

H-France Review Vol. 17 (June 2017), No. 77

Glyn S. Burgess and Leslie C. Brook, eds. and trans., *The Anglo-Norman Lay of Haveloc: Text and Translation*. Cambridge: D. S. Brewer, 2015. 229 pp. \$84.95 U.S. (hb). ISBN 978-1-84384-413-6.

Review by Jaclyn Rajsic, Queen Mary University of London.

This is a welcome edition and translation of the Anglo-Norman lay of *Haveloc*, but it is also a great deal more. Burgess and Brook bring together several medieval versions of the Haveloc story written in French, Latin and English, which they also translate into modern English, along with a few post-medieval accounts of the story. This is one of the volume's strengths: it facilitates comparisons between longer and shorter versions of the legend, and the translations make the French and Latin texts in particular accessible to a wide readership of scholars and students. The volume is an indispensable resource for those interested in both the Anglo-Norman lay of *Haveloc* and the legend more widely—its other insular versions and its development over time.

The volume is divided into two parts. Part one presents a new edition and translation of the Anglo-Norman lay of *Haveloc* (composed c. 1190-1220), with introduction and explanatory notes. The introduction provides a helpful overview of the lay, including some of its main themes (e.g. kingship, land and power, and marriage and love) and a discussion of its sources, analogues, and historical background. Periodization, geography and setting, and proper names are recurrent points of interest, both here and in later sections of the volume. Part one also includes a new translation of Gaimar's Haveloc episode, which is the ultimate source for the lay, and this enables and encourages comparison between the lay of *Haveloc* and Gaimar's earlier version of the Haveloc story. The edition of the Anglo-Norman lay "completes a project, begun in the late 1990s, to ensure that all twenty-three of the non-Marie-de-France lays would be accessible for further study" (p. 5, n. 3). The lay of *Haveloc* survives in two manuscripts: London, College of Arms, MS Arundel XIV, fol. 125v, col. 1 – 132r, col. 2 (MS H), and Cologny-Genève, Bibliotheca Bodmeriana, MS Codex Bodmer 82, fol. 1r, col. 1-7v, col. 1 (MS P). Burgess and Brook select MS H as the base text for their edition, which is accompanied by a translation. However, the editors also provide a new edition of MS P, in an appendix, for ease of comparison with MS H. They draw attention to some of the differences between the two manuscript readings in their explanatory notes, which are thus an asset for readers wishing to compare the two texts of the lay.

The texts of the lay of *Haveloc* in both MS H and MS P have been edited before; but Burgess and Brook make a compelling case for the need of new editions of both texts. MS H was edited most recently in 1888 and MS P has only been edited once, by Alexander Bell, ed., *Le Lai d'Haveloc and Gaimar's Haveloc Episode* (Manchester: The University Press, 1925). Bell's edition, however, "is now quite hard to find" (p. 5). Moreover, it "incorporates some passages from H" into the edition of P, "thus adding fourteen lines to the 1098 lines in P (H has 1106 lines)" (p. 4, and see p. 10 for a list of the lines in P which do not appear in H). Clearly, previous editions of MS H are outdated, and Burgess and Brook's new edition of MS P makes a more reliable text of this manuscript version available to scholars and students alike. The editors' decision to use MS H as their base text was made "principally on the need for a critical edition of this version" (p. 10), in recognition of the critical tendency to consult Bell's edition of MS P. In their

view, “neither H nor P provides a more authentic text of the lay” (p. 10). Their volume will facilitate studies of both manuscript versions. Their editions follow the texts in MS H and MS P closely, with “as few corrections as are necessary for comprehension” (p. 10, and see p. 13).

Part two brings together shorter accounts of the legend, which are primarily embedded into larger histories of England’s rulers, “in order to show that over a lengthy period the story intrigued a number of writers of history and came to be an essential ingredient in any history of British kings,” and to “provide the materials for further research” (p. 46). The editors certainly achieve these aims.

The shorter versions of the Haveloc story are organized into three sections, by language: French, English and Latin. Each version has its own introduction, in which Burgess and Brook draw attention to some of the points of interest of the tale. They often look back to Gaimar’s Haveloc story and to the Anglo-Norman lay, drawing links between longer accounts and shorter ones, and encouraging fuller comparisons of all of these versions. I was delighted to see accounts from short chronicles such as Rauf de Boun’s *Le Petit Bruit* (1309), the so-called *Lignee des Bretons et des Engleis* (Brutus to King Edward I, found on fol. 149r of MS H), and the *Anonymous Short English Metrical Chronicle* (c. 1307), alongside accounts from longer historical texts, such as Sir Thomas Gray’s *Scalacronica* (c. 1363), Peter Langtoft’s *Chronicle*, Robert Mannyng’s *Chronicle of England* (or *Story of England*), the very different account of the Haveloc story found in the Lambeth Interpolation of Mannyng’s chronicle (in London, Lambeth Palace, MS 131), and the *Eulogium historiarum* (to 1366). The attention to Latin versions is especially important and valuable to facilitate future research, since these accounts have not received nearly as much critical attention as vernacular versions. The translations will be especially appealing to students, and ensure the volume’s accessibility to a wide readership. Some of the French and Latin versions have not been translated into modern English before.

A passage about Haveloc in one of the Latin accounts, which is a very brief part of a Latin prose *Brut* chronicle found in Wiltshire, Longleat House, MS 55 (the *Liber Rubeus Bathoniae*, or Red Book of Bath, c. 1420–30), resembles a short passage about the ruler in the Oldest Anglo-Norman Prose *Brut* chronicle. In both histories, the passage situated at the time of British king Belin (for the Prose *Brut*, see Julia Marvin, ed. and trans., *The Oldest Anglo-Norman Prose Brut Chronicle: An Edition and Translation* [Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2006], p. 100). It concerns a tribute paid to the Britons until the time of Haveloc, whose wife is referred to as Goldeburgh, not Argentille, as in the Prose *Brut*’s later Haveloc story (which takes place after the reign of King Arthur). The passage subsequently appears in many later versions of the Prose *Brut*, including the Anglo-Norman Prose *Brut* to 1332 (ed. Heather Pagan, [Manchester: University of Manchester for the Anglo-Norman Text Society, 2011], p. 51) and the Middle English Common Version (ed. Friedrich W. D. Brie [London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner, for the Early English Text society, 1906–08; repr. 1960], p. 26). Burgess and Brook include the Haveloc story from the Prose *Brut* to 1332 and Middle English Prose *Brut* in their volume (i.e. the account after Arthur’s time), but not this additional and earlier passage (during Belin’s reign). Although the passages in the Oldest Prose *Brut* and in Longleat MS 55’s Latin prose *Brut* are similar, there are some differences between them, notably the reference to Haveloc as king of Denmark and “ceste terre” in the Prose *Brut* (Marvin, ed. and trans., *Oldest*, p. 100) but as “king of Norway and Britain” (p. 206) in the Latin prose chronicle. Burgess and Brook point out that the Oldest Prose *Brut* was a source for the Latin *Brut* in Longleat MS 55 (p. 205). Erik Kooper has recently argued further that the Latin text represents an unacknowledged Latin Prose *Brut* chronicle (i.e. a Latin *Brut* in prose ultimately deriving from the Oldest Prose *Brut*): “Longleat House MS 55: An Unacknowledged *Brut* Manuscript?” in Jaclyn Rajsic, Erik Kooper, and Dominique Hoche, eds., *The Prose Brut and other Late Medieval Chronicles: Books Have Their Histories; Essays in Memory of Lister M. Matheson* (York: York Medieval Press, 2016), pp. 75–93. This would explain the close relationship between the two Haveloc passages. However, the editors could not have been aware of Kooper’s essay, since the collection in which it appears was published after their edition.

More accounts of the Haveloc legend may await discovery in unedited manuscripts. A few royal genealogical rolls, composed in the fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries, for instance, incorporate compressed accounts of the Haveloc story into their histories of England's rulers. Those known to me stem from the Anglo-Norman and Middle English Prose *Bruts* (see my "The English Prose *Brut* Chronicle on a Roll: Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, MS 546 and its History," in Rajsic, Kooper and Hoche, eds., *Books Have Their Histories*, pp. 105-24 [pp. 106 n. 4, 108-110, 116 n. 44]). These manuscripts contribute to Burgess and Brook's picture of the Haveloc legend's dynamic transmission and adaptation in English historical literature, and of its lasting appeal over time as part of the British and English pasts.

If there is a disappointment with the volume, then it is with the presentation of the edition and translation of MS H. Unfortunately, the edition and translation are non-facing, although a facing-page edition and translation was clearly the intention. Instead, the edition is one page ahead of the translation throughout. Lines 1-45 of the translation, for example (p. 50), face lines 46-90 of the edition (p. 51). The mismatch makes it tricky to compare text and translation, since to do so the reader must flip from one page to the next and then back again. On a more positive note, however, perhaps the arrangement will encourage readers to consult the Anglo-Norman text in the first instance, using the translation only when necessary. This would be welcome. Ultimately, the mismatch does not detract from the edition's importance or value as a resource for scholars and students.

This volume has a great deal to offer readers who are familiar with the Anglo-Norman lay of *Haveloc*—and the wider Haveloc legend—as well as those who are newcomers to it. Burgess and Brook's new editions of the lay in MS H and MS P will quickly become the standard ones, and the translation of the text in MS H makes the Anglo-Norman lay available to a wide audience of students and specialists. But the value of Burgess and Brook's work goes well beyond their study of the Anglo-Norman lay of *Haveloc*. Their attention to a range of later versions of the Haveloc legend, written from the medieval period through to the seventeenth-century (along with one modern English folk-tale), draws attention to several shorter accounts of the story and opens doors for further and fuller studies of the Haveloc legend in its many different versions.

Jaelyn Rajsic
Queen Mary University of London.
jaelyn.rajsic@qmul.ac.uk

Copyright © 2017 by the Society for French Historical Studies, all rights reserved. The Society for French Historical Studies permits the electronic distribution of individual reviews for nonprofit educational purposes, provided that full and accurate credit is given to the author, the date of publication, and the location of the review on the H-France website. The Society for French Historical Studies reserves the right to withdraw the license for redistribution/republication of individual reviews at any time and for any specific case. Neither bulk redistribution/republication in electronic form of more than five percent of the contents of H-France Review nor re-publication of any amount in print form will be permitted without permission. For any other proposed uses, contact the Editor-in-Chief of H-France Review. The views posted on H-France Review are not necessarily the views of the Society for French Historical Studies.