



King's Research Portal

Document Version
Peer reviewed version

[Link to publication record in King's Research Portal](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

Gaunt, S. B. (2016). Philology and the Global Middle Ages: British Library Royal MS 20 D 1. *Medioevo Romano*, 40(2016), 27-47.

Citing this paper

Please note that where the full-text provided on King's Research Portal is the Author Accepted Manuscript or Post-Print version this may differ from the final Published version. If citing, it is advised that you check and use the publisher's definitive version for pagination, volume/issue, and date of publication details. And where the final published version is provided on the Research Portal, if citing you are again advised to check the publisher's website for any subsequent corrections.

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the Research Portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognize and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the Research Portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the Research Portal

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact librarypure@kcl.ac.uk providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Philology and the global Middle Ages: British Library Royal MS 20 D 1

Recent years have seen a plethora of projects—almost exclusively in the

Anglophone world—devoted to the so-called global Middle Ages. Carol

Symes succinctly states the purpose of one new journal in this field:

The *Medieval Globe* will promote scholarship in three related areas of study: the means by which people, things, and ideas come into contact with one another; the deep roots of global developments; and the ways that perceptions of ‘the medieval’ have been (and are) created around the world.¹

«Global» has been a buzzword in funding applications for some time and this may partially explain the phenomenon of the global Middle Ages, but the

intellectual agenda of «global medievalists» should not be dismissed as mere

fad or fashion, for understanding better how different parts of the medieval

world were connected to each other is an intrinsically worthy enterprise. Yet

the challenges are enormous. This is amply illustrated by the following

position statement on the G-Map (Global Middle Ages) website:

G-Map grew out of a teaching experiment at the University of Texas in 2004, when 7 scholars of different specializations invited students to see what the planetary past looked like when teaching was not carved up into disciplines and departments, or bound by area studies and regional studies.

Our charge was to see the world whole in a large swathe of time—as a network of spaces braided into relationship by trade and travel, mobile stories, cosmopolitan religions, global cities, cultural borrowings, traveling technologies, international languages, and even pandemics, climate and wars. We travelled in the seminar room from Europe to Dar ar-Islam, Sub-Saharan Africa to India, Eurasia, China, and the many Asias in a time span of about a millennium.

Our students, and others, told us over and over again that learning should be more often like this.²

While the excitement of emerging from the silos of «disciplines and

departments» and of not being «bound by area studies and regional studies»

is palpable, the elephant in the room here—in my view—is language, slipped

in as one element in a list of forms and loci of cultural contact and exchange,

¹ C.SYMES, *Introducing the Medieval Globe*, in «The Medieval Globe» 1 2014, pp. 1-8 (p. 4).

² <http://globalmiddleages.org/about>, consulted 3/12/15.

but in fact vital to both the object of study and then the modern scholarly enquiry that is envisaged. On the one hand, language is to a large extent the means whereby «people, things and ideas come into contact with one another» through «trade and travel, mobile stories, cosmopolitan religions» and so on; on the other, learning of the kind proposed here requires common languages and/ or a translation or mediation of primary sources into a common language. Yet, language *per se* (if current publications are anything to go on) receives little or no attention from self-styled global medievalists and the common language for global medieval studies (as google searches demonstrate unequivocally) is English, which delimits enquiry and certainly severely limits direct contact with medieval sources.³

This article—and my contribution to the *Medioevo Romanzo* seminar on which it draws—is a plea for the incorporation of core philological skills and practices into global medieval studies, but also a plea for philology to engage with the issues raised by the global Middle Ages movement. It offers a case study of «the means by which people, things and ideas come into contact with each other» through an analysis of a single manuscript: British Library Royal Manuscript 20 D 1.⁴

³ With such an emerging field, it is hard to do a systematic survey, but the Anglophone focus and the lack of any overt consideration of language or of any philological enquiry is to my mind apparent. See for example <http://globalmiddleages.org/research-and-teaching> (consulted 03/12/15), which only gives Anglophone publications on cultural/ historical topics. Google searches on «medioevo globale» or «moyen âge global» produce no results relating to academic research on the Middle Ages; a search for «Global Middle Ages», however, produces a string of links to funded projects and research groups in the Anglophone world, including at: Austin, Georgetown, Minneapolis, Sydney.

⁴ Research on this manuscript was initially conducted under the auspices of a project funded by the UK Arts and Humanities Research Council, *Medieval Francophone Literary Culture outside France*, and more recently a project funded by the European Research Council, *The Values of French*. For more information see <http://www.medievalfrancophone.ac.uk/> and <http://blogs.kcl.ac.uk/tvof/>. I am very grateful to the AHRC and to the ERC for their support.

This sumptuously illustrated manuscript was made in Naples in the late 1330s, either for, or in the orbit of, the court of Robert of Anjou. By 1380 it was in France, where it had been taken as a gift for Charles V, from Henry II of Castile. It probably found its way to Spain after 1367 as part payment for the ransom sent to Peter the Cruel, by Jeanne of Anjou (Robert of Anjou's daughter), in order to secure the release of her third husband, Jacques of Majorca, who had been captured at the battle of Nájera. If this is how the book came to Spain, it would have passed into the hands of Henry II, along with other items of value, when he defeated his brother, Peter the Cruel, who was killed in battle in 1369.⁵ This book therefore has a remarkable trajectory, but it is also, as we will see, a remarkable work of art as well as being remarkable—indeed quite exceptional—in demonstrably occupying a crucial position in the textual tradition to which it belongs. It is almost unheard of to be able to point to a specific manuscript as the source of a particular version of a text, but Royal 20 D 1 contains what, for want of a better word, is the Ur-text of the so-called second redaction of the *Histoire ancienne jusqu'à César*, the first redaction having been composed in Flanders before 1213 for Roger de Lille before then enjoying a significant transmission in the Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem and Italy as well as Northern France.⁶ This does not necessarily mean that Royal 20 D 1 is the «original» copy of this second redaction, of course, just that it is the point of origin for subsequent extant copies.

⁵ For a summary see L. BARBIERI, *Le « epistole delle dame di Grecia » nel Roman de Troie in prosa : la prima traduzione francese delle Eroïdi di Ovidio*, Tübingen and Basel, A. Francke Verlag, 2005., pp. 10-12 ; also *Les Epistres des dames de Grece : une version médiévale en prose française des Héroïdes d'Ovide*, ed. by L. BARBIERI, Paris, Honoré Champion, 2007, pp. 15-16.

⁶ For a summary of our current state of knowledge, see <http://www.medievalfrancophone.ac.uk/textual-traditions-and-segments/histoire/> and <http://www.medievalfrancophone.ac.uk/textual-traditions-and-segments/histoire/manuscripts-and-periods-of-production/>, consulted 04/12/15/.

This second redaction of the *Histoire ancienne* begins with the story of Thebes and although with the exception of the Troy section (on which more in a moment) it follows the text of the first redaction of the *Histoire ancienne* fairly closely,⁷ the transmission of this material without the extensive Biblical material with which the first redaction opens is transformative: no longer a sacred universal history, the *Histoire ancienne* becomes a history of Europe focussed rather on classical, and particularly Trojan history.⁸ In the first redaction of the *Histoire ancienne*, Troy is a staging post in the story and is quickly left behind; in the second redaction Troy is at the heart of the narrative. This emphasis on Troy is achieved in two ways. First, in addition to the removal of the Biblical material, the *Histoire ancienne* has now also lost its Alexander section and its final section on Caesar's conquest of Gaul, which means that the direct movement from Troy to Rome is unsullied by the presence of the great Greek hero, and also that the amount of material devoted to the Romans is shorter.⁹ Secondly, and more importantly, the relatively brief translation into French of Darius that makes up the Troy section in the first redaction of the *Histoire ancienne* is substituted by a much longer version of the Troy narrative. This fifth *mise en prose* of Benoît de Sainte-Maure, or *Prose 5*, is derived only indirectly from the *Roman de Troie*: long passages lifted directly and often verbatim from two prior *mises en prose*

⁷ See, for example, Barbieri's comparison of the rubrics of Royal 20 D 1 with those of Vienna Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, 2576 (*Le « epistole »*, pp. 11-17, and his conclusions on p. 17).

⁸ See L. BARBIERI, *Entre mythe et histoire : quelques sources de la version en prose « napolitaine » du Roman de Troie (Prose 5)*, in « *Ce est li fruis selonc la letre* » : *Mélanges offerts à Charles Méla*, ed. by O. COLLET, Y. FOEHR-JANSEENS and S. MESSERLI, Paris, Honoré Champion, 2002, pp. 111-32 (p. 112) : for Barbieri, the second redaction enacts « le passage d'une histoire universelle ecclésiastique à une véritable histoire ancienne laïque et courtoise ».

⁹ The second redaction also reorders the material on Rome to give it greater narrative logic, see <http://www.medievalfrancophone.ac.uk/browse/mss/99/manuscript.html> (consulted 04/12/15) for details of the contents of Royal 20 D 1.

(*Prose 1* and *3*, both late 13th-c. and composed in Morea and Italy respectively) are spliced together, but there are also some passages drawn directly from Benoît, some that may have been written (or translated?) specifically for this context, and then loose translations of fourteen of Ovid's *Heroides* that are embedded, sometimes carefully, sometimes more jerkily, into the Troy narrative with a view to offering first-person perspectives in letter form of a range of woman characters (and several men), some of whom are somewhat marginal figures in the *Roman de Troie*.¹⁰ It is likely, but not certain, that this ramshackle (if compelling) version of the Troy story was put together (composed is not quite the right word) specifically for inclusion in this new redaction of the *Histoire ancienne*: all we can say for sure about its date of composition is that it postdates *Prose 1* and *Prose 3*, and that it predates the completion of Royal 20 D 1; its provenance too is uncertain, though it is not unreasonable to assume that like Royal 20 D 1 itself, *Prose 5* comes from Naples. It is also possible, but a lot less likely, that the translations into French of Ovid's *Heroides* were made specifically for inclusion in this compilation.¹¹

The Troy section of the second redaction of the *Histoire ancienne* in Royal 20 D1 takes up 166 of its 363 folios; this may be instructively compared

¹⁰ BARBIERI, *Le « epistole »*, pp. 22-28 gives a useful table detailing the sources, where these have been identified, of all of *Prose 5*. See also BARBIERI, *Entre mythe et histoire*, pp. 111-32. On *Prose 1* and *Prose 3*, see M.R. JUNG, *La Légende de Troie en France au moyen âge*, Basel and Tübingen, Francke, 1996, pp. 440-84 and 499-503. *Prose 1* is the most widely disseminated of the five *mises en prose*, surviving as it does in nineteen manuscripts. It is generally thought to offer a moralizing and euhemeristic interpretation. *Prose 3* only survives in its entirety in one fifteenth-century French manuscript (Rouen, Bibliothèque Municipale, O.33), but there are a number of late thirteenth-century Italian fragments that indicate Italian origin and early circulation in Northern Italy.

¹¹ As BARBIERI (*Le « epistole »*, pp. 42-77) has demonstrated, close parallels between the *Heroides* in *Prose 5*, contemporary Italian glosses, and Italian translations of the *Heroides* point to the existence of a prior and independent version in French as a common source, but when he posits «un manoscritto francese, probabilmente dell'ultimo quarto del XIII secolo, che doveva contenere la storia troiana, le *Eroidi* rilette a base al modello elegiaco medievale e probabilmente anche il commento vicino all'*Ovide*» (p. 78), this is conjecture.

to the most extensive version of the first redaction, the one in Paris BnF f.fr. 20125, where Troy takes up just 25 of 375 folios. Royal 20 D 1 is thus truly a book of Troy,¹² and once it was in France copies were made, then copies of these copies. Prior to this the book seems to have left its mark in Spain,¹³ but interestingly as far as we can tell it left no trace in Italy. Since Royal 20 D 1 is almost certainly the direct or indirect source of all known copies of the second redaction of the *Histoire ancienne*, this manuscript's presence in France seems to have been the catalyst for a new interest in the *Histoire ancienne*—in a rejuvenated form—in Northern France in the late fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. I will return to the significance of this.

Royal 20 D 1 offers an imagined cultural and historical geography, and one that was to prove particularly influential. The role of the movement of books in the production and then impact of this book is particularly striking and I shall pursue here three lines of enquiry: 1) the movement of books to Naples; 2) how *translation* in and of itself figures the movement of books, particularly in the new and compelling reworking of the Troy story; 3) finally (and more briefly), the effects of the movement of Royal 20 D 1 itself from Naples, to Spain, to France. For the sake of simplicity and clarity, I will refer to the Troy section of Royal 20 D 1 as *Prose 5* and to its author as «the redactor», but questions of textual integrity and authorship are particularly fraught with difficulty in this instance.

Naples was an important centre for vernacular literary culture in the first half of the fourteenth century. The towering figure of Neapolitan literary

¹² On this point, see M. DESMOND, *The translatio of memory and desire in The Legend of Good Women: Chaucer and the vernacular Heroides*, in «Studies in the Age of Chaucer», xxxv 2013, pp. 179-203 (p. 190).

¹³ See BARBIERI, *Le « epistole »*, p. 11: the miniatures of Escorial h.l.6, which is a Spanish version of the *Roman de Troie*, are strongly reminiscent of those of Royal 20 D 1.

culture is undoubtedly Boccaccio, who was resident from 1326 until the early 1340s, but Naples also saw extended visits from other giants of Italian humanism, such as Petrarch. The Angevin court was French-speaking (though no doubt not exclusively) and strongly networked with French and Occitan speaking aristocratic circles in Western Europe and the Eastern Mediterranean: Robert the Wise (1277-1343, reigned 1309-43) was King of Jerusalem and Count of Provence as well as King of Naples. Naples—like some cities in Northern Italy—therefore stood at the crossroads between Western Europe and the Eastern Mediterranean. It is worth stressing that literary culture in Naples was strikingly multilingual and erudite. Boccaccio, for example, wrote in both Italian and Latin, certainly read widely in Latin, probably read French too,¹⁴ and had more than a passing interest not just in translations from Greek, but also in teaching himself enough Greek to appreciate the prosody of Homer. Indeed Homer was beginning to circulate in Greek in humanist circles as well to be translated into Latin, most notably by a close friend of Boccaccio's, Leonzio Pilatus, who was living in Boccaccio's house for much of the time he was at work on his Homer translations, which were also used by Petrarch.¹⁵ It is from this literary *milieu* (even if there are no grounds for assuming any direct connection between Boccaccio and Royal 20 D 1) that the second redaction of the *Histoire ancienne* emerges. Quite

¹⁴ The extent to which Boccaccio read French has been contested, see M. BARBATO and G. PALUMBO, *Fonti francesi di Boccaccio napoletano*, in *Boccaccio angioino: Materiali per la storia culturale di Napoli nel Trecento*, ed. G. ALFANO, T. D'URSO and A.P. SAGGESE, Brussels, Peter Lang, 2012, pp. 127-48 (pp. 146-47) Barbato and Palumbo describe Boccaccio's relation to French literary texts as «allo stesso tempo strettissimo e superficiale». I have unfortunately been unable to consult G. BRUNETTI, *La filologia romanza e l'interpretazione di Boccaccio*, in *Boccaccio e i suoi lettori. Una lunga ricezione*, ed. G. M. ANSELMINI, G. BAFFETTI, C. DELCORNO, S. NOBILE, Bologna, Il Mulino, 2013, pp. 43 – 64.

¹⁵ For an excellent and thought-provoking account, see M. DESMOND, *On Not Knowing Greek: Leonzio Pilatus's Rendition of the Iliad and the translatio of Mediterranean Identities*, in *Rethinking Medieval Translation: Ethics, Politics, Theory*, ed. E. CAMPBELL and R. MILLS, Cambridge, D.S. Brewer, 2012, pp. 21-40.

apart from a copy of the first redaction of the *Histoire ancienne*, *Prose 1* and *Prose 3* of the *Roman de Troie*, there is clear evidence that whoever composed *Prose 5*, also knew Guido delle Colonne's *Historia destructionis Troiae*, possibly the *Ovide moralisé*, the *Roman de la Rose*, as well as Ovid's *Heroides* and a range of other Latin Ovidian texts.¹⁶ One question that arises therefore is: where did the French-language manuscripts that were used to make these copies come from?

Royal 20 D 1 offers some suggestive clues that may help us answer this question. Consider, for example, its colophon:

Ici finies les livres des estoires dou commencement dou monde. C'est d'Adam et de sa lignie, e de Noe et de la seue lignie, et des .xii. filz d'Israel, et la destruction de Thebes, et dou commencement dou regne de feminie, et l'estour de Troie, et d'Alexandre li Grant et de son pere, et de Cartaje et dou commencement de la cite de Rome e des granz batailles que li romain firent jusque a la naisance nostre signor Jesu Crist, qu'ils conquistrent tot le monde. (f. 363r)

As others have pointed out, this does not correspond to the contents of Royal 20 D 1, which begins with the story of Thebes and also lacks the Alexander the Great section of the first redaction of the *Histoire ancienne*.¹⁷ However, it may instructively be read alongside a brief, summary of the Biblical sections of the first redaction of the *Histoire ancienne* that occurs near the beginning of *Prose 5* (British Library Royal 20 D 1, f. 28v). As already noted, with the exception of the Troy section, the second redaction of the *Histoire ancienne* follows the text of the first closely. The résumé of Biblical history on f.28v, which draws on the Genesis section of the first redaction (§§ 95 and 106-108),¹⁸ indicates that the redactor of *Prose 5* worked with a copy of the first

¹⁶ See BARBIERI, *Entre mythe et histoire*.

¹⁷ For example BARBIERI, *Le « epistole »*, p. 17.

¹⁸ References are to *The Heard Word: a Moralized History. The Genesis Section of the Histoire ancienne in a Text from Saint-Jean d'Acre*, ed. by M. COKER JOSLIN, Mississippi, Romance Monographs, 1986.

redaction in front of him. And if the second redaction of the *Histoire ancienne* as a whole and *Prose 5* are seen as parts of a single editorial project, it would seem that at various points parts of the first redaction that are reprised in the second redaction have been consciously refashioned so as to make them more consonant with *Prose 5*. Sometimes this is achieved through asides that summarise sections that have been removed (as on f. 28v), sometimes by making excisions. For example, the end of the Thebes section in Royal 20 D 1 (f. 21 v) lacks the moralising and clearly Christianising conclusion usually copied in first redaction manuscripts, which is consonant both with the loss of the Biblical material in Royal 20 D 1 and the more secular and often erotic concerns of *Prose 5*.¹⁹ We can see the same editorial process at work in the opening paragraphs of *Prose 5* (ff.27r-27v), where textual material from the Genesis section of the first redaction of the *Histoire ancienne* reminds readers of the Flood, by reproducing the text of §§ 47-48, and then of the tripartite division of the world into three continents by using the text of §§ 71-72, before seamlessly introducing the prehistory of Troy by reproducing all but the first few lines of the first paragraph of the Troy section of the first redaction (British Library Royal 20 D 1, f.27v). This is the only use the redactor of *Prose 5* makes of the Troy section of the first redaction of the *Histoire ancienne*, since the rest of the text is drawn from other sources (or may occasionally be newly composed), but once again we can see that he probably had a copy of the first redaction in front of him, one which included the Biblical material. One

¹⁹ See *Histoire ancienne jusqu'à César (Estoires Rogier)*, ed. M. DE VISSER-VAN TERWISGA, 2 vols, Orléans, Paradigme, 1995 and 1999), *Thebe*, § 125, 6-16. It should be noted here, however, that Vienna Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, 2576 also lacks this moralizing ending. It was produced later than Royal 20 D 1, but is a first redaction manuscript that seems to have a particularly close relationship with it, on which see below.

corollary of all this is that the second redaction does not lack the Biblical material because the compiler was working from an incomplete source. The colophon also offers evidence for this, and it becomes clear that the colophon of a first redaction manuscript has been copied unthinkingly in Royal 20 D 1, since no modifications have been made to reflect the actual contents of the manuscript.

Interestingly, then, the colophon in Royal 20 D 1 corresponds closely with the one found in Vienna Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, 2576, a manuscript made in Venice (f. 154r):

Ici finies les livres des estoires dou comencement dou monde. C'est d'Adanz et de sa lignie, et de Noe et de la seve lignie, et d'abraam, et de .xij. filz Israel, et de la destrucion de Thebes; et dou comencement dou regne de femenie, et l'estoire de Troie, et d'Alixandre li grant et de son pere, et dou comencement de la cite de Rome, et des batailles que li romain firent jusque a la naisance nostre seignor Jesu Crist, qu'il conquistrent tot le monde.

Despite orthographical variants and the mention of Abraham in the Vienna colophon, the otherwise identical text and the common (possibly erroneous) reading for the second word («finies») point to a common source, and Luca Barbieri reports that his initial researches indicate that Royal 20 D 1's text for material drawn from the first redaction is closer to that of Vienna 2576 than it is to the text of BnF f.fr. 20125.²⁰ It may also then be significant that Vienna 2576 is one of only two manuscripts (along with the much earlier BnF f.fr. 20125, made in Acre) to transmit the verse moralisations that are believed to have been integral to the original version of the *Histoire ancienne* set out as

²⁰ See BARBIERI, *Le « epistole »*, p. 17. However, as the Vienna MS is almost certainly later than Royal 20 D 1 (c.1350), it cannot be its source. *Finies* is usually classified as an error, but verb morphology is notoriously inconsistent in some Franco-Italian manuscripts and the reading may also be an Italianism.

verse.²¹ Of course we have no idea what other manuscripts have been lost, but on the basis of the evidence we have, we seem to be dealing here with a trajectory that moves from East to West, which is to say from Acre to Venice to Naples, one which is entirely independent of France.

There are other indicators that the vernacular sources for the version of the second redaction of the *Histoire ancienne* did not come from France, but from the Eastern Mediterranean or Northern Italy. Most notably *Prose 1*, on which the Royal 20 D 1 Troy sections draws extensively, was composed in the Kingdom of Morea (Greece). After the opening folio (27r-27v) of the Troy section (on which see above), Royal 20 D 1, reproduces the text of *Prose 1*, with only minor modifications (such as the summary of Biblical history drawn from the first redaction of the *Histoire ancienne* on f. 28v) up to the end of the story of Jason and Medea on f. 36v. This means that Royal 20 D 1 includes the detailed and accurate account of the geography of Greece with which *Prose 1* opens, including its reference to «la noble cité de Corinthe» (§3, 28; f. 28v in Royal 20 D 1), the significance of which I will return to shortly.²² One intriguing feature of the first *mise en prose's* section on Greece is its account of how Greeks may really be Romans:

Les gens se traient volentiers pour la seürté as illes, dont il a en Grece sans nombre, qui toutes furent habitees jusqu'a tens que il orent la seignorie des Romains, et meïsmant de Constantin, qui longement le tindrent en pais. Et por icele seürté laisserent il mout de ces illes et se retrairent a habiter a large terre, ou il faisoient plus de lour profit et de leur aises. Et por ce fu li pais apelé Romanie et changa le non de Grece. Car encore, se vos demandés a un Grezois en son langage quez honz il est, il respondera que il est Romain, quar ce li samble une maniere de franchise. Et surqueutot, quant il avient que aucun Grizois veulle franchir son serf de liberal franchise, si li dist «Soies Romain». §3, 10-22

²¹ The verse moralisations survive more frequently than had previously been thought, but they are often copied as prose or prosified. More details can be found by searching for the verse passages as interstitial segments at <http://www.medievalfrancophone.ac.uk/>.

²² Cited from *Le Roman de Troie en prose*, ed. L. CONSTANS AND E. FARAL, Paris, Champion, 1922.

Royal 20 D 1, however, has a modified version of the end of this passage:

Et encore se vos demandes en gregiois quelz hons est grec, il vos respondra «Romeos» qui vaut autant comme franc. Et se aucun gregios vuille son serf franchir, si dit «Soies franc», non seulement comme li hons franchist son serf, mes «Soies ausi frans come Romain». (28r-28v)

Whereas the version of *Prose 1* I have just cited from Contans and Faral's edition simply narrates how Greeks are proud to proclaim themselves «Roman» because they equate being Roman with being free («une maniere de franchise»), so that when a serf is freed he «becomes Roman», the Royal 20 D 1 text first makes a proper name out of «Roman» and then seems to pun deliberately on the etymology of *franc*, perhaps anticipating the passage at the opening of the *Eneas* section of the *Histoire ancienne* which speculates as to the origins of France and the French,²³ but in all likelihood also playing on the common usage of the term «Frank» in the Eastern Mediterranean as a blanket term for Western Europeans (the Angevins in Naples being after all «Franks» in the broadest sense of the term). Rome and being Roman thus become a kind of quilting point that reinforces while eliding *translatio imperii*: Greeks are always already Romans, who are in fact always already Franks.²⁴

This elision is further compounded in by §§4-5 in *Prose 1* and ff. 28v-29r in Royal 20 D 1 (into which is interpolated the summary of the Biblical sections of the first redaction), which effectively gives an accurate description of territory corresponding roughly to the Kingdom of Naples, stressing that Greek is still spoken in much of Calabria and Sicily, and that the cities of

²³ On which see S.GAUNT, *French literature abroad: towards an alternative history of French literature*, in «Interfaces», I 2015, pp. 25-61 (pp. 46-48).

²⁴ Fabio Zinelli also comments on this. See F.ZINELLI, « *je qui li livre escrive de letre en vulgal* » : *scrivere il francese a Napoli in età angioina*, in *Boccaccio angioino: materiali per la storia di Napoli nel Trecento*, ed. G. ALFANO, T. D'URSO, AND A. PERRICCIOLI SAGGESE, Brussels, Peter Lang, 2012, pp.149-73 (p. 167)

Labour (in *Prose 1*), or Partonope (in *Prose 5*) are in fact Naples. The assertion that the inhabitants of the Kingdom of Naples «furent anciënement tous grizois» (§ 4, 12) is not retained in *Prose 5* (one of the few excisions to this passage), but this does not detract from the close relation between Greece and Naples that is explicitly articulated.²⁵

The specifically Eastern Mediterranean and then Neapolitan orientation of this telling of the Troy story is further reinforced at the end of the Troy section in Royal 20 D 1, where on ff. 191 r-93v we find the story of Laudomata, who is a son of Hector and Andromache. This relatively brief episode was probably originally the work of the author of *Prose 1*, it is adapted somewhat by the author of *Prose 3* (almost certainly an Italian, working in Italy), and it is this last version that the compiler who produced *Prose 5* uses. Some time after the fall of Troy, Laudomata returns from the refuge further east to which his father had sent him, liberates Troy, and then tracks down, one by one, the Trojan traitors and his father's surviving Greek enemies. He then rebuilds Troy, marries, and sets about conquering the neighbouring lands: Georgia, Turkey, Armenia, Syria, and Egypt. Eventually he «tint tout le pais oriental» (f. 193v rubric) and «gaagna tout le pais iusques as desers de Nubie et a la mer d'Inde, et que par amour que par force: tout le païs oriental mist il sous sa seignorie» (193v). The end of the story in *Prose 1* reads as follows:

Si vos ai ore menee a fin la veraie histoire de Troie selonc ce qu'elle fu trovee en l'almaire de saint Pol de Corrinte en grijois langage, et dou grizois fu mise en latin et je la translatai en françois et non pas par rime ne par vers, ou il covient par fine force avoir maintes menchoignes com font ces menestriez qui de lor lengues font maintes fois rois et amis solacier de quoi il font sovent lor profit et autrui damage, mais par droit conte selonc ce que je la trovai san riens covrir de verité ou de mençoinge demoustrer, en tel maniere que nus n'i poroit riens ajindre ne amermer que por vraie deüst estre tenue.

²⁵ See again ZINELLI, « *je qui li livre escrive* », p. 167.

Explicit. Amen. Que Dieuz tous nos gart.²⁶

The author of *Prose 1* thus returns to the city of Corinth, rounding off his Troy story by vaunting the authority of a local, Greek source, while also explaining (using the established topos that verse is mendacious and therefore not suitable for history), why he uses prose rather than verse. The redactor of the version found in Royal 20 D 1 adds a paragraph to the more abrupt ending of *Prose 3* (which simply states «Or vos ay conté la vraie ystoire de Landomatha le filz Hector»):

Mesure est que nous facons a fin de cestui livres car nous avons bien dit et raconté la vraie ystoire de Troie selonc ce que li aucteur en ont dit et retrait si que riens plus ne main i est mis que droite verité. (f.193v)

The ending of *Prose 1* is of course the conclusion of an independent text, whereas the ending of the Troy story in Royal 20 D 1 is the conclusion to an episode in a longer narrative. While the concluding paragraph in Royal 20 D 1 lacks much of the detail of the end of *Prose 1*, the reference to the *aucteur*, the claim not to have added anything, and the insistence on *droite verité* (cf. *droit conte* and *verité*) all seem to echo the conclusion of *Prose 1*, as if the redactor has both versions (*Prose 1* and *Prose 3*) in front of him. Is it too fanciful then, to wonder whether the *bas de page* illustration immediately underneath the concluding paragraph, which also encases a final rubric, is intended to represent the church of Saint Paul in Corinth, perhaps with its *almaire* full of books in its crypt?

²⁶ Cited from H. F. WILLIAMS, *Laodamas in the Prose "Roman de Troie"*, in « Romance Philology », VII 1953-54, pp. 143-55 (p. 148).



British Library Royal 20 D 1, f. 193v, detail

As is often the case in Royal 20 D 1, this *bas de page* is part of a double page programme of illustration, but whereas usually the two pages stress continuous narrative across the opening, here (unusually) there seems to be no connection between the left hand verso illustration and the right hand illustration on 194r:



British Library Royal 20 D 1, ff.193v-194r

There can be no more visually striking way of marking a break between two episodes, but it is also worth dwelling for a moment on the closing rubric on 193v, which reads «Ci finist l'ystoire de Landomatha». This is in fact the conclusion to the entire Troy story, which opened by being called in a rubric «la vraie ystoire de Troie» (27r), which is how it is referred to also in the final paragraph that seems to have been added by the redactor of *Prose 5*.

This stress on Laudomata is interesting because it offers an intriguing counterblast to the usual narrative of *translatio*, even though this is instantly picked up again in the opening rubric of the Eneas section: «Ci comence de Eneas qui si part de Troie et ala en Ytalie» (194r). For in this book, Troy may be left behind by departing Trojans such as Eneas, as usual, who go off so their descendants can found new Troys elsewhere, but meanwhile, and unusually, the original Troy rose from the ashes to become the centre of a glorious Oriental empire. The original Troy, in fact, never really died. This is disconcerting news indeed for readers familiar with the conventional *translatio* topos, according to which the glories of Troy disappear forever from the Orient to be reborn in Western Europe centuries later.²⁷ However, the story of Laudomata, copied from a book that comes from the East, does greatly enhance the Eastern Mediterranean focus of Royal 20 D 1. This manuscript thus offers an historical perspective that often looks back to the East from Naples far more than it looks to the West, despite where it ended up.

I have been making a case for seeing Royal 20 D 1 as a book that in its central Troy section is made from other books, some in French and some in

²⁷ I am indebted here to the thesis of Jessica Stoll, see J. STOLL, *Imagining Troy: Fictions of Translation in Medieval French Literature*, unpublished PhD thesis, King's College London, 2014, pp. 144-59.

Latin, and some of which at least travelled to Naples (whether directly or indirectly) from the Eastern Mediterranean. Royal 20 D 1 therefore offers an exemplary case study of «the means by which peoples, things and ideas came into contact with one another», to pick up Carol Symes formulation. These were not, however, the only books the redactor used for his version of the Troy story and one of the most radical transformations he enacted on his sources texts is the embedding of translations of Ovid's *Heroides*, but filtered also through several layers of vernacular literary culture. Our understanding of the significance of the presence of these translations of the *Heroides* in Royal 20 D 1, and indeed of the nature of both the process of translation and of the embedding of the translations in the longer narrative of the second redaction of the *Histoire ancienne*, is greatly enhanced by Luca Barbieri's careful and deep scholarship in his *Le «epistole delle dame di Grecia» nel Roman de Troie in prosa*. But his work nonetheless raises interesting methodological issues: although he gives us a wealth of information (upon which I draw heavily here) about the literary qualities of the translations, their treatment of their Latin models, their use of other sources, exactly how they are embedded in the text of Royal 20 D 1, and indeed about the text of Royal 20 D 1 and the manuscript as a physical object more generally, the fact that he extracts the *Heroides* from Royal 20 D 1 and edits them in the order in which they appear in manuscripts of Ovid, rather than in the order in which they appear in the Royal manuscript, is revealing of the apparent main point of his scholarly enterprise. Indeed, in presenting the letters derived from Ovid in Royal 20 D 1 primarily as the «Première traduction connue des

Héroïdes»,²⁸ the letters are strangely abstracted from their manuscript context, despite the wealth of information Barbieri gives about Royal 20 D 1. Taking a more literary as opposed to philological approach, Marilyn Desmond's important article on the influence of *Prose 5*'s translations of Ovid on later writers, particularly Chaucer, stresses that «the *Heroides* in this context become separated from Ovidian authorship and take on the status of historically authentic letters», and that «the French textual tradition of the *Heroides* has entirely erased their Latin textual origins».²⁹ However, this last point both is and is not true. While it is certainly the case that Ovid is never explicitly referenced in Royal 20 D 1, the second redaction of the *Histoire ancienne* (like the first) implicitly and explicitly acknowledges throughout that it is a translation from Latin, and also that Greeks and Trojans did not speak Latin in any case. There is thus no need to signal that the *Heroides* included in *Prose 5* are translations because everything in the text is implicitly a translation: even where the text derives from a source in French, this is presented as a translation from Latin and/ or Greek. And although the *Heroides* in *Prose 5* are presented as genuine letters because of their being embedded in the broader Troy narrative and because of the failure to identify them as derived from poems by a well-known writer, it may miss the point a little to say that «the design of Royal 20 D 1 treats these epistles as autonomous texts transcribed into the larger narrative»,³⁰ since their embedding in the larger narrative is precisely what is so remarkable.

Furthermore, Desmond, like Barbieri, evaluates the quality of the translations

²⁸ *Les Espitres*, cover.

²⁹ *The translatio of memory*, pp. 191-92.

³⁰ *The translatio of memory*, p. 190. It is true, however, that they are not illustrated and thereby appear as blocks of texts that are uninterrupted by the manuscript's visual programme.

of the *Heroides* in *Prose 5* by comparing them to the Latin original. This leads her to describe the register of *Heroides 10* (Ariadne's letter to Theseus), as «quotidian» and «banal» in its attention to the humdrum details of everyday life. Her conclusion is that «in seeking a lexical equivalence between Latin elegiac couplets and French prose, the translator sacrifices the rhetorical integrity of the text and replaces it with an earnest simplicity that is as urgently expressive as it is inelegant».³¹ Now while these points are persuasively made, I would like to propose a reading that looks at this material more on its own literary terms as these emerge from the broader frame of Royal 20 D 1.³²

Let us then, in the light of this, consider the first *Heroides* to be included in the Troy story, *Heroides 5* in Ovid, the letter from Cenona to Paris (which is of course the fifth in Barbieri's edition, because he reorders them in order to reflect Ovid). Cenona (also known as Oenone) does not appear in the *Roman de Troie*, but the redactor prepares the inclusion of her letter carefully. First in a section that has no analogue in *Prose 1* or *Prose 3*, and which therefore may have been composed newly by the redactor,³³ which narrates, but more expansively than in the *Roman de Troie*, the judgement of Paris, we are also told of Paris's birth and of how once he has grown up he «prist a fame la deesce Cenona qui li donna de nobles dons et de gratieus»

³¹ *The translatio of memory*, p. 195.

³² C. CROIZY-NAQUET makes some suggestive remarks along these lines, but does not go into any detail, *Usage d'Ovide dans le Roman de Troie de Benoît de Sainte Maure et dans deux de ses mises en prose: Prose 1 et Prose 5*, in *Les Translations d'Ovide au Moyen Âge*, ed. A. FAEMS, V. MINET-MAHY and C. VAN COOLPUT, Louvain-la-Neuve, Institut d'Etudes Médiévales, 2011, pp. 159-74 (p. 172): «Dans sa substance, la traduction des *Héroïdes* se fait au prix d'erreurs commises par le prosateur ou par ceux qui avant lui ont traduit. Mais les 'infortunes du texte ovidien', selon Léopold Constans, relèvent aussi d'une réécriture informée par la tradition lyrique et par les modèles romanesque, antiques et arthuriens».

³³ Unless his manuscript of *Prose 3* had a different version, which is also perfectly possible. Barbieri edits all the substantial portions of *Prose 5*, which do not have analogues in *Prose 1* and *Prose 3*, see BARBIERI, *Le « epistole »*, pp. 297-306.

(BARBIERI, *Le « epistole »*, p. 299; Royal 20 D 1, f. 39r).³⁴ Secondly, the letter itself is introduced by a rubric, but immediately prior to this, there is a rather abrupt sentence that is set off as a paragraph on f. 53v: «La novele s'espandi par toutes les terres et les païs de Troie que Paris out espousé dame Helaine; si que Cenona l'oï, si en fu molt dolente, si li en<v>oia ceste epistre»

(BARBIERI, *Le « epistole »*, p. 306). This is actually the conclusion of a long new section devoted to the birth of Helen, her exceptional beauty, and her first encounter with Paris. This new section therefore provides a specific narrative context to the jealousy of Helen that Cenona articulates in her letter, and the procedure here is not unlike that adopted in Jakemes' romance *Le Chastelain de Coucy*, in which generic emotions expressed in the lyrics by the Chatelain de Coucy are given quite specific narrative weight and context.³⁵

The account of the birth of Helen and of her beauty opens with a fairly detailed recapitulation of the story of the birth of Venus following the castration of Saturn:

Anciennement out uns rois en Crete qui fu appellees par son nom Saturnus, et l'aouraient li gregois comme dieu [...] Puis après par son sens et par son savoir vit et aperçut qu'il engendrerroit .i. fils en lié qui le priveroit de son honneur naturele, si que pour ce il commanda a sa fame que elle li aportast les enfans que elle enfanterait, et elle les li aporloit, et dit on que il les mangioit. A la fin enfanta .i. enfant mult biaux, de qui la mere out pitié por sa grant biauté, si le fist porter en une autre lieu celement pour nourrir et out a nom Jupiter, et manda Saturnus une statua de pierre et li dist que ce estoit l'enfant que elle avoit enfanté et il la menja en poudre. Puis après, quant Jupiter fu grans et parcreüs et sout que Saturnus son pere le cuidoit avoir fet tuer, si fu mult courrouciés contre lui et commença a persecuter son pere, et tan le persecuita que il le trouva pres la mer là ou il purgioit son ventre, et il sailli soudainement et li trencha les coillons et le jeta dedans la mer, et li dist: «je sui ton fils qui tu cuidoies avoir fet tuer qui tu doutoies tant: or as trouvé ce de quoi tu avoies si grant paour. Des ormais regnerai je, voilles tu ou non». Quant Jupiter out

³⁴ Barbieri details the introduction of names in *Prose 5* to prepare the ground for a number of the *Heroides*, see BARBIERI, *Le « epistole »*, pp. 136-38). He makes a distinction between these «Aggiunte e riletture funzionali» and «Aggiunte e modifichie in funzione del progetto dell' autore» (pp. 138-44), which make the text more courtly in outlook. See also CROIZY-NAQUET, *Usage d'Ovide*, pp. 171-72.

³⁵ See *Jakemes: Le Roman du Châtelain de Coucy et de la dame de Fayel*, ed. C. GAULLIER-BOUGASSAS, Paris, Champion Classiques, 2009.

geté les coillons son pere en la mer si se conjoint le sanc o l'escume de la mer et en issi une masse grosse par la vertu du soloil et de la lune, et de celle masse selonc aucuns aucteurs nasqui la deese Venus. Mes selonc la vraie ystoire, et raison acordant a verité, elle fu fille de Saturnus et de Rea, car c'est donné a entendre que li coillon segnefient le pere, li sanc segnefie le sperme de l'omme, la mer segnefie la mere et l'escume la substance nutritive de la mere, et ensint le doit en entendre. (BARBIERI, *Le « epistole »*, pp. 300-301; Royal 20 D 1, ff.47v)

Luca Barbieri has suggested that this material may be drawn directly from the *Ovide moralisé*.³⁶ While the version of this story in the *Ovide moralisé* is less detailed, the narrative contextualisation of the story in Royal 20 D 1 resonates far more with the contextualisation of the story in the *Ovide moralisé* (even if it is not identical) than, for example, with the more schematic and passing reference to the castration of Saturn in the *Roman de la Rose* (which is simply to the episode and gives it no narrative context);³⁷ furthermore, the following interpretation of what all the elements in the story mean, and also the acknowledgement that the verisimilitude of the story itself might be questionable, is entirely consonant with the *Ovide moralisé*'s euhemeristic treatment of Ovid more generally. This is underlined in both texts by the fact that Saturn is introduced not as a god, but as a king of Crete who is worshipped as a god (see *Ovide Moralisé*, 1, 515).³⁸ But given the redactor presumably used Latin sources for the *Heroides*, why must one assume only a vernacular source here? It is not impossible that further Latin sources will

³⁶ BARBIERI, *Le « epistole »*, pp. 65-66 and *Entre mythe et histoire*, pp. 126-28.

³⁷ See *Le Roman de la Rose*, ed. F. LECOY, 3 vols, Paris, Champion, 1966-70, 5505-24 and 20 003-20 052. The most salient feature of the second reference is its rampant punning on the word *escoillié*.

³⁸ Cited from *Ovide Moralisé: poème du commencement du quatorzième siècle, tome 1*, ed. C. DE BOER, Amsterdam, Verhandelingen der Koninklijke Akademie van Wetenschappen te Amsterdam, 1915. However, in the *Ovide moralisé* there is no interpretation of the symbolic elements in the story as there is in *Prose 5*, precise lexical parallels between this passage in *Prose 5* and the *Ovide moralisé* are in fact rather slight, and the accounts differ on many points of detail. Thus although both texts use the words *parcreüs* (*Ovide moralisé*, 525) and mention the *escume* (*Ovide moralisé*, 653), there is no reference in the *Ovide moralisé* to Rea in this context, the statue is made of stone in the *Ovide moralisé* (584) rather than salt, and perhaps most tellingly Saturn's testicles are referred to as *genitaires* in the *Ovide moralisé* (651), not *coillon*, which gives the passage a rather different feel.

be identified among commentaries and glosses on Ovid. In any case, what seems more significant than identifying the source of the story (even though this is undoubtedly an interesting question), is the process whereby material from a wide range of different sources (and possibly some material composed or translated specifically for the occasion), including sources in at least two languages, is not just being spliced together to make a coherent narrative, but also rendered into a markedly sophisticated prose style.

From a stylistic point of view, this passage has some striking features:³⁹

- The range of connectors used: «Anciennement», «Puis après», «si que pour ce», «A la fin», «Quant», «car», «Mes», «Des ormais» etc.
- The use of pairs of synonyms: «par son sens et par son savoir», «vit et aperçut», «fu grans et parcreüs»
- The Latinising use of the absolute gerund «Mes selonc la vraie ystoire, et raison acordant a verité, elle...»

This proclivity for complex and sophisticated syntax is also apparent elsewhere. For instance, consider the length and tone of the description of Helen, which may be one of the passages composed specifically for inclusion in *Prose 5*:

Bele estature de biau grant, longue, graille, roonde, grasse, tendre, non mie molle ne vaine mes serree, resortissant et souave comme hermine; esquillant comme aiglete, fremillant fuille de tremble, droite et transpellant comme jonc en mer; plus blanche que n'est fleur de lis, clere comme cristal, sus la fache et sus les oreilles vermeilles, cleres rubians comme rose parmi le verre ou comme sinople sus or. Cheveuls blons reluisans et lons, crespés, menus recercelés, galonnés de riches galons, restrains d'un riche cercel d'or a riches pierres precieuses; par devant en mi le front out .i. safir blons d'Orient de la couleur du firmament, bien esprovez en sa vertu a donner grace et bien plaisance et santé contre apostimie et contre bouche de raanle et contre maintes maladies; a ce saphir sont collateraus et conjointes quatre pierres tout environ, dont l'une estoit une esmeraude plus vert que nulle herbe de pré, plus fine que nulle rien qui soit contre la maladie des yez. (Barbieri, p. 301; Royal 20 D 1, ff. 48r-48v).

This represents only about a third of the description of Helen's beauty. As can be seen here, the redactor is much given to the accumulation of adjectives, to

³⁹ I am indebted to Simone Ventura for ideas about the style of these passages.

simile, and to showing off his knowledge of ancient Greece in a quasi Orientalist manner; his syntax is significantly more complex than that of much thirteenth-century French prose. He also has a rich, varied, and sometimes quite *recherché* vocabulary. When he describes Helen's hands as «beles mains petites, blanchetes, crassetes, poutelees», the diminutives show a clear command of the French courtly register that is apparent throughout the passage, but this is also overlaid with an attention to the detail of the physical body that moved beyond twelfth- and thirteenth-century courtly convention into something approaching a more classicising apprehension of the body, which goes hand in hand with what is arguably a more classicising, possibly even humanist, prose style, characterised by the adjectives, the use of simile, and the syntax.

Of course it is impossible to know whether the author of this passage and the translator of the *Heroides* that have been incorporated into the narrative are one and the same person, but the homogeneity of style and language in *Prose 5* is nonetheless striking. However, this assertion nonetheless does need some qualification for in the description of Helen, the prose is flowing freely: the adjectives therefore accumulate, and the similes expand. In the letters based on the *Heroides*, the redactor or translator is constrained by following a model, but this does not mean he follows it slavishly, nor that he does not put his own stylistic mark on the text. Indeed, at times whoever produced these translations (not necessarily the redactor of *Prose 5* of course) does so much more than translate (if by translate one means simply transposing from one language to another) and his work is far

from literal.⁴⁰ I will take just one example, again from the first letter to appear in *Prose 5* (Oenone/ Cenone), the introduction to which we have already discussed:⁴¹

Tu quoque clamabis: Nulla reparabilis arte
Laesa pudicitia est; deperit illa semel. V, 103-104

(You too will lament: 'By no art may wounded chastity be restored: it is ruined once and for all.)

Aussi t'en plaindras tu et ne le poras amender, ne ja n'en sera plains, car tu vois ja bien et sés sa fauseté et sa mauvaise foi, et a ja sa loiauté et sa cha<s>téé faussee. (V, 93-95)

Ovid's pithy couplet contrives to be at once astonishingly laconic, yet rich in meaning, playing as it does on ideas of wounding and healing, damaging and restoring, while playing ironically on the idea of art and artifice, which cannot undo the consequences of the actions of the unchaste (by implication through surface appearance), and climaxing in the crushing and unequivocal finality of the present indicative *deperit* and the adverb *semel*. The *Prose 5* redactor (wisely and realistically) makes no attempt at emulating Ovid's economy of expression and of course in any case concision is never the main virtue of medieval French prose. What he does instead is to home in on some of the main elements of Ovid's couplet and riff upon them: lamentation (*plaindras/ plains*), art and artifice (*fauseté* and *faussee*), chastity/ virtue (*loiauté/ chasteé*) and finality (*ja, ja*). This is rhetorically and semantically embellished (with the talk of making amends and of being pitied), but the most sophisticated effect of the translator is to create a play on words between *fauseté* and *faussee*, which picks up on *pudicitia* (chastity or purity) and *arte*

⁴⁰ Cf. BARBIERI, *Le « epistole »*, cover and DESMOND, *The translatio of memory*, p. 192. For Barbieri, we are dealing with «la prima traduzione in lingua d'oïl delle *Eroidi*», while for Desmond «they mark the earliest attempt to render a *literal*, French equivalent to classical Latin poetry» (my emphasis).

⁴¹ Cited from *P. Ovidii Nasonis: Epistulae Heroidium*, ed. H. DÖRRIE, Berlin and New York, Walter de Gruyter, 1971, and Barbieri, *Le « epistole »*.

(art or artifice) in the Latin text, to imply the inherent falsity or duplicity of art. This is not a *literal* translation, but it is an intelligent and extremely interesting response to Ovid's text.

Royal 20 D 1 is a crux in the manuscript tradition of the *Histoire ancienne*. Its legacy is not necessarily extensive: there are twelve other manuscripts of the second redaction of the *Histoire ancienne* (if one includes Grenoble, Bibliothèque Municipale, 860, which exceptionally only includes *Prose 5*), at least one of which (Paris, BnF f.fr. 301) is a direct copy of Royal 20 D 1 and reproduces a substantial portion of its illustrations. However, its legacy is crucial. First because, as already noted, Royal 20 D 1 is apparently the direct or indirect source for subsequent copies of the second redaction. Secondly—and even more significantly for our purposes—because it moves from Naples to France, which is where all these copies are made and where the tradition it represents also starts to impact upon the production of some first redaction manuscripts.⁴² The ideological re-orientation of the material that the elimination of the Biblical sections and the substitution of the original version of the Troy story with *Prose 5* enacts, makes Royal 20 D 1 into a vehicle for ideas and a style that are being expressed in the vernacular for the first time in Italy in the first half of the fourteenth century, precisely in the cultural milieu from which Royal 20 D 1 emerges (the Naples where Boccaccio spent his formative years). It is well-known that some of these ideas and this style find their way into French culture in the early fifteenth century, in the work of Christine de Pisan, for example, or in that of Laurent de

⁴² See JUNG, *La Légende de Troie*, p. 507. London British Library Additional 25884, Malibu, The J. Paul Getty Museum, Ludwig XIII 3, New York Pierpont Morgan M 516, and Paris BnF f.fr. 250 are all later first redaction manuscripts that borrow elements from *Prose 5*.

Premierfait. But the arrival of Royal 20 D 1 in France predates their activity by at least several decades.

Could this manuscript be one of the principle vectors or agents whereby new ideas arrived in France from Italy, and indirectly from the Eastern Mediterranean?⁴³ Its presence in France certainly seems to have had considerable impact, both on the reception of the *Histoire ancienne*,⁴⁴ which is irrevocably changed, and on perceptions of Trojan material.⁴⁵ The impact of the stylistic features on which I have commented have yet to be fully traced and evaluated, but even setting aside the intriguing possibility that this manuscript is key to the dissemination of a new style of writing in the vernacular, brought from Naples where it began to evolve to Northern Europe, this is precisely the kind of «contact» and «network of spaces» that go to make up the Global Middle Ages, but core philological skills and a close attention to language and to the original texts are needed to tease out all their implications.

Simon Gaunt,
Department of French,
King's College London
simon.gaunt@kcl.ac.uk

I should like to thank Bill Burgwinkle, Jane Gilbert, Simone Ventura, and Fabio Zinelli for illuminating discussions about Royal 20 D 1.

⁴³ I am using «agent» here in the technical sense made popular by actor-network theory, see B.LATOUR, *Reassembling the Social: an Introduction to Actor-Network Theory*, Oxford, OUP, 2005.

⁴⁴ Several fifteenth-century French manuscripts seem to record attempts to combine the first and second redactions (the so-called third redaction). For more details, see <http://www.medievalfrancophone.ac.uk/textual-traditions-and-segments/histoire/textual-tradition/>, consulted 04/12/15.

⁴⁵ See DESMOND, *The Translatio of Memory*, pp. 187-207.