyd & mannyde" (Berners 13 March 1522).

The spelling is, for Berners, also typical. The functionless "e" seems added at random, though with some frequency after terminal "d," and "v"; and "e" is absent where it might serve some purpose: "extrem" and "hast."

"No" remains "no" before words beginning with a consonant, such as "lenger"; it becomes "non" before words beginning with a vowel, such as "occasyon." "Boulogne" is spelled in two different ways in as many lines. One of the cities mentioned most frequently in the letters, it is spelled in four different ways throughout the letters: "bulloyn," "bolloyn," "boloyn," and "bouloyn." The spelling of other regularly mentioned locations, e.g. "caleys," is fixed.

The word "nodyr," described above, retains its characteristic form. "Lenger," the spelling of the comparative degree of the adverb "long," is consistent with Berners' spelling with this comparative form elsewhere in the letters, though the adverbial form "longer" appears in Huon. The spelling "lenger," also employed by More and Fisher (CEOED 1: 1602),
evidently passes out of common use by the end of the Sixteenth Century. It derives from the OE comparative form "lengra."

A later letter to Cromwell confirms Berners' stylistic consistency:

Ryght welbelouyde jn my best maner j recommende me to you prayynge you to be my ffrende as ye haue been & that j may know the kynges grases plesure what recompense j shall haue ffor pete caleys also j send you her wt the endentre that was be twen Master leghe & and me off the purchasynge off part off the grounde & housynge at pete caleys j haue wrytyn to you be ffor thys tyme what charges j haue been at syn that house & grounde was myn ye have Both wrytyn to me & seyd how j shall be no lossere & j desyr to be no wynner how be yt all ys at the kynges plesure & what so euer that be j requyr you lett me know schortly/ j ensure you that what so euer j shall haue yt woll do me more goode now then twyse as mych at lenger leyser & j know well by yo' good meanes j may the soner haue an ende j know well all odyr that hath odyr londe or houssynge taken ffro them ar well rewardyde so that everty man ys well content & j ensure you ther ys no man that hath ffor goen so grett a plesure as j haue don nor no man hath been at the charges that j haue been at as eevity man knowt & as yt may well aper both by the house & grounde j dought nott But that the kynges grass wolw consider yt & the rather at by yo' good meanes the wych j ensure you shall be deservyd on my part By the grass off jesu who kepe you wrytyn at caleys the vijth day off august wt the jll hande Off yo' assuryd louver
John Berners

In this letter to Cromwell of 7 August 1532, Berners' last surviving letter, the writer's sentence structures and techniques of organization remain true to form. Most of the sentences are complex, beginning with short
independent clauses followed by at least one relative clause and often an adverbial clause as well. Here, as in the previous letter, the average sentence is brief, running to about 27 words, and none is of the "invertebrate," anacoluthic species for which Berners has sometimes been reproached. The organizational technique remains essentially paratactic: relationships among sentences generally depend upon additive conjunction, where there is any form of conjunction at all.

Grammatically, few things in this letter call for comment. In the eighth sentence the pronoun "odyr," clearly plural, agrees with its plural verb "ar," while the indefinite pronoun "every man" agrees with its singular verb "ys." Elsewhere in the letters, one finds the phrase, "every man by them selff," however.

Several spellings in this letter are worthy of note. The comparative adjective "lenger" accords with the comparative degree of the adverb "lenger," described above ("longer" occurs as the adverb in *Huon*). The word "lossere" seems to reflect a new, nontraditional spelling: the *MED* records "leser" (L.3: 866) as the standard form of the word "loser," and More in 1533 is still using "leser" (*CEOED* 1: 1666). However, Berners' regular first person singular form of the verb "lose" remains "lese," and the third person singular "leseth" is recorded by the *OED* (*CEOED* 1: 1597)
as appearing in Berners' Froissart. The past participle form "goen," as in "ffor goen" (l. 16), continues to be used by Udall and later writers in the Sixteenth Century. Berners' contemporary Skelton, however, uses as the past participle the form "go" (*CEOED* 1: 1164). The form "mych," Berners' regular spelling of the word "much," seems unusual (it is also the preferred spelling--at times with a terminal "e"--in *Huon*); Berners' contemporaries appear to have preferred the forms "much" and "moche" (*CEOED* 1: 1868-9). The spelling "dought" for "doubt" is also characteristic of Berners. The form appears in *Huon*. Malory employs both "dought" and "doubte" (*MED* D: 1264).

The view of Lord Berners as a Tudor English prose stylist which one gains from a study of the letters varies from the traditional view, based solely on a study of the printed prose. Berners the letter-writer is essentially a conservative stylist, not an experimenter. He writes clear expository prose in a straightforward style, not always rhetorically colorful, but at times graceful. The pervasive method by which Berners organizes his observations is parataxis, as additive conjunction links sentence after sentence. The individual sentences themselves are generally complex, less often compound; but the independent clauses governing the relative clauses may be no more than a brief "know." Within each letter
there are sentences of various lengths, but these are typically composed of three or four clauses of approximately equal length, ten words, more or less, so that the letter-reader perceives overall a regular rhythm, approximately the rhythm of the prose in Berners' *Huon*. This sense of balance is reinforced by the regular subject-verb-object order of the clauses, an order but rarely violated. Although the normal balance may expose the occasional weak concluding trail of infinitive or of-adjunct phrases, it may also heighten the effect of a variant sentence structure such as a periodic. But this balance is certainly not that of a pre-Euphuistic style, whatever the late influence of Guevara upon Berners might have been. The sentence structures of the letters remain constant over an eleven-year period, while during the same years there is demonstrable difference—if not development—among the predominant sentence structures in Berners’ published prose.

In matters of grammar and spelling, Berners again emerges from the letters as careful and conservative. As a matter of course he maintains case distinctions among pronouns and concord between pronouns and their antecedents. Subject-verb agreement is also normal, as is the use of the subjunctive mood. And Berners retains verb-endings for the third person conjugation which would be dropped as archaic by editors of his books early in the
It is of course because of Berners' books that the letters now matter for students of literature, for while the letters themselves may rarely be justly described as literary, they are useful ancillae to the appreciation of the romances and the histories. The content of the letters reveals that Berners is well acquainted with the mechanics and strategies of warfare and with international politics, concerns which dominate his histories and his fictions. And the evidence of the letters suggests that Berners recognizes that the paratactic style best suits his stylistic needs in such works.
Lord Berners, in his close, conservative translation of *Huon de Bordeaux*, proves much less an individual prose stylist than a noteworthy exponent of late medieval "period style" in his characteristic rhetoric, his figures of speech, and his diction. He accepts and carries over into his English translations many of the conventional values and expressions of medieval histories and especially romances such as *Huon*. Berners' diction in *Huon*, particularly in his choice of modifiers from among those present in the French text, normally emphasizes the chivalric and Christian values of the romance rather than more physical, sensuous details, even though some of the details which he retains, as in passages of *descriptio*, delight rather than inform the reader. More often than remarkable individual details, one finds Berners retaining patterns of description, repeated similes or narrative incidents, which place characters and actions in a broad Christian context. In like manner Berners retains the intrusions of the narrator and the frequent proverbial expressions used by both the narrator and the characters which focus the reader's
attention upon ideas which, if relatively simple, are yet beyond the immediate needs of the narrative. In *Huon*, Berners has a romance which features the chivalrous deeds and marvelous adventures typical of the genre, presented in the context of an explicitly Christian world view. Berners preserves this context from the French and heightens the reader's awareness of it by retaining in most cases the French source's conventional expressions while selectively reducing extended, individualized descriptions of battle and by adjusting the forms of certain verbal expressions from the French to standardize those forms (e.g. the binary form of the proverb) and so to emphasize the moral themes of the romance. In so doing he produces a literary work which is more consistent in style and thematic presentation than the French *Huon*, and one which has more in common with the works of preceding generations than with those of later prose writers.

Early in the reign of Henry VIII, Berners, then in his mid-forties, writes of having "redde and seen many a sondrye volume of dyverse noble hystoryes," which contain "many a straunge and wonderfull aduenture the whyche by playne letter as to our understandynge sholde seme in a maner to be supernaturall" (*Arthur [i.] v. A/39-41, B/3-7*), suggesting that his general taste in literature at
the time runs to romance as well as to what twentieth-century readers would distinguish as history. Such a distinction of genres was far less absolute in Berners' era, as certain forms of expression could be shared between the genres; Berners, however, does recognize a difference. Even so both genres, not mutually exclusive, attract Berners the translator because of his social, didactic interests. Having read so much himself, and observing that "it is delectable to all humayne nature to rede and to here these ancient noble Hystoryes of the chyualrous Feates and martyall Prowesses of the vyctoryous Knyghtes of tymes paste" (Arthur [i.] v. A/4-9), Berners wishes to take advantage of that delight to offer more than simple entertainment. He desires to present English readers with models of valiant, honorable, and courteous behavior, to draw upon the "bountie," the "innumerabile commodyties" of heroic literature so as to encourage his audience to "knyghtly feates/ manhode/ and humanyte," i.e. courteous behavior (Cronycles a.ii. r. A/22-3, A/13-14, A/29-30).

In this desire Berners is typical of the writers and translators of the era, during which romances as well as classical and religious works are regularly offered for the instruction and improvement of the individual. Caxton's preface to Le Morte Darthur, in which the printer declares that he has produced Malory's work "to
the entente that noble men may see and lerne the noble actes of chyvalrye, the jentyl and vertuous dedes that somme knyghtes used in tho dayes" (xv/4-6) is only the best known of several such declarations as one discovers affixed to the early printed editions of the *Siege and Conquest of Jerusalem* (a "history" of Godfrey of Bouillon, 1481), *Charles the Grete* (1485), *Blanchardin and Eglantine* and *The Foure Sonnes of Aimon* (both 1489). Other romances of the period, including *Paris and Vienne* (1485) and *Valentine and Orson* (1502?) lack such prefatory remarks, yet in content and style they are clearly of that ilk, as Berners' own *Huon of Burdeux* (1515?) proves to be.¹

The romances translated by Malory, Caxton, Watson and Berners from French into English prose maintain traditional chivalric values: bravery in battle, loyalty to one's love, and faith in Providence. Such values continue to be asserted in these romances popular at the beginning of the Tudor era by means of several romance conventions which affect a writer's—and a translator's—prose style: conceptual description, which can determine the kind and the frequency of adjectives; *descriptio*, which provides occasional rhetorical "color" without much affecting the narrative action; and stock phrases, similes, and proverbs, which in their use and repetition provide an undercurrent of order beneath any apparent chaos described in the narrative action. It is these
of the romance he has chosen to translate, and it is these
that he imitates, truncates, expands, or otherwise
manipulates in his English version to emphasize the ro­
mance's moral, chivalric themes.

The majority of the adjectives which Berners uses in
Huon, many of them closely based on the adjectives
used in the French Huon, describe abstract qualities
rather than sensuous, physical qualities. The reader may
discover several vividly described scenes in the romance,
but the most striking episodes depend for their effect
less upon pictorial, sensuous detail than upon the clarity
with which the action of the narrative is rendered. Al­
though well over one hundred different adjectives are used
by Berners, only about 10% of these appeal directly to the
senses. Thus the reader has little idea of the appearance
of most of the principle characters and only a general
notion of most of the locations in the romance. The
medieval literary conventions of descriptio and
amplificatio would haved allowed for fuller physical
description, but Berners does not increase the minimal
descriptiveness of the source, and in fact deletes some
adjectives in his occasional suppression of the source's
numerous doublets. Clearly Berners is more interested in
reiterating and reinforcing the source's value-judgements
than in rendering a continuously pictorial narrative.

In keeping with the moral, educative tendencies in the romance, most of the adjectives describe abstract qualities, psychological or ethical characteristics. Unlike the few sensuous adjectives, many of the abstract adjectives are repeated frequently in the French and also by Berners, with the effect that the reader finds himself often engaging in the evaluation of character by the narrator and by the characters who share the narrator's descriptive vocabulary. Terms such as "fyne" "excellent," "fayre," "good," and "ryche" do not enable the reader to envision a character or a setting in any but the most general way. Yet they are regularly applied to characters and settings approved by the narrator, and Berners does not add any more concrete details to them. Thus Huon "is so fayre and so well formyd that nature cannot amende hym" (Berners 11/21-2), but the reader is left to imagine for himself the specific details of his appearance. About all that one has to go on is an early description of Huon's arms: "the blasure of [Huon's] shylde, wherin was purtruyed .iii. crosses gowelles" (Berners 99/14-15) is enough to identify Huon as a Frenchman. Years later, when Huon is about 37 years old, he is said to have "a great berd and long here" (Berners 546/1), but these may be part of a temporary pilgrim disguise. "Old" Gerames (to give him his frequent epithet) also has "a long whyte berde, and
... heyre hangynge ouer hys shulders," and one later sees Gerames' "whyte berd hazyng downe on his brest vnder his helme" (Berners 60/25-6, 198/8-9), all entirely conventional details. Likewise one encounters "colanders, a great and a fayre citye," or "a great courte and a sumptuous," (Berners 489/12-13; 536/6: in the latter phrase Berners creates a doublet by introducing the post-positional "sumptuous"), essentially featureless locations. Of the adjectives of this sort which are limited to characters, "sage," "wyse," "yentyll," and "noble" are among the most frequently repeated by the French writer and so by Berners. Antagonists in the romance, particularly heathens and monsters (most Christian antagonists, e.g. the German Emperor Thierry, being potential allies) are likely to be "ill," "horryble," "lothely," or "howdeous." Both the heroes and villains, however, may be "bold," "expert," "hardy," or "fell": even Huon himself is held to be "fell & cruell" (Berners 337/29) by his enemies. Such abstract descriptions, in most instances retained from the French, are clearly more important to the Berners than ephemeral appearances.

As convention dictates Berners' choice of adjectives, whether singly or in doublets, so convention determines the romance's more extended descriptions. The longest descriptive passage is the detailed blazon of Huon's
daughter Clariet presented when the hero sees her for the first time after he has returned from one of his long voyages:

when she enteryd into the hall rychely aparalyd no man coude dyscryue her beaute, she was so well formyd that god and nature coude not amende her/her skynne was as whyte as ye floure in the mede/ & colouryd lyke the red rose/ her hanches low and her pappys sumwhat resynge, her throate smoth and clere/ her chyne vaunted/ her mouth as vermeyl as a rose/ her teethe small and well rengyde, and whyte/ her face whyte and well colouryd, meddelyd whyte & red/ her eyene smylyng, her chere amerous to behold, her nose strethe/ her forehed whyte/ her here yelow/her eeres gentyll and close, I can not deuyse the .x. parte of her excellent beaute/ none coude regarde her but that praysed and louyd her/ all her beaute and her swete demenor, and great humelyte that was in her/ yf I shulde dyscryue it/ it shulde be ouerlong to rehers

(Berners 549/2-17)

Clariet is not a major character in *Huon*: her story takes up only 84 of 782 pages. She is, nonetheless, on the basis of this blazon, the most thoroughly described. Yet she is not here an individually realized woman (in fact, "she is but .x. yerys of age" at his time, notes her guardian: Berners 548/10-11) but a type of the medieval ideal of feminine beauty, a standard expressed in the portrait of Beauty in *The Romance of the Rose* and glanced at ironically by Chaucer in his description of Prioress Eglentyne, a standard which informs a number of Middle English love lyrics, a standard which moulds the descriptions of the giant Fyerabras' sister Florypes in Caxton's *Charles the Grete* and of Guinevere in the
English Merlin. One thinks, secularly, of Galatea, or perhaps more appropriately of the Virgin Mary, she who is so often mentioned in Huon (among Berners’ effects at his death is a "table with 2 leaves of Our Lady painted": L & P v. 7: 141): static and remote, a beautiful object of devotion. Lest Clariet seem entirely artificial, her guardian notes that "'yf she be garnysshed with beaute/ in lyke wyse so she is with wytte and bounte’" (Berners 549/24-5), but it is some chapters before the reader may evaluate her wit in action, when she is rudely toppled from her pedestal and determines to go about incognito. Even then, her lover Florence suspects her high lineage.

After a passing reference to Clariet’s attire ("ryche," of course) the description begins—in Berners as in the source—with the conventional device of occupatio. The first example, "no man coud dyscryue her beaute," is neatly echoed ten lines later as the narrator states, "I can not deuyse the .x. parte of her excellent beaute," and these two short sentences frame the longer, more specific listing of Clariet’s physical features. The remark that Clariet "was so well formyd that god and nature coude not amende her" recalls the similar remark made of young Huon when he is first introduced to the story, and is itself later recalled when the narrator says of Clariet and Florence that "the great beaute wherwith they were
garnysshed coude not be dyscryued/ for god & nature had no thynge for goten in fourmynge of them" (Berners 626/28-31).

Berners slightly modifies from the French the structure of this blazon of Clariet's beauties, regularly omitting the verb (variously estoit or avoit) in all but the first of the clauses. He thus converts a series of short sentences into a single elliptical compound sentence in which the verb (was) of the first clause operates as the understood verb of each of the following balanced clauses: a figure of speech known as zuegma, recommended by medieval rhetoricians such as Bede (97-8) and Matthew of Vendôme (27-9), who specifically mentions its appropriateness in descriptive passages.

The only other extended description of a protagonist in Huon also employs a medieval commonplace, the ubi sunt motif. Esclaramonde, mother of Clariet and a more prominent character in the romance, languishes in the emperor's while Huon is off seeking assistance against the emperor, and the women who visit Esclaramonde bemoan her fate:

"A, ryght noble lady, where is become the great beautye that ye were wonte to be of/ for now your vysage is pale and dyscolouryd that was wonte to be so fayre, and now so lothely and disfyguryd/ where is become your fayre herys, that nowe be so blake and ruggyd for the great pouerty that ye haue enduryd/ Alas, noble lady, great pety we
haue to se you in this estate yf we coud a mende it"

(Berners 533/1-8)

The sentences in this formulaic passage are relatively balanced—not neatly so, but enough so as to stand apart from the surrounding prose. The passage has been altered very little by Berners: he removes the verb "voyons" after each adverb "now," which focuses the passage all the more upon its subject, Esclaramonde, rather than the speakers. The placement of the adjectives, which the translator retains from his source, suggests that despite her unfortunate physical transformation, Huon's wife remains "noble."

Just as the detailed descriptions of characters are mainly conventional and derive some of their effect from their relative scarcity in Huon, so too the elaborate set-pieces, the ferocious sea-storms or the lavishly decorated palaces, depend upon conventional elements and are the more memorable to the reader for their infrequent appearances. The world of nature is, for example, rarely depicted at length in the romance except when it threatens the characters. In such cases, the storms or other natural disasters occur specifically as punishment for the misbehavior of certain characters, especially Huon, or as a direct result of prayer, as when Clariet, threatened at sea by pirates, prays to the Virgin Mary for assistance:
therwith there rose vp so great a wynde and so horryble that the see that was calme and peaseable began to ryse and swell so maruaylously that the wawes were as hye as mountaynes and the wynde so great that whether the sarasyns wolde or not it behoued them to abandon theyr shyp to ye wynde and wether. . . .

(Berners 620/29-31, 621/1-4)

Here again the adjectives in this passage appeal very little to the reader's senses, and the notable visual image occurs in the stock simile about the waves, a typical feature of sea-storm descriptions in Huon (see Berners 156/24-5, 367/7-8 & 29-30, 585/6-7). Such passages are never metaphorical, never explicated at length in the text. Both the prosateur and Berners are certainly capable of detailed explication, as is demonstrated in the episode of Huon's encounter with Judas (Berners 366: see below, Ch. 5). Yet the storms remain unconstrued, for no explication is needed. It is always readily apparent to the reader that the storms are the effects of particular causes. Thus scenes involving the natural world generally contribute to the didacticism of the romance, reinforcing the theme of God's Providence toward his people, and so Berners retains them with little significant change from the French.

The architectural set-pieces, on the other hand, are rarely so edifying. They rarely serve a specific didactic end, existing more for the reader's pleasure than for his instruction. Almost all of these scenes, as well as
Huon's encounters with Judas, Cain, the dragon, and the griffin appear in the "Esclaramonde" section of Huon, that is, in the first of the continuations added to the original chanson de geste before the conversion of the works into prose in the middle of the fifteenth century. There are no other scenes and few other characters so fully described elsewhere as those in the "Esclaramonde" section, a distinction which suggests a difference in narrative technique if not in purpose between the writer of the earliest form of the Huon story and those who later added to the story. Be that as it may, Berners never reduces any such descriptive passages to the extent that some of the battle scenes are reduced, probably because of the very infrequency of such descriptions, which certainly enliven the narrative rather than impede it. While the translator rarely omits even minor details from these scenes, he does not add any material either, not even such as would suggest some figurative significance in the scenes described.

Similes in Huon may also suggest purely visual images, but they are more likely than passages of descriptio to figure forth more abstract ideas. Similes are used almost exclusively by the narrator, and the few exceptions echo some of the narrator's most common comparisons. Most of the similes may be classed as the narrator's--and Berners'--conventional responses to
recurring situations, and they are most often found in the narrative action rather than in passages of description. The similes can be grouped into a number of distinct categories: those pertaining to battle and to weather are the largest, and smaller categories include birds, forests, and light. Berners neither adds to nor subtracts from the number of similes in his source, but occasionally he varies the expression, the phrasing of the comparison.

Narratives of battle elicit the most frequent use of simile in Huon, and Berners often deletes particular details of specific battles while retaining the commonplaces. Most of the animal similes are applied to Huon himself, normally as he engages in combat. None is likely to enable a reader to distinguish one battle particularly from another, but such is not their purpose. Rather they locate each battle squarely within the conventional world of chivalric action familiar to readers of other romances popular in the early Tudor period. The repeated similes also operate within the individual narrative to associate certain characters with other characters or events with other events.

Such operations are best seen as Huon in combat is compared to a wild boar. This simile in Huon is only applied to protagonists involved in a specific battle situation, in which a hero stands alone or with a very small company against a potentially overwhelming number of
enemies. The hero is put in the position of the probable victim: the boar surrounded by dogs at the end of a hunt. But Huon, who finds himself so beset three times in the course of the narrative, always to the accompaniment of this simile, never succumbs, but leaves his opponents bloodied: as Huon "stode at a baye like a wylde bore baytyd with houndis, there was not so hardy a paynym that durst assayle hym" (Berners 515/21-3).

Because this simile is most frequently applied in the text to Huon, the reader is apt to associated other characters so compared closely with Huon. This is clearly the effect of the simile's one other occurrence, applied to Gerames at the old warrior's last stand. Gerames has been left as the chief support of Esclaramonde and the defender of Bordeaux when Huon travels to the East to secure the military aid of his wife's brother in Bordeaux's battle against the emperor. Ultimately old Gerames finds himself in a situation familiar to his master: "for as the wyld bore doth kepe a baye agaynst mastyues and bayynge houndes, so did they of Burdeux agaynst the almayns" (Berners 395/16-18). Here Berners calls attention to the simile, expanding it into traditional binary form by the addition of the second clause. That Gerames is Huon's surrogate in this action is further underscored for the reader a few lines earlier by Gerames' call to his men, "let vs shew them how our swordys can
cut, "a clear echo of Huon's boast, four chapters earlier, that "I shall shew them how my sword can cut" (Berners 395/5-6, 371/26-7). That Huon, like a wild boar, survives in the face of enormous odds allows the reader to hope that Gerames and his company might also survive. That they do not, but succumb instead to the emperor's vengefulness, is a strong indictment against Huon, who has willfully and foolishly waited too long to seek help. Gerames is the most significant victim of Huon's "sins of omission." Berners expands the boar-simile in a manner consistent with the conventions of the text, and so causes the reader to pause a little longer upon a simile significant to the themes of the romance.

The descriptions of general battles in *Huon* are not distinguishable from one another by details of battle strategies, for such details rarely serve the romance's thematic ends. Instead the descriptions are created largely from regularly repeated conventional phrases. Among these phrases are several similes which echo throughout the romance. Mass battles or sieges of cities become so intense that "on both partyes" there is "great shotynge with crosebowes and lyngynge of stonys, so thycke that it semyd snowe fleynge in the ayre" (Berners 389/14-15), an age-old simile which also appears in Berners' translation of Froissart's *Cronycles.* A frequent result of large-scale armed encounters is that
blood—always and only enemies' blood, never that of the Burdeloys—runs "vpon ye pauement lyke a ryuer,"
or "in grete stremes" (Berners 289/28-9, 305/19-20). Such repeated similies can have an oddly self-contradictory effect on the reader, like the too-frequent use of superlatives. Taken individually, each simile confronts the reader graphically, albeit conventionally, with the sanguinary violence and almost environmental chaos of war; but when each simile has appeared five or six times across several hundred pages, the collective effect is almost a sense of order, of constancy, of normality even in war. Although combatants may be individual heroes such as Huon or armies of Saracens or Germans, war proceeds according to its own rhythms and patterns, if not quite by its own momentum. Such a perception is perhaps not inconsistent with the view stated elsewhere that the outcome of battles lies not in man's hands but in God's.

It must be said, however, that not all similes repeated in Huon demonstrate a conscious attempt at a systematic vision. Some standard images suggest connections between people, places and incidents when nothing else in the narrative supports such connections. Horses run, ships sail, and even swimmers swim "as fast as though a byrde had flowen" (Berners 439/27). Berners even regularizes a conventional expression as he replaces "he" with "a byrd" for the sentence "[Mallabron] swamme as
fast as though a byrd had flowyn" (Berners 112/14-15).
This modification, while in keeping with the conventions
of the French, hardly improves the original save to render
it a little more consistent. More specifically, as Huon
and his crew sail toward Adamant Island, they see that "at
the porte there lay many shyppes so that theyr mastes
semiyd a far of to be a great foreste." Fifteen chapters
later, Huon alone approaches the port of Tauris by sea,
and as the narrator again expresses it, "in the hauen
therof there were so many shyppes and galyes that
theyr mastys semiyd to be a great forest" (Berners 370/1-2,
443/10-12). Here the effect of the simile is purely
visual, attaching to no network of figurative meaning.
The ships at the Adamant port are drawn and held there by
magnetism, and Huon's stay on the Island is full of marvel
and adventure. At Tauris, on the other hand, Huon
counters Barnard, who has been searching for him, and he
gains the friendship and conversion of the Admiral of
Persia, who helps Huon on his journey. Neither the
narrative incidents nor the themes of these two episodes
bear any specific similarity to one another, and Berners
simply retains the mast/forest image without modification.

Proverbs serve much more regularly in Huon to knit
together characters and themes. Proverbs figure
significantly in the texture of the prose: often these
concise statements appear amid more complex sentence
structures, focusing the reader's attention because of their brevity and pithiness. As do the proverbs in Berners' own letters, the proverbs in the romance serve the rhetorical end of the ethical appeal: that is, they establish a sense of shared heritage and values between writer and audience. Always in Huon they represent the authority of received wisdom, sometimes scriptural, and they suggest that the world depicted in the narrative, and by extension the reader's world, operates and may be understood in a morally ordered universe. More than a third of the proverbial statements specifically remind characters and the reader that the moral order of the world derives from God, and so it comes as no surprise that the tone in which the wisdom is conveyed is normally serious and straight-forward, nor that the received wisdom is almost exclusively the inheritance of the narrator and his Christian characters. By implication, at least, competing systems of belief lack a coherent tradition.

The repetition of proverbial observations establishes the Christians' world view as coherent and consistent, though the view cannot fairly be said to develop in the course of the romance. The received wisdom is static, or better yet firmly established, and all experience may be referred to it. Individuals such as Huon or Croysant may grow and develop as they come to appreciate this wisdom and to order their lives accordingly.
Yet in the final section of the book, Croysant's story, the theme of God's helping His faithful is expressed not so directly as in earlier sections, but more obliquely by means of a complementary set of proverbs concerning good government. To ensure that Croysant proves a worthy leader when he succeeds his parents, Ide (who by miracle has become male) and Olive, as ruler of Rome, the prince is sent to school with a venerable knight and a wise clerk, for, as the narrator observes, "comonly it is said that a kyng without letter or connyng [sans scauoir lettre in the source] is compared to an asse crowned" (Here Berners' introduction of the alliterating "k" sound is not associated, as is usually the case, with a battle, but it serves to set the verbal expression of the French more distinctly apart from the surrounding narrative, and thus call attention to the proverb: Berners 730/19-21: cf. Tilley 356.K69). And yet upon assuming the throne, Croysant, overly generous, gives away his inherited fortune and is consequently reproved by his court. One unnamed lord declares, in Croysant's absence, that "cursyd is that land wherof ye lorde is a chyde [sic]" (Berners 739/23-4: cf. Tilley 739.W600), a biblical proverbial condemnation ("A bad outlook for you, country with a lad for a king," Ecclesiastes 10:16) recalling Duke Naymes' criticisms of the unstable Charlemagne as childish in the earliest chapters of the
romance. More to the point, the unnamed lord further observes that "yll shulde he governe his londe and contre whan he can not kepe it that is closed fast in his cofers" (Berners 739/27-9: again the alliterating "k" sound is Berners' addition). Wise men at court had foreseen that Croysant would fall on account of his being overly generous; however, Ide had advised Croysant to "gyue almes to the poore for loue of our lorde Iesu cryst/ let thy coffers be open to thy good knyghtes, beware be no nygarde. . ." (Berners 735/16-19). Huon himself has received similar advice from his mother before he journeyed to Charlemagne's court (Berners 10/16-19).

Croysant follows what is essentially good advice from Ide, but he follows it without moderation, and eventually he gives away all he has. It may be that the distinction made in the Croysant section of the romance between largesse and financial prodigality on the part of a ruler attracts Berners (always financially strapped himself, complaining in Calais of having to pay official expenses out of his own shallow pocket) to Huon because of contemporary socio-political circumstances. Early in his reign, Henry VIII began to engage in costly and ineffective wars, primarily against France, and he continued to do so throughout his reign. Even his peaceful efforts, such as the 1520 meeting with Francis I on the Field of the Cloth of Gold (about which Berners writes a report for
the Privy Concil), were inordinately expensive. John Skelton, at about the same time that Berners translated *Huon*, explored the topic of largesse and prodigality at greater length in his play *Magnyfycence*. If immediate concerns about Henry VIII motivated either Skelton or Berners, these writers were nonetheless oblique in their references to the subject. In an earlier prose tract, *Tree of Commonwealth* (1509), Henry VII's former agent, Edmund Dudley, came more quickly to the point:

> I suppose right great treasure is soon spent in a sharp war, therefore let every man beware what counsel he giveth to his sovereign to enter or to begin war. There are many ways to enter it, and the beginning seemeth a great pleasure, but the way is very narrow to come honorably out thereof, and then often times full painfull, besides that it is very dangerous for the soul and body.

(Cited in Ferguson, "Indian Summer" 165-6)

Interestingly, the proverb which lies behind Dudley's statement (which Ferguson oddly calls "one of the least conventional passages in a generally conventional tract [165-6]" also occurs in *Huon*, when Esclaramonde warns Huon about the dangers of warring against the German Emperor. In this instance Berners restores the balance in the proverbial expression. Finding the redundant "'larges & amples'" in the French, Berners selects the former to render Esclaramond's balanced phrasing, "'the entre into warre is large/ but the issuyng out ther of is very strayte'" (Berners 312/21-4). Dudley's handling of the proverb has its own effective balance, but Berners'
handling is characteristically more compact. Considering the literary context of the English *Huon* and the political conditions in England in the early years of the reign of Henry VIII, one could reasonably argue that Berners is attracted to *Huon* because he senses its topical applicability as well as its more general moral concerns.

Croysant and Huon are characterized in part by the specific proverbial refrains with which they are associated. Huon, more than any other character in the romance, is the struggling Christian, usually but not always remembering God's love and power; Croysant is, among the several bad, albeit Christian, rulers in *Huon*, the only one who actually learns to govern better. Other characters speak proverbially, but each is normally allowed only a single statement to distinguish him or her. Generally, the effect of the use of proverbial statements by a dozen of the characters and by the narrator with some confirming interplay between narrator and characters, is not to individuate characters but to establish that in the world of *Huon*, members of at least the upper levels of Christian society see their world and express their views according to received wisdom, group-wisdom.

The themes in *Huon* which the proverbs demonstrate are certainly not unique to this romance. One sees the
Christianity of the romance not only in other romances printed during the same period, e.g. *Valentine and Orson* and *The Four Sons of Aymon*, but also in histories such as Berners' own translation of Froissart (where again Berners preserves rather than introduces the Christian elements). One sees also the more secular social themes explored by writers who are Berners' contemporaries. The vehicles such as similes, which Berners uses to explore these themes in *Huon*, derive from romance convention, and Berners heightens the effect of these by manipulating the conventions, regularizing verbal expressions or adding alliteration to focus the reader's attention upon the themes expressed. Berners does not invariably modify figures of thought and speech from the French *Huon*, and of the modifications he does make, not all demonstrates clear thematic significance. The extended set-piece descriptions and the character portraits are inherited from the romance convention of *descriptio*, and while they rarely interrupt the narrative for long, neither do they add much to the presentation of themes. Nevertheless some of the changes in form effected by Berners do focus the reader's attention more closely upon the ethical content of the romance. The "descriptive" diction exemplified in the use of evaluative modifiers does much to establish the tone of the romance as a showcase for romance values still prized
in Berners' world: valorous behavior when combat is necessary, responsible fulfillment of one's proper role in society, and above all belief that God is still directly concerned in the affairs of His creation.
LORD BERNERS' ENGLISH *HUON* AND THE FRENCH *HUON*

In translating the 1454 prose Charlemagne romance, *Les Prouesses et faitz merveilleux du noble Huon de Bordeaux per de France/ duc de Guyenne*, into English, Lord Berners produces a version which is faithful to the narrative while not a strictly literal, word-for-word rendition. His aim in his *Huon*, as in his *Arthur of Lytell Brytayne* and his *Cronycles* of Froissart, is "the true reporte of the sentence of the mater."¹

The editorial changes Berners introduces in *Huon* are less extensive than those he brings to the *Cronycles*. He "reduces" Froissart's four books into two, yet also adds historical information, as from Fabyan's *Cronycle* of 1515, to clarify passages in his source or to add facts not available to Froissart. For different purposes, Berners also edits *Huon* considerably, omitting small passages on many pages of the narrative as well as a fair number of longer passages. Minor additions to *Huon* are much less frequent than the omissions, and Berners makes only two extensive additions. Berners' approach to translation resembles Caxton's (in Caxton's translation of the Charlemagne romance *The Four Sons of Aymon*, for
example) in the kind and the degree of changes from the source, and in the fact that both Berners and Caxton translate works not requiring the large-scale rearrangement of materials characteristic of Malory's translations. Berners need not unlace intricately intertwined tales to emphasize the activities of favored characters; he sometimes rearranges the order of clauses or of whole sentences, but he leaves the overall structure of the narrative unchanged. Nevertheless, he does modify the surface texture of *Huon* in several identifiable ways.

He regularly takes the opportunity to convert reported speech into direct address dialogue. He performs this conversion 65 times throughout the text, often by the simple devices of inserting an expletive such as "ha" (or expletive and address such as "ha sire") at the beginning of the speech and then rendering the third-person pronouns of reported speech into first- and second-person pronouns. Thus

```
labbe de clugny passa auant & dist au roy charlemaigne que oncques iour de sa vie nauoit ouy une si grant mensonge que le traistre amaury auoyt dicte/ et que luy et quatre moynes tous prestres estoient prestz et appareillez de iurer & faire serment solempnel. . . .

(Huon f. ix, v. A/2-10)
```

becomes, in Berners,

```
ye abbot of cluney stept fourthe, and sayd to the kyng, 'syr, ye neuer herd so false a tale before as this traytoure Amaury hathe sayd, for I
```
and .iii. moo of my mounkes, beynge preests here present, ar redy to swere & to make solemne othe. . . .'

(Berners 36/11-16)

The term "ha" is sometimes rendered "a" in the source, in which case there exists the possibility that the expletive might be taken for the preposition "a," a difference between, for example, "and he said 'Ah, Huon'" and "and he said to Huon." The French prosateur himself becomes confused once on this point, inserting the expletive speech signal into a passage which is otherwise reported speech: Bernard "racompta et dist/ ha huon la maniere & comment la bonne cite de bordeaux auoit este prinse . . ." (Huon f. cx, v. B/43-4, cx1, r. A/1). Berners rectifies the error and writes that Bernard "shewed to Huon the maner how ye good citye of Burdeaux was taken . . ."(Berners 453/6-7).

The French prose Huon is freighted with verbal padding, frequently repeated words, phrases, and clauses which contribute little or nothing to the development of either character or plot. Throughout his translation, Berners systematically omits many such pointless repetitions. The most frequently cut phrase is the tag "de bordeaux" which often follows the name "Huon." Berners drops the tag in nearly a hundred instances, usually in narrative passages rather than in dialogue. Such omissions occur in the names of other
characters as well: "de bauier" is dropped from "duc Naymes" three times on p. 52 alone, and several times at other places in the narrative. In the prose source there is no apparent pattern in the use or omission of the territorial tag, nor is any pattern evident in Berners' translation, other than that the tag is most often omitted. In both texts the tag is used too indiscriminately for the reader to perceive any specific significance in its use.

Berners often drops the adjective phrase "la dicte" or its variants, which are in most cases hardly needed to identify the subject under discussion. In the source one reads that Huon "choisit de la fontaine ung serpent moult grant & merueilleux qui gardoit ladicte fontaine . . . " [saw by the fountain a serpent exceedingly large and marvelous, which guarded the said fountain] (Huon f. xxix, v. A/8-10), but Berners reduces the last clause to "who kept the founteyne" (Berners 117/8). On the same page the reader sees that Huon "print son cor & le mist a sa bouche si le sonna si merueilleusement et par telle vertu que le roy oberon louyt qui a cestuy iour en ca forest & quant il eut ouy le son dudit cor . . . " [took his horn and put it to his mouth and sounded it so marvelously and with such force that King Oberon heard it, who this same day was in that forest, & when he had heard the sound of the said horn]
(A/31-5), and again Berners reduces the last clause, without loss, to "& whan he hard it" (117/24-5).

The relative clause "qui la estoit" is likewise often employed gratuitously (that is, in terms of necessity for reference) by the prosateur. The clause "Quant les roynes/ dames & damoyselles qui la estoyent veirent au roy oberon. . ." [When the queens, ladies, and damsels who were there saw King Oberon] (Huon f. cxxx, v. A/40-1) follows by a mere seven lines a specific list of the ladies present at Oberon's court. Not only does the translator drop the needless "qui la estoyent," but he also replaces "au roy oberon" with "hym," as Oberon has obviously been the subject of the two preceding sentences (Berners 536/11-17). Berners' frequent omission of this redundant relative clause gives the prose source the appearance of using a greater number of subordinate clauses (i.e. of being more hypotactic) than the translation, but the English version gains forward momentum by being so relatively streamlined.

Certain ubiquitous adverbs are also frequently eliminated by the translator. The temporal adverb "auiourd'hui" often occurs in comparative clauses such as "quil nest auiourd'hui homme" (Huon f. xix, v. B/5-6), as well as in other passages, mostly in dialogue, and though Berners occasionally retains the adverb as "now," he omits it altogether 24 times. He is more likely to retain the
phrase "a ces temps," rendering "temps" as either "tymys" or as "season." Berners is less rigorous in deleting the adverb of manner, "incontinent" (i.e., immediately), dropping it just fifteen times. He renders the adverb in English as "incontinent," in which form it had been in use in the language throughout the fifteenth century. The retention and frequent use of this adverb creates a headlong quality about the narrative appropriate to the reckless Huon and his descendants, who often "bash on regardless."

There is one consistent omission late in Berners' translation which does bespeak a pattern, a sensitivity to the requirements of the narrative. After Huon and his wife Esclaramonde depart Bordeaux to receive sovereignty over the fairy kingdom of Momur from the dying Oberon, their daughter Clariette is kidnapped from her guardians, and upon her rescue decides to keep secret her true name and heritage. She even hides her identity for nine chapters (clxi–clxix) from her true love Florence. Nevertheless, in the prose source she is in those chapters regularly referred to by name not only by the narrator but also by characters such as Florence who are supposed not to know her true name. However, in his corresponding nine chapters, Berners omits Clariette’s name 17 times, retaining only a few of the narrator's references. After one such reference, late in the episode, the translator
even adds the observation that "how be it he [Florence] knew not what she was" (Berners 662/8-9). Berners clearly detects the flaw in the presentation of this episode by the *prosateur* and makes the sensible corrections.

But the *prosateur*, if sometimes careless, is not always artless, and not every example of Berners' attentiveness to his text involves "improvement" of his original, though usually Berners retains the strengths of the French. In converting the various verse sources of *Huon* into a prose romance, the *prosateur* eliminates virtually all the sources' rhymes. But occasionally he finds a stylistic usefulness for rhyme. Thus, when Huon asks the identity of the foe he hopes to slay, the giant Galafer boasts that "iusques au sec arbre voire de la la [sic] rouge mer nya homme si grant qui ne me soyt tributaire . . ." [unto the dry tree to see from the Red Sea, there is no man so great who is not tributary to me] (*Huon* f. xxvi, r. B/3-5). Here the *prosateur* retains the sense while modifying the structure and the rhyme of his verse source: "*Il n'a païen, Sarasin ne Escler/ Desc'au Sec Arbre ne tant c'on puët aler/ Qui ne me doive quatre deniers d'or cler*" [There is no pagan, Saracen nor heathen/ Unto the Dry Tree not such a one able to go/ Who should not owe me four shining gold pieces] (*Huon de Bordeaux* 240/5071-3). This rare example of rhyme in the prose, more balanced, more artificial than
the surrounding text, emphasizes the formal boast as an element of pre-combat ritual. Berners senses the significance of the rhyme and preserves it to good effect in his version, though like the prosateur he modifies the structure and the rhyme as necessary: "thou mayest say that vnto the drye tree and the red see/there is no man but is trybutayr to me/" (Berners 105/5-7). This rendition of the source is typical of Berners' approach: not a word-for-word translation, but a slight reorganization of the source to render "the true sentence."

Other reasonable changes effected by Berners involve not only deletion but also variety in translation according to dramatic context. In the prose source, the term "vassal" serves as a sort of all-purpose salutation when speakers address various audiences. Berners simply omits the word 18 times, often making the speakers seem abrupt, but 24 times he renders it in different words according to the circumstances. "Vassal" becomes "frende" 14 times. King Ivoryn, whom Huon has just released from the obligation of a bargain, addresses Huon as "frende." Admiral Gaudis, recognizing that Huon has just slain the admiral's enemy, also calls Huon "frende," as does that enemy himself, the giant Galafer, when he ironically taunts Huon (Berners 180/25, 120/26, 103/19). Later, however, the German Emperor Thierry, whose son Huon has slain, calls Huon "thou
traytoure," a more specific insult than the source's 
"vassal," introduced by the belittling pronoun "thou" 
(Berners 292/2). Later still, the emperor challenges Huon 
with "thou knyghte" (Berners 300/13), again derived 
from the source's "vassal." At about the same time, 
Huon himself speaks of a worthy opponent as "yonder 
knught" (Berners, 298/5-6), from the French "se 
vassal." Toward the end of the romance, the King of 
Naverne calls Florence "'thou vnkynd nephue'" (Berners 
643/25-6), from the French "vassal." Elsewhere in the 
romance Berners renders "vassal" as a respectful "syr" 
and as a more neutral "man," "felow," and "varlet" 
(Berners 170/29, 742/11, 260/22, 187/24). Berners' 
exploitation of the range of meanings of the term 
"vassal" demonstrates an appreciation of distinctive 
tones of voice in dialogue, distinctions muted by the 
omnipresent "vassal."

The phrase "nostre seigneur iesucryst" also 
appears frequently throughout the romance, but Berners 
does not often render the words directly into English. 
Normally the phrase appears as either "god" or "our lord 
god," though "the name of our lorde Iesu chryste" (Berners 
364/30) does occasionally occur. Berners retains the 
plural possessive pronoun "our" in a sufficient number of 
instances to ensure that the reader counts the narrator 
among the community of Christians. Yet in another way he
regularly distances himself from the characters in the romance. The phrase "noz gens," when not omitted altogether (Berners 664/31), is usually converted into some less inclusive phrase: "Gerames & his company" (Berners 395/13), "chrysten men" (Berners 474/14, 475/29), or "Florence men" (Berners 664/27). Evidently the translator feels that referring to the French as "our men" is inappropriate in a work intended for an English audience.

Certain other French terms also inspire Berners' adaptive imagination. In expressions indicating the more-than-mortal abilities of Huon and others, the term "lennemy" often occurs. When it appears as "lennemy denfer," the image is plainly diabolic, and Berners usually adapts the terms as "dyuell" (Berners 759/23). Sometimes he renders the word directly into English as "ennemye," but inserts explanatory wording into the text: "but the dewyll, which is ennemye to all vmayne creatures," phrasing which echoes the French's earlier "the dewyll: the enemye of all humayne lynage . . ." (Berners 365/30, 366/1, 364/3-4: underscoring indicates Berners' additions). More often, however, he renders the term as "speryt," "spirite," or "spryghte" (Berners 321/22, 758/22, 492/2), words more fitting for a story of the hero who becomes the Fairy King. The first Fairy King, Oberon, has not only sprites at his command but also
"luytons," which Berners renders once with technical accuracy as "warwolfes," but elsewhere as both "best" and "beer," although he recognizes the more specific "ours" as "beeres" (Berners 604/16, 168/13, 111/8, 121/19).

Apart from such adaptations, Berners also corrects several mistakes in his source. In Chapter lxxxviii, the prosateur erroneously locates a tournament at "strabourg" which he has, earlier on the same page, placed at "mayence" (Huon f. lxviii, v. B/16, A/32). Berners corrects the mistake (Berners 279/11). He also corrects the name "pierre darragon" (Huon f. clii, v. A/11) to read "the king of Nauerne" (Berners 632/10), so that Claricette's eventual father-in-law, King Garyn, is defending himself against his enemy rather than against his ally. When, in the subsequent chapter, Garyn gives orders to some pirates in his employ, they depart to fulfill their mission; yet after a few lines the prosateur attributes to Garyn a speech he could not have made unless he had accompanied his pirates, which he had not. Berners more realistically ascribes this speech to the pirates themselves and inserts third-person references to the king (Berners 638/24-8). Elsewhere the translator remedies a typographical error in the source by rendering "table" as "cables" to complete the doublet "corde ne table" as "cordys and cables" (Berners
In preparing the E.E.T.S. *Huon*, Lee evidently did not consult the French prose source, not even for doubtful readings. Such consultation might have revealed to Lee a few real misreadings and prevented him from "correcting" some non-existent problems. In one chapter heading, for example, Berners mistakenly replaces "admiral" with "emperour" (Berners 464/20), possibly because some of the activities ascribed to the admiral in this heading resemble the activities of Emperor Thierry in a slightly later chapter. This slip of Berners' is not noted by Lee, nor does the editor of the 1601 edition correct it, even though in the 1601 table of contents the heading appears with the correct reading.3

Another more complex error, arising from uncertain orthography and injudicious editing, passes entirely unremarked by both Lee and the 1601 editor. In one of the rare purely descriptive passages in the romance, *Huon*, arrived at the Castle of Adamant, discovers a sight which impresses him but perplexes the attentive reader:

> a chaumey, wherof the two pillers that susteynyd the mantell tree were of fyne Iaspar/ and the mantell was of a ryche Calasedony/ and the Lynett was made of fyne Emeradis traylyd with a wyng of fyne golde/ and the Grapys of fine Sapers. (Berners 383/20-4)

The description piles up details in a serial-additive manner, yet this lapidary's delight, when closely
examined, hardly offers a clear image of the fireplace which Huon sees. The past-participial phrase "traylyd with a wyng" appears to modify the more immediate "Emeradis" rather than the more logical referent, "Lyntell." Even when the antecedent of this phrase has been established, the meaning of the word "wyng" remains obscure: no definition of the word "wing" (as it is spelled in the 1601 edition) allows the use of the verb "to trail" in the sense which the context requires. Finally, the relationship of the "Grapys" to the whole structure is ill-defined.

Most of these puzzles can be solved by comparison of Berners' text to the French. The prosateur writes that the "manteau" --Berners' "mantell tree"-- "soubstenoit la clere voye" (Huon, f. xciii, v. B/21). The source offers "manteau" for both Berners' "mantell tree" and "mantell," and the translator, distinguishing one from the other, equates the "mantell tree" with the "Lyntell," which fulfills the same supportive function in a fireplace. After the word "Emeradis," however, Berners deletes the words "& la clere voye estoit faicte" (B/23-4). Originally it is neither lintel nor emeralds but "la clere voye," i.e., the lattice, supported by the lintel, which is "traylyd with a wyng." The word "wyng" is derived from the source's "vigne," a vine, and a trailing golden vine
is not difficult to picture in this setting. As Berners' letters show, the translator sometimes wrote a "w" for a "v" (e.g., "wawghan" for "Vaughan," Berners 6 Feb. 1522), and he may have done so in this instance.

The *OED* records the spellings "vygne" and "vigne" for "vine," the first ca.1315, the second as late as 1604, but the spellings "vyne" or "vine" were more common during Berners' era. Berners may have written something like "wygne," which could have been misunderstood by the *editio princeps* typesetter as "wyng." The restored "vine," of course, explains the grapes. The source, however, is no better at attaching the "grappes de raisin" to the vine: it merely provides the verb, "estoient faictes," deleted in Berners' final elliptical clause. So what Huon actually sees at the end of the Adamant Hall is a fireplace crafted of precious stones to resemble natural floral growth. Berners' use of the term "mantell tree" reinforces that image, but the apparent misspelling of "vine" as "wyng" mutes the effect.

Lee notes two misreadings which, upon consultation with the source, turn out not to be Berners' mistakes at all. As Huon and his crew approach a perilous gulf in which they will encounter Judas, they hear a noise like "a thowsande great rynnynge riuers to gether, betynge and taybourynge" (Berners 361/26-8). The translator has cast the French "tamburement" (*Huon* f. lxxxix, v, A/2
5-6) as the present participle "tabourynge": Chaucer and Langland employ "tabor" as verb ("taboryng" also occurs in Middle English), and the verb appears in a book printed by Caxton (CEOED 2: 3217). Lee, however, seems not to recognize the form, and he replaces it with the lame "labourynge" (Berners 361 n.). Likewise, Lee "corrects" Berners' apparent slip when a thief "drew out his dager and strake his felawe into the body to the ha[r]te" (Berners 615/5-6). Berners wrote the last word as "hafte," an accurate translation of the prose source's "manche" (Huon f. cxlvi, r. A/17), which makes as much sense in this context as Lee's emendation.

It must be admitted, though, that not all of Berners' misreadings—fewer than 30 in 782 pages—are attributable to the vicissitudes of Parisian typesetting. Most of these misreadings fall into one of three categories: numerals, anatomy, and days of the week. Fifteen of the errors involve numerals. Some of the numerical mistakes might be caused by London typesetting, as when ".lx." in the source is transposed to ".xl." (Berners 579/18). Other numerical errors require a different explanation. When, at one point in the narrative, Huon is to be judged by his peers—that is, the Peers of France—Berners twice replaces "unze" with ".xii." (Berners 241/14, 251/1). As this occurs twice under similar circumstances, it is less likely to be simply a typographical error than the
previous example. Perhaps Berners wants to make sure that the reader understands that these are in fact "ye xii. peres of france" (Berners 2/19). Even so, when Duke Naymes steps aside from his fellows, their number becomes ".x." (Berners 253/6). Presumably the prosateur continues to regard Huon, even in disgrace, as one of the Twelve Peers, and so he has but eleven come to judge him.

Late in the romance Berners appears to become careless about human anatomy in his descriptions of one-on-one combat. Most sword-strokes in Huon, if they light upon an opponent's head, cleve the head to the teeth (dentz); lighter strokes only cleve the brain (ceruelle) but especially powerful strokes penetrate all the way to the chest (poyctrine). Yet after 500 pages of close rendering, one finds both "ceruelle" (twice) and "poyctrine" taken as "tethe" (Berners 623/3, 511/24, 637/9), "poyctrine" again as "chyn" (Berners 749/33), and "dentz" as "braynes" (Berners 715/22). One possible explanation for these changes is that their general effect (except when "ceruelle" becomes "tethe") is to lessen the violence of the blows, and so to some extent reduce the hyperbole of the source.

Indifference rather than ignorance seems also to explain the misreadings of days of the week in the narrative. Certain feast days such as Easter, Whitsunday
and Midsummer's Day ("ye fest of saynt Iohna,"
Berners 124/4) are designated in the romance for such
ritual events as tournaments or the release of prisoners.
Among these days, Berners reads "le blanc ieudy" (Huon
f. cxxxvi, r. A/44), which he renders accurately as "sher
thursdaye" (Berners 560/13). Elsewhere, however, one
finds "ieudy" cast as "mondaye" and "mardy" as
"thursday" (Huon f. cxxi, v. B/6; f. cxxxii, v. B/9;
Berners 498/31, 545/20). These latter days of the week
are among several scattered widely throughout the story,
most of which are gratuitous details, not even useful in
determining the passage of time in the narrative, and
nothing is lost by Berners' acknowledgement of their
uselessness unless one regards them as contributing a
sense of specific historicity to the story.

Less defensible are the few misreadings which are
likely to confuse the reader, at least momentarily—faulty
readings which arise from injudicious editing of the
French by Berners. Early in the quest on which he is sent
by Charlemagne, Huon goes to Brandys to meet his uncle,
Garyn (not the same Garyn who becomes father-in-law to
Huon's daughter Clariette), and he discovers "Garyn
syttynge before the porte in a loge, well and richely
hangyd in a ryche chayre" (Berners 55/34, 56/1-2). This
is an uncharacteristically clumsy passage for Berners, as
even without Lee's insertion of the comma after "loge" the
dangling participle "hangyd" seems to leave Garyn himself dangling in a chair. Here Berners has ineffectively condensed his source, which has Garyn "assis dedans une moult belle loge. Enquelle estoit tendue et paree dune moult riche tapisserie/ dessoubz la tappisserie en une moult riche chaire estoit garin assis" [seated in a most lovely booth. In which was hung and adorned with [sic] a most rich tapestry/ beneath the tapestry in an exceedingly rich chair Garin was seated] (Huon f. xiii, r. B/39-42: underscoring here indicates material deleted by Berners). Berners senses the redundance here, as well as the apparent inappropriateness of the period after "loge," but he deletes the wrong material. The prosateur clearly explains that it is a tapestry which hangs in the loge, and that Garyn sits in his chair beneath the tapestry. It is not unusual for Berners to replace a relative phrase such as "enquelle" with a participial phrase, but he is normally not so careless about participles and their antecedents.

Berners does, however, occasionally run afoul of pronoun reference problems, even if one allows for pronoun uses peculiar to Berners' era. During one of the first great one-on-one battles in the romance, Huon and his traitorous opponent Amaury unhorse one another. Freed of their riders, the horses themselves fall to fighting, and Huon's horse "strangles" (Berners 42/18) Amaury's:
"& when he saw his horse slayne/ Amaury stept to Huon for
to haue slayne him/ than Huon stept between them and
lift vp his sword . . ." (Berners 42/18-21). Now, this
passage makes sense only if "him" at the end of the second
clause is understood to indicate Huon's horse. But such a
reference is not clear from the lines preceding this
passage, and the structure of that second clause suggests
"Huon" as the natural antecedent for the pronoun. Yet if
"Huon" is the antecedent, the following clause ("than
Huon stept between them") makes little sense.
Again, this problem arises because of the translator's
ineffective editing. According to the source, Amaury
"sen vint moult vsnellement devers le cheual du dict
Huon pour le occire & detrancher/ mais Huon qui que bien
tost de ce se prin taret se mist a deuant de son destrier
et haulsa son epee . . ." [came most quickly toward the
horse of the said Huon for to murder & slay it/ but Huon,
who was well aware of that grasped his hilt and placed
himself in front of his horse and raised his sword]
(Huon f. xi, r. B/13-17). Berners' "than Huon stept
between them" is much less precise than the equivalent
French clause. If the reader works out the reference,
"them" must be Huon's horse and Amaury. The 1601
editor resolves the problem by replacing the troublesome
clause entirely with "but Huon met him valiantly" (Berners
42 n.).
These few misreadings warn the reader against the automatic assumption that any omissions from a work so long and so wordy are necessarily an improvement. The misreadings are the more obvious because Berners so neatly omits, rearranges, and/or adds to his materials that the surface texture of the narrative is rarely noticeably disrupted, and most of Berners' changes are detectable only when the French prose version is consulted.

In addition to the consistent minor omissions already noted, Berners omits other material throughout the narrative, more often as a sentence here, a clause there, than as a large passage all at once. Surprisingly, considering the notoriety of romances for violence (even Caxton, in his preface to *Le Morte Darthur* (1485) was aware of the wicked actions often portrayed in such works), Berners sometimes omits details of battle (see note five, below), usually involving the cut-and-thrust of man-to-man combat rather than formulaic details on the order of "arrows thick as snow" or "blood running like rivers." Because *Huon* demonstrates other qualities of the pious romance, one might regard such deletions as part of Berners' effort to focus the reader's attention upon the religious lesson of the story, explicitly expressed late in the romance by Croissant: "so goeth the workes of our lorde god/ man maketh batayles/ and god gyueth ye victory" (Berners 753/26-8). Even so, one also finds the
translator occasionally omitting references to Providence or divine intervention.

One extreme example of Berners' omissions of both battle details and religious sentiment occurs in Chapter xvi, during the trial by combat between Huon and Amaury mentioned above. Berners relates that the two knights "couchyd ther speres and dasht so to ther horses/ that it semed that the thounder had fallen fro heuen" (Berners 42/8-10), but then omits from his source "Si sen vindrent les deux cheualliers dessusditz courrir lung sur lautre et assirent leurs lances dont les fers estovent moult tranchans et tresbien affilez ..." [came the two knights aforementioned to run the one upon the other, and they set their lances, of which the points were most piercing and well filed] (Huon f. xi, r. A/33-6) before resuming the text with "thus with ther sharpe speres they encoatered in such wyse ..." (Berners 42/10-11). The four lines of French omitted from the French simply rephrase information that has been offered in the surrounding sentences, and even the detail that the spear points are "most piercing and well filed" may be said to be implied by Berners' "sharpe speres."

Three lines later, Berners describes the unhorsing of Huon and Amaury much more briefly than his source, condensing seven lines of French into a single, short, past-participial clause. The translator follows his
source in writing that "both ther horses fell to the erth," but then adds tersely: "& the knyghts sore astomyd with the fallyng" (Berners 42/13-15) The prosateur, however, continues at length after "tomberent par terre":

que oncques ny eust ne sangle/ ne poitral qui' les en peusse destourber/ et alors convint il que les deux cheualliers qui dessus estoient tombassent par terre si tres estourdys que a bien peu ne sceurent que aduenu es toit tant furent estourdys des grans & merueil leux coups quil'eurent receus/ [that never might there be strap/ nor breastplate which might hinder them/ and then was it fitting that the two knights that were above fell to the earth so very stunned that for a little while they knew not what had happened, they were so stunned by the great and marvelous blows which they had received/]

(Huon f. xi, r. A/44, B/1-7)

One misses perhaps the specific note on the efficacy of the horse armor, the strap and breastplate (a word retained by Caxton in his translation of The Four Sons of Aymon and rendered as "poytrell" [197/15]), and Berners has the knights stunned by the fall rather than "by the great and marvelous blows which they had received." Not only does Berners replace this latter clause, but he also eliminates the preceding clause which describes just how stunned the knights were: "so very stunned that they little knew what had befallen them." Berners omits the obvious information that the knights on the horses also fall when the horses fall, and avoids the repetitive phrasing of the description of the knights' condition. This particular omission parallels another, seven chapters later, when Oberon works an illusion upon
Huon and his men: "they lost ye syght of ye castell, it was clene vanysshyd a way" (Berners 68/22-4). Here again the short latter clause replaces the wordier development of the source: "& ne sceurent qui fut devenu/ car ou lieu ou ilz lauoyent veu ny auoit quelque apparence que oncques y eust en chastel ne tour/" [they knew not what had happened/ for in the place where they had seen it there was no sight whatsoever that of it there had ever been castle or tower] (Huon f. xvii, v. A/13-15). Berners' succinct comment renders the rapidity of the castle's disappearance much more immediately than the source's labored explanation.

So far during the Huon/Amaury episode, Berners has eliminated eleven lines of prose without serious loss to the narrative. During the subsequent six lines Berners stumbles through the thicket of pronoun references concerning Amaury and Huon's horse before returning to the battle on foot between the two knights. Huon gives Amaury "suche a stroke [again Berners, suppresses the doublet "si grant & merueilleux"] that he was astomyed therwith, & reculyd backe more than .ii. pase . . . " and everyone has "meruayll of Huons vertu" (Berners 42/21-3, 24). Thereafter the translator picks up the narrative immediately, in line 26, with Amaury suffering from his wound and launching a counterattack. The to-and-fro of personal combat is easy to follow in these lines: Huon strikes, Amaury
falls, Amaury recovers and returns the blow. The progress of the battle is so efficiently described that it is surprising to realize that between lines 25 and 26 an episode running to 21 lines of French prose has been eliminated without a trace by the translator. Briefly, in the omitted passage, Amaury returns Huon's stroke and would have cloven Huon's head to the teeth, "but our lord Jesus Christ saved [Huon] from death." Nonetheless Huon staggers back a few feet, as Amaury himself had done in the preceding passage retained by Berners. Huon then deals Amaury a deadly blow to the hip, after which point the translator resumes the narrative of the source.

The reasons for Berners' omission of this material are not readily apparent. In them there is little of the repetitiveness which characterizes the previously suppressed passages, so it is not simply a matter of the translator tightening the manner of expression of the French. Nothing here is condensed or adapted; not even the significant reference to divine intervention is retained. The material is dropped, and the narrative easily proceeds as if it had never been. A total of 32 lines out of 57 in the source have been dropped, with hardly an editorial misstep on Berner's part save for the pronoun confusion in lines 19 and 20.

In a later battle sequence, Berners again selectively edits his source to streamline the narrative action. The whole of Chapter xxiv has been trimmed. In all about 16
lines are pruned, but the reader hardly senses the loss.

The giant Galafer first aims a lethal blow at Huon, but he misses: "ye stroke glent & the fauchon lyght vpon a pyller & enteryd in to it more than .ii. fote"

(Berners 108/5-7). What Berners has deleted from the passage is of little consequence to the narrative:

"car si guenchyt pource que moult legier et viste estoit la faulx descendit bruyant comme foudre si en ataignant ung pilier qui la estoyt si tres grant et si merveilleux cop [sic] que la faulx y entra plus de deux piedz de parfond. [for he turned aside because most light and quick was he. The scythe fell braying like thunder and striking a column that was there so very great and so marvelous a blow that the scythe there entered more than two feet of depth]"

(Huon f. xxvii, r. A/1-5)

Among these omissions only the second, describing the thunderous blow, might be counted a loss (Berners omits the phrase again in a later battle scene (297/19) when Huon "venoit bruyant comme fouldre," riding against Emperor Thierry's troops. Huon f. lxxxiii, v. A/18).

The first omission simply attributes the stroke's deflection to the fact that Huon is light and quick, a fact which the prosateur repeats only four lines later, in a reference retained by the translator. The third omission suppresses mostly gratuitous information such as the ubiquitous "qui la estoyt." In this romance, nearly all strokes are great and marvelous: indeed, a mere six lines later, Huon himself, seeing that he has the advantage over Galafer, "baille ung si
merveilleux coup & si hastivement que oncques ne donna
loysit au gsaunt dauoir se faulyx releuee" [gave so marvelous a blow and so hastily that he never gave leisure to the giant to have raised his scythe] (Huon f. xxvii, r. A/10-12); but again Berners has omitted these clauses. The remaining seven omissions in this chapter eliminate material also of no great narrative or thematic significance.

Such radical reduction is the exception rather than the rule in Berners' treatment of his source, yet one discovers occasional clusters of extended omissions elsewhere throughout the romance. In Chapter xxx, Berners streamlines a dialogue by deleting some 10 lines out of 15 in his source. Gonder, the good provost, has been sent by Huon's apostate uncle, Duke Macaire, to negotiate a truce with Huon, who is holding a castle in self defense. Macaire tells Gonder:

I wyll do as thou doest counsell me'/ than y^prouost cam to y^palayes & sayde to Huon/ 'syr, for goddes sake speke with me'/ 'what art thou? quod Huon/ 'I am your host y^prouoste/ and I requyre you, in as moche as ye loue your lyues, kepe well this palayes'/ (Berners 93/24-29)

Again, the passages reads smoothly despite the omissions. Yet for all the efficiency of the translation, it must be admitted that the source here offers a better sense of the "staging" of the scene and better characterization. When Gonder comes to Huon's palace, the reader of the English
text has no clear idea of the relative positions of the two men. But the *prosateur* informs the reader, after Gonder's request that Huon speak with him, that Huon leans out of a crenelation of the palace and asks who is below (*Huon* f. xxiii, v. A/19-22). When Gonder advises Huon to "kepe well this palayes," Berners leaves the advice at that, while in the French Gonder continues to warn that whatever promise Macaire might make, Huon should not trust the duke, for there is no truth in him. The reader of the French readily accepts this advice as sound because the duplicitous Macaire, having earlier agreed to do as Gonder counsels, says to himself that he will cause his nephew and his company "to die an ill death" (*Huon* f. xxiii, v. A/27-9, A/15-17). While Berners might feel that the character of Macaire is clearly enough delineated elsewhere in the chapter, the omitted material in the source does not merely tediously rephrase nearby statements, and in this instance the source is more dramatic than its spare English counterpart.

Ordinarily as Berners omits passages of varying lengths from the source, he contents himself with simple omission to condense his matter. Far less frequently he ventures to rearrange the source's sentence structures, and such reorganization involves some omission and adaptation as well as simple repositioning. As is usually the case with the many omissions, Berners' rearrangements
are so neatly crafted that the reader loses little if any of the narrative and rarely senses Berners' subtle changes. In the earliest example of such restructuring, toward the end of Chapter xxi, one finds the translator once more omitting or at least significantly condensing repetitive material. Oberon and a hundred thousand of his men come to Huon's aid at Tormont and slay all the pagans who will not be baptized. At the end of this episode, Berners briefly sums up the preceding action: "thus all that were in the towne and wolde not beleue on god were slayne" (Berners 95/10-11). The prosateur, however, provides a much wordier summary: "& ceulx qui avec le roy oberon estoient venus en la ville ou ilz detrencherent et m iserent [sic] a douleur tous ceulx qui en dieu ne voulurent croire" [& those who with King Oberon were come into the town where they slew and put to grief all who in God would not believe] (Huon f. xxiii, r. A/17-20). Here Berners has abbreviated the French by converting an active-voice construction into the passive voice, moving the final, object clause of the French sentence to the beginning of the English sentence as the subject clause, and then extracting one of the verbs (detrencherent) from the third clause and casting it into the passive voice. Thus Berners follows his source in presenting a summary, but he returns to the narrative action more quickly.
Berners also ably performs more complicated transformations of his text. Huon, having long been trapped on the Isle of Adamant, has the opportunity to share the miraculous hospitality of Adamant Castle with some converted Saracens and a bishop they have rescued, and the prosateur describes the delightfulness of the place:

\[ne du chant des oyseaulx qui si bien chantoyent\]
\[que aduis estoit a leuesque & a son nepueu quilz fussent rauis et mys en paradis: car telle odeur & telle doulceur gectoyent les herbes & les fleures qui par leans estoit esparses quilz ne sceurent que penser pour le grant odeur quelles sentoyent . . . .\] [nor of the song of the birds who so well sang that it seemed to the bishop and his nephew that they were ravished and put into Paradise: for such scent and such sweetness gave out the herbs & the flowers that in that place was [sic] spread that they knew not what to think for the great scent they smelled]

\[(Huon f. ciii, r. B/29-35)\]

In the French, the prepositional phrase about the birdsong which introduces this passage modifies the verb "esbahyr" ("abasshyd" in Berners) in the preceding main clause (B/28). But Berners converts the passage into a more independent unit by extracting a clause from line 30 and placing it at the beginning of the passage to serve as the main clause of the new sentence: "& they were rauysshyd" (Berners 422/5). He then compresses the relative clause modifying "oyseaulx" into the single adjective "sweet" to modify "chant": "with the swete syngynge of the byrdys" (Berners 422/5-6). The demonstrative clauses up to the colon are deleted
(B/30-2: the bishop and his nephew are mentioned in the previous sentence), and Berners changes the compound subject (les herbes & les fleures) of the subsequent main clause (B/32-3) into an object of the preposition "with": "and ye herbes & flowres that were there spred abrode smellynge so swetely that they thought themselues in Paradyse." The active-voice verb "gec-toyent" is transformed into the present participle "smellynge" to introduce an adjective phrase modifying "herbes & flowres." Finally, Berners lifts the words "en paradis" from lines 31-2, so that instead of not knowing what to think, the bishop and his nephew are said to think Adamant Castle is paradise. The new structure of Berners' sentence has become: Main clause + preposition (functioning adverbially) + Noun Phrase 1 + NP 2 (NP + Demonstrative Clause + Present Particpial Phrase + Demonstrative Clause). Here Berners has made no misstep in reforming the source passage, and the reader has no difficulty following the revision.

Not every such transformation is a success, however. In Chapter cii Berners performs an equally complex rearrangement which, though adequate in form, does not do justice to the pictorial content of the original passage. The prosateur describes an assault on Bordeaux and, after listing the objectionable items the defenders are casting down upon the assailants, he pays more particular
attention to the archery of Huon's folk:

puis quant ung pou ses toyent eslongnez ceulx
que sur les murs & tours leur tiroient des
arcs arbalestres si me nu & souvent que force
leur estoit deulx retraire que aultre chose ny
scauroyent conqueste moult grant corroux auoit
empereur & le duc sauary son frere quant aultre
chose ne pouoyent faire car tant dur & si menu
volloyent flesches et viretons que tout lair
en estoit obscur & sembloit aueoir que ce fust
neige qui volust maint alle mant gisoit mort sur
la champaigne & maintz naurez que par leurs
amys furent raportez aux tents. [then when
they were a little withdrawn, those who were on
the walls & towers drew the bows of their cross­
bows so fine & often that they were forced by
them to retreat, that they might know no other
thing but defeat. Most great sorrow had the
Emperor & the Duke Savary, his brother, when they
could do no other thing. For so hard and so fine
flew the arrows and quarrels that all the air was
dark, & it seemed to sight that it was snow that
flew. Many Germans lay dead on the field and
many wounded who by their friends were carried to
the tents.]

(Huon f. lxxxiiii, r. A/1-13)

Although he reduces the number of lines by half, Berners
does preserve most of the narrative action in his
condensation. He lifts details about the archery from the
middle of the passage (8-10) and conflates them with an
idea from line two to begin his version of the passage
with a conventional battle image: "& they wt in shot
arrowes so thycke/ that it semed lyke snow" (Berners
339/26-27). It is curious that Berners, who had
accompanied Henry VIII on a campaign in northern France in
the very year of Huon's first French publication, and
who certainly knew about sieges from that campaign (Taylor
9-12), should here eliminate just those details which
distinguish this siege from others in the romance; but as such details do not function thematically, he is not interested in preserving them.

Berners' next sentence fairly reproduces the weakness of its source (A/5-8). Berners converts the Object-Verb-Subject order of the first clause to the more regular S-V-Predicate Complement, but taking his cue from the singular verb "auoit," he divides the compound subject and leaves the second element of the compound hanging like an afterthought following the complement: "themperour was sore dyspleased, & duke Sauarey/ when they saw none other remedy" (Berners 339/27-9). In the dependent clause, Berners again repositions the object to follow the verb: "they saw" represents the source's plural verb "pouoyent."

Yet Berners ignores the French distinction between singular and plural in his prosaic rendition of the final clauses of the passage. Where the prosateur sets a vivid scene before the reader, as "many a German lay dead on the field & many [were] wounded who by their friends were carried to the tents," Berners offers the matter-of-fact: "many were slayne and sore hurt" (Berners 339/29). As with Berners' rendition of the Macaire/Gonder episode described above, the adaptation here lacks the drama of the original. It is again evident that war in and of itself is not the center of Berners' attention,
even in a generally martial romance such as *Huon*.

While it may be too much to say that Berners has a personal distaste for war, as a translator he often omits warlike details, especially hyperbolic details, and instead reinforces the romance's religious themes.

But if Berners' omissions and adaptations are sometimes only qualified successes at best, more generally successful are the additions he makes to his text. Fewer in number and smaller in scale than the deletions, the additions cluster in particular chapters, mostly in the second half of the romance (Chapters cviii, clxviii, clxxvii, clxxx): most chapters show few if any significant additions. These additions differ from the previously discussed adaptations in that they are not derived from condensed or omitted passages, though they often emphasize ideas mentioned elsewhere in the text.

Another distinctive quality of the additions is that they do not as a rule contribute directly to the narrative action: no episodes and few individual acts are introduced. Instead, the cumulative effect of Berners' additions is to reinforce *Huon's* spiritual themes.

One way in which Berners draws his readers' attention to the efficacy of Christianity is to heighten the villainy of pagan antagonists. Before the exchange in which Gonder warns Huon of Duke Macaire's treachery, the French knight Geoffrey, one of Macaire's officers, enlists
the aid of some of the duke's French prisoners to rescue the unsuspecting Huon by explaining to the men (in lines added by the translator) that Macaire "was ones crystenyd, & hath renyed ye feythe of our lord god Jhesu Cryst . . ." (Berners 91/16-17). This amplification of Macaire's wickedness explains a slightly earlier addition, in which Berners has the narrator observe that Macaire "was so cruell ageynst all crysten men." Berners inserts this passage immediately before one of the thematic refrains of Huon: "but god, who neuer forgettyth his frendes, socouryd them" (Berners 91/1-2). Elsewhere, Berners allows villains to reveal their own heathen cruelty. Agrapart the giant expresses with a conventional phrase his eagerness to defeat Huon: "I shall neuer haue ioy at my herte . . . ." But then Berners attributes to the giant a grisly conclusion to his statement: "tyll I haue rased his herte out of his body" (Berners 145/9-10).

Berners also adds to the more positive (i.e. Christian) statements of his heroes, as when Huon's eventual son-in-law Florence urges his men to defend themselves mightily by reminding them of the power of Providence. Florence speaks in the proverbial terms characteristic of such expressions of faith in Huon: "whom god wyll ayde can not be perysshed/ no mortal man can hurt hym" (Berners 664/1-2). By adding the verb phrase "can not be
perysshed," Berners brings the structure of the expression into accord with those of like statements by the narrator and other characters throughout the romance, preserving thematic continuity from speaker to speaker.

Berners also preserves continuity by introducing passages into the description of one character which remind the reader of that character's lineage. Twice in the space of 18 lines Berners describes the activities of Florence's warrior daughter, Yde, in terms distinctly reminiscent of Yde's grandfather, Huon:

\begin{quote}
then [Yde] dasshed into the thyckest presse and euer dyd chese out of the greatest parsonages . . . 
. . . she rode into the thyckeste of the prese & bete downe the Spanyardes on al sydes, that petye it was to se.
\end{quote}
(Berners 714/31-3, 715/13-15)

Huon, Yde and other brave Christian warriors in the romance ordinarily perform in this manner in battle.

Another much larger addition seems on first reading more difficult to justify. At several points throughout the romance, characters have occasion to summarize the preceding action (either the action immediately preceding or the whole of the previous narrative) ostensibly for the benefit of characters newly introduced into the story. In Chapter cxxvi Huon, newly arrived in the realm of the noble Admiral of Persia, responds to the admiral's inquiries and relates his recent adventures on the Adamant Island and his encounter with the griffin by means of
which he escaped the island. Certainly the reader, having read the full story in the previous few chapters, hardly needs this summary and, noting the additional 21 lines which Berners introduces to the recounting, may recall the narrator's frequent comment: "it were ouerlong to reherce." Yet this one retelling by Huon has some narrative justification. It repeats the "moralitée" of the romance, and it moves the good admiral to observe that Huon's "god is pusant, and louethe moche them that byleuethe on hym" (Berners 461/4-6). On the basis of Huon's story of God's Providence, the admiral decides to receive baptism, even before Huon makes known to him the miraculous apples, one of which will restore the admiral's youth. Yet Berners' additions, it must be said, add nothing especially miraculous to Huon's story, but mostly detail the initial difficulties of his voyage.6

By far the most successful of Berners' additions, the ones which most effectively underscore the didactic content of Huon, occur in Chapter cviii, during Huon's encounter with Judas Iscariot, trapped and tormented in the Perilous Gulf. Huon hears a loud voice of one bewailing his despair and consequent damnation, and conjures the being by various holy powers to identify himself and explain its situation. There follows a monologue of 45 lines in which the speaker identifies himself as Judas and expands upon the lament Huon has
heard. Berners adds to Judas' speech lines in which Judas reveals that even in his damned state he has not been entirely forgotten by God. Judas explains the presence of a sheet of canvas which protects him at least partially from the buffeting waters of the surrounding gulf: "oure lorde god wolde that the good dede that I had done in geuynge this canwas for his sake, shulde not be vnrewardeyd" (Berners 366/18-20). Yet he declares that he must suffer eternally: "for neuer shall I deparde from hens: for now it is to late to call for grace, for ye dome is geuen vpon me: wherfore I do and muste suffer this tourmen & payne" (Berners 366/5-8). The words express the insurmountable despair of Judas, the cause of his damnation. He concludes his speech on a similar note, but adds a warning to his hearers: "I had no grace to aske marcye of our lorde god for my trespas, the deuyll was so great withe me/ wherfore let every man take ensaple [sic] by me, and aske marcy while he haue space" (Berners 366/25-8). The effect of Berners' additions here, particularly the last passage, is to turn Judas' speech more nearly into an exemplum, a moralized tale. Judas comes to sound all the more like a character in a mystery play, warning his audience not to follow his example. Here Berners, who elsewhere diminishes the dramatic impact of certain episodes of battle, heightens the dramatic effect and so reinforces the romance's spiritual themes.
The comparison of Berners’ English *Huon* with the French *Huon* reveals that Berners usually does discover and present "the true reporte of the sentence of the mater." He does not feel bound to produce a word-for-word translation, but often demonstrates a pleasing flexibility, and rarely does he produce noteworthy misreadings. Some readers might prefer the French prose, faulting Berners for an apparent reliance upon formulaic rather than individualised details, particularly in battle scenes. Yet in his selection of what kinds of material to omit and what kinds to insert, the translator demonstrates an awareness of the pious, didactic nature of this particular romance, of the qualities which distinguish it from some of its more secular counterparts. While such romances as are translated by Malory and Caxton do develop some religious themes, such themes seem more central to *Huon*, and Berners often takes opportunities to draw the reader’s attention to them.
Lord Berners demonstrates both conservativism and independence in his translation of Huon. He preserves the generally paratactic organization of sentences characteristic of the late medieval popular romance, as he preserves the overall structure and the chivalric values of his original, though he refines the focus on these values. Within individual sentences, however, he does not feel constrained to follow the patterns and the language of his source literally, but sharpens some relationships between clauses by altering relative pronouns or by introducing conjunctions, and intensifies aesthetic, rhetorical effects by selectively rendering doublets or by introducing alliteration into passages. The gallicisms which abound in Berners' Huon are to some extent a feature of the "high style" in which Berners and his predecessors think it appropriate to present the romance, yet in practices such as his frequent suppression of doublets Berners moderates the gallic influence of the source upon his English, more so than does his predecessor Caxton, who can be painfully, obscurely literal when translating comparable works. Berners effectively
exercises his independence as a translator in his adaptation of source into lively vernacular vocabulary and sentence structure.

Berners generally follows his French source in the structuring of sentences in *Huon*, and so the predominant method of indicating relationships between sentences is the use of coordinating conjunctions, especially the copulative "and" and the consecutive "then," appropriate for the chronological organization of the uncomplicated narratives typical of late medieval popular romance. Such works are often written with a chronicle-like matter-of-factness which does not require an audience to engage in tightly reasoned, logical analysis of the events narrated, as might the style of persuasive prose, but rather to comprehend events as they happen in order of occurrence. The popular prose romance, if it persuades at all, persuades by example rather than by appeals to reason. The paratactic pattern of linking in sequence series of sentences of similar length and structure is characteristic of historical prose such as Froissart's as well as of romances such as *Huon* and the works of Malory. Yet within the paratactic framework, individual sentences in *Huon* often exhibit considerable complexity and variety in the arrangement of clauses and in the use of subordinating conjunctions, and Berners demonstrates a modest yet significant freedom in dealing
with subordination, or the lack of it, in the source.

Artfully balanced clauses, whether formed by hypotaxis or parataxis, are infrequent in *Huon*. Late in his literary career, under the influence of such modish stylists as Diego de San Pedro and Antonio de Guevara (especially popular with the younger set at Henry VIII's court, including Berners' nephew Sir Francis Bryan), Berners exhibits the capacity for managing extended passages of balanced, rhythmic prose unhampered by excessive use of doublets or triplets. A farewell declaration by Marcus Aurelius from Berners' translation of *The Golden Boke of Marcus Aurelius* (1533) demonstrates the typical style of Berners' late prose:

"Nowe, my harty frendes, ye se that I am come to the end of my last journey, and to the begynnyng of my firste journey with the goddis. It is reason that syth I have loved you in tyme past that ye believe me nowe. For the tyme is com that ye can demande nothyng of me, nor I have nothing to offre you; nor myn eares as now can not here flateries, nor my herte suffre importunities. Yf ye never knewe me, knowe me now. I have ben he that I am, and am he that hath ben, in tymes past lyke unto you somewhat."

(Golden Boke 405/1-7)

In *Huon*, however, syntactic balance occurs not in long passages but in isolated expressions in narrative and dialogue. Balanced clauses in the French text are few, and these Berners usually retains; but he also truncates or expands the language of the original to achieve or to emphasize balance. Usually the balanced clauses stand out
among less stylized discourse:

Then he auansyd hym to the serpent, and gaue hym a great stroke on the haunche be hynde/ & yf he dyd but lytell with his first stroke he dyd less hurt with that stroke/ for he coude in no wyse cut through y' serpenti skyn: wherefore he was in great fere

(Berners 382/12-16)

The central, balanced clauses here are expanded from the source's less insistently balanced "mais si pou y auoit faict par auant encores y feist il mains [sic; moins?]" (Huon f. xciiiii, v. A/7-8). More subtly, a few lines later, Berners condenses the phrase "ung gros espieu & carre moult beau & riche" (A/15-16) to "a great square spear," and then adds significant details in a parallel phrase to produce the compact sentence "Then he saw by the gate a great square spear with a sharp, brode hede" (Berners 382/20-1).

Berners may also enhance the symmetry of proverbial expressions, expanding a conventional simile, for example, into a balanced, binary structure: "for as the wyld bore doth kepe a baye agaynst the mastyues and bayyng houndes, so dyd they of Burdeaux agaynst the almayns" (Berners 395/16-18). Here Berners has added the final explanatory clause to give the expression a form which draws attention to it; however, as the ideas in the simile are implied slightly earlier in the text, the 1601 editor drops the entire simile.
Ordinarily, sentences in narrative passages in *Huon* are short, composed of two or three clauses, and subordinate clauses usually branch right to follow initial independent clauses. Few sentences are so long as to appear ungainly, and relationships between sentences and among clauses are most often simple and clearly stated. Berners, however, sometimes simplifies relationships still further by occasionally suppressing relative pronouns, especially "*lequel*" and its variants:

[1] than he behelde all about yf there were any other entre/ [2] at last he saw nere to a pyller of marbell a basyn of gold fast tyed with a cheyne/ [3] than he aprochyd nere ther to and drew out his sworde, wher with he strake thre grete strokes on the basyn/ so that the sounde ther of myght well be harde in to the castell/ [4] within the toure there was a damesell called Sebylle/ [5] whan she harde the basyn sowne/ she had gret meruayll/ [6] than she went to a wyndowe/ and lokyd out and saw Huon that wolde enter. [7] than she went bake agayne and sayde, "a, good lorde, what knyght is yonder without that wold enter?/ [8] for yf the Gyaunt awake anone he wylbe slayne/ [9] for yf there were a .M. knyghtes to gether they shulde sone be dystroyed suerly."

(Berners 98/25-32, 99/1-7)

This passage is typical of the narrative style of *Huon* in several ways. In adverbial clauses of condition and purpose, Berners regularly employs the subjunctive forms of verbs. Most of the sentences contain just two clauses, and only the third contains three. Most of the sentences begin with the consecutive coordinate "then" or with a temporal adverb, and the sequence of events from sentence
to sentence is easily comprehensible. Berners has, however, deleted the relative pronoun "laquelle" after "Sebylle" to create a succinct conditional statement. He also omits the phrase "par laquelle" after "wyndowe," eliminating an unneeded relative pronoun to create a compound-verb independent clause. In neither instance is the relative "laquelle" strictly required to identify its antecedent. It is ubiquitous in *Huon*, and as with other regularly repeated words and phrases, Berners occasionally suppresses it with no appreciable loss to the narrative.

The *prosateur* employs the pronoun "laquelle" for both personal and inanimate antecedents, though he also uses "qui" for the personal relative pronoun. Berners prefers the interrogative "who" as the nominative personal pronoun of relative clauses, particularly if such clauses are non-restrictive. He is more likely to use "that" to introduce restrictive clauses, though this distinction is not everywhere absolute. Even so, such a distinction is not common in English before Berners' time. Earlier English writers usually employ "that" as the general relative pronoun (Mossé 113). Furthermore, Berners clearly distinguishes the nominative case "who" from the accusative case "whom": "and so [Malabron] came to Huon/ whom he founde sore wepynge"; and as Huon himself later says, "'I haue brought with me his daughter
ye fayre Esclaramounde, whom I haue taken to my wyfe'" (Berners 168/8, 224/11-13). In the former instance the prosateur uses "lequel," while in the latter he uses "laquelle." As the object of a preposition, the form used is also "whom."

Relative clauses in Huon ordinarily immediately follow their antecedents, but minor irregularities do sometimes occur. Late in the romance, Malabron and Gloriand explain to the king of Navarre that Huon "'wyll gyue his daughter Claryet to your nephue Florence, who is the fayrest lady of ye world'" (Berners 681/12-14). Of course the relative clause must apply to Clariet, but the relative is separated from its antecedent because it begins in the source not as a relative but as an independent imperative clause which contains its own relative clause. Following "fleurens," the source continues "&_ cuyde que plus belle on ne trouerovent on monde ne qui a sa tresgrant beaul te se puisse comparer" [& think that [a girl] more lovely one may not find in the world, nor one to whom her very great beauty can be compared] (Huon f. clviii, r. B/17-19). Berners has reduced the imperative statement into a similarly superlative but more compact relative clause, but he has not rearranged the clauses to indicate the more logical relationship. An embedded relative clause immediately after "Claryet" would be more consistent with sentence
structure normal in *Huon*.

Nevertheless even when Berners closely follows his source such problems of reference are possible, for the problems occur in the source, especially in longer-than-normal sentences. One of Huon's knights, explaining his leader's misfortunes, concludes with a relative clause of uncertain reference:

"this knyght slewe Charlet, sone to the kynge Charlemayne, by a mysaduenture, wherefore he was banysshed out of y*e realme of Fraunce/ & sent by kynge Charlemayne to doo a message to the Admyrall Gaudys, who is deed in pryson as it is shewed vs."

(Berners 135/7-12)

The antecedent of "who" in the penultimate clause is not in fact "Gaudys" but "he" in the second clause, and "he" clearly refers to initial subject "knyght," whom the reader understands from the context to be Huon. Berners has added to the passage the name "Charlet," but this one change does not clarify the more significant confusion of reference. The only defense of the resulting sentence is that it preserves the chronological sequence of events.

Such problems of relative pronoun reference are much the exception rather than the rule in *Huon*. Berners deletes a number of gratuitous relative clauses of the "qui la estoit" type, as he also reduces the number of subordinate clauses by omitting the relative "lequel."

Occasionally he collapses a relative clause into a single modifier, as when he derives the more vivid statement,
"the porter answered chorlyshely, and sayd," from the source's less pithy "le portier qui moulte rebelle estoit luy respondit . . ." (Berners 757/12-13; 
*Huon f. clxxxii, r. A/3-4*). More frequently, especially in the early chapters of the romance, Berners converts some relative clauses into present participial phrases which, like their sources, are usually embedded between subject and verb: "Whan Duke Naymes, beynge there present [qui la estoit present], herd the wordys of Amaury . . ." (Berners 6/1-2). The prose source itself includes a number of present participial phrases which Berners commonly translates into corresponding English form. Such retained clauses are ordinarily embedded directly after their antecedents, e.g. "And also theyr mother who louyth theym intirely/ wyll not gladly suffer them to departe fro hyr, by cause of theyr yonge age" (Berners 6/13-15).

Another structural variation employed by Berners is the use of the subordinate clause with a zero relative, i.e. a clause not introduced by a pronoun. In the use of this structure Berners is less influenced by his French source than in other variations, for in the majority of cases such clauses are formed when Berners omits the source's pronoun: "he shold be the fyrst sholde lese his life" [a qui il ostera sa vie] (Berners 226/12; 
*Huon f. lvi, r. B/2-4*). However, Berners also leaves
out a pronoun when he adds a clause of his own devising to modify a noun: "the boty they had wonne" (Berners 188/32). The translator may also omit the pronoun "that" at the beginning of an object clause: "I had lytell thought [que] thou hadest ben such a man"; "she commaundyd two of her knyghts to se [que] ye pylgremes sholde haue meet and drinke" (Berners 106/6-7, 276/33, 277/1-2). Such headless clauses appear in both narrative and dialogue passages, but are not frequent in either.

If Berners reduces hypotaxis in Huon by his characteristic adaptations of his source, he restores it effectively in his frequent insertion of the adverbial conjunction "therefore," which also takes the form "wherefore." The use of this conjunction does not indicate the presence of rigorous syllogisms in the narrative, though simple logical patterns may indeed underlie the surface structures. When Esclaramond believes that Huon is about to be put to death, she entreats his supposed persecutor (in fact Gerames): "'yet I pray you let me go in to the pryson with you, to the entent that I may se Huon ones yet or I dye/ for the loue of whom I am content to dye; if he dye I wyl not liue one day after/ therefore let me ones take leue of him'" (Berners 137/25-9). The appeal of this plea is overwhelmingly emotional, yet the addition of "therefore"
contributes a suggestion of reasonableness as well. In any event it signals the conclusion of the character's discourse, as it does in most other instances when Berners either inserts the word or retains it from his source.¹

Within both subordinate and relative clauses in *Huon*, the normal order of the major elements of the sentence is Subject-Verb-Object, especially in narrative passages. Variations in narrative sentence patterns do occur, e.g. "and there sate down to gether the emperour and Huon and the duches" (Berners 571/20-1), but such patterns are rare except in repeated formulae such as "Now leueth thystory to speke of Huon," or "Now sheweth thystory . . ." (Berners 136/10-11, 17) which often respectively conclude and begin chapters.

Word order in dialogue is much more liable to inversion because of the frequency of commands and questions. Although inversion is a possibility in partial questions (Mosse 127), Berners has not inverted the word order following the interrogative adverb "why." In direct questions, V-S inversion is frequent. Huon asks a gate-guardian, "'seest not thou this rynge . . . ?'" and the porter, recognizing the token, asks in reply, "'how fayreth ye lord that ye come fro?'" (Berners 114/23, 26-7). Somewhat later the porter asks Huon of his supposed lord, the giant Galaffre, "'comyth he hether or not?'" (Berners 116/11). Much less frequent than the V-S
inversion is the inversion which emphasizes the object, as in Huon's remark to the porter, "'good day mayst thou haue,'" or Malabron's statement to Huon, "'other ayde may I not do the'" (Berners 116/4-5, 169/4).

Inversion of word order is much more frequent in Huon than in Berners' letters, which lack substantial dialogue and are full of declarative sentences which are neither questions nor commands. Nonetheless inversion does occur in the letters, as when Berners writes Wolsey that "the refformasyon j remytt to yo' grasyouse plesir," or that "odyr persons j haue a brode jn odyr plasses" (Berners 13 March 1523; 25 January 1521). In Huon, as in the letters, some of the inversion is accounted for by the regular use of the pseudo-subject "there" at the beginnings of clauses, as when Huon laments to the minstrel Mouflet, "'for ther was neuer man that hath sufferyd so myche pouerte as I'" (Berners 171/1-2).

Other than the inversions of main sentence elements, the most notable inversions in Huon affect adjectives. Adjectives commonly precede the nouns they modify: "he was a fayre old man," "ryght noble lady Esclaramonde," "two gret carbuckles" (Berners 458/13, 482/11, 771/11). Adjectives ending in "-all," however, are normally post-positive, retaining their French order: "sete royall," "y* armes imperyall," "a voyse angelicall," "a thyng terrestryall" (Berners 141/29, 322/30, 435/30, 4).
These are political and religious concretions, as is a similar phrase in one of Berners' late letters, "lordys sperytuell and temporall" (10 March 1532; 11 analogous forms are noted in An Anthology of Chancery English ["Morphology" 41]), or a phrase in a letter of 1489 from T. Griggs to Sir John Paston, "Sir, the law civil saith thus: 'If any fish royal be found on the sea'" (Paston 241). This order, however, is not invariable in Huon, as one also finds the grouping "a cordyall hate" (747/17).

Another variant structure sometimes occurs in Huon in which the substantive is surrounded by a pre-positive and a post-positive modifier: "a byg man & a valyant," "this false lawe and detestable," "a grete water and depe," "a fayre apple & a great" (Berners 39/4-5, 462/3, 652/31, 434/26). The French source certainly influences the frequency of this construction in Berners' translation, yet Berners does not always strictly adhere to his models. The phrase "a great water and depe" is derived from the French "ung vivier moult parfound," while "a fayre apple and a great" has its roots in "une pomme moult belle et grosse" (Huon f. clvii, v. A/4-5, f. cvi, v. A/33-4). As has been seen (above, Ch. 3), this pre-positive, post-positive structure also occurs in the letters: "grett wyndes & contrerey" (Berners 3 February 1524).
Comparatives of superiority in *Huon* are regularly pre-positive, and they occur in two forms. Some are created by the application of the "-er" suffix to the positive adjective, e.g. "harder," "stronger" and "lenger" (Berners 380/20, 39/5, 64/21). Occasionally a pleonastic construction is used, in which the adverb "more" precedes the comparative, as in the phrases "a more trewer knyght" and "a more richer thinge," and "a more fouler and hydeous creature" (Berners 211/29, 721/14, 103/2-3). Pleonastic superlatives are more common than their comparative counterparts in *Huon*, and they appear more frequently than superlatives formed simply by the addition of the suffix "-est." French mariners quake before "ye moost cruelest paynym"; Hurdowyyn of France is "the moost untrewest and falsest traytour that as than lyued in the world"; and Huon is "the moost hardyest knyght now lyuyng" (Berners 208/32, 315/24-5, 273/20). Less often, Berners forms superlatives simply by the periphrastic addition of "most" before a positive adjective. Earl Remon describes his daughter as "the fayrest/ the swetest/ and the moost humble damsell that is now lyuyng," while to this same daughter Remon describes Croysant as "the most fayre and hardiest knight" (Berners 752/21-2, 753.12-13). In the 1601 edition, though, the editor has expanded "humble" to "humblest." If one supposes that the 1601 editor employs current usage, Marc Antony's remark about
"the most unkindest cut of all" is less anomalous in Shakespeare's day than it has seemed in more recent years.

The prose source again influences the frequency of the superlative in its various forms, and Berners as a rule follows closely the superlative structures of the *prosateur*. This closeness accounts for one curious description, when Geramis first describes Esclaramond to Huon: she is "the most fayrest creature in all Inde, and the grete and most swetest and most courtesest that euer was borne" (Berners 64/30-2). Berners derives these lines from the French *"la plus belle qui soit iusques en ynde la maiour la plus doulce & la plus courtoyse que oncques nasquist de mere"* (Huon f. xvi, v. A/21-3). Berners omits the relative clause "qui soit," but that omission does not explain the puzzling attributive "grete" amid the superlatives. Berners has probably misunderstood the modifier *"la maiour,"* applying it to Esclaramonde when it applies instead to *"ynde"* (cf. "India major The lande of prester Iohn," from *The Interlude of the Four Elements*, 1519, cited CEOED 1: 1414).

The frequency of superlatives is not surprising in *Huon* when one recalls that romances as well as histories are regarded in Berners' era as offering models of behavior and values for readers. Action and description are mutually reinforcing: a knight is the best knight because he can perform a particular deed, and
because he can perform a particular deed he must be the best knight. Consequently, although Berners may subdue some of the wilder hyperbolic descriptions of battles, he does not delete the superlative descriptions of characters, so that both the simple superlative and the pleonastic superlative are regular features of his style in the romance.

An even more pervasive characteristic of Berners' style is the use of doublets, pairs of words, in a variety of contexts. Doublets of course include but are by no means limited to adjectives: nouns and verbs often appear in pairs as well. In the writings of Berners' younger contemporaries, notably in the works of Sir Thomas Elyot, doublets can fulfill didactic as well as stylistic functions. As a means of acquainting the reading public with the widening range of English vocabulary, foreign or newly minted words might be paired with existing vernacular synonyms. Yet although doublets are a regular feature in *Huon*, Berners rarely takes advantage of the opportunities offered to educate his readers. He may wish to move his audience to emulate his heroes, but he demonstrates no schoolmasterish desire to teach the English language to his readers. In *Huon*, Berners exhibits little if any of the intense concern about language and "correct" style characteristic of contemporary humanists who, involved in the translation of Scripture or classical
authorities, might disparage romances as poorly written (Dowling 188).

Berners does retain many doublets, but no consistent patterns emerge in his translations of them. Sometimes both elements of the French doublets are rendered as English cognates or are brought bodily into English with little or no change, as when the narrator writes of "the petuous and dolorous aduenture" (Berners 396.30-1). At other times, a native word may be paired with a gallic synonym, as when Esclaramond apostrophizes her absent husband: "'A, Huon . . . ye haue lost your most sorrowfull and dolorous wyfe . . . " (Berners 397/13-14). Often the elements of doublets enhance one another's meanings by relatedness rather than synonymy, e.g. the Roman emperor's instructions to Ide, "'beware that your thoughtes be not lyght nor vauerynge'" (Berners 712/23-4). Yet at times there seems little meaningful difference between the meanings of the elements. Clariet, for example, asks Peter of Aragon to "'helpe and ayde'" her (Berners 640/9). It is true that "help" derives from OE "helpan" and "ayde" from OFr "aider," but "ayde" was by Berners' time enough assimilated into English to constitute the recognizable element in certain repeated doublets such as "ayde and counsayle" and "ayde and socoure" (Berners 697/16, 468/15). Berners once even retains the word "ayde" while he drops "& secourir,"
thus eliminating the doublet from the proverbial sentiment that "'god is puyssant ynoough to ayde vs'" (Berners 60/21-2). Indeed, Berners far more frequently renders only one element of an existing doublet than he creates a doublet of his own. More often, however, especially in battle scenes, Berners simply reduces to a single element a regularly repeated doublet such as "detranch et occis," which he usually renders more simply as "slayne" (Berners 32/21).

Berners suppresses doublets often enough in Huon to suggest that he regards the device as rhetorical coloring optional to narrative and dialogue, to which it can lend a formal stateliness. The Admiral of Persia, in gratitude to Huon, tells him "'leue your sorowe and dyspleasure and cast it fro you, and take Ioye and confort/ for by the holy lawe that I haue reseyuyd, I shall . . . ayde and socoure you . . .'." (Berners 468/12-15). Not long afterward, Huon recalls his besieged wife and laments: "'when I remember the paynes, and dolours, and pouerties that by my cause ye suffer and haue sufferyd/ all my body sweteth for payne and doloure/ Alas I had thought in short space to haue aydyd and socuryd you . . .'" (Berners 482/11-16). But the device remains rhetorical color rather than a consciously educative technique. Berners' additions to the body of doublets in Huon are largely traditional collocations, often
alliterative pairs, as in "wind and weather." The doublet "wynd & weder" appears more than once in Berners' letters as he describes to Wolsey the sailing conditions on the English Channel, and Berners adds to or modifies expressions in his prose source to employ the phrase three times in Huon. He introduces the words "and wether" into an old mariner's account of "'the wynde, and wether, and fortune of the see,'" and later adapts "au vent & a la marine" as "to y* wynde and wether," making a similar adaptation just two pages later. If such adaptations do anything for the narrative, it is to render the language slightly more colloquially English, in spite of the numerous gallicisms identified and listed by Lee ("1601 Revision" 795-7).

It is surely overstating the matter to claim that Berners makes a consistent effort to anglicize (as distinct from simply to translate into English) the language of Huon, yet he sometimes adds to his text distinctive vernacular words and phrases. When Judas, for example, laments his punishment, he chastizes himself for the "'pryde and mysbeleue and wanhope that was in'" him (Berners 364/9-10). The words "and wanhope" are not suggested by the source passage, though elsewhere in the episode Judas speaks of his despair. Later, in a lines added by Berners, Judas explains his despair to Huon: "'y* dome is geuen vpon me'" (Berners 366/6-7). The
1601 editor evidently regards "wanhope" and "dome" as archaisms, for he converts them to "false hope" and "judgement." Elsewhere the source's verb phrase "'pour rachepter ton chef'" becomes the noun phrase "'for thy hed money,'" and Berners transforms "enclume daycer" into a resounding "stethy of stele" (Berners 142/17, 380/20-1). Rarely does Berners attempt auration of his prose, but one successful example of this technique appears in a prayer of Huon's: "'A, swete vyrgyn mary, I humbly reuyre the to be medyatrix to thy swete sonne'" (Berners 103/8-10). Here Berners has derived the unusually exotic noun "medyatrix" from the French verb phrase "tu veilles de prier," creating a phrase which echoes the expression "Pray the vierge immaculat To be good mediatrix," from a mid-fifteenth century English poem (cited as the earliest English use of "mediatrix," CEOED 1: 1758). This particular auration fits into Berners' general scheme of refining the religious themes of the romance, and in Huon the intercession of Mary is a regular feature of the general theme of divine intervention in human affairs. The 1601 editor drops the phrase "medyatrix to thy swete sonne," probably for sectarian rather than philological reasons.

Berners sometimes introduces figurative diction not paralleled in the prose source. Before Huon is able to enter Adamant Castle and satisfy his hunger, he and his
men lie starving on the deserted island. The narrator
states "that Huon . . . saw his men dye before his
face/ and also he saw that he must follow the same daunce"
(Berners 378/31-2, 379/1). Berners creates that last
image from the less vivid French" "il veoit que apres
eulx conuenoit venir a ceste piteuse fin . . . ."
III, also uses "daunce" in the sense of a course of
action (CEOED 1: 643); but it is not improbable that
in this instance Berners is calling to mind the Dance of
Death, described by Lydgate but likely to be better known
to Berners' contemporaries through Holbein's famous series
of woodcuts. On a happier occasion, Berners relates that
"with gret tryumphe Huon was conuayed rydynge cheke by
cheke by kynge yuoryn" (Berners 188/33, 189/1). The
French describes Huon only as "a coste du roy."
"Cheke by cheke" is a phrase current in English as far
back as the fourteenth century, and Berners also employs
it in Arthur of Lytell Brytayne (supposed to be
earlier than Huon; CEOED 1: 389).

Another device which affects the diction in Huon
is the frugal use of alliteration. Berners may have been
influenced in his use of the technique by Middle English
alliterative verse such as the Morte Arthure, or by
Malory's adaptation of the verse in the "Arthur and
Lucius" section of Le Morte Darthur, for alliteration
in *Huon* usually coincides with scenes of battle. In Berners' work, however, the aesthetic effects of alliteration are more localized than in the earlier works: that is, the technique does not often carry the reader beyond the immediate syntactical unit. As with the doublets, alliteration is employed in both dialogue and narrative. When Huon's ally, the newly christened Admiral of Persia, responds to an ultimatum from a Saracen foe, alliteration underscores the admiral's self-assurance and his contempt for his enemy, an effect similar to that created by rhyme in a giant's boast earlier in the romance. The admiral begins by telling the Saracen messenger "'go and say to thy mayster that I sette no thynge by his thretenynge nor by no thynge that he can do,'" and concludes, ten non-alliterative lines later, with, "go thy waye & saye to thy mayster that he shall not fynde me fleying for any fere *that* I haue of any man byleuynge in the false & detestable faythe of Mahomet" (Berners 501/10-13, 21-4).

Mention has been made of Berners' alliterative adaptation of a source phrase as "a stethy of stele." That phrase, used to describe the invulnerability a hero must possess to attack the dragon of Adamant Castle, is recalled two pages later in the context of a much longer alliterative passage depicting Huon's assault on the beast:
Huon, who was lyger and light, leapt by the syde of the serpent and gaue him a great stroke with hys sworde on the ere, that he thought to haue clouen asonder his hede. But he coude do it no more hurte then yf he had streken on a stethy; so that his sword reboundyd agayne/ wherof Huon was sorowfull . . . .

(Berners 382/2-8)

In the corresponding French passage (Huon f. xciii, r. B/37-44), the prosateur offers but a single alliterative phrase: "toute la teste." The alliteration here is entirely Berners'. He converts "fort et legier" to the conventional doublet "lyger and light," and derives the echoic "streken on a stethy" from the less potent "emprimer . . . une enclume la plus dure que on sceust trouuer." Admittedly only Berners' first few clauses here approach the rhythms of artful alliterative verse, though the alliteration does not neatly bind phrases and clauses as it does, for example, in *Sir Gawain and the Green Knight*. Nevertheless the use of alliteration invigorates an otherwise nondescript passage of prose, and Berners usually reserves alliteration for battle scenes.

A more distinctive feature of Berners' prose is his unusual use of the infinitive form of the verb to express futurity, specifically in cases involving obligation on the part of the subject. F. Th. Visser labels this form the "absolute infinitive" and lists eight different types (Visser 1054-61). Visser’s numerous examples range
as far back as ca. 1205 (in Layamon), but despite occasional citations of literary sources including Chaucer, Langland, Malory and More, the majority of citations are from governmental and/or legal documents. Berners continues the traditional use of the infinitive following verbs of thinking or wishing: "' he desyreth you to put them in preson . . . and then to brynge them into the medow . . . '" (Berners 132/6-9). He also employs the infinitive, however, to translate French future-tense verbs. When Sorbryn dictates terms to King Ivoryn, the infinitive stands alone as the future-tense periphrasis in the two clauses following the conditional: "'& yf he can vanquysshe me/ then he shall delyuer to thee thy nece Esclaramond/ & yf I overcome thy man, then thou to returne to thy cite & suffer thy nece styll with him/ & also thou to restore all ye domages that thou hast done him . . . '" (Berners 185/9-13). The giant Agrapart, in similar circumstances, speaks so to Admiral Gaudys: "'for yf thou wylte prowe the contrary, or to fynde .ii. champyons to be so hardy . . . yf it be so that I conquere them bothe/ then thou to be my subgett, and to pay me trybute . . .'" (Berners 142/8-9, 15-16). This construction appears in both direct and indirect discourse, and the infinitive is regularly preceded by a noun-subject or a nominative pronoun. Once when Gerames speaks to Esclaramond, an infinitive follows the
nominative singular pronoun: "'That I am in wyll to do/ & that is, that ye wolde leue the law of Mahounde & receyue the crysten fayth/ & I to go in to fraunce with these prisoners'" (Berners 137/6-9). But the infinitive used so does not always follow a pronoun, as is seen when Admiral Gaudys offers rewards for Huon's services: "'I shall delyuer the & all thy company quyte to go into thy countre at thy pleasure/ and surely to condute the to the cite of Acre. And also to gyue the a somer chargeyd with gold . . .'" (Berners 144/12-15), in which "I" is the understood subject of the second and third clauses. While this structure is not unique to Berners, it appears in his published prose more often than in that of his contemporaries. It is rare in More's Richard III and in Malory's works. It does not appear in William Roper's Life of Sir Thomas More, Knight, nor in Caxton's Charles the Grete, nor in Henry Watson's Valentine and Orson. It does, however, occur in Berners' translation of Froissart as well as in Huon:

Eustace said: "Sir, let us all be afoot, except three hundred men of arms, well horsed, of the best in your host and most hardiest, to the intent they somewhat to break and to open the archers, and then your battles to follow on quickly afoot and so to fight with their men of arms hand to hand."

(Chronicles 121, 2/33-40)

Berners does not derive this construction from his French sources, which use future tense verbs, and occasionally
conditional verbs, in the corresponding passages. The construction does, however, appear in English letters of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, and is evidently a vernacular device, evidently stemming from legal language, for overcoming the lack of a future tense form for English verbs without employing modal auxiliaries. The construction occurs in an early letter of Berners': "don fferdenando the emperours brother shall mary the kynge of hongreys daughter and son after the emperour to return ageyn jn to spayne" (Berners 25 January 1521). Years earlier (1465), Margaret Paston employs the construction in a letter to her husband: "if they were not apower to pay ready money, that then they to find sufficient surety to pay the money . . ." (Paston 9/6-8). Not long after Berners' death, Robert Acton, King's saddler, writes to ask Lady Lisle, wife to Berners' successor at Calais, "whether ye will have a stirrup parcel-gilt, with a leather covered with velvet, or else to have a footstool . . ." (Lisle 2: 253). Despite an apparent currency among letter-writers, the construction appears rarely to have crossed the boundary into published prose.

Apart from this peculiar use of the infinitive, Berners treats his verbs traditionally and systematically, though with some limited instability in spelling. In the present tense, indicative mood, first person singular
verbs often end in "-e": "I praye," "I thanke," "I knowe." Second person singular verbs more regularly end in "-yst": "thou makyst," "thou cummyst," "thou knowyst": for verbs ending in "y," the suffix becomes "-est": "thou lyest," "thou sayest." Occasionally the suffix loses the vowel: "thou canst." Third person singular verbs are regularly inflected with the suffix "yth" preferred over "eth," a preference reflected in Berners' letters: "rayne abatyth," "he commandyth," "it dyspleasyth," "my flesshe trymbleth." Third person plural is also regularly inflected, except when preceded by "they," a practice Berners shares with contemporaries such as Watson: "Huon/ and gerarde, who . . . settyth," "them that louyth," "knyghts who dysdanyth," "they thynke skorne." Singular and plural subjunctive forms often end in "-e": "yf I touche hym," "I wolde shew," "yf they coude." The present participle is regularly formed with the suffix "-ynge," which converts to "-enge" after verbs whose roots end in "y": "thynkynge," "holdynge," "lyenge." The "e" is sometimes dropped from the suffix, for no consistent reason.

Berners also uses the preterit system of weak verbs in a regular manner. In the indicative mood, the plural and the first- and second-person singular verbs are formed by the addition of the suffix "-yd," which becomes "-ed" after verbs whose roots end in "y": "we departyd," "they
wysshyd," "Huon perceyuyd," "I demaundyd." Second-person preterits are formed by the addition of "-est": "thou dydest," "thou haddest." As is suggested by verbs such as "perceyuyd" and "demaundyd," Berners continues the Middle English practice of inflecting verbs borrowed from French according to weak verb flexion. He draws the larger part of his vocabulary of native verbs from the system of weak verbs, not surprisingly, as the stock of strong verbs had been shrinking or weakening for years before he comes to write.

Still, Berners continues to use some strong verbs in forms already being superseded in his own day. From Class II strong verbs he perpetuates the old form first-person singular "lese" but also uses the newer "lose": "lese" is the preferred form in his letters. The present participle is "lesynge," but the past participle is "lost." The nominalization of the verb in Berners' letters takes the form "lossere." From the same class he retains the preterit "clave" (pp "cloven"), whereas his predecessor Caxton preferred the weakened "clefte." Similarly Berners retains the preterit "clame" from Class III for the newer "climbed." Agayne from Class III Berners maintains the paradigm for "wynne," "wan" (also "van"), "wonne" and "rynne," "ranne" (also "ronne"), rynne." In "ranne/ronne" there is already some wavering in the preterit form, as there is in the Class I preterit "strake/stoke" and the
Class IV "brake/brocke." For the Class V verb "geten" Berners continues to use the preterit form "gat(e)," but the past participle appears as both "get(te)" and "gotten." In the letters he uses the form "get," derived from the earlier pp form. Other strong class preterits are weakened in Huon: "wepte," "stept," "slept."

Certain preterits regularly, if not invariably, end in "-t": "stept," "myst," "washt." The preterit "kyst" appears also as "kyssed," and the preterit "glynt" as "glentyd." Berners often employs the syncopated preterit "lyft(e)" for "lifted."

Nouns, too, are regular in Huon, uninflected save for plurals and possessives. Both are indicated by the addition of the suffix "-es" or "-ys." The vowel in the suffix is, however, not fixed: "londys" and "londes" appear alternately. Generally, nouns ending with "r" or nasals "m" and "n" receive the suffix -s" with no vowel: "a .M. paynyms," "my faders chambre," "Oberons company," "barons/barones." Nouns already ending in "s" receive no visible inflection: "kyenge Charles courts," "his horse hede." Rarely, other words also receive no inflection: "Charlot horse." As in the letters, the post-positive genitive is less frequent than the pre-positive, though it does occur: "a seruaunt of the popyps." The genitive construction in which the first element of a group is inflected occurs just twice: "temperours fauore your
father" and "the dukes seschall of Calaber" (it does not appear at all in Berners' letters, it will be remembered). Among plurals, Berners retains some umlaut plural forms: "kyne/keen," "shone," "teth," and "men."

He regularly employs the form "eyen/iyen" for "eyes," though the latter form occurs once. As in the letters, Berners employs the noun "newes" as a plural: "these newes."

Terms of measure, as in the letters, are often uninflected: "how many fote the water was . . . but .v. fote," ".xxx. yere"; however, "two yerys" and "seuen monethes" also appear. The names of some domestic animals, e.g. "horse" and "shepe," are uninflected.

Among pronouns, the reflexive "self" is, as in the letters, usually uninflected and often spaced apart from the preceding pronoun: "our selfe," "them selfe," "themselfe," "themselves," "hym selfe," "my selfe." The form "them selff" without the terminal "e," appears in the letters. The first-person singular possessive pronoun "my" regularly becomes "myn(e)" before a substantive beginning with a vowel, but not before one beginning with an "h": "myne vnkle," "myn affayre," "my hede," "my herte." This accords with Berners' practice in his letters. The genitive second-person singular is always "thy" before substantives beginning with consonants. Other genitive pronouns remain uninflected (except for "our/ours," "your/yours"), though spelling may vary.
slightly: "his/hys," "her/hyr/heyr," "their/theyr/ther."
The nominative case pronouns in Huon are quite regular: "I," "thou," "he," "she," "it" "we," "ye,"
"they." Also regular are accusative case pronouns: "me," "the(e)," "him/hym," "her/hyr/heyr," "it," "vs," "you,"
"them/theym/theim." Berners follows his source to good effect in the social distinctions in the use of
"thou/the(e)" and "ye/you." Even so, there are occasional slips in the generally careful attention to case usage:
"god rewarde thou," "yf god haue not pytye of thou
I can not se how ye can escape . . . ." Mention has been made earlier of Berners' distinction between "who" and
"whom." As a genitive, the form "whose" also occurs in Huon.

As in the letters, pronouns in the romance are occasionally redundant or else absent in places where later usage might require them. One example of apparent redundance occurs as Huon attempts to restore himself to the favor of the Emperor Thierry: "Huon, who had great desyre to be the fyrst & to haue the fyrst gyfte of the emperoure; he drewe out of his bag a rych stone/
ye whiche was of such vertue that who so euer dyd
dere it hym coude not be ouer come . . . ." (Berners 562/21-5). When omitted, the pronoun "he" is likely to cause even more confusion: "ye know well ther is none of vs can tell whether he be alyue or deed/ for yf we shulde
say he is deed/ & [he] after warde returne home, then we shulde be reputed for false men . . . " (Berners 130/4-7).

Prepositions as well as pronouns can be redundant in Huon. Duke Naymes informs Gerard that "[c]ertaynely of such a counseller as ye be the kynge hathe lytell nede of" (Berners 240/6-8). Others of Berners' prepositions do not always accord with later idiomatic usage: "'a vyllayne of Fraunce on whom she was amorous'"; "'he wolde caste me in his necke as lyght as though I had ben nothynge'" (Berners 175/16-17, 176/24).

Another regular feature of Berners' prose, one tending to better order rather than confusion, is his systematic use of disjunctive coordinates, "other . . . or . . ." and "nother . . . nor." The first structure appears in indirect discourse: Esclaramond "dyd put it to there pleasures, other to slee her or to drowne her or to bryng her to her uncle" (Berners 159/28-9). It also occurs in passages of dialogue. The pattern also occurs in the letters: "all odyr that hath odyr londe orhoussynge" (Berners 7 August 1532). The second structure likewise occurs in various circumstances: "Huon saw that his horse wolde nother forwarde nor backe warde"; "'a paynym kynge who byleueth nother in god nor in good saynt"; and it occurs in the letters in the phrase, "nodyr schype not bott koud pase" (Berners 186/23-4, 191/19-20; 14 January 1525).
The 1601 editor converts the relative clause about the "paynym kynge" to "who byleueth not in our god." Again, this change is probably dictated by doctrinal rather than philological reasons, but the editor has conformed his revision to the standard pattern in *Huon*, in which negation is often indicated by "not" post-positive to the verb. Double negation still occurs with some regularity in the romance: "Huon sayd to the maryners, 'Syrs, I pray you make this nyght no grete noyse, nor make no fyer, nor shewe no lyght'" (Berners 212/8-10). But negative constructions with "any" also occur, sometimes alongside the older double negative form: Gerarde reports to Charlemagne of Huon's return, "'but he coude gyue me none answere nor saye ony wordes that I coulde byleue/ & when I sawe that I coude fynde no trouthe in none of his wordes . . .'" (Berners 237/22-4). The word "no" regularly converts to "none" when it precedes a word beginning with a vowel.

In certain other ways, as well, spelling practice in *Huon* accords with that in Berners' letters. In the letters Berners regularly writes the medial [₃] as "d" when it occurs before a vowel followed by an "r," although the "th" spelling also appears; in the romance, both forms also occur, although the frequency of occurrence is reversed, and "th" is the preferred form. The spelling of the glide [w] is still not fixed: "whent" appears for
"went" and "where" for "were." The letter "w" is often interchangeable with "v," especially initially. As in the letters, the spellings "myche" and "moche" appear for "much," the former being the preferred spelling in the romance as well. The spelling "besynes" for "business," considered a misspelling by Lee, is regular in both the romance and the letters. The forms "axeth" and "axed" appear in addition to "ask" in Huon; in the letters, Berners spells the word "ax." The consonants "l" and "s" are often doubled in the romance, as they are in the letters: "f" and "t" are much less frequently doubled.

Other spelling conventions are followed in Huon which are not evident in the letters. To some extent the initial spelling "in-" is preferred to "en-" in words such as "inioynyd" and "intyerly." The dipthong [ai] is spelled "ai," "ay," or "y," while in the letters the spelling "ey" is a demonstrated preference. The distinction between the homonyms "see" and "sea" is the regular spelling of the verb as "se" and the noun as "see."

Certain aspects of Berners' English, such as his spelling and his negative constructions, as well as his generally careful distinction between the pronoun forms "thou/thee" and "ye/you," support the view of Berners as a conservative and conscientious writer of prose. Looking beyond such aspects, one sees also an inventive, adaptable writer willing to attempt a greater clarity of clause
relationships by beginning to systematize the use of relative pronouns and by converting relative clauses into other types of clause; a writer able to heighten certain structural patterns such as syntactical balance which are sometimes not fully realized in the source; and a writer ready to enhance the aesthetic effects of his source by the selective employment of English vernacular techniques such as alliteration. While Berners does not, in *Huon*, anticipate directly the carefully stylized prose of his own late works, nor the prose of his younger contemporaries, nor that of his sixteenth-century successors, he does employ a style which gives to the romance/chronicle styles of his predecessors a greatly flexibility of verbal expression and sentence structure.
A careful examination of the ways in which Lord Berners' adaptation of the language of *Huon of Rurdeux* refines the thematic focus of the romance increases the reader's understanding of Berners' general abilities and merits as a translator. The rhetorical and linguistic conventions of the late medieval romance which he retains in *Huon*, once understood, broaden the reader's perspective on Berners' translation of Froissart's *Cronycles*, with which *Huon* shares many literary qualities, as well as on his late translations of *The Castell of Loue* and *The Golden Boke*, which derive from different stylistic sources. A knowledge of *Huon* deepens one's appreciation of the literary and, to some extent, the cultural milieu of early Tudor England. The chivalric values which inform Malory's *Le Morte Darthur*, printed by Caxton in the year Henry VII ascended the throne--those values presented in the romances printed by Caxton and his successors--continue to be upheld in the literature fostered by the court of Henry VIII. The king who supported the humanist disciples of the New Learning also supported writers whose works extol the knightly
virtues of his real or imagined forefathers, virtues which include not only the acceptance but also the maintenance of established social hierarchies, loyalty to one's leader, bravery in battle for just causes, honesty in one's dealings with others, loyalty to one's love, and above all devotion to God, who maintains an active interest in the affairs of His people. That these virtues were not all the exclusive property of the late medieval romance and chronicle but are to differing degrees promoted in humanist literature as well suggests that the motivating forces behind older and the newer writings were not entirely antithetical, in spite of differences in generic conventions and in language.

As a writer of English prose in the early sixteenth century, Berners may fairly be regarded as conservative, as long as that term is not held to be synonymous with the term "reactionary," for it is not the case that Berners is swimming against the literary stream either in his choice of material to translate or in his style of translation. He is certainly conservative in the sense that he perpetuates medieval genres and rhetorical techniques of story-telling developed and codified throughout the Middle Ages, and in the sense that he largely preserves the paratactic syntactical patterns suitable to the chronological narratives of chronicle and romance. Yet unlike Malory, who lamented at length that the world is
not as it once was, Berners never conveys the attitude that there is any real qualitative difference between the ways of life and modes of behavior presented in his romances and chronicles and those of his own era, except for his realization of the obvious fact that some of the events in his *Huon* and *Arthur* are supernatural. Furthermore, in Berners' own lifetime, in the upper levels of English society at least, the values expressed in such literature did influence the behavior of individuals. Berners' guardian, John Howard, Duke of Norfolk, wrote to John Paston in August 1485 (when Berners would have been about 18 years old) of an incident at the close of the Wars of the Roses which was very much in keeping with actions characteristic of the heroes of pious romance:

"Well-beloved friend, I commend me to you, letting you to understand that the King's enemies be a-land, and that the King would have set forth as upon Monday, but only for our Ladyday; but for certain he goeth forward as upon Tuesday . . . " (Paston 236). It is not difficult to imagine Huon observing such a religious scruple. Berners views the values set forth in his romances and chronicles as viable models for behavior even in his own day, as the worthy examples of illustrious forebears which can inspire emulation in descendants, literal or figurative.

The ideas and values which underlie *Huon* are reinforced for the reader by the romance conventions which
dictate both form and content. The overall narrative pattern in *Huon* is episodic, and the episodes become more loosely connected to one another as the romance progresses from the original *chanson de geste* of Huon to the stories of his descendants on to the fourth generation. The loose structure accommodates a variety of medieval rhetorical commonplaces of *amplificatio*: *descriptio* of inanimate objects such as palaces, blazons of notable beauties, *ubi sunt* laments, and proverbial observations. These elements of the romance are presented to the reader by a narrator who, while outside the narrative and plainly able to see beyond the horizons bounding his characters, nonetheless clearly shares the values of his characters. The narrator invites his readers to laugh (though not often) *with* his characters but not *at* them. There is, in *Huon*, no ironic distance between narrator and character.

These conventions and values are of course those expressed in the French prose *Huon*, and Berners conveys them to his English readers with little interference. Yet although the content of the romance does not originate with Berners, he adapts the language of *Huon* in ways which demonstrate both a firm control of vernacular English and a greater sensitivity than the *prosateur* to rhetorical possibilities in the narrative.
Vernacular English in Berners' day could, for example, accommodate the frequent use of relative pronouns found in the French Huon, but Berners recognizes that not all of the relative pronouns in the French are strictly referential (that is, that some are used merely as connectives without the force of the relative): therefore, he eliminates the pronoun altogether in some cases, and in others he renders the undistinguished relative "lequel" and its variants as either "who" or "that" to introduce nonrestrictive or restrictive clauses respectively. Another option Berners employs is to render relative clauses as present-participial clauses. He also retains the literal translation of "lequel," "the which," acceptable in his own time but less so by the beginning of the seventeenth century, when the editor of the 1601 edition modifies the relative by eliminating the definite article "the."

Berners' choices in the translation of the relative pronoun, and in his frequent omission of referential terms such as "ladicte," streamline the narrative and enable the reader to proceed more quickly than in the French version, without over-frequent and unnecessary reference to previous information and without the loss of thematic development. Berners has moderated the use of relatives in Huon to the extent that J. D. Burnley includes Berners' Huon among works by Skelton, Tiptoft and
Fortescue (all of the fifteenth century) which "are largely free of the devices of curial style" (Burnley, "Curial Prose" 611). In other words, in spite of R. W. Chambers' arguments on behalf of the singularity of a religious prose tradition in Middle English, it is evident that for Berners and for his contemporaries there are other traditions (e.g. curial or non-curial style) from which to choose.

Burnley holds the hallmarks of curial prose to be the frequent use of relative pronouns and of demonstratives that appear to function as relatives, and the use of repeated doublets and lists to ensure "precision of reference and ceremony of tone" (Burnley, "Curial Prose" 595). Doublets, too, are among the stylistic devices which Berners moderates in *Huon*. He retains doublets when their effect is an appropriate elevation of tone, as in public speeches by figures of authority such as emperors and admirals. In narrative sequences he often omits one element of a doublet, especially in battle scenes, in which the source's use of frequently repeated collocations (e.g. "*detrançh et occís*") delay forward momentum. In other words, Berners recognizes certain rhetorical options and exercises them more frequently than the prosateur. Other, contemporary writers such as More and Elyot employed doublets as a stylistic device which could elevate the tone of a passage and/or increase
the reader's vocabulary, and doublets are also a marked feature of Berners' prefaces to his translation of Froissart. In Huon, though, the use of doublets is limited to the purpose of elevation, and the device is not characteristic of the unadorned, vernacular prose of his letters.

Berners' improvement of the text is not limited to such streamlining. He further enhances Huon by a variety in his vocabulary which, though limited, still reduces the amount of sheer repetition in the French. Whereas the prosateur uses the term "vassal" again and again in a variety of circumstances, Berners assesses the speaker and the situation in each case and renders the word (when he does not omit it entirely) eight different ways, exploring the range of meanings of the term "vassal" within the chivalric society. In like manner he does not limit himself to following unimaginatively the less inspired passages of the French, but can convert a colorless expression on the order of "and he saw that he must also die" into a more vivid statement such as "he saw that he must follow the same dance," which calls up inconographic images popular in the translator's day. Such variety is certainly not incompatible with the view of Berners as a close reader and a thoughtful translator. In attempting to render sense for sense, he reveals meanings not made explicit in the French, much to the
benefit of the English reader.

On the other hand, Berners also reveals his sensitiv­ity to his text in his ability to imitate its verbal forms and conventions so closely that the reader can not easily distinguish additions from original material. He recognizes, for example, the standard binary form in which proverbs and proverbial similes are often expressed (e.g. in the three proverbial phrases Berners employs in his late letters), and in Huon, as in other translations of his, he modifies expressions in the French to conform to the standard. He may tighten such expressions and increase their pithiness by the reduction of doublets to single elements, or he may expand the expressions to drive home the specific point of the general statement. Berners also selects conventional details which are characteristic descriptions of Huon and employs the same details to describe protagonists whose kinship with Huon he wishes to underscore. Thus Ide, Huon's grandchild, fights much as her forbear does: both cut their way into the thickest crowd of enemies and disperse them. The reader recognizes the appropriateness of the description, but is not likely to suspect the Berners has introduced it at the later point in the text to increase the cohesiveness of the narrative.

Berners' additions to the text are of course not limited to mere imitation, however neat such imitation may
be. As has been noted, Berners recognizes the rhetorical suitability of doublets to establish dignity and formality of tone in authoritative public pronouncements. He also understands the effectiveness of a restricted use of rhyme in prose, and so retains, with some modifications, the rhymed boast with which a giant taunts Huon. Another device he employs to elevate the language of passages of dialogue is the introduction of alliteration, a device not consciously employed by the prosateur. Berners also employs alliteration in descriptions of battles (a convention in English narrative verse), and some of the collocations have an attractive onomatopoeic quality (e.g. Berners' favorite "stethy of stele," with its plosive sounds so fitting for armored combat with swords) which belie assertions such as J. M. Berdan's that Berners is not a conscious artist (371).

Still, literature such as Berners renders so ably does not challenge the reader to think critically about the artistic merits of the individual behind the text. Rather it fulfills audience expectations and in that fulfillment reinforces in readers a sense that the knightly virtues it depicts are connected with, perhaps derived from, the social hierarchy depicted in the romance, an order which reflects the divine hierarchy manifest in the world. This is not to say that Huon operates on the level of allegory. Rather it is an extended literal exemplum
offered to its readers as an incitement to virtue. This exemplary aspect is strengthened by Berners in his judicious additions to the monologue of Judas—another instance of Berners' making explicit for his reader what is only implicit in the French. The romance is also an inducement to realize a social status quo in which the nobility behave worthily toward one another and set the pattern for the social behavior of the lower classes. Berners perceives the audience for his Froissart translation to be both nobles and commons, and there is reason to believe that a similarly mixed audience could be expected for a work such as *Huon*.

It is instructive to note the rhetorical and linguistic similarities between Berners' *Huon* and his translation of Froissart, similarities which suggest that the distinctions between the two genres are less inviolable in Berners' era than they have since become. The chivalric nature of the events described in *Huon*, barring supernatural incidents, resembles very much that of the incidents described in Froissart's *Cronycles*. Certain individual characters stand out in both works, and yet among the many events described in each there are marked similarities. In the *Cronycles*, as in *Huon*, the narrator and the characters sometimes express themselves in proverbial statements. Just as in *Huon* Berners modifies the language to emphasize
themes, so to in his Froissart, according to B. J. Whiting, he adds to the number of proverbs in Froissart and modifies some expressions to cast them in more traditional proverbial form (295 n.). The narrator of Huon invokes God or attributes to God the deliverance of participants in the action of the narrative, as does the narrator of the Cronycles. The conventional descriptions of the activities of battle which appear so often in Huon also appear in the Cronycles. Arrows, for example, fly as thick as snow in both romance and history. The dominant syntactic structure in both works is parataxis, for both are concerned with the chronological occurrence of events. Certain small, deliberate features of style, such as the use of the infinitive form of a verb to translate a future tense verb and indicate obligation are characteristic of both works, and indeed appear elsewhere in his prose, for example in his letters. Such similarities in expression support the idea of a similarity in purpose between history and romance. Works in both genres serve on the one hand to strengthen the inherited claims of the nobility by reminding them and other readers of the deeds of their predecessors, and on the other hand to inspire readers to contemporary emulation of previous noble behavior.

Berners is far from being a lonely voice harking back to old ways in the early years of the reign of Henry
VIII. Printers such as Wynkyn de Worde, Richard Pynson and Julian Notary continued to issue and reissue the popular literature of previous centuries. Amid religious works in Latin and in the vernacular, amid grammars and instructional manuals, de Worde issued *Kynge Rycharde* *Cuer de Lyon* (1509), Lydgate's *Courte of Sapience* (1510) and the *Proverbs of Lydgate* (1510, 1520), *Mandeville's Travels* (1510), the romances *Melusine* (1510), *Kynge Ponthus* (1511), *The Knyght of the Swanne* (1511), and *Olyver of Castille* (1518), as well as Chaucer's *Troilus and Criseide* (1517).

Pynson, who printed Berners' translation of Froissart in 1523 and 1525, also issued a volume of the *Proverbs of Lydgate* (1515), *The Newe Cronycle of Englande and of Fraunce* (1516), and, in the 1520's, volumes of Chaucer's major works, including the *Canterbury Tales* and *Troilus and Criseide*. Julian Notary, the likely printer of Berners' *Huon*, issued a *Cronycle of Englonde* in both 1504 and 1515. It is worth remembering that Henry VIII himself was aware of the propaganda value of romance, and he caused the Round Table at Winchester, mentioned by Caxton in his preface to *Le Morte Darthur* (reissued by de Worde in 1498), to be decorated with the Tudor Rose and court colors (white and green) in order to impress Emperor Charles V. Original works by writers such as Stephen Hawes and John Skelton continued to reflect
older conventions and interests. Hawes, for example, a Groom of the Chamber for the first two Tudor monarchs, a writer for whom John Lydgate was the ideal poet and master, produced the *Pastywe of Pleasure* (de Worde 1509, rpt. 1517), an allegorical romance in which the hero, on his way to his goal, must confront and successfully pass the trivium and quadrivium—a far cry from the educational writings being produced in the early years of Henry VIII’s reign by the likes of John Colet, William Lily, and Thomas Linacre. In about 1515, Skelton composed his allegorical play *Magnyfycence*, a didactic work in which the title character, who probably represents Skelton’s former pupil Henry VIII himself (the King being about 25 years old at the time), is surrounded by figures representing good and evil counselors and fends off a figure representing despair, situations and events not unlike some occurring in *Huon*. Skelton, a learned commoner whose abilities were recognized by Cambridge, Oxford, and Louvain, did not express his commitment to the perpetuation of the social order with the language and literary conventions employed by Berners, but his attacks on New Men such as Wolsey were notable for their virulence. Skelton was certainly a skilled Latinist, but he did not apply his abilities to such typical humanist concerns as the refinement of Latin prose style and the improved textual analysis of Scripture, concerns also
foreign to Berners. Nevertheless Skelton did compose some serious religious verse. Skelton, of course, was a cleric; but even secular writers such as Berners indicate a concern with preserving a belief in Providence, a devotion to God.

Humanist writers are, to be sure, also concerned about matters of faith, but Berners, in his published works and in his letters, never demonstrates a interest in the humanist textual-critical approaches to theology. He does not get caught up in the raging religious controversies of the 1520's and 1530's, as did Sir Thomas More and William Tyndale—controversies about the proper vernacular translation of the Bible, or about the merits of various sacraments. Berners, in Huon and in his other works, confirms a conservative view of Christianity, an essentially simple Christianity in which pilgrimages are accepted forms of devotion and penance, and saints, especially the Virgin Mary, are recognized as mediators between man and a God who is active in His world. The rhetorical choices Berners exercises as the translator of Huon consistently reinforce views. Berners, at his listening post in Calais, is evidently aware of the seeds of protestant revolt being sown on the continent, as he informs Wolsey of the Diet of Worms in 1521. Yet he remains apart from the religious turbulence which engulfed his humanist contemporaries, but which led by circuitous
means, across decades, to the flowering of the language in the King James Bible.

Berners also differs from contemporary humanists such as Erasmus, Linacre, and Colet, in that several of them presented specific programs of education. It is not clear that, like Hawes, he would advocate older, scholastic forms of education. Nor, on the other hand, is it clear that he would, like Colet and his circle, expand the access to education so that any deserving student, noble or not, might avail himself of the opportunity to learn. The literature which Berners translates is didactic in a general way, but not preceptive, and he does not use the language itself as a tool of teaching, as did Sir Thomas Elyot, for what Erasmus might call the education of the Christian prince. Rather Berners repeats centuries-old claims about the value of history (and he, like his predecessor Caxton, would extend this to include romance) as an example of "humanity," i.e. proper, courtly behavior. His definition of courtly behavior, however, does not embrace all the ideas set forth in Castiglione's *Book of the Courtier*. It is closer to the idea expressed in Malory's description of Sir Tristram, in which the knight's abilities in hunting and in music were praised, as Huon's musical abilities are praised in Berners' work. Berners never expresses a vision of an educational program in which future leaders of society are
trained in classical literature and history, though such a vision, expressed by Elyot, an associate of Linacre and More, in the 1530's, and later by Roger Ascham, does not seem necessarily incompatible with Berners' expressed views about the value of history.

Lord Berners' translation of *Huon of Burdeux* is an indication of the extent to which the values expressed in the subject matter and the styles developed during the Middle Ages survive into the Tudor era. The vernacular literature which is printed and/or composed in England during the first two decades of the sixteenth century is not proto-humanist, but rather a perpetuation of the style and content of vernacular literature favored in the fifteenth century, the literature offered to noble and commoner alike by the pen and the presses of Caxton. Looked at in terms of what was being published during the first decade of the reign of Henry VIII, a work such as Berners' *Huon* is much more typical than, say, More's vernacular rendition of the *Life of Pico* or the Latin *Utopia*. Looked at from the perspective of later centuries, More's work seems the more valuable and far-seeing, but Berners' work from the same period demonstrates that English prose embodying the conventions of medieval literature continued to be written as capably as it had been by earlier masters such as Malory.
ENDNOTES

A TEXTUAL NOTE

1 Lee's edition of Berners' *Huon*, published during the 1880's, is the most authoritative currently accessible edition of the work (the unique copy of the first edition [ca. 1515] being in a private collection), but it ought to be noted that Lee's edition, although based on the first edition, is by no means faithful to it in every particular. Lee modernized the punctuation to accord with late nineteenth-century British practices, and so his edition contains question marks, quotation marks, colons, semicolons, commas and periods not in the original edition. Furthermore, he tacitly corrected apparent printer's errors in the punctuation of the original. It must be allowed that Lee usually sensed accurately the rhythms of Berners' prose, and that the majority of such corrections make sense, as in the case of the following sentence, "the cause they have not come to your presence or thys tyme to serve you. Is none other cause but by reason they be so yonge" (1515, f. ii, r. B/7-10), which Lee emended to read, "the cause that they haue noi come to your presence or thys tyme to serue you i s  none other cause but by reason they be so yonge" (Berners 6/10-13). But Lee's emendation, while sensible, also incorporates a mistranscription: the added word "that." On the previous page he mistranscribed the beginning of a direct-address passage, so that "Than he sayde to kyng A noble emperour how is it . . . " (1515, f. ii, r. A/12-13), becomes, in Lee's edition "Than he sayde to the kyng & noble emperour, 'how is it . . . ?'" (Berners 5/8-9). Similar errors in transcription and punctuation occur elsewhere in the edition. Lee's edition, then, while helpful for the general reader, cannot be depended upon as a diplomatic edition for the scholar.

CHAPTER 1

1 The printer's preface to the 1513 French *Huon* notes that the work was printed

```
affin qu'il fust communiqué et manifeste à tout chascun/ & que en lisant icelluy
plusieûrs princes cheualiers escuyers et
aultres gens de bien se pourront grandement
recreer & veoir de lexercice des armes et de la
```
At the conclusion of the final chapter of the 1513 *Huon* it is stated that

Lequel liure & hystoire a este mise de rime en prose a la requête et prière de monseigneur Charles seigneur de rochepfort/ & de messire nues de longueual seigneur de vaulx et de pierre ruote lequel fut fait & parfaict le .xxix. iour de januier Lan mil quatre cens cinquante quatre

(79/45-54, 80/55-66)

Caxton continued his remarks on the variety in the English language of his day in an even better-known (and frequently quoted) passage from the *Eneydos* prologue:

And that comyn Englysshe that is spoken in one shyre varyeth from another. In so moche that in my dayes happened that certayn marchauntes were in a shippe in Tamyse for to have sayled over the see into Zelande. And for lacke of wynde thai taryed atte forlond and wente to lande for to refreshe them. And one of theym named Sheffelde, a mercer, cam into an hows and axed for mete and specyally he axyd after eggys. And the goode wyf answerde that she coude speke no Frenshe. And the marchaunt was angry for he also coude speke no Frenshe, but wolde have hadde egges; and she understode hym not. And thenne at laste another sayd that he wolde have eyren; then the good wyf sayd that she understod hym wel. Loo! what sholde a man in thyse dayes now wryte, 'egges' or 'eyren'? Certaynly it is hard to playse every man bycaus of dyversite of and chaunge of langage.

For in these days every man that is in ony reputacyon in his countrie wyll utter his commynycacyon and maters in suche maners and termes that fewe men shall understonde theym. And som honest and grete clerkes have ben wyth me and desired me to wryte the moste curyous termes that I coude fynde. And thus bytwene playn rude and curyous I stande abasshed.

(79/45-54, 80/55-66)

C. S. Lewis, however, opines that "[t]he truth is that, in 'advanced' circles at that time [the early 1530's] any party might accuse any other of medieval proclivities; the romances were out of fashion" (*English Literature* 273).
CHAPTER 2

1 G. G. Coulton, in 1938, follows Collier in his presumption of the primacy of Henry, Earl of Essex, though Coulton referred to the Earl as "Humphrey":

Thus the [minstrels] petitioned for and received the grant of a Royal Minstrels' Gild in 1469. The players, like the minstrels, "put themselves under the protection of the nobles and persons of honour." The earliest upon record are those of Humphrey [sic] Bourchier, Earl of Essex, and those of Richard, Duke of Gloucester, afterwards Richard III. Henry VII had four "King's Players, alias, in the vulgar tongue, les playars of the Kyngs enterluds," each receiving five marks a year, with a special bonus when he played before the king. At vacation times they toured the provinces. Once [1503] they accompanied the Princess Margaret to her wedding with King James IV of Scotland. Henry VIII increased their number to eight. (Coulton 611-12)

2 The evidence of the entries in the Howard Household Books and of numerous references in the first five volumes of Letters and Papers suggests, if the spellings reflect contemporary pronunciation, that in Lord Berners' lifetime his title was pronounced [bär' närz] or perhaps [bær' nəz] rather than [bûr' nûrz]; that is, the vowel in the first syllable sounded like that in the British rather than the American pronunciation of the word "clerk." The Household Books, compiled by the family in which Berners was raised, contain the spellings "Barneis" (eleven times), "Barnes" (five), "Bernes" (four), "Barneys" (three), "Barners" (two), and "Berenes" (one), while the Letters and Papers offer numerous examples of the variant spellings "Berners," "Bernes," "Barners," "Barnars," and "Barnes." In the year 1513, for example, four of six documents listing Berners as participating in the French war feature the spelling of "Berners" with an "a" in the first syllable, as does a document noting his participation in the campaign against Scotland (L & P 1). Berners himself always signed his letters "John Berners." His surname, "Bourchier," is also spelled variously in L & P documents: "Bourchier," "Bouchier," "Bourghchier," "Burgchier," and "Bowser." In the Household Books it also appears as "Bourcher" and "Bowcher."
3 The 14 titles in the list of John Howard, Duke of Norfolk's books include the following (Collier has expanded abbreviations and modernized spellings):

La Destruction de Troy
Le Recueil des histories troianes
L'Arbre des batailles
Ponthus et la belle Sidonye
Sir Baudin, Conte de Flandres
La belle dame sans merci
Les Accusations de la dame
Le Miroir de la mort
Le Jeu des echecs
Le Jeu des des
Le Debat de la demoiselle et bons freres
L'Amant rendu Cordelier
Les Dits des sages
Paris et Vienne.

(Collier xxvii)

At some point between 1475 and 1483, i.e. at about the same time as Norfolk's list was compiled, a comparable list was compiled of the "Englyssche bokis" of John Paston (d. 1503). The titles in Paston's library suggest a strong interest in matters of chivalry in a man of lower social station than Norfolk, a man who nonetheless aspired to better his standing—and that of his family—and who would in fact be knighted by Henry VII. The list reads as follows (Warrington has modernized spelling and tacitly supplied some letters missing from the decayed manuscript):

1. A book had of mine hostess at the George . . . of the Death of King Arthur beginning at Cassibelaun, Guy Earl of Warwick, King Richard Coeur de Lion, a Chronicle . . . to Edward III, price . . .
2. Item, a book of Troylus which Willaim Bra . . . hath had near ten years, and lent it to Dame . . . Wingfield, and ibi ego vidi; value . . .
3. Item, a black Book with the Legend of Ladies, la Belle Dame sans Merci [cf. no. six in Norfolk's list], the Parliament of Birds, the Temple of Glass, Palatise and Scitacus, the Meditacions of . . . Sir Gawain and the Green Knight; value . . .
4. Item, a Book in print of the Play of the Chess [cf. no. nine in Norfolk's list].
5. Item, a Book lent Middleton, and therein is Belle Dame sans Merci, the Parliament of Birds, Ballad . . . of Guy and Colbronde, of the Goose
th . . ., the Disputation between Hope and Despair . . . Marehaunts, the Life of St. Christopher.

6. A red Book that Percival Robsart gave me . . . of the meeds of the Mass, the Lamentation . . . of Childe Ypotis, a Prayer to the Vernicle . . . called the Abbey of the Holy Ghost.

7. Item, in quires: Tully de Senectute in . . . whereof there is no more clearly written . . .

8. Item, in quires: Tully, or Scipio, de Amicitia left with William Worcester; value . . .

9. Item, in quires, a Book of the Policy of In . . .

10. Item, in quires, a Book de Sapientia . . . wherein the Second Person [of the Trinity] is likened to Sapience [Wisdom] . . .

11. Item, a Book de Othea, text and gloss, value . . . in quires. Memorandum, mine old Book of Blazonings of Arms. Item, the new Book portrayed and blazoned. Item, a copy of the Blazonings of Arms, and the . . . names to be found by letter. Item, a Book with Arms portrayed in paper . . . Memorandum, my Book of Knighthood and the manner of Making of Knights, of Jousts, of Tournaments, fighting in lists, paces holden by soldiers . . . and challenges, statues [sic] of war, and de Regimine Principum, value . . . Item, a Book of new statutes from Edward IV.

Warrington suggests that the information from the first Memorandum in no. 11 was "probably added during the reign of Henry VII" (Paston 230-1).

4 Collier xxviii: Le Recueil des histoires troianes is said by Collier to have been "printed in French by Caxton before 1470"; L'Arbre des batailles was printed in 1477 (Collier cites "M. Van Praet" on this).

5 The typographical peculiarities of the 1513 French edition involve line-end divisions of words. On one of Huon's several sea voyages, a mariner tells the luckless hero, "yf ye had turned your sterne towards the sirode, ye hadde never come hether . . ." (Berners 359/8-9). From the context, both the 1601 editor of Berners' Huon and Sir Sidney Lee, the 1880's E. E. T. S. editor, understand the mysterious "sirode" to mean "sea-roade," although always Berners spells the word "sea" "see". What the translator reads in his source is,
"vostre proubbe alencontre de si rot iamais ne fussiez cy venuz . . ." (Huon f. lxxxviii, v. B/38-39), in which the line breaks after "si" without the conventional punctuation [ ] to indicate that "sirot" is a single word. But on the following page appears the phrase "ung si merueilleux vent de siroc" (Huon f. lxxxix, r. A/12), which Berners translates simply as "suche a wynde" (Berners 359/24). The terminal "t" in "si rot" (if it is a "t" and not a malformed "c") must be a typographical error, as the subsequent phrase suggests. The OED identifies "siroc" as an older French form of the Italian "sirocco," a word whose first recorded use in English comes in 1617 (CEOED 2838), a century after Berners is translating. Encountering a word probably unknown, a word misspelled into the bargain, Berners renders "alencontre de si rot" not as "against the sirocco," but as "towards the sirode," which if not accurate is at least intelligible.

Berners has rather less success with a later typographical quirk. Croissant, Huon's great-grandson, hopes to relieve Earl Remon of St. Giles, who is besieged at Nice by Saracens. According to the prosateur, "aduis luy [Croissant] estoit que sarrazins sen yroyent ou lair royent leur siege . . ." (Huon f. clxxviii, r. B/11-13): that is, it seemed to him that the Saracens would go or leave their siege. Here again, however, "lair royent" is in fact a single word, a verb divided between two lines without punctuation to indicate its unity. And so Berners, confronting "sarrazins sen yroyent ou lair," produces the most unusual image in a book full of marvels, as the hardy Croissant thinks "the sarazins flewe in the Eyre, and that he wold reyse theyr sege . . ." (Berners 741.19-20).

6 The listing for the first edition of Berners' Huon in the second edition of the Short Title Catalogue reads as follows:

1399.8 Huon of Bordeaux. [heading Air:] Here begynneth the boke of duke Huon of burdeuxe. [Tr. from French by Sir J. Bourchier.] fol. [J. Notary, c. 1515.] Private Owner (imp.).

The types and most of the woodcuts are Notary's; see Edward Hodnett, English Woodcuts, Additions and Corrections pp. xii, II, 36-9.
CHAPTER 3

1 A. C. Baugh considers the vicissitudes of spelling in early printed works:

It is not always clear how much of [popular writers'] spelling is to be credited to them and how much to the printer. Most printers probably took advantage of the variability of English spelling to "justify" a line, with as little scruple about optional letters as about extra spaces.

(Baugh 251-2)

G. E. Dawson and L. Kennedy-Skipton also note that "[r]esponsibility for punctuation (as for spelling) was forced upon the printing house compositors by the erratic punctuation employed by most writers" (Dawson 18).

2 Examples of Berners' epistolary prose cited in the present chapter are taken from letters transcribed by this writer at the Public Record Office, London. It is apparent from transcriptions in the Letters and Papers, Foreign and Domestic, of the Reign of Henry VIII that those of Berners' letters now at the British Library are mostly mutilated and incomplete. What may be gleaned from the L & P transcriptions supports what is said here of the PRO letters.

CHAPTER 4

1 C. S. Lewis notes similar expressions of purpose at the beginnings of two fourteenth-century works, Barbour's Bruce and the prologue to the first volume of Froissart's Chronique (Image 177-8).

2 The collocation "chyne vaunted" poses a minor problem. The OED cites this passage, "correcting" the spelling of "vaunted" to "vauted," and defines the word, with specific reference to the chin, as "rounded," a fair rendition of the source's "voltis" (C.E. 3569). Berners' use of the word thus is the only one cited; however, the OED fails to cite Berners' use, also in Huon, of the "correctly" spelled "vaultyd" in the more usual, architectural sense, also from the source's "voltys" (Berners 407/23). "Vaunted" in the description of Clariet may be a misprint: elsewhere Berners translates the source's "vantes" as "vaunt" (Berners 177/13: also not cited in OED).
3 The narrator says that "[t]hen the English archers stept forth one pace and let fly their arrows so wholly [together] and so thick, that it seemed snow" (Chronicles 130).

CHAPTER 5


2 Randle Cotgrave, in his 1511 French-English dictionary, defines the word "ennemi" as "An enemie, a foe, an aduersarie," without any supernatural implications.

3 The unique copy of the editio princeps of Berners' Huon lacks a title page, a table of contents, and a colophon. The 1601 (3rd?) edition contains all three features, but there is disagreement as to whether the editio princeps ever contained any of them: Lee believed so (lii), but N. F. Blake finds Lee's evidence unpersuasive ("Survey" 122). The difference between the 1601 edition's actual chapter heading and the corresponding lines in its table of contents suggests the possibility at least that the original English version did contain a table of contents. The 1601 editor, if he had extracted a table solely from the actual chapter headings, would hardly have corrected a misreading in the table while retaining the same misreading in the heading.

4 See also "woyse" for "voice" and "wanyshed" for "vanished" (Berners 365/11, 729/17).

5 The passage omitted by Berners reads in full as follows:

```plaintext
/ef lempereur charlemaigne mesmes sen asbahyt moult. Adoncques quent ledit conte amaury eust sentu le tresgrant coup que par Huon de bordeaulx auoit recu il embrassa son escu lespee au poing vint courir sus a huon et luy donna si grant coup sur le heaulme que se il neust este de fin acyer il leust pourfendu iusques aux dentz/ mais nostre seigneur iesucrist le garantist de mort non pourtant fut le coup si tres grant que voulsist ou non huon il en desmarcha troys ou quattre pas. Et luy dist le conte amaury/ huon de ce coup vous ay taste. a lors le vaillant cheualier huon par grant ire haulsa lespee/ de laquelle il bailla au dessus dit conte amaury ung tres
```
merveilleux coup qui lattaignit sur lung des costes en descendant que toutes les mailles de son haulbert luy detrancha et descendit lespee sur la hanche dudit amaury. tellement qu'il luy fist une playe tresgrande & parfonde/ et par laquelle le sang ensaillit et cheut tout pasme sur la praerye. . . . [& the Emperor Charlemagne was himself much abashed. Then when the said Earl Amaury had felt the very great blow that by Huon of Bordeaux he had received, he clasped his shield: sword in hand he came to run upon Huon and gave to him so great a stroke on the helmet that had it not been of fine steel [the blow] had descended to the teeth. But our Lord Jesus Christ saved him from death. Yet for all that the blow was so great that whether he would or no, Huon removed backward three or four paces. And Early Amaury said to him, "Huon, of this blow you have tasted!" Then the brave knight Huon with great anger raised his sword, of the which he gave the abovementioned Earl Amaury a very marvelous stroke which reached into one of the sides, descending so that all the mail of his coat of armor was sliced, and the sword descended upon the hip of the said Amaury, so much that it made a wound very great and deep, and by the which the blood issued out & he fell all faint on the field]

(Huon f. xi, r. B/25-44, v. A/1)

6 The longest of the additions in this chapter reads as follows:

and my chapelayne and a clarke to serue hym, and we toke our schyppe at Burdeaux, and we saylyd downe the riuer tyll we come in the mayne see/ then the wynde rose contrarye to vs, and so contynuyd a longe space, so thet our patron knew not where he was/ so at the last we came to a porte, where we founde many shyppes of stran[ge] countres/ and there we gote vs a newe patron; and as shortely as we myghte, we wente forthe on our Iourney.

(Berners 458/23-31, 459/1)

CHAPTER 6

1 Ironically, the most reasoned discourse in Huon, the most logically ordered, is the early public declaration by Charlemagne which initiates the sequence of events leading to Huon's banishment and quest. The irony
is that for most of the rest of the romance, Charlemagne is characterized as an irrational dotard. Perhaps the inconsistency is intended to suggest the pernicious effects of evil counsel, for Charlemagne's rapid plunge into moody senility takes place only after he has listened to the traitorous Amaury. Be that as it may, the reader's first impression of Charlemagne is of a reasonable emperor capable of sequential thought and expression. In a long (33 line) public pronouncement, organized into two successive syllogisms, Charlemagne explains to his assembled nobles his reasons for asking that they determine his successor and his arguments against the obvious choice, his son, Charlot. The two-part speech is divided approximately in half. The pattern of the first half is "ye know ryght well . . . that . . . in which . . . therof . . . [major premise]. and now by cause . . . [minor premise]. for thys cause . . . [conclusion]. for . . . [restatement of minor premise]. wherfore . . . [restatement of conclusion]". The pattern of the second part is even simpler: "Ye know all . . . [major premise]. But . . . for ye know well . . . [minor premise]. wherfore . . . [conclusion]." In spite of Berners' occasional additions of "therefore" to subsequent narrative and dialogue, neither the narrator nor any other character in Huon expresses himself in quite so logical a manner. Interestingly, although Charlemagne never again rises to such rational discourse, he remains sensitive to the use and abuse of rhetoric. After Huon returns from his quest, his jealous brother Gerard gives false witness against him before the emperor. Gerard begins by piling up circumlocutions, causing Charlemagne to declare "Gerard . . . come to ye poyn, and use no more such langage nor suche serymonyes/ by that I se in you it is but yll that ye wyll saye" (Berners 236/26-8).

In full, Charlemaigne's initial speech reads as follows:

"Sir Duke Naymes, and al ye my barons beyng here present/ ye know ryght well the greate tyme and space that I haue bene kyng of Fraunce/ and emperour of Rome/ the whiche tyme durynge I haue bene seruyd and obeyed of you al, whereof I thanke you/ & render grace and prayse to god my swet creatore/ and now by cause that I knowe certenly/ that my lyfe by course of nature can not long endure/ for thys cause pryncipally I haue causyd you all to be assemblyd here to gether/ to declare to you my pleasure & wyll/ the whiche I requere you all, & humblye desyre you/ that ye wyll counsell together, and aduyse whiche of you may and wyll haue the gouernaunce of my
realme/ for I can no longer bere the trauayle and payn of the gouernyng therof/ for I wyl fro hense forth lyue ye resedew of myn age in peace, and serue our lorde god/ wherfore, as moche as I may, I desyre you all to aduyse whiche of you all shalbe therto most able/ ye know all that I haue two sonnes/ that is to say, loys, who is to yonge, and Charlot, whom I loue well, and he is of age suffysyent to rewll. But hys maners and condesyons are not mete to haue the gouernaunce of suche two noble empyrs as the realme of Fraunce/ and the holy empyre of Rome/ for ye know well in dayes past, by reason of hys pryde, my realme was lykely to haue bene dystroyed, and I to haue had warre agynst you all, whan by hys felony he slew Baudouyn, sonne to the good Ogyer the Dane/ wherby so many illes hath fallen/ that it shall neuer be out of remembrance; wherfore, as longe as I lyue, I wyll not consent that he shal haue the gouernance/ though he be ryghtful enherytor/ and that after me he ought to haue the syngnory. Thus I desyre you to aduyse me what I shall do."

(Berners 3/10-29, 4/1-15)

2 Alliteration involving the word "stithy" also appears in Berners' translation of Arthur of Lytell Brytayne, and as in Huon, occurences of the word are close to one another: "hamers strikinge on a stithy"; "it semed to [Arthur] that he strake on a stethy of stele" ("Arthur" 403/123-4, 137-8).

3 Visser describes the absolute infinitive thus:

[It] is used, in Middle and Modern English, in ordinances, testamentary dispositions, wills, bequeathals, parliamentary rules, prescriptions, ecclesiastic, monastic commercial and military regulations, in contracts and appointments. From the context it appears that the activity expressed by the infinitive is commanded, ordered or arranged to be performed in the future. It is possible to read the sentences with is or are before the infinitive ('and he is to paie therfor'); this is of course not meant to imply that the idiom should owe its origin to the suppression of is or are. As a matter of fact the origin is unknown and in Old English there are no examples.
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