

NARRATIVE FORM AND MEDIAEVAL CONTINUITY IN  
THE PERCY FOLIO MANUSCRIPT:  
A STUDY OF SELECTED POEMS

by

S. G. St. Clair-Kendall

VOLUME I

A thesis submitted in fulfilment of  
the requirements for the degree of  
Doctor of Philosophy

DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH

UNIVERSITY OF SYDNEY

May, 1988.  
Revised September, 2007.

## **Mediaeval Continuity in *The Percy Folio***

Copyright © 1988, 2007. S.G. St. Clair-Kendall, PhD.

email: drkendall@optushome.com.au

Post: P.O. Box 463, King St, Newtown, NSW 2204, Australia.

Tel: +61 2 9569 5886

Please feel free to contact me as above if you have any queries, or if you have found this work useful.

## SYNOPSIS

This study examines the continuity of mediaeval literary tradition in selected rhymed narrative verse. These verses were composed for entertainment at various times prior to 1648. At or shortly before this date, they were collected into *The Percy Folio*: BL. Add. MS. 27,879.

Selected texts with an Historical or Romance topic are examined from two points of view: modification of source material and modification of traditional narrative stylistic structure.

First, an early historical poem is analysed to establish a possible paradigm of the conventions governing the mediaeval manipulation of fact or source material into a pleasing narrative. Other texts are compared with the result of this analysis and it is found that twenty paradigmatic items appear to summarize early convention as their presence in other poems is consistent — no text agreeing with less than twelve.

The second step is the presentation of the results of an analysis of some fifty mediaeval Romances. This was undertaken in order to delineate clearly selected motifemic formulae inherent in the composition of these popular narratives. It is shown that these motifemes, found in the Romances, are also present in the historical texts of *The Percy Folio*.

The findings, derived from both strands of investigation, are that mediaeval continuity exists in the texts studied. The factors which actually comprise this 'mediaeval continuity' are isolated: it is then seen that rather than discard tradition as society grew further and further from the early circumstances that gave rise to it, later poets have chosen to contrive modifications designed to fit new requirements as they arise. Such modifications, however, are always within the established conventional framework. In short, no text examined failed to echo tradition, and mediaeval continuity is an important feature of the popular rhymed narrative in 1648 and *The Percy Folio*.

\*\*\*\* \* \* \* \* \*\*\*\*

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish to thank my supervisor, Dr. David Lawton for his unstinting contributions of time, kindly patience and expertise. I also gratefully thank the Dean of the Faculty of Arts, Professor Sybil Jack and the following people in the Department of English, University of Sydney, for their invaluable personal support in difficult times, and continued interest and scholarly assistance over the years it has taken me to complete this study: Dr. Geraldine Barnes, Professor Leslie Rogers, Mrs. Margaret Singer, Dr. Diane Speed, and Professor G.A. Wilkes. My thanks are also due Professor Stephen Knight, Department of English, University of Melbourne, and Professor Bernard Martin, School of English, University of N.S.W.

Many other people assisted me, some in person and some through correspondence, and my thanks go to all of them: to Mr. Arthur Credland, Keeper, Town Docks Museum, Hull; to Professor K.S. Goldstein, Graduate Chairman, *Folklore and Folklife*, University of Pennsylvania; to Dr. W.H. Kelliher, Assistant Keeper of Manuscripts, The British Library, London; to Mr. Robert Latham, Pepys Librarian, Magdalene College, Cambridge; to Professor G. Legman, editor of *Kryptádia: Journal of Erotic Folklore*, Valbonne, France; to Mrs. Anne Norbury, of Poole Museum, Dorset; to Mr. Roger C. Norris, Deputy Chapter Librarian for the Dean and Chapter, Durham Cathedral; to Mrs. Catherine Oliphant (Stephenson), Rockville, Connecticut; to Professor Derek Pearsall, Harvard University; to Messenger Sergeant-Major Thomas Taylor, M.V.O., M.B.E., The Queen's Bodyguard of The Yeomen of the Guard, St. James's Palace, London; to Dr. Robert Thomson, English Department, University of Florida, and to Dr. Melanie Wisner, Houghton Library, Harvard.

I am also grateful to the Commonwealth Department of Education for financial support in the early part of this work and to Mr. Ross Carlidge and Mr. John Rosauer of the University Computing Centre, Sydney, for help with typesetting of tables in the later stages of this study. My thanks also go to Mr. Luke Kendall for permitting me to write the final draft of this work on his computer, and to Mr. Neil Walker of Information Concepts Pty. Ltd., Camperdown, who allowed me to typeset and print it on his laser-writer.

This thesis is dedicated to Walter Charman, Marjorie Charman  
and Luke Kendall.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

### VOLUME I

1. THE <i>PERCY FOLIO</i> MANUSCRIPT	
I. Introduction	[1]
A. The Purpose of This Study	[1]
II. Subject Texts	2
III. The Manuscript	5
A. Material State	5
B. Scribal Hands	6
C. Watermarks	8
D. Gathering	8
E. Dating	8
F. Other Notabilia	13
IV. Manuscript Contents	14
A. Titles in Manuscript Order	14
B. Quantification of Items	17
C. Singularity of Items	17
D. Authorship	17
E. Topics	20
V. The Collector and his Folio	22
2. HISTORICAL ITEMS — NATIONAL BATTLES	
I. Utilisation of Primary Material in <i>Durham Feilde</i>	[31]
a. Introduction	[31]
b. Synopsis of Tale	34
A. The Omission of Major Historical Facts	38
a. Introduction	38
b. The Omissions	38
c. The Effect of The Omissions	41
d. Omission of Detail	48
B. Modification of ‘Fact’	49
a. The Inventions	52
b. Conclusions	56
II. Organisation of Material and Date of Origin	57
a. Introduction	58
A. Systematisation of Narrative Units	58
a. Conclusions	58
B. <i>Durham</i> and <i>Neuil Cross</i> Compared	59
a. Introduction	59
b. Comparison	59
a. Conclusions	60
III. Summary of Findings: <i>Durham</i> as a Particular Text	60
A. Dating	62
IV. Form and Tradition	75
A. The Middle English Motifeme	77
B. Continuity and <i>Durham</i> as a ‘Model’ Text	97
V. Conclusions	103

3. HISTORICAL ITEMS — NATIONAL BATTLES: THE BATTLES OF AGINCOURT AND BOSWORTH	
I. Utilisation of Primary Material in <i>Agincourte Battell</i>	[106]
a. Introduction	[106]
b. Synopsis of Tale	110
A. The ‘Agincourte’ Poet’s Sources	113
a. <i>The Brut</i>	115
b. Hall	116
c. Conclusions	117
II. The ‘Durham’ Paradigm and <i>Agincourte Battell</i>	128
A. Examination ??	129
B. Conclusions	130
III. Form and Tradition in <i>Agincourte Battell</i>	128
A. The Motifemes	129
B. Conclusions	130
IV. Utilisation of Primary Material: <i>Bosworth Feilde</i>	133
a. Introduction	133
b. Synopsis of the Tale	140
A. The ‘Bosworth’ Poet’s Account and the Historical Sources	147
V. The ‘Durham’ Paradigm and <i>Bosworth Feilde</i>	147
A. Examination	147
B. Conclusions	160
VI. Form and Tradition in <i>Bosworth Feilde</i>	163
A. The Motifemes	164
VII. Conclusions	168
4. HISTORICAL ITEMS — NATIONAL BATTLES: THE BATTLE OF FLODDEN	
I. Utilisation of Primary Material in <i>Scotish Feilde</i>	[171]
a. Introduction	[171]
b. Synopsis of the Tale	173
A. The ‘Scotish’ Poet’s Account and the Historical Sources	178
II. The ‘Durham’ Paradigm and <i>Scotish Feilde</i>	179
A. Examination	179
B. Conclusions	187
III. Form and Tradition in <i>Scotish Feilde</i>	190
A. The Motifemes	190
B. Conclusions	195
IV. Utilisation of Primary Material in <i>Flodden Feilde</i>	197
a. Introduction	197
b. Synopsis of Tale	202
A. The ‘Flodden’ Poet’s Account and the Historical Sources	208
V. The ‘Durham’ Paradigm and <i>Flodden Feilde</i>	208
A. Examination	208
B. Conclusions	217
VI. Form and Tradition in <i>Flodden Feilde</i>	220
A. The Motifemes	221
VII. Conclusions	223

VOLUME II

5. HISTORICAL ITEMS — DOMESTIC EVENTS POEMS WHICH COMMEMORATE AN INDIVIDUAL	
I. Utilisation of Primary Material in Five Texts	[229]
A. Introduction	[229]
B. Synopses of Tales	242
C. Conclusions	245
II. The Historical Sources, the Five Texts and the Paradigm	248
A. Conclusions	265
III. Form and Tradition in the Five Texts	270
A. The Motifemes	271
IV. Conclusions	275
6. THE ROMANCE ITEMS	
I. <i>The grene knight</i> and <i>The Squier</i>	[278]
A. Introduction	[278]
II. <i>The grene knight</i>	[278]
A. Synopsis of the Tale	279
III. The 'Durham' Paradigm and <i>The grene knight</i>	288
A. Examination	288
B. Conclusions	302
IV. Form and Tradition in <i>The grene knight</i>	306
A. The Motifemes	306
B. Conclusions	310
V. <i>The Squier</i>	313
A. Introduction	313
B. Synopsis of the Tale	319
VI. The 'Durham' Paradigm and <i>The Squier</i>	322
A. Examination	323
B. Conclusions	327
VII. Form and Tradition in <i>The Squier</i>	
A. The Motifemes	330
VIII. Conclusions	331
7. MEDIAEVAL CONTINUITY AND <i>THE PERCY FOLIO</i>	[355]
I. Conclusions	[333]
A. Introduction	[333]
II. Conclusions — The Paradigm	334
III. Conclusions — The Motifeme	340
IV. Conclusions — General	343
Bibliography	[369]



LIST OF TABLES

1. Stylistic Structure of <i>Durham Feilde</i>	103
2. Stylistic Structure of <i>Agincourt Battell</i>	137
3. Stylistic Structure of <i>Bosworth Feilde</i>	173
4. Stylistic Structure of <i>Scotish Feilde</i>	198
5. Stylistic Structure of <i>Flodden Feilde</i>	231
6. Stylistic Structure of 'Egerton' Passage in <i>PF 39</i>	232
7. Stylistic Structure of <i>PF 168: Barton</i>	285
8. Stylistic Structure of <i>PF 87: Buckingham</i>	286
9. Stylistic Structure of <i>PF 122: William</i>	286
10. Stylistic Structure of <i>PF 183: Edgar</i>	287
11. Stylistic Structure of <i>PF 22: Aldingar</i>	288
12. Stylistic Structure of <i>The grene knight</i>	324
13. Stylistic Structure of <i>The Squier</i>	351

LIST OF FIGURES

1. Chronological distribution of the words 'Comminality' and 'Commons' in the thirty- two 'popular' rhymed texts in which they occurred in a searched sample of 2,350 such texts covering the period 1300-1800 .....	73
2. <i>Valediction</i> .....	85
3. <i>Terminal Status-Quo</i> .....	88
4. 'Other-worldly' references in the motifemes <i>exhortation</i> and <i>alediction</i> in the texts cited .....	106
5. Stanzaic patterning in <i>Bosworth</i> and <i>Durham</i> .....	147
6. Stanzaic patterning in <i>Flodden</i> .....	209
7. Weapons, crew and casualties cited in <i>Bartton</i> .....	266
8. Stanzaic patterning in <i>The Squier</i> .....	340
9. The 'Durham' paradigm and the Percy texts: I .....	357
10. The 'Durham' paradigm and the Percy texts: II .....	358

# CHAPTER ONE

## THE *PERCY FOLIO* MANUSCRIPT

### I. Introduction

#### A. *The Purpose of This Study*

Historians, for their convenience, have taken various spans of history, labelled them as particular 'Ages' or 'Periods' and confined them within specific dates. These dates are artificial: no period terminates abruptly, all periods encompass transitional years and some aspects of any given epoch are longer in passing than others. Thus the transitional area between ages is blurred. However, the general opinion among historians seems to be represented by Ferguson who suggests that by 1500 and the Tudors the mediaeval era in England is over.<sup>1</sup> This study explores the thesis that nevertheless there is a strand of mediaeval continuity which flourishes well beyond this date: it is postulated that this strand of continuity reflects something of the mediaeval picture of an ideal social order through the retention of the formulaic methods used to structure the tales in which the conventions of this unreal world were perpetuated. As Wittig has shown, the values of this idealistic social order, this 'Golden Myth', are an integral part of the Middle English Romance.<sup>2</sup> Since long-established values tend to change slowly, it is further postulated that the values of the Romance are likely to have continued in, and to have become part of, a tradition of popular entertainment. Therefore this study investigates the traditional content of sixteenth and seventeenth century narrative verse presented to the general public as unsophisticated rhymed entertainment. It demonstrates what part of mediaeval convention is retained unchanged, what is modified, and what is new.

The exploration of this thesis requires the presence of a large body of popular rhymed entertainment written down at a period distant, but not too distant, from the mediaeval years. Ideally the individual texts would be collected from a limited geographic area within a fairly short period; would cover many topics and be compiled by one man. Thus it would be possible to be reasonably sure of a representative sample of popular taste in one area at one time. Such is *The Percy Folio*.

- 
1. A.B. Ferguson, *The Indian Summer of English Chivalry* (Durham, N.C., 1960), p. 23 and *passim*. That this is a general opinion can be seen when it is noted that the periods covered in a wide selection of text books with the word 'mediaeval' in their title vary considerably, but that however different the span covered, none continue the mediaeval years later than the mid-fifteenth century and most terminate the period at or before 1400: in this respect they agree with the *OED* which places this age between the fifth and fifteenth centuries.
  2. S. Wittig, *Stylistic and Narrative Structures in the Middle English Romance* (Austin and London, 1978), Ch. 5, pp. 179-90. See also C. Fewster, *Traditionality and genre in the Middle English romance* (Cambridge, 1987), pp. 32-38.

## II. The Subject Texts

Since it is better to work from the known to the unknown, the items from the *Folio* which are first considered are those which concern themselves with events which either actually took place, and in consequence are dateable and subject to cross-reference from other sources, or ‘historical’ events which in all probability did *not* have a firm basis in fact but were believed by the Chroniclers to the extent that they appear in most early Annals.

There is good reason for opening this discussion of the mediaeval continuity of *The Percy Folio* with this approach: scholars who choose to discuss popular mediaeval fiction are often limited in their appreciation of the original text and the original writer’s ability.<sup>3</sup> There are two main causes for this limitation. First, the text under consideration is all too frequently not known to be, or not known to be unarguably identical with, the prototypical work. Secondly, unless the fictional text is known to be derived from a specific source which is in itself extant and uncorrupted, it is difficult or impossible to discover how the author utilised his primary material. The examination of some of the items in the *Folio* in which the *histoire* is concerned with the relation of actual historical events, together with a comparison with available historical documentation, show in what manner the author has manipulated the facts to create a pleasing tale and conform to narrative tradition.<sup>4</sup> This comparison is undertaken for each text examined. However, the first poem presented is scrutinised in depth and the second chapter produces a tentative paradigm which notes areas where source material has been adapted. The possibility of constructing such a paradigm is evident in the work of McMillan, who examined the battles of Durham (also known as the Battle of Neville’s Cross) and Flodden and the poems celebrating them — *PF 79: Durham Feilde* and *PF 39: [Flodden] Feilde*, together with two other engagements.<sup>5</sup> He scrutinised them with regard to their relationship between folklore and history. His methodology for a workable comparison between his texts and his historical sources involved the division of both the text and the historical accounts into general structural units of content, and he noted which were common to

---

3. Henceforward, unless otherwise stated ‘popular’ in this study *always* has the meaning as defined by the *OED*: **popular**. . . 2.a. . . Pertaining to the common people. 2.c. . . Having characteristics attributed to the common people. 4.a. Adapted to the understanding or the taste of ordinary people.

4. The term *histoire* (and the term *discours* which will also be used in this study) is defined following the French structuralist Todorov:

L’oeuvre littéraire a deux aspects: elle est en même temps une histoire et un discours. Elle est histoire dans ce sens qu’elle évoque une certaine réalité, des événements qui seraient passés, des personnages, qui, de se point de vue, se confondent avec ceux de la vie réelle. . . . Mais l’oeuvre est en même temps discours: il existe un narrateur qui relate l’histoire; et il y en face de lui un lecteur qui la perçoit. A ce niveau, ce ne sont pas les événements rapportés qui comptent mais la façon dont le narrateur nous les fait connaître.

Todorov, ‘Les catégories du récit littéraire’, *Communications*, 8 (1966), p. 126.’

In short, the *histoire* refers to the actual story being told; the *discours* refers to the manner of its telling.

5. The contents of *The Percy Folio (PF)* are listed and numbered in order of their appearance in the manuscript later in this chapter. Throughout this work titles of *Folio* texts are presented with the spelling and capitalisation of the manuscript.

D.J. McMillan, ‘Five Traditional Medieval Historical Ballads and the Nature of Oral Transmission’, Diss. University of Maryland 1963. An article based on this thesis is ‘Some Popular Views of Four Medieval Battles’, *Southern Folklore Quarterly*, 2, 31 (June 1966), 179-191.

both. He did not separate the units he found in the poetic texts from those he saw in the historical sources but set them out in chronological narrative order. This has the consequence that the content of the poetic text alone is not immediately apparent. He did not concern himself with *narrative complement* as presumably he felt his task did not require it.<sup>6</sup> However, McMillan's work forwards the idea that it is possible to analyse texts using the essential and basic facts fundamental to the *histoire* as a frame of reference.

For the purpose of this present study it is necessary to know, or to know as nearly as possible, what exactly is 'fact' and what 'fiction' in each of the 'historical' *Folio* texts being examined. Therefore, unlike McMillan, I compare the account given in *The Folio* against each of the historical annals and not *vice-versa*: that is to say that the 'facts' in the *histoire* of each of the relevant *Folio* texts are sought in the records consulted. Other 'facts' found in the records but not present in the *Folio* items are noted to determine whether they are similar in kind, may have suffered attrition from the work being studied through time or transmission, or may be deliberate omissions.

My first step is to look at the choice of accepted 'facts' present in the item being examined which it has in common with the accounts available; the next is to remark the notable components of received history which have been ignored and then to observe the narrative content of the item which would appear to have been invented. After this, the arrangement of the data present is assessed to determine whether it conforms to any specific pattern of narrative or stylistic structure and what continuity from earlier convention is present. Following examination of historical texts, two Romances — later variants of earlier narratives but, as they stand, unique to the *Folio* — are considered.

Wittig shows that the mediaeval Romance is composed of stylised units.<sup>7</sup> The least is the formulaic syntagmeme: this proceeds to the motifeme and is followed in size by the scene. All of these smaller units comprise the episode, one or more of which make up the completed tale. This study, for reasons which are explained presently, uses the motifeme as the optimal unit for analysis.<sup>8</sup> Although the following is expanded in my next chapter, for clarity a short and simple explanation of the terms 'syntagmeme' and 'motifeme' is given here. A syntagmeme is a lexical pattern, usually short and usually formulaic. It consists of a fairly rigid obligatory framework surrounding what Wittig terms a 'slot' which the poet fills with a word or words chosen from a usually formulaic 'set': for example, the conventional phrase

'that was both [ADJECTIVE] and [ADJECTIVE]'

is a syntagmeme that can be completed by the insertion of appropriate adjectives such as

---

6. 'Narrative complement' is used to mean the expansion or ornamentation of the basic statements relating to the fundamental *histoire*: it is an aspect of *discours* and will be discussed more fully later in this work.

I have refrained from frequently alluding to McMillan's work because (with reference to *Durham* at least) his conclusions are generally erroneous, owing to insufficient exploration of primary sources, too great a reliance on secondary material of doubtful scholarly merit, and an unquestioned assumption that *Durham* is a 'ballad' derived from 'traditional material' and orally 'transmitted' (see his Chapter Three).

7. S. Wittig, *Stylistic and Narrative Structures in the Middle English Romance*, University of Texas Press (Austin & London, 1978).

8. For a full and detailed exposition of the brief sketch presented here, see Wittig, *Stylistic and Narrative Structures*, pp. 37-79.

'bold' and 'brave', 'old' and 'young'. The expressions chosen to complete the syntagmeme are the 'syntagms'.

A motifeme is a larger unit of structural narrative composition but is similar to a syntagmeme in that it also involves poetic completion from a generally formulaic set of variables. As its name suggests, it is in fact a small 'motif' covering a given part of a tale, all of which part is concerned with the same idea. An example is the opening passage of a Romance where the entertainer gathers together and addresses his audience before beginning his story. This gathering and addressing is the motifeme *exhortation*. There are always several components available to complete a motifeme but only one is compulsory: for instance, *exhortation* has the optional components *prayer* and *synopsis*, and the obligatory component *exhortation*.<sup>9</sup> Each of these formulaic components can take a variety of forms: *prayer*, for instance, might address the Deity as 'God', 'Christ' or 'Trinity', or, in theory, request any kind of benefaction whatever — in fact of course, there is for the Romance poet, only a limited set of conventional desires from which he may choose. The matter which the poet chooses to use to complete a motifeme is called the 'allomotif'.

This brief outline has been included here because Wittig's interpretation of the motifeme as part of the stylistic and narrative structure of the Romance, is one of the underlying concepts upon which the work that follows, is built. Her source texts are fictional narratives of popular appeal and Middle English origins which are amenable to formal stylistic analysis. Therefore although the *Folio* 'historical' items are not strictly fictional, because they are similar to the Romance in that they were undoubtedly intended as rhymed entertainment, to appeal to a lay audience, they are assessed not only with regards to their lexical, metrical and factual content, but also with Wittig's analysis in mind. In particular the presence, absence or modification of the mediaeval motifeme is noted. For this reason it has proved necessary to expand Wittig's analysis in order to enlarge the material available for comparison. This expansion is done in the next chapter of this study and a *schema* is made of the traditional motifemes and their components. These show evidence of later mediaeval continuity.

The chosen subject texts are surveyed in the light of such questions as: What 'facts' from his source has the author chosen to use? How has he manipulated his material? In what degree has he oriented his work towards entertainment? Has he utilised methods or structures which conform to traditional audience expectations? Have such methods or structures been modified? The information thus collected for each work, when related to the other poems and the chronological span of the texts, shows what changes are or are not made, and over what period. These findings are set out in tabular form in my final chapter where it is shown that although the increasing dissemination of cheap, printed entertainment roughly parallels a decline in the use of traditional motifemes, the basic structure is not discarded but manipulated by the invention of new allomotif components to fit new circumstances. Thus I will show that the inner allomotif detail demonstrates a growing tendency to accommodate cultural change. However, since the new allomotifs complete the old motifemes, the reluctance to discard the outer traditional form of the motifeme can be seen as an effort to perpetuate an older ideal of narrative entertainment.

The following discussion of *The Percy Folio* is presented in this introductory chapter in order to show that my basic texts conform to the requirements of this study as

---

9. I argue presently that this motifeme may also have the components *moral* and *source*.

outlined above, and because *The Folio* has not been comprehensively described elsewhere.

### III. The Manuscript

*The Percy Folio* (BL. Add. MS. 27879) is named after Bishop Thomas Percy (1729-1811) who alleged that when he was very young he discovered the unbound manuscript 'lying dirty on the floor under a Bureau in y<sup>e</sup> Parlour; being used by the Maids to light the fire'.<sup>10</sup> He begged it from its owner, one Humphrey Pitt, Esq., of Shifnall in Shropshire. Percy gives no date for this discovery but another person, William Yonge, recalls that he read the manuscript as a boy when (about 1757) it was kept in a cupboard at Pitt's house.<sup>11</sup>

#### A. Material State

The manuscript is written on paper. As presently bound it contains 268 inscribed folios. The binding is modern: the original sheets have been gauzed on both sides and inset in paper frames. The framing leaves measure 44.5 x 23.5 cm while the original pages average 39 x 14.5 cm, although many of them are damaged and consist of half-sheets or fragmentary scraps. Whole sheets are present at fol. 1<sup>v</sup>, fols. 30-258 and 266-68. Fols. 2-28 are half-sheets and are the upper halves of the leaves. Folio 29, sometime after Furnivall's use of the manuscript about 1868, has separated into two halves. These have been collated incorrectly and mounted in the wrong order.<sup>12</sup> Thus fol. 28<sup>r</sup> ought to be the upper half of fol. 29<sup>r</sup> and fol. 28<sup>v</sup> should be the upper half of fol. 29<sup>v</sup> so forming fol. 29 containing the end of *PF* Item 20: *James & Browne* and the beginning of *PF* 21: *Sir Lambewell*.<sup>13</sup>

Folios 259-265 are fragments of varying size and shape; fols. 266-268 are complete. Folios 259 and 262-268 contain matter which was not part of the original manuscript, being notes and memoranda written by Percy (fols. 259, 263-64); Percy's index to the *Folio* items (fols. 266-68), and a stray poem written in a later hand than the *Folio* scribe's (fol. 265), unconnected with the manuscript but placed within it by some owner or user.

- 
10. BL. Add. MS. 27879, fol. 1<sup>v</sup>, also *Bishop Percy's Folio Manuscript*, eds. J.W. Hales & F.J. Furnivall, 3 vols. (London, 1868; facsim. Detroit, 1968), I [lxvi].  
Where necessary *The Percy Folio* will henceforward be referred to as *PF* and the Hales' and Furnivall's printed edition will be abbreviated to *HF*.
  11. L. Shepard, 'The Finding of the Percy Folio Manuscript: A Claim of Prior Discovery', *Notes and Queries*, ns. 14 (1957), p. 415.
  12. I brought this error to the attention of The British Library's Department of Manuscripts in January, 1985, when Mr. W.H. Kelliher, Assistant Keeper, kindly noted that my observation was correct.
  13. Because the individual texts which comprise *The Percy Folio* vary in kind — poems, songs, ballads, ditties, doggerel verses and so on — and the only feature held in common is that they are not prose, where appropriate the neutral term 'item' is used.  
A complete list in manuscript order of the individual items listed by title is given immediately after my description of the *Folio* itself. Throughout this study the item number and full title of a text to be discussed is given at its first mention; thereafter in any prolonged discussion of a particular work the item number and/or an abbreviation is given.

The original manuscript was paginated in ink; pp. \*1-4, \*13-14, \*250-53 and \*488-89 are now missing. Folio 63<sup>r</sup> and fol. 63<sup>v</sup> are both paginated as p. 127, and fol. 187<sup>v</sup> and fol. 188<sup>r</sup> are both paginated as p. 379: folio 148<sup>v</sup> and fol. 149<sup>r</sup> are both paginated as p. 301 but fol. 149<sup>v</sup> is correctly paginated as p. 303. Folio 188<sup>v</sup> being originally blank, has no page number (however see presently ‘Additional Matter’ and ‘Scribal Hands’.)

## B. Scribal Hands

### a. Main text — *Facile/Rapid Elizabethan Secretary with Hybrid Italic*

One scribe alone, in a variable hand — sometimes cramped, sometimes more spacious; sometimes hurried, sometimes more leisurely — wrote almost all the main text. There may be a little doubt in the case of folios 187-88 as the handwriting on fols. 187<sup>r</sup>, 187<sup>v</sup> and 188<sup>r</sup> is not wholly congruent with that which precedes and follows it.<sup>14</sup> However after careful study I believe that the handwriting here, though superficially different from elsewhere — noticeably in the random use of the miniscule cursive hybrid Italic *c* and the angular Secretarial form of the letter (cf. the word ‘came’ on fol. 187<sup>v</sup>, ll. 16 and 17) — is simply a sample of the scribe’s later hand which can be seen for instance, in *PF* 188: *Balowe*, fol. 257<sup>v</sup>. The more generally observable difference in the writing of fols. 187-188 does not lie in the formation of the letters but in the presentation of the text. These folios have been written in a leisurely manner on a sufficiently adequate amount of paper to allow for wider spacing between words and lines. Folio 188<sup>v</sup> was not found necessary for the completion of the text and so was left blank and unpaginated.

It is quite certain that folio 124 is in Percy’s own hand. He was (as he explains in a marginal note) replacing the end of *PF* 79: *Durham Feilde* which was ‘torn out in sending the subsequent piece [\**King Estmere*] to the Press’. This item is no longer present in the Manuscript and the pagination jumps from p. 248 to p. 254. *PF* 80: *Guy & Phillis*, which originally followed \**King Estmere* is now acephalous but according to Percy’s index once began on p. 252.

Bold Italic has been used for titles and for the initial word of each text, which word enlarged, consequently extends some little distance into the left-hand margin. Due to the ornamental thickening of each letter such words and titles are strongly ghosted on the reverse of each folio. The scribe’s normal Secretary hand is interrupted by the occasional and inconsistent use of Italic for proper nouns in some of the first items and more frequently in the later. Italic is also used to denote the beginning of a new ‘Part’ in those items which are divided into fitts.

### b. Additional Matter.

By ‘additional matter’ is meant items not apparently part of the original collection and marginalia other than Percy’s own voluminous annotations.

---

14. These folios cover the text for the last section of Part Three and the first section of Part Four of *PF* 111: *Sir Degree*.



- i. Folio 188<sup>v</sup> (no pagination). This folio contains a copy of Rochester's song 'I Promised Sylvia'. It is in a separate and later hand which has also written the opening line of Congreve's song 'I Tell Thee Charmion' beneath 'Sylvia'. 'Charmion' first occurred in Congreve's play *Love for Love* produced in 1695.
- ii. Folio 140<sup>r</sup>: right hand margin. A different hand from the above has added:

My sweet brother sweet Cous' Edward Reuell' Booke Elizabeth Reuell'

The abbreviation mark after Edward Revell is certainly for the apostrophe of ownership. This is not necessarily true of the similar mark after Elizabeth Revell. Other writing, upside-down in the left-hand margin of this folio, is probably a pen-trial. It is I think, in the same hand as the Revell note. It reads:

f f the sam  
 f henerey  
 h hen

- iii. Folio 265. The text of *PF* 195: *Such a Lover am I*, is in a different and later hand and uses modern punctuation. The text on the verso is written upside down — as though the bottom of the page were the top. This inversion does not occur elsewhere.

c. Punctuation.

- i. With the exception of the occasional colon employed haphazardly in some titles for apparently decorative purposes and its similar function after some Italic headwords, the *PF* scribe has used no formal punctuation whatever.<sup>15</sup>
- ii. In several items the *PF* scribe has used an idiosyncratic form of punctuation as follows:

*PF* 118: *In olde times paste*, p. 405 (fol. 201<sup>v</sup>); *PF* 131: *Now the springe is come*, p. 433 (fol. 215<sup>v</sup>). In the former the scribe has used the symbol:

:#:#:

In the latter he has used the same symbol but with three cross-strokes. The symbol signifies that the line is to be repeated.<sup>16</sup>

---

15. Throughout this study, where quotations are cited the punctuation employed is generally mine although from time to time the punctuation used may be found to agree with Hales and Furnivall. However unless punctuation is relevant to the point I am making or essential to the meaning of the lines cited, I have preferred to present items as they were written by the scribe. Similarly manuscript spelling is used: modernisation is present only in the use of the short 's' to replace the long 's', the expansion of abbreviations without comment, and the use of 'F' instead of ff.

16. That 'repeat' is the significance of this otherwise enigmatic symbol can be seen by comparing the *PF* text of this item with the same song as set out in *Elizabeth Roger's Virginall Book* (1656), BL. Add. MS. 10337.

*PF* 163: *A Louer off Late*, p. 486 (fol. 242<sup>f</sup>); *PF* 164: *Panders come awaye*, p. 486 (fol. 242<sup>f</sup>) and *PF* 174: *In the Dayes of olde*, p. 501 (fol. 248<sup>v</sup>), all have a bold comma ( , ) at a midline or near mid-line position to mean that the scribe has written as a single line that which which occurred as two short lines in his source.<sup>17</sup>

### C. Watermarks

The watermarks in the manuscript are principally of the ‘pot’ variety — a popular seventeenth century design.<sup>18</sup> The initials on the bowl vary from RP, RO and IM to GD. At fol. 187 occurs what appears to be the sole appearance in the *PF* of a set of posts or pillars. The following folio, 188, is also unique in that it alone of all the folios of the main text, has no discernible mark and is presumably the blank half of fol. 187. In view of the apparent change of handwriting of fols. 187-88 it would seem likely that these sheets are a later insertion — probably analogous in purpose to Percy’s own insertion of fol. 124 to replace a lost or damaged text.<sup>19</sup> Folio 124 is eighteenth century paper marked with a double-circle.

### D. Gathering

The watermarks in *The Percy Folio* fall across the central fold, sometimes towards the top and sometimes the foot according to the accidental make-up of the gatherings. In estimating the gatherings in the *Folio* I concluded that it was originally composed of sixteens with the gatherings at folios 110-24 and 125-39 each missing a sheet, and an irregularity that makes folios 172-86 a gathering of fourteen followed by a bifolium of fols. 187-88. It seems likely that folios 1-10 are the eighth to final leaves surviving from a gathering of sixteen of which the first seven are missing. The make up from folio 237 to the end is indeterminable.<sup>20</sup>

### E. Dating

There is little major change in the scribal hand throughout this lengthy manuscript. In the early part the script is facile/rapid Elizabethan Secretary with Hybrid-Italic for headings. As the manuscript progresses Hybrid-Italic is used more frequently for proper names requiring emphasis and the cursive Hybrid-Italic *c* appears in the body of the text

---

17. *PF* 163 and 164 are unique to *The Percy Folio* but *PF* 174 is by Thomas Deloney and copies of it are available in the Ewing, Shirburn, Bagford, and Pepys collections of broadside ballads. Using these as exemplars the meaning of the bold commas becomes apparent.

18. See E. Heawood, *Watermarks: Mainly of the 17th and 18th Centuries*, Vol. 1 of the *Monumenta Chartae Papyraceae Historiam Illustrantia* series (Hilversum, 1950). Regrettably I have been unable to find samples identical to the *Folio* watermarks in any of the standard works.

19. That this is an insertion is also born out by the repetition of the pagination for p. 379. The scribe probably noted that the last page before the new matter to be written was p. 379, kept the figure in mind and rewrote it so that p. 379 was duplicated.

20. For assistance with this information I am indebted to W.H. Kelliher, Assistant Keeper of the Department of Manuscripts at the British Library.

at fol. 176<sup>v</sup>. From that point onwards it replaces the old majuscule *C*, but the more angular Standard Secretary miniscule *c* is not discarded — both types being used at random. Similarly the Standard Secretary *x* is replaced at fol. 222<sup>v</sup> with a form resembling the modern letter and this is used from then onwards.<sup>21</sup> However the overall style does not degenerate into a comprehensively mixed hand: unlike other mingled scripts of the period, in *PF* there is no noticeable change in the formation of the miniscules *f*, *r*, long and short *s*, or *h* and the scribe uses Elizabethan Secretary cursive reversed *e* to the end of the manuscript.

Elizabethan Secretary had become unusual by the end of the third decade of the 17th century and the gradual trend was towards the increasing use of Italic so that with the exception of a few elderly diehards, the use of Secretary had passed by the fifties.<sup>22</sup> Elizabethan Secretary was established by about 1560 and flourished until about the end of the 1630s, when it survived in a ‘diluted form by admixture with *italic*’.<sup>23</sup> The hand of *The Percy Folio* then, would appear probably to be post 1630 and prior to 1650.

The general homogeneity of the *Folio*’s hand, the consistency of the ink used and the paper upon which it is written, as well as the uniformity of presentation, all point to the manuscript having been completed in a relatively short space of time: ten years would be a generous estimate.

There are only four *PF* items that can certainly be dated later than 1641: *PF* 49: *When loue with unconfinde*; *PF* 51: *The Kinge enjoyes his righ[ts againe]*; *PF* 56: *Newarke*; *PF* 59: *The tribe off Banburye*.

*PF* 49 is well known and is generally accepted as being by Richard Lovelace (1618-1658). Lovelace’s contemporary, Anthony á Wood (1632-1695) reported that Lovelace ‘was made choice of . . . to deliver the Kentish petition to the house of commons, for restoring the king. . . . For which piece of service he was committed to the Gatehouse at Westminster, where he made that celebrated song called *Stone walls do not a Prison make*’.<sup>24</sup> This imprisonment took place in 1642 for some three or four months.<sup>25</sup> The song was printed in 1649 in Lovelace’s *Lucasta*. It became very popular — an expanded version based on Lovelace’s poem (but bearing little relationship to *PF* 49) was printed as a broadside ballad, *The Pensive Prisoner’s Apology* (registered with the Stationers’ Company in 1656). It was also set to music and appeared in Playford’s *Select Ayres and Dialogues* of 1659.<sup>26</sup> It is unlikely that the *Folio* scribe was familiar with the printed version as the *PF* text contains the line:

---

21. Not first seen as Furnivall states ‘at p. 342’ [fol. 235<sup>r</sup>]: *HF*, I [v].

22. A.G. Petti, *English Literary Hands from Chaucer to Dryden* (London, 1977), p. 20; G.E. Dawson and L. Kennedy-Skipton, *Elizabethan Handwriting: 1500-1650* (London, 1966), p. 12.

23. Petti, *English Literary Hands*, p. 12.

24. A. Wood & P. Bliss, *Athenae Oxoniensis*, 3rd edition (London, 1817; rpt. New York, 1976), Vol. 3, col. 460ff.

A note: ‘Captaine loueles made this poem in his duresse at the Gatehouse’, heads the text in Harl. MS. 6918, fol. 94<sup>v</sup>. See also Ashmole Montagu e.14, fol. 26<sup>v</sup>.

25. Wood & Bliss, *idem.*; *Cavalier Poets*, ed. T. Clayton (Oxford, 1978), p. 330.

26. H.E. Rollins, *An Analytical Index of the Ballad Entries (1557-1709) in the Registers of the Company of Stationers of London* (Chapel Hill, NC, 1924), item 2064, p. 179.

For a copy of the broadside see *Roxburghe Ballads*, ed. W. Chappell (Hertford, 1875) (Rox. Coll. I, 498), p. 178ff.

*The Poems of Richard Lovelace*, ed. C.H. Wilkinson (Oxford, 1930), III, 286.

The burds that wanton in the ayre. . . .

line 7

All but one of the extant manuscript versions of this poem, have this line. The exception is probably taken from the printed variant which has

The gods which wanton in the ayre. . . .

Similarly *PF* 49 has:

The spotlesse soule an innocent . . .

line 27

This is the version found in the manuscripts: the printed copies have:

Minds innocent and quiet . . .<sup>27</sup>

It would therefore appear probable that *PF* 49 was obtained either at first or second hand from a manuscript pre-1649. It is known that Lovelace ‘fram’d his poems for the press’ and published them in that year. It is likely that the printed version is the poet’s revision and that (*vide* the manuscripts) these revisions were unknown before that time. Because the *PF* poems are written *seriatim*, running over from one page to the next and with the correct catch-words, their original order appears to have been as it is today. Therefore it seems that the *Folio* scribe had reached *PF* 49, page 191 (fol. 95<sup>v</sup>) sometime between 1643 and 1649.

On the evidence of a passage from *The Gossips Feast, or Morrall Tales* (1647), which names the ballad and its author, *PF* 51 would appear to be by the famous balladist and Royalist sympathiser, Martin Parker.<sup>28</sup> The following lines are informative:

Full 40 yeeres his royal crowne  
Hath been his fathers and his owne. . . .

*PF* 51: ll. 17-18

The ‘his’ refers to Charles I and therefore (if the given figure is accurate) the earliest date of composition would seem to be post July 1643.<sup>29</sup> However BL. Add. MS. 22603, fol. 17<sup>v</sup> contains a copy of this piece headed ‘on the Prognosticators of the yeare 1644’. This may be the correct date if the ‘full’ in ‘full 40 yeeres’ is not present merely for alliteration but has an emphatic function and means ‘40 complete years’. Since *PF* 50, which separates *PF* 49 from this work, is short — 28 lines — it is probable that *PF* 49 and 51 were written into the *Folio* without any great interval of time between them.<sup>30</sup>

The next dateable item, *PF* 59, *The tribe off Banburye* refers to an incident occurring in the First Civil War on the 8th August, 1642.<sup>31</sup> It is of no further significance

---

27. Wilkinson (ed.), *Poems*, p. 284.

28. *A Collection of National English Airs*, ed. W. Chappell (London, 1840), p. 177. This fact is also noted by Hales in his preface (*HF* II, 24) and the majority of other scholars who have had need to make reference to this ballad — which is thought to have had much influence on popular Royalist opinion.

29. James I, Charles’ father, was crowned on St. James’ Day (July 25th), 1603.

30. *PF* 50, *Cloris*, is reputed to be by George Waller (1606-1687) but its date of composition is not known. It appears in the 1686 edition of his poems but not in the earlier collections.

in relation to the dating of the *Folio*.

*PF 56, Newarke*, thought to be by John Cleveland (1613-1658) is rather more closely dateable than would appear from Hales' preface.<sup>32</sup> The extract he cites from Samuel Lewis' *Topographical Dictionary of England* is lacking in accuracy: the second Governor of Newark was not Sir John Byron, but Sir Richard Byron.<sup>33</sup> This is important since if, as Percy suggests in a marginal note (*PF* fol. 195<sup>v</sup>), Cleveland was the author and writing when he was Judge Advocate, he entered this office under the Governorship of Sir Richard Willis. I have been unable to discover the precise date of Willis' appointment but Sir Richard Byron ceased to hold gubernatorial office about January 1645 and Sir Richard Willis succeeded him. His tour of duty was short, ending as it did in October 1645 when he was replaced by Lord Bellasyse who surrendered Newark on the King's orders on the 8th of May, 1646. Thus the text's original composition was between February 1645 and May 1646 since Cleveland kept his position until Newark's surrender.<sup>34</sup> However internal evidence unrelated to putative authorship and which has been overlooked by Furnivall and Hales, places the song quite certainly after the relief of Newark in March 1644. The crucial reference is to 'Sweetelipps' in the following lines:

but if Lesly gett [the Scotts] in his power  
gode Leard, heele play the devill & all,  
but let him take heed how hee comes there  
lest Sweetelipps ring him a peale in his eare.

*PF 56: ll. 12-16*

'Sweetelipps' is a gun: 'a Basiliske of Hull foure yards long, shooting 32 lbs.'<sup>35</sup> It formed part of the parliamentarian ordnance captured by the royalists after the relief of Newark on March, 21st 1644. Prior to this acquisition 'Sweetelipps' has not been a royalist piece; yet in this royalist song — 'here's a health to King Charles' (line 3) — it is held up as a threat to the roundhead General Leslie. It follows that the song dates from after the basilisk's capture.

The last two lines of the song are also helpful:

for Morrise our prince is coming amaine  
to rowte & make them run againe.

*PF 56: ll. 23-24*

- 
31. G. Risdill-Smith and M. Toynbee, *Leaders of the Civil Wars 1642-1648*, (Kineton, Warwicks., 1977), p. 160.
  32. *HF* II, p. 33
  33. 'Mercurivs Avlievs: Saturday, March 23 1643' (sic: properly 1644), *The English Revolution, III, Newsbooks I, Oxford Royalist* (facsim. London, 1971), Vol. 2, p. 898.
  34. *DNB*, ed. S. Stephen and S. Lee (London, 1949-50), IV, 506ff.  
A remark found in this reference: 'We are assured that Cleveland foresaw and declared beforehand, that shameful sale of his sovereign's blood three days before the king reached the Scottish army' is in line with line 9 of *PF 56*: 'All beyond trent be sold to the scott' and may lend some credence to the attribution of Cleveland as author.
  35. *A Briefe Relation of the Siege at Newark* (London, Mar. 26, 1644), Thomason Tracts: E.39.8. See also E.38.10.  
The name apparently derives from the nickname of a notorious Hull whore of the period (private communication from Arthur Credland, Keeper, Town Docks Museum, Hull; also Anne Norbury, Assistant Curator, Poole Museum, Dorset).

This refers to Prince Maurice of the Rhine (1621-1652) who with his brother Prince Rupert, commanded a large section of the royalist force. Both the princes left England in July 1646. Therefore from internal evidence, *PF 56* was composed between March 1644 and July 1646.<sup>36</sup> This period can be narrowed to the months covering the last siege of Newark. On November 27th, 1645 the town was beleaguered by the Scots, who took up a position to the north, and by the parliamentarians who under Colonel-General Pyntz, sat to the south.<sup>37</sup> Two things lead to the conclusion that it was after this that *PF 56* was composed. First, there is the external evidence that since the siege of March 1645, Newark appears to have been relatively safe and in no particular need of especial rallying — Charles himself stayed there in October 1645 for the purpose of consultation with several of his commanders. The second thing to be considered is the internal pointer found in the bitter cry:

all beyond trent be sold to the scott,  
to men of a new protestation.

*PF 56: ll. 9-10*

Newark's full name is Newark-Upon-Trent and the lines quoted in the context of current events, refer to:

- a. The Parliamentary negotiations currently under way between the Lords and Commons and the Scottish Commissioners;
- b. Postponement (13th November) of Parliamentary demands for the surrender of northern strongholds in order that Parliament might avail itself of Scottish support;
- c. The subsequent Scottish march southwards.
- d. The investment of Newark.<sup>38</sup>

Thus it appears that *Newarke* was composed between mid-November, 1645 and Newark's surrender on the 8th of May the following year. November appears probable because of the following lines:

heeres a helth to our garrisons drinke it to them  
theyle keep vs all warme in December.  
I care not a figg what enemy comes  
for wee doe account them but hop of my thumbs. . . .

*PF 56: ll. 19-22*

This extract indicates that the enemy is on its way but has not yet arrived, and the date is prior to December. The tone of the song is exactly appropriate to the braggadocio which might be expected in such a situation.

If *PF 56* was composed circa November 1645, at Newark, then in view of the martial circumstances pertaining to a siege, it is unlikely that the Percy scribe would have known it, heard it, or seen a copy of it (unless he was himself present — and nowhere is there anything to suggest that he may have been) before New Year at the earliest and probably not until after the surrender of Newark in May, 1646.

---

36. P. Morrah, *Prince Rupert of the Rhine* (London, 1976), p. 208.

37. S.R. Gardiner, *History of the Great Civil War, 1642-1649* (New York, 1965), III, 11.

38. Gardiner, *Hist.*, III, 10ff.

I have dealt with *PF 56: Newarke*, at some length because insofar as I have been able to determine, this item has the most recent date of the few datable items within the *Folio*. Thus it can be inferred that the *Folio* scribe had reached *PF 56*, page 195 (fol. 97<sup>v</sup>) no earlier than January 1646. All the Royalist songs in the *Folio* occur between items 44 to 59 inclusive.<sup>39</sup> In other words they fall between pages 182 -196 (fols. 91-98) — some eight folios. Thereafter for the remaining 163 folios or 326 pages, the scribe confines himself to other, less potentially dangerous topics. This sudden flurry of political interest and its abrupt cessation is perhaps significant. For the present purpose it seems reasonable to argue that this small gathering of Royalist songs was written down over a short period, probably while enthusiasm ran high and prior to the Royalist defeat and the disbandment of the king's army in June, 1646. The remainder of the *Folio* must post-date mid 1646 or so and such is the bulk of the material in it that it could not have been collected and copied in much less than two years, and given that the task was unlikely to have been the Scribe's sole occupation, probably longer. The fact that there is no mention of the death of Charles I suggests that the *Folio* as we have it was completed before his execution of the 30th January, 1649. Thus the compilation of the *Percy Folio* can be dated with reasonable certainty as having taken place on various occasions between 1640 and 1648.

#### *F. Other Notabilia*

Commencing with the first complete sheets of the *Folio* a considerable number of folios have a horizontal crease approximately 20cm from the upper edge of the paper; in other words this crease occurs half-way down the sheets where it is present. In some instances this crease is so pronounced that separation or near separation of the two halves has occurred and actual damage to the paper is clearly visible. This is particularly evident in the folios of the first two complete gatherings (fols. 28-45 and 46-61), although the gathering of folios 94-109 is badly damaged up to the central sheet of the group. After the first two gatherings the crease is most plainly visible in the outer folios of each gathering until from fol. 155 it disappears entirely. The evidence of wear on the outer sheets (also noted by Baird), may have come about (and I can think of no other more plausible explanation) if the scribe folded a gathering in half, put it in his pocket or perhaps saddle-bag, and took it on expeditions to the 'field'.<sup>40</sup> The lack of horizontal wear towards the end of the *Folio* can be accounted for by an increase in static copying from material available to the scribe at a given location. That this is so is highly likely in view of the increase of texts known to have been copied from printed sources, and which are present in increasing numbers in the last quarter of the manuscript.<sup>41</sup> Thus if the creases were made whilst the gathering was being carried on field-work it is highly likely that many of the texts were derived from oral sources and are authentic reproductions of works which were sufficiently popular to be sung or recited in the 1640s.<sup>42</sup>

---

39. *PF 157: A Caulere* is, despite its title, *not* a political text.

40. *Scottish Feilde and Flodden Feilde: Two Flodden Poems*, ed. I.F. Baird, (New York & London, 1982), p. xxiii.

41. R.A. Schwegler, 'Sources of the Ballads in Bishop Percy's Folio Manuscript', Diss. Chicago 1977.

42. The oral content of the *Folio* is however, marginal to my thesis: for further reference see D.C. Fowler, *A literary history of the popular ballad* (Durham, NC, 1968), Chapter 5, p. 132f; A.B. Friedman, *The Ballad Revival* (Chicago & London, 1967), pp. 29-31 and Schwegler, *Sources. passim*.

## IV. The Contents of the Manuscript

### A. A List of Titles in Manuscript Order

Item No.	Title
1.	<i>[Robin Hood, a Beggar and the Three Squires]</i>
2.	<i>[Robin Hood and the Butcher]</i>
3.	<i>Robine Hood &amp; Fryer Tucke</i>
4.	<i>[Robin Hood and the Pindar of Wakefield]</i>
5.	<i>Robin Hoode &amp; Quene Kath[erine]</i>
6.	<i>[Little John, the Beggar and the Three Palmers]</i>
7.	<i>Robin Hoode his death</i>
8.	<i>[King Arthur and the King of Cornwall]</i>
9.	<i>Sir Lionell</i>
10.	<i>[Captain Carre]</i>
11.	<i>Sir Lancelott of Dulake</i>
12.	<i>The Turke &amp; Gowin</i>
13.	<i>The Marriage of Sir Gawaine</i>
14.	<i>[Lord Barnard and Little Musgrave]</i>
15.	<i>Muselboorrowe Feild</i>
16.	<i>[Thomas, Lord Cromwell]</i>
17.	<i>Listen Jolly Gent[lemen]</i>
18.	<i>See the bwildinge</i>
19.	<i>[The Child of Ell]</i>
20.	<i>Kinge James and Browne</i>
21.	<i>Sir Lambewell</i>
22.	<i>Sir Aldingar</i>
23.	<i>The heire of L[in]</i>
24.	<i>Lord of Learne</i>
25.	<i>Scotish Feilde</i>
26.	<i>Old Robin of Portinga[le]</i>
27.	<i>As it befell one Saturday</i>
28.	<i>Walking in a Meadow gren[e]</i>
29.	<i>G[las]gerion</i>
30.	<i>O Jolly Robin</i>
31.	<i>Came you not From</i>
32.	<i>I haue a loue thats faire</i>
33.	<i>When Phebus addrest</i>
34.	<i>Fryar &amp; Boye</i>
35.	<i>As I was ridinge by the [way]</i>
36.	<i>The man that hath</i>
37.	<i>Earles of Chester</i>
38.	<i>Earle of westmorlande</i>
39.	<i>[Flodden] Feilde</i>
40.	<i>Eger and Grine</i>
41.	<i>Merline</i>
42.	<i>Dulcina</i>
43.	<i>Kinge Arthurs Death</i>
44.	<i>Off a puritane</i>
45.	<i>Cooke Laurel</i>
46.	<i>Kinge John &amp; Bishoppe</i>
47.	<i>Marye Aumbree</i>
48.	<i>Cheuey Chase</i>
49.	<i>When Loue with unconfined</i>
50.	<i>[Cloris]</i>
51.	<i>The kinge enioyes his righ[ts againe]</i>
52.	<i>[The Aegiptian Quene]</i>
53.	<i>The Mode of France</i>



54. *[Be not] afrayd*
55. *Hollowe me Fancye*
56. *Newarke*
57. *Amongst the mirtles*
58. *[The worlde is ch]anged*
59. *The Tribe off Banburye*
60. *[Doe you mea]ne*
61. *A maid & a young man*
62. *Ay me Ay me*
63. *Faine Wolde I change*
64. *When First I sawe*
65. *A creature For Feature*
66. *Lye alone*
67. *How fayre shee be*
68. *Dow[ne] sate the shepard*
69. *Men that More*
70. *[Come] come come*
71. *The grene knight*
72. *Sir Triamore*
73. *Guye & Amarant*
74. *Cales Voyage*
75. *Kinge & Miller*
76. *Panche*
77. *Agincourte Battell*
78. *Conscience*
79. *Durham Feilde*
80. *[Guy & Phillis]*
81. *John a Side*
82. *Risinge in the Northe*
83. *Northumberland Betrayd by Dowglas*
84. *Guye of Gisborne*
85. *Herefford & Norfolke*
86. *Ladyes Fall*
87. *Buckingham betrayd by Banister*
88. *Earle Bodwell*
89. *Bishoppe & Browne*
90. *Chil[de] Waters*
91. *Bessie off Bednall*
92. *Hugh Spencer*
93. *Kinge Adler*
94. *Boy and Mantle*
95. *When as I doe reccord*
96. *White rose & red*
97. *Bell my Wiffe*
98. *I liue where I loue*
99. *Younge Andrew*
100. *A Jigge*
101. *Eglamore*
102. *When Scortching Phæbus*
103. *The Emperour & the childe*
104. *Sittinge Late*
105. *Libius Disconius*
106. *Childe Maurice*
107. *Phi[ll]is hoe*
108. *Guy & Colbrande*
109. *John De Reeue*
110. *Sir Cawline*
111. *Sir Degree*
112. *In a May morninge*
113. *The Turke in Linen*
114. *Death & Liffe*
115. *Adam Bell Clime of the Cloug[he] & Willam of Cloudeslee*
116. *Younge Cloudeslee*
117. *Come wanton wenches*
118. *In olde times paste*

119. *Darkesome Cell*
120. *Marke more Foole*
121. *Thomas of Potte*
122. *[William the Conquerour]*
123. *The Drowning of Henerey the i his Children*
124. *Murthering of Edward the Fourth his sonnes*
125. *The Fall off Prince[s]*
126. *The nutt Browne mayd*
127. *The rose of Englande*
128. *The pore man and the Kinge*
129. *Sir John Butler*
130. *Will Stewart & John*
131. *Now the springe is come*
132. *Bosworth Feilde*
133. *Aæneas & Dido*
134. *As it befell on a Day*
135. *The Squier*
136. *Blame not a Woman*
137. *O noble Festus*
138. *O Watt where art tho*
139. *Carle off Carlile*
140. *Off all the seaes*
141. *Hero & Leamder [sic]*
142. *Cressus*
143. *Songs of Sheparden*
144. *Louers heake alarum [sic]*
145. *A Freinde of mine*
146. *O nay O nay not yett*
147. *I Cannot Bee contented*
148. *Lillumwham*
149. *The Sea Crabb*
150. *Last night I thought*
151. *The Lauinian Shore*
152. *Come my dainty doxeys*
153. *To Oxfforde*
154. *Ladye Bessiye*
155. *Are Women Faire*
156. *I Dreamed my Loue*
157. *The Cauilere*
158. *A Propecye [sic]*
159. *Maudline*
160. *Come pretty wanton*
161. *Hee is a Foole*
162. *Lulla Lulla*
163. *A Louer off Late*
164. *Panders come awaye*
165. *Great or Proude*
166. *A Dainty Ducke*
167. *[The Spanish Ladies Love]*
168. *Sir Andrew Bartton*
169. *The Sillye Siluan*
170. *Patient Grissell*
171. *Scroope & Browne*
172. *Now Fye on Dreames*
173. *Kinge Humber*
174. *In the Dayes of olde*
175. *Amintas*
176. *Winninge of Cales*
177. *Edward the third*
178. *As yee came fr the Holye [sic]*
179. *Leoffricus*
180. *A Mayden heade*
181. *Tom Longe*
182. *Proude where the Spenc[ers]*
183. *Kinge Edgar*

184. *Christoper White* [sic]
185. *Queene Dido*
186. *Alffonso & Ganselo*
187. *All in a greene meadow*
188. *Balowe*
189. *Old Simon the Kinge*
190. *Gentle Heardsman*
191. *Thomas You Cannott*
192. *I am [ . . . ]*
193. *Coridon*
194. *[Siege of] Roune*
195. *[Such a Lover am I]*

## B. Quantification of Items

*The Percy Folio* is a collection of 195 individually titled items in verse. The 196th which would have been *PF 80: King Estmere*, was removed by Bishop Percy when he sent it to the press to be included in his *Reliques of Ancient Poetry*: it is not therefore included in this exploration of the *Folio*. *PF 194: [Such a lover am I]* is a later addition to the *Folio* and is also omitted from this discussion.

A text of *PF 42: Dulcina* is present in BL. MS. 116011. 1. 25 fol. 35<sup>v</sup>, *Giles Earle his booke* (1615), where *PF 60: Doe you meane* is shown to have been a Second Part to *Dulcina*. *PF 60* therefore may not be a separate item as the *Folio* has it. However I have found no other instance of *PF 60* to confirm or deny its association with *PF 42*. Since the extant texts of *Dulcina* in the Roxburghe, Pepys, Douce and Jersey ballad collections cite a different Second Part to *PF 42*, it is here listed as a free-standing text and one of the 194 items which still remain to the original collection.<sup>43</sup>

## C. Singularity of Items

Of these 194 items, 56 have no existence other than within *The Percy Folio*, neither in a foreign language variant nor in any version which can be seen to have a common origin with the *Folio* text. Perhaps not surprisingly, 23 of these 56 are late sixteenth and early seventeenth century bawdy songs written in the popular idiom. Of the remaining 138 *PF* items, 32 are unique as they stand: that is to say that although the actual *Folio* texts exist nowhere else, there are variants in another language or the *Folio* text is seen to be an interpretation of matter which exists elsewhere but in a different form. The text of *The Squier* (*PF 135*) for instance, is undoubtedly unique to the *Folio* but its narrative content is plainly a version of the Middle English Romance *The Squire of Low Degre*. Such items, although they have a singular aspect, cannot be defined as unique on all counts.

## D. Authorship

None of the 56 items of which no variant version is known has up to now been

---

43. Rox Coll. II. 402; Pepys, IV 6; Douce, II. 204; Jersey, I. 295. It is in any case doubtful if these two ballads belong together as the repeated refrain of the last line of each stanza of *PF 42* is in no way echoed in *PF 60* — while being a notable feature of the Second Part printed in the ballads cited above.

firmly established as being the work of any one author although, as noted, Cleveland probably wrote *Newarke*. It is also possible to speculate that *PF 69: Men that more* is the work of Thomas Churchyard (?1520-1604) on the grounds that first, the subject and the style are closely allied to other texts from his known works and secondly, that the item contains a pun on his name in the manner in which he has included such puns or cognominal references in other, authenticated verses. The evidence for *PF 142: Cressus* being an hitherto unrecognised work from Thomas Campion (c.1567-1620) written to pair with his known song *Aeneas & Dido (PF 133)*, is very much stronger. It is based on the fact that in-depth analysis of the two texts demonstrates that there is no feature in the one poem that does not have a matched counterpart in the corresponding work. This pairing is present to such an extent that one song can only be an ‘answer’ to the other and almost certainly the work of the same author.<sup>44</sup>

The original authors of the 29 traditional narratives retold in the *Folio* items which are unique as they stand are not surprisingly, unknown. The composers of the *Folio* texts are also quite anonymous. The earliest known writer whose work is represented in the *Folio* is John Page in the fragmentary and slightly modernised *PF 194: [The Siege of] Roune*. This siege was begun on July the 30th, 1418 and the author states that he was present throughout. It is not known when the poem began its circulation but it was probably before the accession of Henry VI in 1422.<sup>45</sup>

After this early author there is a considerable temporal gap until the next writer, William Elderton (d. ?1592). There are several copies of ballads that came from his pen, the earliest being *PF 89: Bishoppe & Browne*.<sup>46</sup> This was registered with the Stationers’ Company on May the 31st, 1581.<sup>47</sup> The oldest extant copy is with the Society of Antiquaries in London and the author ‘VV. Elderton’ is given at the foot of the ballad.<sup>48</sup>

The *Folio* also has items by or attributed to, some twenty-one late sixteenth/early seventeenth century writers, ranging from the well-known author to the obscure hack or private gentleman. In alphabetical order these authors are as follows:-

<i>PF 175:</i>	Robert Aytoun	1570-1638
<i>PF 119:</i>	? William Basse	? 1590-1653
<i>PF 37:</i>	Richard Bostock <sup>49</sup>	fl. 1628
<i>PF 133; 142:</i>	Thomas Campion	1657-1620
<i>PF 69:</i>	? Thomas Churchyard	? 1520-1604
<i>PF 52: ? 56</i>	John Cleveland	1613-1658
<i>PF 32:</i>	? Richard Climsell	fl. 1630s
<i>PF 137:</i>	Richard Corbet	1582-1635
<i>PF 11; 85; ?91; 122; 122; 123; ?167;</i>		

44. However, this discovery is peripheral to the principal subject of this study and is therefore not detailed here.

45. H. Huscher, *John Page’s Siege of Rouen: Kritische Textausgabe Nebst Ausführlicher, Einleitung, Anmerkungen, Glossar und Zwei Kartenbeilagen* (Leipzig, 1927), p. 108ff.

46. The others are *PF 20: Kinge James & Browne* and possibly *PF 47: Mary Aumbree*.

47. Rollins, *Index*, p. 51.

48. Archives at the Society of Antiquaries, Burlington House, London: *Broadsides: Henry VIII, Elizabeth 1519-1603, 1-107*, no. 71.

As far as I have been able to determine this and the *Folio* copy are the only ones still in existence.

170; 173; ?176;		
179; 183; 186:	Thomas Deloney	? 1543-1600
PF 64:	? Thomas Ford	? 1580 -1648
PF 57:	Robert Herrick	1591-1674
PF 113:	Thomas Heywood	? 1574-1630
PF 45:	Benjamin Jonson	1572-1637
PF 54	? Thomas Jordan	? 1612-1685
PF 49	Richard Lovelace	1618-?1657
PF 141:	William Meash	fl. 1614
PF 152	Thomas Middleton	1580-1627
PF 51:	Martin Parker	? 1612-1656
PF 73:	Samuel Rowlands	? 1570-1630
PF 50:	Edmund Waller	1606-1687
PF 67; 161:	George Wither	1588-1667

PF 178: *As yee came from the Holye Land* has been accepted by some scholars, such as Latham and Chambers, as being the work of Sir Walter Raleigh (1552-1618) on the grounds that the style is similar to his known works and the Bodleian MS. Rawl. poet. 85, fol. 123<sup>r</sup>, has a copy of the poem signed ‘Sir W.R.’.<sup>50</sup> However, not all scholars agree: Professor Mann reproduces it in *The Works of Thomas Deloney* on the argument that it was printed in Deloney’s *Garland of Good Will* — probably first published in 1593, as it was in that year that it was first entered into the Stationers’ Register. There is no certain evidence as to authorship although as Latham and others argue, the poem is far above Deloney’s average standard.<sup>51</sup> Nevertheless it is almost certain that the *Folio* scribe had his original (whether directly or from an intermediate source), from Deloney’s book as it occurs in the manuscript in the centre of a cluster of items (PF 167, 170, 173, 176, 179, 183, 186) all of which are indubitably from Deloney’s *Garland*.

PF 155: *Are Women Faire*, has been attributed by Wells and Stevenson to Francis Davison (?1575-?1619).<sup>52</sup> These authors give no reason for their attribution but I assume that it is because a text of the item appears in the publication put out by Francis Davison and his brother Walter, *A Poeticall Rapsodie* (1602). This work is a collection of poems by a variety of authors and PF 155 (here called *An Inuectiue against Women*) is subscribed as being the work of ‘Anon’s’ older relative ‘Ignoto’. Tannanbaum, on the strength of a manuscript copy of the item where it is attributed to ‘P. Sydney’, asserts that this is ‘in all probability correct’, and he assumes that Sir Philip Sidney (1554-1586) is meant.<sup>53</sup> This is refuted by Wardroper on the grounds that ‘since the 1602 and succeeding editions of *A Poeticall Rapsodie* were dedicated to Sir Philip Sidney’s

49. HF, I [ix], ‘Notes’, quotes marginalia from Harl. MS. 2149, fol. 198<sup>v</sup>, which attributes this item *Earles off Chester*, to a ‘Mr. Bostock of Tathall’ (1628). This note is indeed present in this Harleian manuscript: however BL. Add. MS. 5830, p. 101 attributes the poem to ‘Richard Bostock of Tattenhall, Gent.’ as does Bodleian MS. Top. Chesh. C.9. fol. 153<sup>r</sup>. That Mr. Bostock came from Tattenhall seems probable as no gazeteer owns to a ‘Tathall’ while ‘Tattenhall’ is apparently situated a few miles south-east of Chester. This aligns with the geographical source area (which will be discussed presently) of the majority of *Folio* items. This Richard Bostock is otherwise unknown.

50. *The Poems of Sir Walter Raleigh*, ed. A.M.C. Latham (London, 1951), p. 120ff; *The Oxford Book of Sixteenth Century Verse*, corrected edn. ed. E.K. Chambers (Oxford, 1961), p. 468.

51. *Poems of Raleigh*, ed. Latham, p. 121.

52. *The Book of Humorous Verse*, revised edn. ed. C. Wells (New York, 1947), p. 190; *The Home Book of Verse*, 9th edn., ed. B.E. Stevenson (New York, 1953), p. 1902.

53. S.A. Tannanbaum, ‘Unfamiliar Versions of Some Elizabethan Poems’, *PMLA*, XLV (1930), p. 809ff.

nephew, William Herbert, Earl of Pembroke, it seems unlikely that Sidney's authorship would have gone unmentioned.'<sup>54</sup>

### E. Topics

The topics covered by these authors and the remaining anonymous writers, are varied and range from the religiously solemn debate of *Death & Liffe* (PF 114), to the Grobianic *Panche* (PF 76); from the classic story of Hero and Leander (PF 141) to the seventeenth century bawdy roll-call of courtesans in *Panders come away* (PF 164). Nevertheless despite the eclectic nature of the contents of the *Folio* it is possible to arrange the items in certain general categories as follows:<sup>55</sup> (The figures refer to the number of texts within the classification):

#### I. Historical

- A. Battles — Formal Military Engagements ..... 9
- B. People
  - a) Single recorded incident involving a known person ..... 13

---

54. *Love and Drollery*, ed. J. Wardroper (London, 1969), p. 264.

55. A few items can be subsumed under two headings but where there is doubt they are placed under the heading which relates to their ostensible or principal topic: thus for instance, where in an item an historical subject has been used to illustrate a short moral, the item qualifies as 'History' rather than 'Ethics'.

The *Folio* item numbers representing the poems in each group, are as follows:

- Group I.A: PF 15, 25, 39, 48, 77, 79, 132, 176, 194.
- Group I.B(a): PF 10, 16, 83, 85, 87, 88, 122, 123, 124, 168, 177, 179, 183.
- Group I.B(b): PF 37, 38, 82, 96, 127, 154, 182.
- Group I.B(c): PF 14, 20, 47, 81, 89, 92, 129, 167, 171, 174.
- Group I.B(d): PF 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 41, 73, 84, 80, 108, 141, 185.
- Group II(a): PF 17, 62, 153, 158.
- Group II(b): PF 51, 56, 58, 59, 74.
- Group II(c): PF 44, 137.
- Group II(d): PF 53, 113, 117, 119, 152, 164, 181.
- Group II(e): PF 55, 104, 112, 118, 136, 144, 155, 192.
- Group III.A: PF 8, 11, 12, 13, 21, 43, 71, 94, 105, 139.
- Group III.B(a): PF 93, 103.
- Group III.B(b): PF 9, 22, 26, 40, 72, 101, 110, 111.
- Group III.B(c): PF 19, 23, 24, 29, 90, 106, 135.
- Group III.B(d): PF 99, 115, 121, 130.
- Group III.C: PF 91, 116, 159, 170, 173, 184, 186.
- Group IV.A(a): PF 32, 52, 131.
- Group IV.A(b): PF 18, 31, 64, 95, 98, 147, 160, 162, 169, 172, 190.
- Group IV.A(c): PF 50, 57, 60, 86, 100, 126, 133, 142, 146, 148, 150, 178, 180, 187, 188.
- Group IV.A(d): PF 28, 35, 65, 166.
- Group IV.A(e): PF 30, 33, 54, 61, 134, 145, 156, 191.
- Group IV.B: PF 102.
- Group IV.C: PF 42, 68, 107, 175, 193.
- Group V.A: PF 34, 45, 76, 149.
- Group V.B: PF 46, 75, 109, 120, 128.
- Group V.C: PF 27.
- Group VI.A: PF 70, 189.
- Group VI.B: PF 138, 143, 157.
- Group VII.A: PF 114, 125.
- Group VII.B: PF 69, 78, 151.
- Group VIII: PF 36, 49, 63, 66, 67, 97, 140, 161, 163, 165, 195, 196.

b)	Recorded train of events .....	7
c)	Probable pseudo-history .....	10
d)	Legendary/Mythical .....	14
II. <i>Social and Satirical</i>		
a)	James I and his times .....	4
b)	Charles I — Royalist/Cavalier .....	5
c)	Religion — anti-Puritanical satire .....	2
d)	Life Styles — customs, fashions, behaviour .....	7
e)	Opinions — women, the times, Englishmen &c. ....	8
III. <i>Romance</i>		
A.	Arthurian .....	10
B.	Miscellaneous	
a)	Kings .....	2
b)	Knights .....	8
c)	Gentle Youths .....	7
d)	Nobles and Commoners .....	4
C.	Broadside Romance .....	7
IV. <i>Amatory</i>		
A.	General	
a)	Joyful .....	3
b)	Doleful .....	11
c)	Exemplary .....	15
d)	Unsuccessful seduction .....	4
e)	Successful seduction .....	8
B.	Classical .....	1
C.	Pastoral .....	5
V. <i>Humorous</i>		
A.	Vulgar .....	4
B.	King and Subject .....	5
C.	Intellectual .....	1
VI. <i>Popular Pastimes</i>		
A.	Drinking .....	2
B.	Hunting .....	3
VII. <i>Ethical</i>		
A.	Religious .....	2
B.	Moralistic .....	3
VIII. <i>Personal Philosophies</i> .....		
		12

The 194 texts which comprise *The Percy Folio*, in terms of their original composition, were composed over a period of at least 250 years. The earliest item to which a firm date can be given is in fact an historical work: *PF 194: The Siege of Roune*, composed c.1420. The latest item is *PF 56: Newarke*, written in 1645/6. The majority of items within the *Folio* do not exhibit those features of topic and style usually found in works of high literary quality, but rather incline to the commonplace in their subject, vocabulary and standard of composition: in short, most of them are ‘popular’. As would be expected in so large a number of items, the degree of ‘popularity’ is on a sliding scale between the two extremes of *belles lettres* and pedestrian doggerel. The most scholarly

or literate item is the debate *Death & Liffe* (PF 114). This is a religious allegory written in the alliterative tradition and owing much to Langland's *Piers Plowman*.<sup>56</sup> At the other end of the scale is *As I was rydinge by the [way]* (PF 35). This describes the narrator's refusal to accompany 'a whore' and his subsequent attempt to have sexual congress with an outspoken 'market maide'. The remaining 192 *Folio* items fall between these two examples but with very few towards the upper end of the scale.

Thus, on balance, the general tone of *The Percy Folio*, is that of the fairly basic rhymed entertainment of the tavern, with only a small sampling of a higher intellectual pleasure. The following section suggests a reason for the transcription of such a mixture of texts.

## V. The Collector and his Folio.

It is probable that the *Percy Folio* Scribe and the *Percy Folio* Collector were one and the same person. As I have previously shown, the manuscript pages show signs of having been folded together into convenient 'pads' of a few leaves. Judging by the sometimes substantial wear on the crease of the outer leaf of each separate 'pad', and the placement of the script on each leaf, they have the appearance of having been carried about, written on, smoothed out, and placed with the completed pages when filled. Such a proceeding is unlikely to have been carried out by anyone other than the original Collector and Scribe.<sup>57</sup> Thus any facts which can be deduced from the *Folio* or its contents are likely to refer to the original Collector.

From the nature of some of the texts collected, I think it can be assumed that the Collector was male and not averse to the jocular and ribald.<sup>58</sup> He was a Catholic and a Royalist.<sup>59</sup> Because there is a likelihood that the Collector took his writing materials to his sources, it seems that his life style involved at least some travelling even though his journeys may generally have been short. It would seem too, that he habitually met or expected to meet people, and it follows that some of his sources may have been oral. Examination of the manuscript strengthens this suggestion with the presence of homophonic errors, the speed at which some items appear to have been written, and the

---

56. See *Death & Liffe: A Mediaeval Alliterative Debate Poem in the Seventeenth Century Version*, ed. I. Gollancz (London, 1930).

57. It is possible that the long narrow sheets were originally supplied in gatherings folded along the shorter length, cf. Bodleian MS. Ashmole 61, but this does not account for the wear (worse on some sheets than others) almost certainly caused by repeated folding and rubbing; nor does it account for the fact that on some sheets but not others, the scribe seems to have placed his lines to avoid the crease. These things can be accounted for by the fact that the first, and inner sheets of a newly folded handful of pages, when opened out and written on would probably not require the writer to avoid the crease. However, by the time the last, and outer sheets had been reached, they would be likely, according to the length of time the scribe had taken to fill his 'pad', to have a more heavily marked or damaged fold which sometimes might preclude scribal use.

58. I say 'male' because the bawdy items in the *Folio* lean more towards male fantasy than female: for a discussion of male fantasy in popular texts of the period, see M. Spufford, *Small Books and Pleasant Histories: Popular fiction and its readership in seventeenth-century England*, (London, 1981), pp. 62-64.

59. The manuscript contains no works in favour of Parliament or the Protestant religion and many against. For instance: PF 44: *Off a Puritane*; PF 51: *The kinge enioyes his rights againe*; PF 56: *Newarke*; PF 59: *The Tribe of Banburye*; PF 118: *In olde times paste*; PF 137: *O Noble Festus*; PF 153: *To Oxforde*.



presence of a prevailing dialect. All three of these points have been observed by Furnivall, and others have noted that sundry given texts were probably written from recitation.<sup>60</sup> In fact they were probably sung to the Collector. For each of one hundred and sixty-two of the *Folio* texts, I have found either the actual tune to which it was sung; a reference to it in connection with an air which apparently no longer exists, or a reference to it as a sung piece but with no notification of any specific music. There is no evidence to suggest that some of the texts for which I was unable to find a musical connection, may not nevertheless have been sung. It appears that although hitherto not specifically remarked by musical scholars, the *Folio* may be of interest in fields other than the purely literary.

Scholars who have had cause to examine *The Percy Folio* agree that from the general dialect of the texts and, as Furnivall says, ‘the strong local feeling shown by the copyist in favour of Lancashire, Cheshire and the Stanleys’, it is probable that the Collector and much of his material came from that area of the Midlands.<sup>61</sup> As the *Folio* Collector appears to have learnt to write when Elizabethan Secretary was the normal hand, he was probably thirty years old or more in the 1640s. However, changes in the prevailing style of metropolitan penmanship were not likely to become the rule in distant country areas until long after they had become thoroughly established elsewhere. Therefore there is a possibility that the Collector — especially if he had been taught by an elderly pedagogue of conservative habits — may have been only in his late twenties. He seems to have achieved at least the standard level of contemporary formal education for gentlemen.<sup>62</sup>

The identity of the Collector is not known. Bishop Percy noted in the margin of his manuscript that the man from whom he obtained it, the previous owner, Humphrey Pitt of

---

60. F.J. Furnivall, *HF*, I, [v]. For a thorough discussion and listing of scribal errors see R.A. Schwegler, ‘Sources of the Ballads in Bishop Percy’s Folio Manuscript’, Diss., Chicago 1977, pp. 28-60, 198-209. The following authors note oral transmission in the manuscript and some also remark its geographic origins: G.L. Kittredge, *A Study of Gawain and the Green Knight* (Gloucester, Mass., 1960), p. 127; *The Squir of Lowe Degre*, ed. and intro. W.E. Mead (Boston, 1904), p. xiii; R.S. Loomis, introduction to *A Medieval Romance of Friendship: Eger and Grime*, by M. van Duzee (New York, 1963), p. vii; D.C. Fowler, *A literary history of the popular ballad* (Durham, N.C., 1968), p. 132; A.B. Friedman, *The Ballad Revival* (Chicago and London, 1961), p. 31.

61. Furnivall, *HF*, I, [v-vi].

62. He does not appear to have known French, as the refrains, ‘to Iaur bonne tance’ (*toujour bon temps*), and ‘par melio shance’ (*par meilleur chance*), of the macaronic *PF* 102: *When Scortching Phæbus* are perhaps a little too phonetic. From the copying of the tautological title of *PF* 11: *Sir Lancelott of Dulake*, it can be assumed that he was not familiar with either the French language or classic Arthurian literature: this latter point is further explored later in this study. His Latin, however was probably excellent. For example, note the use of the word ‘didon’ in the lines:

Wheras Æneas, with his charmes,  
locket Queene didon in his armes  
& had what hee wold craue!

*PF* 133: *Aeneas & Dido*, st. 1

‘Didon’ (Didonem) is the Latin singular accusative case of the name ‘Dido’ (genitive: Didonis). It is so used in Ovid but not Virgil (*Heroides and Amores*, ed. and trans. G. Showerman, 2nd edn. (Cambridge, Mass., 1977), I, 82 ff.) *PF* 133 is by Thomas Campion, but ‘Didon’ is not used in *any* of the many variants of this text including the first publication: George Mason and John Earsden, *The Ayres that were Sung and Played at Brougham Castle in Westmerland* [August, 1617], in *the Kings Entertainment* (London, 1618). In the *Folio* someone has been sufficiently familiar with Latin accidence to use the accusative form where, if the poem were a Latin text, the syntax would require it. Because the *Folio* is the sole variant where this form occurs, it is probable that it is a scribal emendation.

For contemporary education, see Spufford, *Small Books*, Ch. II, pp. 19-44.

Shiffnal, thought that it was written down by Thomas Blount (1618-1679). Furnivall finds this doubtful but on no evidence other than the strength of a personal value-judgement:

If anyone can believe that a man of Blount's training copied this MS. when he was in full power at the age of 30 or 32, I cannot.<sup>63</sup>

Bongaerts thinks that the hand of the *Folio* does not match samples of Blount's handwriting.<sup>64</sup>

Regardless of his identity, whoever collected the items that make up Add. MS. 27879 had a reason for the undertaking. Both Pearsall and Fowler believe that the Collector was an antiquarian, and more importantly, both note that the contents represent popular entertainment at the end of the Middle Ages:

The Percy folio MS both illuminates the early history of ballad style and marks the end of the period of minstrel influence on the evolution of balladry.<sup>65</sup>

The following discussion proposes that the political circumstances prevailing in

---

63. Furnivall, *HF*, I, [v-vi]. Blount was called to the Bar in November, 1648 — when, as I have earlier pointed out, the entries in the *Folio* cease. As a Catholic and a Royalist a public career was ruled out for him, so although he had Chambers in London, he spent much of his time in the country: T. Bongaerts, *The Correspondence of Thomas Blount (1618-1679): A Recusant Antiquary* (Amsterdam, 1978), pp. 1-17.

Percy's provenance for the *Folio* is in a marginal note to BL. Add. MS. 27879, fol.1<sup>v</sup>.

M<sup>r</sup>. Pitt has since told me that he believes the Transcripts into this Volume &c. were made by that Blount who was Author of *Jocular Tenures* &c., who he thought was of Lancashire or Cheshire, and had a remarkable fondness for these old things. . . . A Descendant or Relation of that M<sup>r</sup>. Blount . . . sold the Library of his said predecessor Tho<sup>s</sup>. Blount, to the abovementioned M<sup>r</sup> Pitt.

64. Bongaerts, *Correspondence*, p. 16. His examination appears to have been rather perfunctory and he gives no details: he seems to have compared the *Folio* hand of about 1645 with samples of Blount's handwriting made in the eleven years before his death in 1679. It is not part of my purpose in writing this study to identify the Collector, but I have seen Blount's later hand in an annotated copy of his *Boscobel* (London, 1660): I am not convinced that the *Folio* manuscript cannot be in Blount's younger hand and that he cannot be the Collector. Of the personal tastes and habits shown in Blount's letters and the known biographical details pertaining to him, only one, the fact that Bongaerts places him in Herefordshire, is at variance with Percy's note and the attributes deduced from the manuscript set out above. Furthermore, Blount, besides his other qualifications to be the *Folio* compiler, was an early antiquary and a friend of other like-minded people, amongst whom were Elias Ashmole, John Aubrey, Ralph Sheldon, Fabian Philipps and, be it noted, his closest literary friend was one of the first of the large-scale ballad collectors, Anthony à Wood. Blount was also related to Sir Edward Harley with whom he corresponded. Sir Edward was an antiquarian: it was his son, Robert, who later founded the Harleian Library and initiated the Roxburghe and Bagford ballad collections (Bongaerts, *Correspondence*, pp. 33, 199, 223; H.E. Rollins, 'The Black-Letter Broadside Ballad', *PMLA*, NS 28, 1 (1919), p. 262). Blount researched and published *Fragmenta Antiquitatis, Antient Tenures Of Land, and Jocular Customs Of some Mannors* (London, 1679) — many of the 'jocular customs' being bawdy. He was given in his later years to riding about the countryside collecting information for a *History of Herefordshire*: "I have made som progress in the Description of Herefordshire, have been in 60 Churches" (Bongaerts, *Correspondence*, pp. 60-63). It is not at all impossible that in an earlier venture he had collected songs. Further investigation is needed before it can be confidently asserted that Thomas Blount was not connected with the making of Percy's manuscript.

65. Fowler, *Literary history*, p. 133; Pearsall dislikes the term 'minstrel' and prefers 'popular entertainer' but otherwise agrees that the *Folio* represents a stock of pieces from the end of a period: D. Pearsall, *Old English and Middle English Poetry* (London, 1977), p. 260.

England at the time of the the creation of *The Percy Folio*, have much to do with the probable reason for the collection of its items and explains why these items mark the virtual end of a stylistic and narrative continuity.

It seems a tenable theory that initially the *Folio* Collector, discovering the Robin Hood narratives (which even in his day were venerable) wrote them down, and thus began his collection. However, after a few other pieces which are likely to have seemed old to him, more contemporary works were added.<sup>66</sup> It is possible that there was a temporal gap between the transcription of the first few *Folio* items and the remainder. But be that as it may, although there is still the occasional text which in the 1640s probably presented the appearance of some antiquity to the Collector, it does not seem to have been his first consideration for textual collectability after the outbreak of the Civil War in 1642.<sup>67</sup> The Collector has become more eclectic in his choice. The Collector is, in a small way, confounding his enemies.

The Catholic and Royalist Collector is deliberately preserving the popular songs his Puritan and Parliamentary enemies wished to suppress. This statement presents an idea which accounts for the varied nature of the contents of the manuscript where the evidently (or apparently) old is jostled by the obviously new. Briefly, the evidence supporting this suggestion lies in the fact that the Collector, as a Cavalier, and judging from the texts he chose to transcribe, of broad tastes, is likely to have viewed the steadily growing Puritan influence on the regulation of popular entertainment with unease.<sup>68</sup> Puritan attempts to suppress matters which did not accord with their straitlaced morality are well known and have been fully documented and discussed in the literature: therefore the following paragraphs merely outline the general situation with regard to popular song in seventeenth century England.<sup>69</sup>

The use of the street ballad not only for politically innocent entertainment but also for satire and/or the expression of anti-establishment views, antedated printing — the

---

66. It is difficult to know what the Collector might have regarded as sufficiently early to be collected. It is probable that he had no specialist knowledge and that Lawson Dick's comment 'English . . . developed so fast that, even for the Stuarts, the language of the Elizabethans had become antiquated', holds good: (*Aubrey's Brief Lives*, ed. and intro. Oliver Lawson Dick (Harmondsworth, 1958 edn.), p. 16.

67. I have already pointed out that the *Folio* scribe had reached his 49<sup>th</sup> text by 1642/43. Therefore items 1 to 48 were transcribed prior to that. The addition of contemporary songs probably begins as far back as *PF 18: See the bwildinge (PF 17: Listen Jolly Gentleman*, although a somewhat rollicking drinking song, celebrates Henry VIII, and therefore it is just possible that the Collector regarded it as as old as its topic).

68. See L.B. Wright, *Middle-Class Culture in Elizabethan England*, (New York, 1958), for the early Puritan influence.

69. For detailed discussion of popular entertainment see: C.V. Wedgwood, *Poetry and Politics Under the Stuarts* (Cambridge, 1960); H.E. Rollins, 'The Black-Letter Broadside Ballad', *PMLA*, NS 27, 1 (1919), 258-339; Wright, *Middle Class Culture* (Ithaca, New York, 1958); V.F. Calverton, 'Sex in Puritan Esthetics', Ch. II of *Sex Expression in Literature* (New York, 1926); G. Williamson, *Seventeenth Century Contexts*, rev. edn. (Chicago, 1969); R. Nettel, 'Puritan Stimulus', Ch. V of *Seven Centuries of Popular Song: A Social History of Urban Ditties* (London, 1956); *Cavalier and Puritan: Ballads and Broad-sides Illustrating the Period of the Great Rebellion*, ed. and intro. H.E. Rollins (New York, 1923); P.A. Scholes, *The Puritans and Music* (London, 1934).

For other aspects (excluding purely military history) see:

C. Hill, *Society and Puritanism in Pre-Revolutionary England* (London, 1964); T. Liu, *Discord in Zion: The Puritan Divines and the Puritan Revolution* (The Hague, 1973); *Reactions to the English Civil War 1642-1649*, ed. J. Morrill (London, 1982); M. Bence-Jones, *The Cavaliers* (London, 1976); J. Ridley, *The Roundheads* (London, 1976); D. Zaret, 'Puritan Preaching and Social Control', Ch. III of *The Heavenly Contract* (Chicago, 1985).

advent of which merely increased their production. From time to time ineffectual legislation had been passed to restrain their publication.<sup>70</sup> In 1637 a *Decree of Starre-Chamber* noted that previous

Orders and Decrees haue beene found by experience to be defectiue in some particulars; And diuers abuses haue sithence arisen, and beene practised by the craft and malice of wicked and euill disposed persons, to the preiudice of the publike.

It therefore enforced all previous Acts and, adding new legislation, provided severe penalties for the publication of 'Bookes, Ballads, Charts, Portraiture or any other thing or things whatsoever' that could not be sworn to as containing nothing

Contrary to the Christian Faith, and the Doctrine and Discipline of the Church of *England*, nor against the State or Gouernment, nor contrary to good life, or good manners, or otherwise, as the nature and subject of the work shall require.<sup>71</sup>

This could be widely interpreted. There were very few ballads of irreproachable piety but there were a great many ballads which were politically or doctrinally seditious; or which could, both with or without a strained interpretation, be seen as lending themselves to moral corruption.

Thus ballads were officially damned: the traditional songs of Robin Hood or Arthurian knights lumped together with less innocent ditties. However, as Rollins points out, the *singers* of ballads continued unmolested until the Puritans came into power with the outbreak of open Civil War in 1642:

Thenceforward the Long Parliament harassed and persecuted the profession, till in 1649, magistrates were instructed to flog and imprison ballad-singers at sight and confiscate their stock, the trade fell into complete desuetude for eight or ten years.<sup>72</sup>

In the early 1640s, the *Folio* Collector could not know how successful attempts to regulate popular entertainment would be, but after the Decree mentioned above and other legislative measures including the closing of the theatres and the banning of 'Stage-Playes' — the source then as now, of many popular songs — he could not have failed to be aware of Puritan intentions.<sup>73</sup> Thus I see the compilation of his manuscript as being in part his own, private, Royalist rebellion.

As it happened, he preserved a cross-section of popular rhymed entertainment which as I have shown, almost certainly consisted mainly of songs currently known and sung in the West Midlands. As I have already noted, other authors have seen his Collection as marking the end of a style that flourished in the Middle Ages.

The topic of this study concerns the quantity, quality and nature of mediaeval

---

70. Rollins, *Black-Letter Ballad*, p. 258-59.

71. Cited in *Transcript of the Registers of the Company of Stationers of London*, ed. A. Arber (London, 1877), IV, 528-536.

72. Rollins, *Black-Letter Ballads*, p. 321.

73. Nettel, *Popular Song*, p. 86; Scholes, *Puritans and Music*, p. 202. Further legislation repressing plays and ordering the demolition of theatres was passed in 1647 and 1648.

continuity in selected texts from *The Percy Folio*. I discuss the first hesitant narrative and stylistic modifications to tradition — the precursors of a trend which further developed through the influence of the Civil Wars and eventually resolved itself into the popular rhymed entertainment of the Restoration.<sup>74</sup> A detailed examination of this later genre is however, beyond the scope of this work. Nevertheless, the following summarises the major changes in tradition and gives a concise (and necessarily simplistic) overview of the circumstances which caused them. This is done, first, to outline the principal reasons why the *Folio* is seen as marking the end of an era in popular verse, and secondly, to show the general direction of the development of the ‘new’ style beyond the period covered by *Folio*. This is presented in order to underline the significance of such germinal changes as are seen in some of the *Folio* texts and which are presently discussed in this study.<sup>75</sup>

The first circumstances which contributed to the demise of the mediaeval tradition in rhymed popular entertainment were the general popularisation of print and the rise in literacy; ‘the disintegration of the minstrel profession’ and the centralization of culture in London.<sup>76</sup> A further contributing factor in the mid-seventeenth century, was the official prohibition of the printed ballad. The Stationers’ Registers record virtually no traditional ballads (except for copyrights changing hands on the death of a holder) or new ballads in the traditional style, from 5<sup>th</sup> February, 1640 to the 12<sup>th</sup> March, 1655/56. Then for two years there is an absolute flurry of ballads and songs, following which publication virtually ceases until the end of December 1664: from thenceforward entries are relatively few compared to the pre-war period.<sup>77</sup>

Statutory attempts to regulate one of the people’s favourite forms of entertainment naturally failed. The silence on the part of the official record hid the flourishing output of numerous clandestine presses producing unregistered ballads and songs. However, not surprisingly, almost all these works concerned the most pressing and interesting topic of the day — the war.

It seems to me to be a tenable idea that for a printer/publisher to risk his livelihood (secret presses were to be destroyed and stock confiscated), he would have to be highly motivated or highly paid. I do not think that the production of traditional rhymed popular entertainment met these requirements: the production of what we might now call ‘underground’, politically inspired texts, did. And so, with few of the old-style ballads

---

74. The influence of the Civil Wars on the direction that English culture took in his times was plainly seen by at least one contemporary. After several substantiating quotations, R.M. Dorson remarks of John Aubrey (1625-97) that he saw a ‘sharp historical division, in the middle decades of the seventeenth century, between the old tradition-soaked culture and the new mechanical civilization’: *The British Folklorists: A History* (London, 1968), p. 6.

75. The *resumé* which now follows is derived from the comprehensive research done by H.E. Rollins and set out in his *Black-Letter Ballads (BLB)* and *Cavalier and Puritan (CP)*; from M. Spufford’s *Small Books (SB)*; from common knowledge; or from my own conclusions resulting from my own study of extant ballad collections and contemporary pamphlet collections such as the Thomason Tracts in the British Library. I have not cited any contemporary poems, songs or ballads to support my discussion because the presentation of one or two samples in the case of a general assertion proves nothing: on the other hand, a perusal of almost any published Collection will provide enough examples to support the statements I make.

76. Fowler, *Literary history*, p. 15. All these circumstances have been generally recognised and are well covered in the literature: see Spufford, *SB*, who sets out the current arguments and provides a good coverage of all the major references.

77. *Transcript of Stationers’ Registers*, Vol. I and II, ed. Eyre and Rivington (London 1875-94; rpt. New York, 1950).

being made, with strict laws against the singing of even those which people remembered, at first in the city, later in the towns and last of all in the country, the long slow cycle of decline and replacement quickened.

The principal intention of the political ballad was to instruct through entertainment, to mould public opinion or give news. In this they were so successful that in 1643 certain news-pamphlets were licensed in order that 'official' news would be available to counteract the opposition's propaganda. Not surprisingly there was a prompt increase in the use of political ballads to undermine the information presented in the government publications and an equal increase in the production of unlicensed news-pamphlets which, unlike the official organs, were not hampered by an official censor.<sup>78</sup>

During the interregnum the 'black-market' for overt fiction does not seem to have been good: those with only a little to spend understandably appear for the time being, to have preferred news of dangerous and exciting contemporary events, ideas and personalities.<sup>79</sup> Probably because of this and because of the risk involved in illicit printing — the use of spies, house-searchers and informers was specifically authorised 'for the better discovery of printing in Corners'<sup>80</sup> — the production of ballads and songs, collected together in small books, increased markedly.<sup>81</sup> Such a work might fetch the price of several ballads in a single sale, thus minimising the risk of discovery associated with selling several ballads individually. Unfortunately a person who could afford the price of a ballad might well not be able to afford more for a book.

Many ballad-writers and/or publishers, turned to pamphleteering — for one thing it was more profitable as the news pamphlet usually cost tuppence as against the ballad's ha'penny or penny, and there was a wider market.<sup>82</sup> Rollins notes that

As a result of their pamphleteering, ballad-writers helped to develop a medium that led to some diminution in the popularity of the ballad and ultimately to its decay. For with the development of the news-pamphlets the range of ballads was greatly lessened and their *clientèle* diminished.<sup>83</sup>

Furthermore, the development of the news-pamphlet led to a change in lexical style: 'Under the stress of events a new, simpler and more explicit kind of writing became general'.<sup>84</sup>

Thus one of the changes in popular reading matter is stylistic. Ballads of the Restoration lean very much towards the journalistic in tone: they are often tediously particular in random unimportant details, and often impart a tone of level reportage throughout an entire poem. Although the standard may be, and more often than not is,

---

78. L. Shepard, *The History of Street Literature* (Newton Abbott, Devon, 1973), p. 58.

79. Spufford, *SB*, p. 22/23; Wedgewood, *Poetry and Politics*, p. 72.

80. 'Star Chamber Decree', *Stationers*, IV, p. 534-35; Rollins, *CP*, pp. 21-22, 26.

81. Often designed to appeal to as wide a market as possible with the inclusion of several bawdy texts, and without identification of printer or author unless by initials: see for instance, the listing of *Musarum Deliciae* and *Wit and Drollery* in my Bibliography. See Rollins, *CP*, p. 65 for further titles; see Spufford, *SB*, *passim*. for chapbooks..

82. Rollins, *CP*, p. 44.

83. Rollins, *CP*, p. 43.

84. Wedgewood, *Poetry and Politics*, p. 71.

abysmally low, these ballads are fundamentally professional. There is no feeling of personal involvement, even though as Wedgewood notes, there is an increasing number of references to social, and in particular, economic conditions.<sup>85</sup> This increase is a topical change. There are others: for instance towards the 'useful' — either for temporal or spiritual benefit. Although the old ballads such as *Chevy Chase* and *Patient Grissell* continue to be reprinted, there is a growth in the number of ballads with a 'message' — sometimes social but, as might be expected, often religious and probably as a result of the storm of hortatory partisan texts — the fashion of the war years — almost always homiletic or didactic.

However, the *Percy Folio* contains more than ballads: the Collector added a large number of songs and ditties. But by and large, these too change towards the end of the century. Fowler suggests that 'the traditional narrative emphasis of ballads gradually became subservient to the influence of melody': the central idea is also relevant to other songs.<sup>86</sup> This, he thinks, amongst other things, resulted in an 'intensification of narrative symmetry' which led to a growth in the stock of commonplace stanzas and the displacement of the line as a unit of composition in favour of the stanza.<sup>87</sup> It also meant that with regard to the broadside ballad at least, the rhythm must be maintained at the cost of the sense. Thus the lines frequently jog along 'at the expense of distorted word order'.<sup>88</sup> It is also noticeable that there is a growth of the auxiliary 'did' to form a preterite. As Moore notes, 'even the best of the Percy manuscript ballads are more unmetrical than the traditional ballads of a century later'; to which I would add 'and also most of the broadside ballads' despite the fact that they were often directed to be sung to old tunes.<sup>89</sup>

*The Percy Folio* contains texts descended from works composed in the early mediaeval period: it also has some poems of contemporary composition. The following chapters analyse and discuss a selection of *Folio* items, which although not arranged chronologically, nevertheless cover an extensive time-span. I show that they contain some elements of mediaeval style and systematic narrative content which are unimpaired even in the most modern of the texts, but that as the items become more contemporary it is possible to determine not only the seeds of change, but also those components of mediaeval tradition which will eventually fall before the onslaught of progress. As a

---

85. Wedgewood, *Poetry and Politics*, p. 194.

86. Fowler, *Literary history*: the quotations in this paragraph are taken from pages 15-19. This period saw an increase in the publication of music for general use, such as formal dancing — thought by the Puritans to be a permissible recreation — and the establishment of chamber music. The masque had passed its musical zenith and a new concept was seen in the introduction of English opera: Nettel, *Seven Centuries*, pp. 86-96; P.A. Scholes, *The Puritans and Music* (London, 1934), pp. 195-213. The works of John Playford, John Wilson, William and Henry Lawes and others brought formal music to the public as never before. It was a popular pastime for groups of people from all walks of life to meet together to make music: it was common for part-songs to be printed so that several people around one sheet would have their part facing them, and these people might be Puritans: (see Scholes, *Puritans and Music*, pp. 137-149) It is not therefore surprising that lyrics come to reflect the influence of music.

87. Fowler also sees incremental repetition and the device known as 'leaping and lingering' as 'suddenly maturing' at this time — partly as a result of the dominance of melody and partly because of the dying minstrelsy tradition. Here, he is of course talking of the folk-ballad but I find that I cannot entirely agree with his premise. I do not however intend to go into this further as it is only minimally relevant to the *Folio*.

88. E.K Wells, *The Ballad Tree* (New York, 1950), p. 214.

89. J.R. Moore, 'The Influence of Transmission on the English Ballads', *The Modern Language Review*, 11, 4 (1916), 394.

necessary preliminary however, the following chapter investigates what constitutes various aspects of mediaeval continuity both in the *Folio* and elsewhere.



## CHAPTER TWO

### THE HISTORICAL ITEMS — NATIONAL BATTLES

#### I. Utilisation of Primary Material: *PF 79*: ‘Durham Feilde’

##### a. Introduction

There are nine items in *The Percy Folio* which can be grouped together under the heading ‘Battle Text’: defined here as ‘a formal military engagement between armies’. The following five accounts of four battles have been chosen for discussion in this study.<sup>1</sup>

<i>PF 79:</i>	<i>Durham Feilde</i>	—	fought 17th October, 1346
<i>PF 77:</i>	<i>Agincourt Battell</i>	—	fought 5th October, 1415
<i>PF 132:</i>	<i>Bosworth Feilde</i>	—	fought 22nd August, 1485
<i>PF 39:</i>	<i>[Flodden] Feilde</i>	—	fought 9th September, 1513
<i>PF 25:</i>	<i>Scotish Feilde</i>	—	fought as above.

The first of these texts, *PF 79: Durham Feilde*, is treated as a specimen text for close analysis. It is analysed as a model text establishing general principles and patterns of composition against which other texts can be compared. The analysis of this text is therefore presented with full critical apparatus in order that the research underlying the conclusions reached may be seen. While the texts which follow *Durham* have been studied equally closely, to avoid tedious repetition I have presented the results in more summary form.

Besides being used as a model text, *Durham* is also subject to a particular scrutiny

- 
- PF 15: Musleboorrowe Feild* is omitted from discussion because it is incomplete, with only seven 4-line stanzas remaining. *PF 48: Cheuey Chase*, is omitted because first, there is no certain documentary evidence for the actual event unless the work is assigned to one of several possible engagements: secondly it depicts a fight between individual lords and their followers rather than a confrontation between formal armies. *PF 176: Winninge of Cales* relates to the taking of Cadiz in 1596 by an English naval force. It was a surprise attack poorly opposed and cannot be classed as a formal military engagement. The poet, (probably not Thomas Deloney despite the occurrence of the song in his *Garland of Good Will*), is more interested in the plundering of the town than in the actual fighting. *PF 194: Siege of Roune*, is omitted because it is grossly incomplete and is in itself an historical source — probably written by a participant:

[I shalle telle you how hyt was,  
[And the better telle I may]  
F[or at that sege with the kyng I lay,  
& [at . . .

*PF 194: 20-22*

(Lacunae restored from the variant of the poem cited in *The Historical Collections of a Citizen of London in the Fifteenth Century*, ed. J. Gairdner (Camden Society, 1876), pp. 1-2).

as a work in its own right. A relatively unknown narrative, and as No. 159, generally ignored among Child's more spectacular pieces, it exhibits a skillful complexity worthy of wider recognition than it now enjoys.<sup>2</sup>

*Durham Feilde* relates the events of the Battle of Neville's Cross, fought on the 17th of October, 1346, between the Scots and the English: the text is unique to *The Percy Folio*.<sup>3</sup> It is written in 4-line stanzas and is divided into two 'Parts' — 38 stanzas to the First and 28 to the Second. The stanzas rhyme a b c b. There are 264 lines with irregular metre but with common metre predominating. From line 197 to the end, the item has been recopied into the manuscript by Bishop Percy following his earlier extraction of the relevant folios. The author is not known.

Professor Fowler remarks that 'a given ballad took the particular shape it has about the time that it was written down, unless there is specific evidence to the contrary'.<sup>4</sup> He is speaking of works which are presumed to have had an antecedent oral tradition. This is not the case with *Durham* which as will be shown, reflects single authorship in the choice of, and addition to, 'facts' and the skill of their synthesis. In this regard *Durham* despite its inclusion in Child's collection, is not a 'traditional popular ballad'. As set out in *The Folio*, it is a transcription from a written source — probably West or North-west Midlands: a provenance which was previously mentioned with reference to the *Folio* as a whole.<sup>5</sup> There is no lexical evidence of seventeenth century alteration or interpolation other than the two doubtful and minor instances mentioned in my discussion of dateable vocabulary presented later. Thus it is probable that the text remains much as it was originally written.

The following brief introductory survey of some of the lexical and stylistic features of *Durham* is present because although in the context of *PF 79* they are not particularly remarkable, they will nevertheless presently be seen to be relevant in the context of comparison with other *Folio* items.

The *Durham* poet's vocabulary is almost entirely English: approximately 70% of the verbs, nouns and adjectives are immediately derived from Old English and the remaining 30% are of Romance derivation. The poet consistently employs words and phrases conventionally found in the Middle English Romance.<sup>6</sup> Some of these tags have undergone the minor modifications of word substitution,<sup>7</sup> alteration in word order,<sup>8</sup> or

---

2. F.J. Child, *The English and Scottish Popular Ballads*, (New York, 'Dover' edn., 1965).

3. HF, II, 190: BL. Add. MS. 27,879, fols. 122<sup>v</sup>-124<sup>v</sup>.

4. D.C. Fowler, *A literary history of the popular ballad*, (Durham, N.C., 1968), p. 5.

5. *Durham* conforms to the lexical usage seen in the majority of the *Folio* items. Its conformity is seen in the presence of the inflection of the present indicative third person plural in '-en': *they* . . . chosen, meeten, flyen, changen, saidden, didden and beene; the 'unvoicing' of the final '-ed' of the weak preterite and past participle ('looket', 'touchet'); the rhyming of 'man' with 'gone' and the use of 'gate' to mean 'way', 'path', 'course of action' in "'That gate was euill gone!'" (st. 31).

6. As follows:

a. stounde, leeue, fee, meede, shoone, dree, faine, gay, may (maiden), may (the month), troth, worthilye, &c.

b. 'buske . . . bowne', 'man of . . . might', 'stiffe & stronge', 'sighed sore', 'steade . . . stand', 'breeme . . . bore', 'kneeled . . . knee', 'louely leege', 'morning of May', 'speere . . . sheeld', 'Mary . . . mylde may', 'game & glee' 'welthe & welfare'.

I have not cited the narrator's opening *exhortation* nor his *valediction*: both of these are formulaic and are discussed later.

semantic change.<sup>9</sup> Because the traditional phrases frequently alliterate, 36% of the stanzas have at least one line where alliteration on the stressed syllable occurs, but the poem does not include alliteration not derived from formulae.

In addition to tags which do not alliterate but which are nevertheless conventions of the Romance genre,<sup>10</sup> there are phrases of a later date which perhaps owe something to the ballad since unlike the Romance tags which are occasionally encountered in the ballad, these seldom if ever, appear in the Romance.<sup>11</sup> Likewise the poet's use of an abrupt change of tense is a feature common to Middle English and the traditional ballad, though in the former this enallage is most frequently seen in a context of plain narrative and in the latter it is associated most often, as it is in *Durham*, with dialogue. There are 13 instances where, when the poet wishes to stress something spoken, he departs from his normal reported speech — 'said the King' (st. 22, line 1) — to the immediacy of the present tense — 'saies the King' (st. 22, line 3) — but apart from the Narrator's introduction and summary, the poet is content to 'tell' his audience rather than 'show' them except for one instance:

the Bishopp orders himselfe to fight:  
with his battell axe in his hand  
he said, "this day now will I fight  
as long as I can stand."

PF 79: st. 44<sup>12</sup>

PF 79 is also similar to the traditional ballad where the first and third lines are more likely to forward the narrative than the second and fourth which, as in *Durham*, carry the rhyme and are frequently 'weak' lines or chevilles.<sup>13</sup>

It is clear that *Durham* has affinities with the Romance, the Minstrel Ballad and the Traditional Ballad.<sup>14</sup> These connections will be examined more fully at a later point in this study: for now it is sufficient to remark only that it appears to be a hybrid text.

- 
7. i.e. the use of 'great' instead of the customary 'most' or 'mickel' in 'a man of great might' (st. 6).
  8. i.e. reversal of noun and verb in 'in stead wheras it doth stand' (st. 12) which is seen elsewhere as 'stonde in no stidde' (*Amadace* 728), 'stande still in a stede' (*Roland* 817), 'Stode in that stede' (*Avowing* 972), 'standeth here in this steed' (*PF* 12: *The Turke & Gowin* 282).
  9. The phrase 'a wise man in this warre' (st. 16) is probably a development of the older 'a wise man and a ware' and its variants: see J.P. Oakden, *Alliterative Poetry in Middle English*, 2 vols. (Manchester, 1930, 1935; rpt. 1 vol. Hamden, Conn., 1968), p. 340 and *passim*.
  10. i.e. 'within a little stounde', 'wonnen him shoone', 'as I hard say', 'worthilye under his sheelde', 'lands and rent' etc.
  11. 'He ware the crowne' and 'of my kin full nye' are present elsewhere in the *Folio* — notably *PF* 132 *Bosworth Feilde*. 'Merrymen', 'on the salt sea gone', 'in a studye stood', 'how now thou . . . ? how may it bee. . . ?' are found in too many ballads to need detailing here. The twice utilised 'then cam in . . . ' (sts. 14, 19) is another formula pertaining to folk-ballad.
  12. P. Gradon, *Form and Style in Early English Literature* (London, 1971), pp. 15-16.  
I have not always agreed with the punctuation of *HF* and here it is my own: *HF* has nothing after the first 'fight' and a semicolon after 'hand'.
  13. A 'cheville' is defined as a word, phrase or line used as a 'filler' between two items of narrative information. It may complement the first item; it may be a familiar tag or it may be a meaningless refrain. Its use frequently results in a 'weak line' as discussed by D.C. Fowler (*Literary History*, pp. 10-12), which is traditionally either the second or fourth stanzaic line — or both. In *Durham* 77% of the 66 stanzas have a 'weak' second or fourth line.

## b. Synopsis of the Tale

In the discussion to follow, readers will need to be familiar with the story that *Durham* tells. I have devised a method of setting out a resumé of the text which has the advantage of reproducing the author's plan of composition with clarity. I would state here that I make no claim to theoretical or analytical sophistication nor do I intend to make a contribution to the study of narrative structures. I have both here and elsewhere in this study, developed empirical tools to help assess and compare the material with which I happen to be currently dealing: they are not intended to be anything other than basic techniques of an essentially pragmatic nature expedient to the task in hand.<sup>15</sup>

### a. Method

#### i. The Plot Unit

The narrative text to be considered is separated — ignoring the scribe's stanzaic divisions — into units of composition which I term a 'plot-unit' (pu.).<sup>16</sup> They are defined according to the evolution of the narrative: each successive element to advance the story is treated as a separate unit regardless of length.<sup>17</sup>

These plot units can themselves be divided according to a number of criteria but for my present purpose, attention is given to the 'plot-line': that is to say the line or lines, phrase or phrases, within the plot-unit that delivers the specific information required for the advancement of the narrative.

---

14. In the context of comparison with later texts I should remark that the use of the verb 'to do' as an auxiliary to form a preterite tense — a marked feature of the Broadside Ballad — is present in only one instance in *Durham*: 'the Prince did present his father. . . .' (st. 61). Since this occurs in the latter section of the text rewritten by Percy, it is by no means certain that it did not originate with him.

15. The method used and the synopsis itself are presented separately from the conclusions drawn from it with reference to *Durham* because these conclusions relate to *PF 79* as a poem in its own right while in the present discussion *Durham* is used mainly as a model.

16. Each of these plot-units very loosely conforms to the definition of the formulaic composite unit of narrative structure which Pike terms a 'motifeme'.  
K.L. Pike, *Language in relation to a unified theory of the structure of human behaviour*, 2nd edn. (The Hague & Paris, 1971), pp. 150-51.

Where formulaic integrants of thematic groups are discussed in this study, the term 'motifeme' is used, but here I prefer the term 'plot-unit' as it more clearly expresses the unit's relevance to the current argument where the divisions are specifically required to be units of content rather than units of structure.

17. Thus the four lines:

then the King of Scotts in a study stood.  
as he was a man of great might:  
he sware he wold hold his Parliament in leeu London  
if he cold ryde there right.

*PF 79*: st. 6

is no less a unit than the single section of 60 lines from the same text (lines 41-100), in which the king, in expectation of their prowess in the forthcoming battle, rewards a succession of individuals with estates from the lands he has not yet conquered. The advent of each new person is a 'repetition of perception': it is not a clear promotion of the narrative even though new characters are introduced who may or may not, play a further part.

ii. The Complementary-unit.

A further term to be used is the ‘complementary unit’ (cu.): that is to say, the whole of that part of the plot-unit which is *not* the plot-line. It may be an entire sentence or several sentences; it may be a clause, phrase or single lexeme — for instance the conjunctive ‘then’ (st. 6). In topic it is usually an embellishment, expansion or repetition (st. 4, line 2), frequently formulaic and can occur in dialogue (st. 30), in description (st.19), or in action (st. 30). In short it may or may not expand information given in the plot-line but it in no way advances the fundamental narrative and if it were to be deleted its omission would leave the basic account undisturbed.

iii. The Extrinsic Voice.

This is an element of *discours* rather than *histoire* and although it may be a component of plot-line or complementary-unit, it is always the narrator addressing his audience directly. It may be the narrator’s *exhortation* or *valediction*; a comment on the action of the text (*PF* 39: *Flodden Feilde*, ll. 435-36); a reference to his ‘authority’ (*PF* 77: *Agincourt Battell*, ll. 71-72); a religious sentiment or the use of the domestic ‘our’.

b. The Synopsis.

The substance of the principal plot-units and complementary-units found in *Durham Feilde*, is set out in the following pages:

<b>Plot Unit</b>	<b>Complementary Unit</b> <sup>18</sup>
	<i>cu 1</i>
	(Narrator’s address to his audience: st. 1)
<i>pu 1</i> In England in the time of Edward III, fighting men are preparing to fight the French: sts. 2-3	
<i>pu 2</i> The Scots hear that the English have left: st. 4	<i>cu 2</i>
	The English defence is reduced to shepherds, millers and priests: st. 5
<i>pu 3</i> The Scottish king decides to hold his own Parliament in London: st. 6	<i>cu 3a</i>
	A squire warns him he will be sorry before he gets to London if he discounts English yeomen: sts. 7-8
	<i>3b</i>
	The king kills him out of hand: st. 9
	<i>3c</i>
	(This was a bad beginning to a day which would prove woeful as no Scot then dared speak: st.10)
<i>pu 4</i> The king appoints battle leaders from among his nobles: sts. 11-18	<i>cu 4a</i>
	He rewards their future valour with

---

18. The ‘extrinsic voice’ is shown in parentheses.

			as yet unconquered English land: sts. 11-18
		4b	Wm. Douglas is refused London as a reward for past and future service as the King wants it himself: sts. 19-24
		4c	The King rewards 100 new knights with English lands: st. 25
pu 5	The Scots prepare for battle: st. 26		
pu 6	James Douglas makes an advance sortie: st. 26		
pu 7	Subdued by the 'cominaltye', wounded, he alone escapes: sts. 27-31	cu 7a (i)	On hearing this, the king brags of revenge: 1 Scot = 5 Englishmen: st. 32
		7a (ii)	Douglas refutes the brag: 1 Englishman = 5 Scots: sts. 33-34
		7a (iii)	The king says there are only a few shepherds, millers, & priests left in England to fight: st. 35
		cu 7b (i)	The king sends out a herald: st. 36
		7b (ii)	He brings good cheer: st.36
		7b (iii)	"The numbers are 10 to 1 in our favour!" st.36
		cu 7c (i)	"Who leads the English?" st 37
		7c (ii)	"The Bishop of Durham." sts. 37-8
		7c (iii)	"I'll rapp that priest on the crown!" st. 38
		cu 7d (i)	The king sees Earl Percy: st. 39
		7d (ii)	He sees 4 standards: st. 40
		7d (iii)	There are 6 others belonging to York Carlisle and 'Fluwilliams' in a valley he cannot see: sts. 41-42
pu 8	The Bishop of Durham addresses the English: st. 43	cu 8a	He tells them to serve God before they fight: st. 43
		8b	500 priests say mass: st. 43
		8c	('I hard say' they bore arms in the battle afterwards: st. 43)
pu 9	The Bishop arms himself as they prepare to fight: st. 44	cu 9a	He declares he will fight to the death: st. 44
		9b	So does Carlisle: st. 45
		9c	So does 'Fluwilliams': st. 45
pu 10	The English archers shoot: st. 46	cu 10a	The 1st shot is too high — it misses: st. 46
		10b	The Bishop orders them to lower their aim: st. 47
		10c	The 2nd shot is successful: st. 47
pu 11	The Bishop shouts that the Scots are fleeing: st. 48	cu 11a	On hearing this the Scots indeed fly: st. 49

		<i>11b</i>	Many are killed: st. 49
		<i>11c</i>	The English continue to shoot as fast as they can: st. 49
<i>pu 12</i>	Standing motionless the King of Scots thinks very anxiously: st. 50		
		<i>cu 12a</i>	He is guarded by his men: st. 50
		<i>12b</i>	Nevertheless an arrow pierces his nose: st. 50
		<i>12c</i>	An arrow hits his armour: st. 50
<i>pu 13</i>	Wounded, he withdraws to the edge of a marsh: st. 51		
		<i>cu 13a</i>	He dismounts and stands by his horse: st. 51
		<i>13b</i>	Supporting himself on his sword, he leans forward: st. 51
		<i>13c</i>	He lets his nose bleed [on the ground]: st. 51
<i>pu 14</i>	He is followed by John of Copland, an English yeoman: st. 52		
<i>pu 15</i>	Copland orders the king to yield to him: st. 52		
		<i>cu 15a</i>	The king refuses as Copland is not a gentleman: st. 53
		<i>15b</i>	Copland agrees that he is only a poor yeoman: st. 53
		<i>15c</i>	He asks if in this 'man to man' situation the King is better than he: st. 54
<i>pu 16</i>	Copland then defeats the King of Scots: st. 55		
		<i>cu 16a</i>	Copland mounts the king on a palfrey: st. 56
		<i>16b</i>	Copland mounts a 'steed': st. 56
		<i>16c</i>	Holding the king's bridle-rein he leads him away: st. 56
<i>pu 17</i>	Copland takes the king to London: st. 56		
		<i>cu 17a (i)</i> <sup>19</sup>	The Scottish king arrives in London: st. 57
		<i>17a (ii)</i>	The English king has just come from France: st. 57
		<i>17a (iii)</i>	Meeting the King of Scots he speaks to him: st. 57
		<i>cu 17b (i)</i>	The English king asks if the Scot liked the shepherds, millers and priests: st. 58
		<i>17b (ii)</i>	He is told that they are the hardest fighting men — 1 English yeoman equals a Scots knight: sts. 58-59
		<i>17b (iii)</i>	The English king states that that is because the Scots' fight was against the Right: st. 59
		<i>cu 17c (i)</i>	The [Black] Prince has taken the

---

19. This section, insofar as the actual Battle of Durham is concerned, is a digression: it will be discussed at length later, but for the purpose of this summary it is simply classified as a complementary-unit of some complexity.

		French king at Poitiers: st. 60
	17c (ii)	He gives his prisoner to his father, the English king: st. 61
	17c (iii)	He then returns to his own business: st. 61
	cu 17d (i)	The Scottish and the French kings meet: st. 62
	17d (ii)	The Scottish king bewails his present circumstances: st. 62
	17d (iii)	The French king does likewise: st. 63
pu 18		Thus ends the battles of Durham, Crécy and Poitiers, all in the month of May: st. 64
	cu 18a	There were celebrations in a prosperous England then: st. 65
	18b	There was good fellowship between everyone — especially the king and his yeomen: st. 65
	18c	God save the king and good yeomanry now: st. 66

These eighteen plot-units with their complementary units, comprise the form in which the author's knowledge of, or choice of 'facts' has survived.<sup>20</sup>

## A. *Durham: The Omission of Major Historical Facts*

### a. Introduction

The next step, examining *Durham* as a particular text, is to determine whether any major event or aspect found or stressed in the historical Annals or Chronicles has been omitted.<sup>21</sup> This is necessary because since *Durham* purports to be the story of a factual event it might be assumed that the author's composition has been constrained by the necessity of adhering to historical fact and chronological sequence. Therefore this assumption must be tested: the author's basic material must be shown. Are there omissions and modifications of fact? Are there authorial inventions? After these questions have been answered it is then possible to see whether the author appears to have deliberately selected his matter to form a patterned structure relevant to both history and his creative purpose, and, if he did, how that purpose was achieved.

### b. The Omissions

#### a. *Scottish Motivation*

Twenty of the thirty-two major historical records consulted commence their accounts with the motivation for the Scottish invasion.<sup>22</sup>

---

20. The term 'fact' in the present discussion relates to items cited in the source documents: the actual historical truth of an item is irrelevant except where otherwise stated.



David II (the 'King of Scots'), was persuaded to take up arms at the instigation of Philip de Valois (the King of France, Philip VI — 'The Fortunate') who, hard-pressed by the activities of Edward III of England in France, incited the Scottish attack as a diversionary tactic designed to cause Edward to deploy some of his force to meet this domestic threat and thus lessen the pressure on Philip.

---

21. **Primary Sources Consulted**

- 'Annales Monasterii de Bermundeseia (AD 1042-1432)', *Annales Monastici*, ed. H.R. Luard, Vol. III (London, 1866).
- 'Annales Monasterii de Oseneia (AD 1016-1347)', *Annales Monastici*, ed. H.R. Luard, Vol. IV (London, 1869).
- 'Annales Prioratus de Wigornia (AD 1-1377)', *Annales Monastici*, ed. H.R. Luard, Vol. IV (London, 1869).
- The Brut*, Pt. II, ed. F.W.D. Brie (London, 1908).
- 'Chronicle of Lanercost', trans. Sir H. Maxwell, *Scottish Historical Review*, 10, 2, 38 (1913), 174-84.
- Chronicon Angliae*, ed. E. Maunde-Thompson (London, 1874).
- Eulogium (Historarium, sive Temporis)*, ed. F. Scott Haydon, Vol. III (London, 1863).
- Liber Pluscardensis*, ed. F.J. Skene, Vol. I (Edinburgh, 1877).
- Robertus de Avesbury, *De Gestis Mirabilis Regis Edwardi Tertii*, ed. E. Maunde-Thompson (London, 1889).
- Thomas Burton, *Chronica Monasterii de Melsa*, ed. E.A. Bond, (London, 1868).
- Galfridi le Baker de Swinbroke, *Chronicon Angliae*, ed. J.A. Giles, Vol. III (London, 1847).
- Jean le Bel, *Chronique*, ed. J. Viard & E. Déprez, Vol. III (Paris, 1905).
- Hector Boëthius, *Chronicle of Scotland* (facsim. Amsterdam, 1977).
- John Capgrave, *The Chronicle of England*, ed. F.C. Hingeston, (London, 1858).
- The Chronicles of England: Westmynstere 1450*. William Caxton's edn., (facsim. Amsterdam, 1973).
- John of Fordun, *Chronicle of the Scottish Nation*, trans. W.F. Skene, (Edinburgh, 1872).
- \_\_\_\_\_, *Scotichronicon, cum Supplementis et Continuatione Walteri Boweri*, ed. W. Goodall, 2 vols. (Edinburgh, 1759).
- Sir John Froissart, *Oeuvres*, ed. Kervyn de Lettenhove, (1867-77: rpt. Osnabrück, 1967).
- \_\_\_\_\_, *Chronicles of England*, ed. & trans. T. Johnes, (London, 1839).
- \_\_\_\_\_, *The Chronicles of Jean Froissart in Lord Berner's Translation*, ed. G. & W. Anderson (London, 1963).
- Ranulf Higden, *Polychronicon*, ed. J.R. Lumby (London, 1882).
- Henry Knighton, *Chronicon*, ed. J.R. Lumby (London, 1895).
- Laurence Minot, *Poems*, ed. J. Hall, 2nd edn. (Oxford, 1897).
- Adam Murimuth, *Continuato Chronicarum*, ed. E. Maunde-Thompson, (London, 1889).
- William Stewart, *The Buik of the Croniclis of Scotland*, ed. W.B. Turnbull (London, 1858).
- Thomas Walsingham, *Gesta Abbatum Monasterii Sancti Albani* ed. H.T. Riley, Vol. II (London, 1867).
- \_\_\_\_\_, *Historia Anglicana*, ed. H.T. Riley, Vol. I (London, 1863).
- \_\_\_\_\_, *Ypodigma Neustriae*, ed. H.T. Riley, (London, 1876).
- Andrew of Wyntoun, *The Original Chronicle*, ed. F.J. Amours, Vol. I (Edinburgh & London, 1914).

**Later Sources**

- Robert Fabyan, *The Concordaunce of Histories* (London, 1559).
- John Foxe, *Acts & Monuments*, ed. G. Townsend (London, 1843).
- John Hardyng, *The Chronicle* (1543; facsim. Amsterdam & Norwood, N.J., 1976).
- Raphael Holinshed, *Chronicles of England*, Vol. II (1587; London, 1807).
- William Martyn, *The Historie of the Lives of the Kings of England* (1615), (London, 1638).
- John Speed, *The Historie of Great Britaine* (London, 1632).
- Polydore Vergil, *Historia Anglica* (1555; facsim. Menston, 1972).
22. The later sources listed, are consulted for two reasons. First, these histories are compiled from older sources some of which are not now extant and which may therefore include matter not present in other works. Secondly, at this point in the investigation the date of origin of *Durham* may in theory, lie anywhere between 1346 and the date when it was written in *The Folio*. If the item is of late composition then the sources which were then available to the author and which are available to me should be read.

b. *The Queen's Presence*

Froissart states:

Quant la bonne dame la royne d'Engleterre entendi que ses gens se devoient combatre et que li affaires estoit si approcie que li Escot tout ordonné estoient sus les camps devant yaus, elle se parti de le ville dou Noef-Chastiel et s'en vint là où ses gens se tenoient, qui se rengoient et ordonnoient pour mettre en arroi de bataille.

Following Froissart, Speed, Holinshed and Grafton all remark her presence.<sup>23</sup>

c. *Flight of the Scottish Battalion*

Seven of the source historians recount that Patrick (9th Earl of Dunbar and Lord of the March), and David's nephew, Lord Robert Stewart, (Steward of Scotland), fled the field together with the 'battel' they commanded, when matters began to go badly for the Scots.<sup>24</sup>

d. *The King's Flight*

Five of the Chronicles state that the king, David Bruce, fled, or was in the act of flying from the victorious English when he was captured.<sup>25</sup>

e. *Copland's Hurt*

Five of the Chronicles (four of them Scottish), note that although severely wounded, the Scottish king's efforts to evade capture by John of Copland resulted in Copland losing some teeth.<sup>26</sup>

---

23. Froissart, ed. Lettenhove, p. 126. Speed, p. 693; Holinshed, p. 644; Grafton, fol. 86<sup>v</sup>.

24. The Chronicles are divided as to which 'battel' they commanded — some maintain that it was the vanguard and some assert that it was the third wing. Stewart, p. 366 and Boethius, fol. LL.xxviii<sup>v</sup>, say that they led the first division of troops — an important position: Wyntoun, p. 186 and *Pluscarden*, p. 225, hold that it was the third (of lesser importance), while *Lanercost*, p. 180-1, has it both ways by noting that the 1st division was offered but refused and the 3rd accepted. The Scottish Chroniclers, putting things in as favourable a light as possible, have been tactful. Thus Andrew of Wyntoun, p. 186:

Bot þe Stewart eschakit þen  
And with him mony of his men,  
And þe Erl of þe Marche alsua.

ll. 6081-83

The Chronicler of *Pluscarden*, p. 294:

Comes vero Marchiarum, et senescallus Scociae, regis nepos, visis  
accidentibus, et remedium nullum expectando sperantibus, incolumnes  
cum multis ad propria redierunt.

25. Wright cites an anonymous poem which exists in three versions, which he believes to be contemporary with events. It provides more detail than the monkish chronicles:

Brus David auffugit, fugiendo contra leo rugit,  
Coplond attingit, fugientem vulnere cingit;  
Regem persequitur, David in Spinis reperitur,  
Coplond arestat, David cito manifestat.  
Rex fugiens capitur, et honos regis sepelitur.

MS. Bodl. 351, fol. 116<sup>r</sup>; BL. MS. Cotton Titus, A.xx., fol. 52<sup>v</sup>; Bodl. MS. Rawl. 214, fol. 122<sup>r</sup>, cited in T. Wright, *Political Poems and Songs relating to English History*, I (London, 1859), 46.

f. *The King's Captivity*

Five Chronicles state that the king was not immediately taken to the Tower of London because of the severity of his wounds.<sup>27</sup>

c. Durham: The Effect of the Omissions

Despite any conclusion which may derive from *Durham's* possibly unique features as a particular text, it is still possible to use *PF 79* as a model for the establishment of tentative general principles against which other rhymed narratives with an historical topic can be compared. This possibility arises because the text with its ballad format, is presented within a genre: regardless of its originality within that genre it must conform in its major aspects to the type-patterning seen in the kind of narrative it purports to be or fail to attract the audience to whom it is addressed as a 'popular' (in Child's sense), historical ballad.<sup>28</sup> However because, as the following pages show, *Durham* does indeed have characteristics which set it apart from the 'average' work present in Child, it is possible that some individual points are *not* valid as general principles. This possibility will be proved or refuted when comparisons are made in later chapters of this study.

The following discussions show various features: a brief outline of those to be illustrated in a specific investigation is set out beneath each of the headings which precede each study (with the exception of those concerning the *Omissions of Major Facts* which also relate to the discussion which follows: *Omission of Detail*). It should be borne in mind that although not always remarked, a feature presented as relative to one particular heading is frequently supported or continued in the text discussed under another, and that the investigation of *PF 79* as a 'model' is parallel to its investigation as a 'particular' text — although the conclusions relating to the latter study are not specifically advanced until all the headings have been examined.

The major conclusions reached with regard to *Durham* as a 'model' text and briefly introduced prior to each discussion, are gathered together and enumerated at the end of this Section as a provisional heuristic paradigm which will later be used as a basis for comparison with other texts.

The study of the effect of the omissions of major 'facts' and the simplification or exception of smaller historical details shows that:

- The tale is comprised of a collection of scenes which progress in a linear chronological sequence towards a single grand climax

---

26. Iohun of Cowplande þar tuk þe kyng  
Off fors, noucht 3oldyn in þat feychtyng;  
þe kyng two teithe out of his hewide  
Wipe a dynt of a knyf hym rewide.

Wyntoun: p. 185

27. He was kept at Bamborough Castle for ten weeks until he was delivered into the hands of John Darcy, Constable of the Tower, on January 2nd, 1347, having been taken there *not* by Copland as *Durham* has it, but by Sir Thomas de Rokeby: Jean le Bel, p. 131: 'Papers relating to the captivity and release of David II', *Miscellany of the Scottish History Society*, 3rd series, 9 (1958), 3.

28. F.J. Child, *ESPB*, 5 Vols. (New York, 1965 edn.).

- The narrative simplifies complicated historical events and omits or generalises small historical details — including names and characters' motivations.
- The text is partisan: the enemy is totally devoid of virtue while the heroes are God-fearing, have Right on their side, and the valour of the least of them is such that they can conquer despite handicaps.

a. *Omission of the Scottish Motivation*

By ignoring the French incitement to attack England, the invasion is seen to be motivated solely by David's realisation of an apparent opportunity to fulfil a personal ambition.<sup>29</sup> The omission removes any excuse that he invaded because of an honourable obligation to an ally — an interpretation which is present in most of the Scottish sources. The King of Scots is made a villain in his own right: he alone performs the 'misdeed'. This directs audience animus towards the Scots and enhances the status of the English victory.

With this omission the beginning of the tale now commences with David's observation of the apparent absence of English military strength, and now conforms without complication to the initial situation set out by Propp as Preparatory Function II beta — Withdrawal.

b. *Omission of the Presence of the Queen*

As Johnes remarks:

A young and comely princess, the mother of heroes, at the head of an army in the absence of her lord, is an ornament to history: yet no English writer of considerable antiquity mentions this circumstance, which, if true they would not have omitted.<sup>30</sup>

No poet would have omitted it either.<sup>31</sup> However Froissart's account of the battle is inaccurate in several points: this would appear to be one of them. Conclusive evidence that the queen was *not* at Durham is given by Hall who refers to a Charter at Mons which shows that on the day of the battle she was at Ypres.<sup>32</sup>

---

29. I sometimes use 'David' and 'Philip' to refer to the kings of Scotland and France respectively, to avoid the necessity of repeating their cumbersome titles too frequently. These names are present in the historical sources and are not taken from *Durham* which, for a reason to be discussed, avoids naming either of the monarchs.

30. Froissart, ed. Johnes, p. 178.  
Froissart's information is second hand as he was himself only nine years old at the time of the battle. The only English or Scottish writers to report the Queen's presence are Speed, Holinshed and Grafton, all of whom write two-hundred years or more after the event and acquire their information from Froissart.

31. That the *Folio* scribe did not know of the report of her presence because, existing before 1523 and the publication of Lord Berner's translation, he was unable to read French, or that he simply had not had access to Froissart in any form, is possible — if unlikely. I postulate Froissart rather than Jean le Bel since the latter's *Chroniques* are not known to have circulated outside France while the former's works were widely known even in his own lifetime. Froissart had a persistent compulsion to rewrite Book I (in which this incident occurs) and issued no less than five editions. The vast number of extant manuscripts — over a hundred — testify to his popularity. *Froissart: Historian*, ed. J.J.N. Palmer, (Woodbridge, Suffolk, 1981), p. 1f; G.T. Diller, 'Froissart: Patrons and Texts', *ibid.*, p. 145; F.S. Shears, *Froissart: Chronicler and Poet* (London, 1930), p. 188ff.

32. Minot, p. 86; see also Froissart, trans. Lord Berners, p. 104; Froissart, ed. Lettenhove, V, 487. Wright, *Political Poems and Songs*, pp. xx and xxiv, without evidence, remarks the unlikelyhood of the presence of the queen. He erroneously calls her 'Isabella' as does Scott Haydon who, carelessly following Wright, brings forth 'additional proof' in that no mention is made of the lady in the nearly contemporary chronicle he is editing: *Eulogium*, III, xxvii.

With regard to this apparent omission from *PF 79*, any hypothesis that perhaps the queen was mentioned in an original text but deleted from later transcripts, is untenable. The flow of the narrative has no disruption as would be evident had any such deletion been made. According to Froissart Queen Philippa's historical function was to encourage the men prior to the battle:

Et là estoit la bonne royne d'Engleterre enmi euls, qui leur prioit et amonnestoit de bien fare le besogne, et de garder l'onneur de son signeur le roy et de son royaume d'Engleterre, et que pour Dieu cascuns se presist priés de estre bien combatans.

In *PF 79* this function (though not the sentiment) has been transferred to the Bishop of Durham. Froissart is the *sole* primary source to state that the Bishop was not only present at the engagement but, as he is made to do in *Durham Feilde*, led the first battalion.<sup>33</sup> Because it would be an unlikely coincidence for the *Durham* author to have independently invented the presence of the Bishop of Durham as a Commander, and because it occurs only in Froissart, there is a strong probability that the author was familiar with Froissart's account and therefore also knew of the presence of the Queen.

Why then, was it omitted? If one were to suppose that the author excluded it because he knew it to be untrue the question then arises of how he came by his knowledge. It is highly unlikely that he himself was present at the battle or that he had his information from someone who was so present, because, as Child points out, the narrative of *PF 79* contains many inaccuracies which are inconsistent with contemporary composition.<sup>34</sup>

An examination of the results of the omission (together with one other important factor yet to be mentioned), shows that the absence of the queen is deliberate. Her exception and the substitution of the Bishop of Durham in her place, permits the author to direct audience perception towards the poem's theme:

---

32. Froissart, ed. Lettenhove, Vol. V, Seconde rédaction, 126.  
This is an elaboration of Jean le Bel, p. 127:

Quant ses seigneurs d'Angleterre furent assemblez, ils vinrent par devant la royne, et elle les prya et requist qu'ilz se voulsissent deffendre et garde[r] le bien et l'onneur du roy.

33. Froissart, ed. Lettenhove, p. 126

The Scottish Cistercian Priory of Pluscarden is the only other source besides Froissart and Jean le Bel to record that the Bishop was present at the battle:

cum aliis militibus . . . qui in partibus Galliae in subsidium regis Angliae infra breve ivisse debuissent et qui auditu de ejus adventu novis, eorum passagium deferendo.

*Liber Pluscardensis*, p. 293.

However *Pluscarden* (elaborating on Bower's Continuation of Fordun (*Joannis de Fordun Scotichronicon*, ed. W. Goodall, I, (Edinburgh, 1759), 341-43 — where the bishop receives no mention), nowhere places him in a position of command: neither does Jean le Bel. He is in command *only* in Froissart and *PF 79*. (Holinshed follows Froissart, but he was not published until 1577, so for the purpose of this argument may be discounted as a source). The author of *Pluscarden* could not have had personal knowledge of the battle as, by the mention of the death of James II (1460), he appears to have written post 1461. However the writer of *Pluscarden* tells us that he has lived in France and belonged to the suite of the Dauphinesse (p. xxi; p. 381). Because no other English or Scottish history mentions the Bishop and the *Pluscarden* author had personal connections with France, it seems probable that his information was derived from French sources in France — perhaps le Bel or Froissart. This suggestion is reinforced by the fact that the oldest extant copy of *Pluscarden* (Glasgow MS. F.6.14), was transcribed by a Frenchman. Later manuscripts are derived from this text or from Bodl. MS. Fairfax 8, which *also* appears to have French connections (*Pluscarden*, p. xff.). Thus the available evidence points to the story of the Bishop of Durham having originated in France.

that the military valour of the humble English yeomen and their tonsured priests is greater than any perfidious Scottish practical fighting force.<sup>35</sup>

The early part of the text has introduced the situation, established the nature of the enemy, and intimated the theme. With the advent of the Bishop (st. 38), the poet warms to his purpose and develops his subject in relation to the prowess of the clergy and the 'righteousness' of the English.<sup>36</sup> He transfers the pre-battle function of a monarch to the Bishop who is shown as the supreme Commander. Thus the sovereign's mandatory pre-battle address to the forces has a new slant in the mouth of a bishop: first it emphasises that the English are god-fearing:

The Bishop of Durham commanded his men,  
& shortlye he them bade  
that neuer a man shold goe to the feild to fight  
till he had serued his god.  
500 preists said masse that day. . . .

PF 79: st. 42

---

34. Child, *ESPB*, III, 282.

The most notable errors are the transference of the 'earl of Anguish' (Angus) and 'Lord Nevill' from their prominent position among the English forces to the leadership of the Scots, and assigning the month of the battle to May (sts. 27, 64), when in fact it took place in October. This kind of error is unlikely to be a deliberate manipulation of fact since unlike other alterations to be discussed, it adds nothing to the effective narrative but does imply that the author had no close knowledge of the events about which he wrote. Child also mentions that the author has confused his Douglases: the Douglas who was beaten in an incautious sally before the battle proper is named by *all* the detailed Chronicles as 'William' but *PF 79* (sts. 26-29) attributes this event to 'James'. No Chronicler cites a 'James' at the battle although mention is variously made of a 'Walter', a 'John', a 'Thomas' and an 'Archibald'. The standard genealogical references are unanimous that there was no 'James Douglas' of fighting age at that period. It is possible that the nomenclature changed through the process of *PF 79*'s transmission: perhaps at some point 'William Douglas' has been confused with the 'James Douglas' of the very well known ballad of the *Battle of Otterburn*.

35. The majority of historical sources suggest but do not develop this theme. They stress the lack of effective opposition which David expected to find and cite clerics and other categories of person presumed to be poor fighters: 'prestes & men of holy chirche & women & children & ploghmen & such oþir laborers'; *Brut*, p. 299: 'agricolae ac pastores et capellani imbecilles et decrepiti'; Knighton, p. 42. All the other sources who comment in detail give a similar list — including the clergy with such people as skimmers, cobblers, merchants, swineherds &c. In *PF 79* this list appears as 'shepards & millers both and preists with shaven crownes' (st. 5) and, unlike the chronicles, it is emphasised by triple repetition as it occurs at the beginning (st. 5), in the middle (st. 35), and at the end (st. 58) of the text.

It is interesting to note that the inducement to invade because of lack of opposition is also proffered in almost identical terms to the King of Scots in *PF 25: Scottish Feilde*: 'there is noe leeds in tha [sic] land saue Millers & Masse preists' (l. 109).

36. In comparison with the long list of Scots it is significant that there is mention of only two lay combatants on the English side: Earl Percy (st. 39) and an unknown 'Lord Fluwilliams' (Fitzwilliams) (st. 41). There is a reference to 'my Lord of York' and 'my Lord of Carlile' (st. 41) but these are certainly the Archbishop of York and the Bishop of Carlisle. William de la Zouche, the Archbishop, was historically one of the Commanders: the majority of annals note him, and Minot and Le Baker also name the Bishop. It is impossible for 'my Lord of Carlisle' to have been the Earl of Carlisle as the last Earl was Andrew de Harcla who met a traitor's death in 1323: he had no issue and his lands and Honours were forfeited. The earldom was not revived until 1622 — the first Barony was not granted until 1473 and was Scottish. Therefore in 1346 there was *no* lay Lord of Carlisle and it is certain that in *PF 79* the Bishop is meant as there is no other possible candidate. (*The Complete Peerage*, ed. V. Gibbs, III (London, 1913), 31, 40; *DNB*, VIII, 1201). The Bishop of Carlisle at the time was John de Kirkeby — renowned for being a militant bishop (1312-1352). On July 30th, 1346 a summons was issued for sundry persons to attend Parliament to discuss the state and defence of the realm and advise the king. However Kirkeby was ordered to 'send a proctor in his place as he is himself occupied with the defence of the March of Scotland': *The Victoria History of the Counties of England: Cumberland*, II (London, 1905), 42, 260; *Calendar of Close Rolls: Ed. III, VIII* (London, 1905), 146.

Only secondly does it utilise the heroic commonplace appropriate to a brave leader:

This day now I will fight  
as long as I can stand. . . .

PF 79: st. 44

Because the text's focus at this point is on the Bishop and his 'heroic' function, York and 'Carlile' are made to swear to fight to the death only *after* the Bishop has set an example (sts. 44-45). Neither of these speeches is appropriate to a lay character like the Queen who by reason of her gender, must perforce be a non-combatant, but they *are* appropriate to a fighting Bishop.

The Bishop also usurps the function of conventional military commanders when he is shown correcting the archers' aim (sts. 46-47) and, with shouted comments on the progress of the battle (st. 48), encouraging *his* 'merrymen'. Some at least of the 'merrymen' are the Bishop's subordinate clergy, 500 of whom, prior to the battle, gave mass (unmentioned in the Chronicles), and afterwards 'bore both speare & sheelde' (st. 43). The result of all this is that it appears to be the Bishop who is the sole leader and to whose conduct of the battle victory is due. Because, ignoring the achievements of the experienced fighting knights, the poet is concerned in this section of the work, to glorify the part played by the clergy in the victory — and thus emphasise that the English had God and the Right on their side — he needed an ecclesiastic as a leader who could be shown acting in the manner described: the queen would not do.<sup>37</sup>

However, as I have remarked, there is one other factor which supports the statement that the omission of the queen is deliberate. Unnoticed by Froissart and the historians who used him as a source, the plain fact is that historically, Thomas Hatfield, Bishop of Durham, had nothing whatever to do with the battle. In short — he wasn't there.<sup>38</sup> The Chronicles agree that York commanded one of the divisions and may have been in charge of the entire army.<sup>39</sup> At first glance such an ecclesiastic is eminently suited to the poet's purpose and yet apart from the fleeting and solitary reference to 'my Lord of York' (st. 41), he is totally ignored in favour of a man who was not there and appears in no English annal. I have observed that the presence of the Bishop is noted in one Scottish Chronicle (which probably obtained the information from Froissart), but Froissart is the *sole* source to remark the presence of both the queen and the Bishop-as-a-Commander with equal status with the Archbishop of York.<sup>40</sup> The poet has had to choose which character best suits his theme. The queen, as I have shown will not do: this being so, because the poet's purpose is to laud the lowly, the Bishop is the better choice since the Archbishop's rank is too exalted for him to be pictured as one

---

37. For his glorification of the yeomanry he had the story of John of Copland and his personal capture of the King of Scots conveniently to hand.

38. Le Baker (p. 169), shows him in France conducting the funeral rites — 'exequias mortuorum soleniter celebravit' — for John, King of Bohemia and his companions slain at the Battle of Crécy on the 26th of August. If that were all it might be argued that Hatfield may have left Edward's forces and returned to Durham by the 17th of October, but that that did not occur is clear from the draft of a letter describing the Battle of Durham which was sent by the Prior and Convent of Durham to their Bishop who was still abroad at the time it happened. BL. MS. Cotton Faustina, A.vi.47, cited in *Historical Papers and Letters from the Northern Registers*, ed. J. Raine (London, 1873), p. 387.

39. C. Oman, *History of the Art of War in the Middle Ages*, 2nd edn. (New York, 1924), II, 149. See also the Primary sources listed.

with the people with any conviction. On the other hand the Bishop can be called ‘that preist’ (st. 38) and thus aligned with the ‘sheperds, millers and preists’ without too much loss of credibility. Thus the poet’s omission of the queen and the transference of the regal function to an ecclesiastic — with all that follows — not only underlines the idea that the English cause was ‘right’ but tightens his tale and expands clerical reputation into an area where churchmen do not usually shine.

c. *The Omission of the Flight of a Scottish Battalion*

It is possible that the poet was unaware of this episode as it does not occur in Froissart. However the effect of its lack is that the size of the larger force opposing the English is not diminished by the flight of an entire Wing, and thus the extent of the eventual victory is the greater. ‘The Scots flyen’ (st. 48) is reserved to signify the end of the battle.

d. *The Omission of the King’s Flight*

Again this episode is not in Froissart. Apparently David II fled only after he had been badly wounded: ‘in facie sagitta vulneratus, a certamine declinavit, et fugiens captus est’.<sup>41</sup> The *Durham* poet modifies this flight into a temporary withdrawal ‘to let his nose bleede’ (st. 51). Thus he is still to be accounted as part of the fighting force — he is not wounded so severely that he cannot fight Copland — and therefore Copland’s glory in taking such an important prisoner is the greater.

e. *The Omission of Copland’s Hurt*

The Scottish King’s resistance to capture is presented as being ineffectual:

The King smote angerly at Copland then,  
angerly in that stonde,  
& then Copland was a bold yeaman  
& bore the King to the ground.

*PF 79: st. 55*

The fact that historically David II, despite his own wounds, was nevertheless able to knock out several of Copland’s teeth, is omitted — perhaps because such a hurt is more appropriate to a tavern brawl than an heroic struggle. Even so the omission is not in line with the treatment which might be expected in a description of such a situation. The poet has ignored the opportunity to use the *single-combat* motifeme which might conventionally be expected to follow the *challenge*:

“Yeeld thee Traytor!” says Copland then,  
“Thy liffe lyes in my hand. . . .”  
“What! Art thou better than I, Sir King?  
Tell me if that thou can!”.

*PF 79: sts. 52-54*

---

40. Froissart, ed. Lettenhove (seconde rédaction), p. 126:

‘Ses gens furent tout ordonné et mis en III batailles. La première gouvernoit li évesques de Durem et li sires de Persi; la seconde, li archèvesques d’Iorch. . . .’

I note again that Percy is the only named English knight in *PF 79*.

41. Thomas Burton, p. 62



*Durham* begins with the conventional narrator's exhortation 'Lordings listen and hold yo still/hearken to me a litle' (st. 1), and as previously noted, formulaic phrase and vocabulary frequently occur thereafter. Such standard formulae imply a knowledge of the conventions. Therefore the omissions of the 'single-combat' motif in a situation where not only is it called for, but in a situation where it actually occurred, is surprising. I suggest that it is absent because its insertion would not forward the poet's underlying theme. It cannot be applied to a fight between Copland and the King because the latter is wounded. For him to be shown to be able nevertheless to inflict physical damage on the 'hero' does not accord with the picture of Copland as an illustration of the valiant English yeomanry able to overcome opposition with insouciant ease, and it *does* add to the stature of the foe. Even though Copland's hurt is omitted, the writer still cannot show the King's capture as the result of formulaic single combat (where the antagonist is never weaker than the protagonist) because the defeat of an unaided and wounded man would tend to mitigate the hero's glory. Prior to this event the *Durham* poet has related the deeds of the 'knaves' (the English shepherds &c.), as 'archers' in general terms: the purpose of this episode is to give a particular instance of the prowess of a yeoman although not involving the audience in every act of the individual's achievement.

f. *Omission of the King's Captivity Prior to his Transmission to the Tower.*

If, as I concluded above, the author was using Froissart as a source, he must have been aware of the delay between David's capture and his eventual incarceration in the Tower of London.<sup>42</sup> Its omission has the same result as the brevity of the account of the King's capture: the poet simplifies historical detail and the audience is hurried on to the 'grand climax' where the valour of the least military of the English is summed up in Edward's taunt to his discomfited prisoner and the Scottish king's reply:

“How like you my shepards & my millers?  
my preists with shaven crownes?”  
“By my fayth, they are the sorest fighting men  
that ever I mett on the ground.  
  
There was never a yeoman in merry England  
but he was worth a Scottish knight!”  
“I, by my troth,” said King Edward & laughe,  
“for you fought all against the right!”

PF 79: sts. 58-9<sup>43</sup>

---

42. Froissart gives much space to the negotiations between Queen Philippa, King Edward and Copland: the latter appears to have been reluctant to relinquish his prize before assurance of a suitable reward. Much of Froissart's reporting concerning this matter is fictitious. However Copland was in fact well rewarded: He was created a 'banneret' with a grant of five hundred pounds per annum to 'maintain that estate'. *Cal. Close Rolls: Ed. III, IX* (1906; rpt. Nendeln/Liechtenstein, 1972), 179. According to Brewer, Copland had the added distinction of being the first knight banneret ever to be made — the order was allowed to become extinct after the first creation of baronets in 1611. *Brewer's Dictionary of Phrase & Fable* (London, n.d.), p. 73. Regrettably Brewer appears, as he frequently does, to be wrong: there is a reference to John de Horne, Robert de Ufford and Philip de Neville and others being given sundry articles pertaining to their knighting 'tamquam Bannerettis', in 1303; N.H. Nicolas, 'History of the Order of the Bath', *History of the Orders of the Knighthood of the British Empire*, III (London, 1842), 8. There is also a banneret present in a list of the garrison of the Castle of Caermarthen in 1282: Nicolas, I, xxxiii.

d. Durham: Omission of Detail

The following shows that the author has omitted details concerning the prelude to, and the aftermath of, the battle. Also absent are specifics having to do with the battle itself and the personnel involved therein. The inclusion of these matters would only serve to dilute the narrative and distract from the poem's theme. The effect of these omissions strengthens the second of the paradigmatic statements I previously made: the narrative simplifies complicated historical events and omits or generalises small historical details — including names. The following shows that 'numbers' are similarly affected.

a. *The Disposition and Composition of the Armies*

In line with the author's purpose of praising the supposedly martially weak, he has simplified his report and omitted the distraction of detailed strategic matters. He is content to imply the pre-battle disposition of the opponents in a single stanza:

The King looket againe towards litle Durham;  
four ancients there see hee,  
(there were to standards, 6 in a valley —  
he cold not see them with his eye).

PF 79: st. 40

Similarly, unlike the majority of the annals, the poet has made no attempt to enumerate the respective parties. He lets it be known that the English were outnumbered by having a Scot remark smugly "Against one wee bee ten!" (st. 36), but there is no hint of the actual numbers involved. Likewise a list of noble Scottish warriors occupies a major part of the first half of the text but there is no corresponding list of English knights. The (untruthful) implication is that there *were* no knights: that the English army was composed of priests and 'yeamen'.

b. *Casualties*

All the Chronicles which do more than merely note the occurrence of the battle, catalogue the names of those killed and those captured. *Durham* cites no one other than the king as captive. For the casualties, that the Scots are killed 'in heapes hye' (st. 49) is deemed sufficient. Although the historical event concerned many people, for his purpose the poet need only focus on a few representative individuals; more would be a distraction.

c. *Nomenclature*

A significant omission is the fact that the text nowhere identifies the King of Scots or the King of France by name. By declining to name the villain once — while stating his nationality and that of the enemy seventeen times ('France' is named six times), the partisan poet leaves the audience in no doubt that the Scots are inimical and the French not much better.<sup>44</sup> Although *Durham* is nominally about a past event, by stressing Scottish perfidy without allying it to the Scots of 1346 any more than can be helped, that, and the contrasting praise of English

---

43. This section occurs in the latter half of the text which was torn out of the *Folio* and rewritten (and probably re-spelt) by Bishop Percy.

44. I have previously remarked omitted items (*Motivation for Invasion*) and shall note invented items (*Squire's Murder*), which present the Scottish king as a thoroughgoing 'villain'.

yeomen, may be related to the audience's present. This matter is discussed further under the later heading *Dating*.

### B. *Modification of 'Fact'*

With the possible misdating of the battle of Poitiers by ten years, the author's modifications of 'fact' are few, unobtrusive and, in the context of the narrative, credible. Their purpose relates solely to the presentation of the battle as a struggle between the strong but misguided Scottish lords and the weak but righteous English commons.

The following examination produces two additional points for inclusion in my tentative paradigmatic scheme:

- Where the historical topic has been chosen for its exemplary nature there will be at intervals, a repetition of the matter from which the 'moral' will be drawn after the final climax.
- Chronology may be inaccurate.

#### a. *Chronology*

The poem agrees with the sequential order of events as set down in the historical accounts although the chronology is poor. The poet has used the conventional phrase 'a morning in May' (sts. 27 & 64) for the day of the battle, when in fact the month was October. Since his concern was other than that of recording the event as an historian this imprecision is of no great importance to the understanding of the text.<sup>45</sup> However the second mention of this 'May morning' heralds an alteration of 'fact' of some significance to the purpose of the verses:

Thus ends the battell of Faire Durham  
in one morning of May:  
the battle of Cressey & the battle of Potyers  
all within one monthes day.

PF 79: st. 64

The battle of Crécy was fought on the 26th August, 1346 and Durham on the 17th of October in the same year, but Poitiers was not fought until ten years later — the 10th of September, 1356.<sup>46</sup> The telescoping of events stresses the superiority of the English *at that period* and there is a hint of the nostalgia of the Golden Myth in the moral which follows it as a caudal 'happy ending'.<sup>47</sup>

Then was welthe & welfare in mery England,  
solaces, game and glee,  
& every man loved other well  
& the king loved good yeomanrye.

PF 79: st. 65

---

45. Indeed 'May' as a *tempus amœnum* in other genres, perhaps serves in its first mention here before the battle, as an intimation that the English will be victorious.

46. A.H. Burne, *The Crecy War* (Westport, Conn., 1955 rpt. 1976), p. 141ff., p. 282f.

47. As Fowler points out (*Literary History*, p. 164), the tone of this stanza is similar to PF 118: *In olde times paste*.

This stanza, introduced by the triple victory made possible by the modification of dates, implies that the well-being of the realm used to be due to this ‘good yeomanrye’ and perhaps that this well-being in the time of the writer no longer obtains. The sudden change from the present tense of stanza 64 to the very definite perfect tense of stanza 65 (which echoes the chronological distancing established in the second stanza with ‘as it befell in Edward the Thirds dayes’), and the reversion to the present in the final stanza (below), strongly suggests the exemplary nature of the poet’s theme which is also perhaps obliquely hortatory within the confines of extreme tact.

But God that made the grasse to growe  
& leaves on greenwoode tree,  
now save and keepe our noble king  
& maintaine good yeomanrye.

A telescoping of events similar to the linking of the three victories, is seen in stanzas 60-63 where the King of France, captured at Poitiers, is shown imprisoned at the same time and place as the King of Scots. This is erroneous.<sup>48</sup> It is used to extend the vindication of the English victory, as the kings are made to wish that instead of opposing England they had taken pilgrimages to Rome and Jerusalem — a ‘good’ course of action. The implication that they know themselves to have been engaged in a ‘wrong’ undertaking which they now regret, is an elaboration of Edward’s remark in stanza 56 that they ‘fought all against the right’.

Another modification of ‘fact’ relating to dates is present in stanzas 19-24 where William Douglas (c. 1300-1353): the ‘Knight of Liddesdale’) and the King

---

48. The French king captured in 1356 was the son of Philip de Valois (d. 13.8.1350), John II (the ‘Good’). It is very unlikely that the two kings met as John was confined to the Palace of the Savoy and Windsor Castle, while from 1355 David II was kept at Odiham Castle and released in Berwick in 1357: *Miscellany Scottish Historical Society*, p. 4. The rumour that the kings met appears not to have been generally current until much later: it is not noted by any historian until Boëthius in 1527 and *he* notes it with some doubt (Bk. 15, Ch. xv):

It is said y<sup>e</sup> king Edward full of vane arrogance sat crownit with septour and diademe betuix two captive kyngis of Scotland and France in his feist of Yule that sic thingis mycht be rehersit to his glore takand na respect of the unsickit stait of man. . . .

Minot (?1300-?1352) in his *neuill cross* intends to make it clear that the kings are not imprisoned together in London:

To be both in a place : þaire forward þai nomen,  
Bot philip fayled þare : and Daudid is comen.

ll. 53-54.

However Minot continues in the next line:

Sir Daudid þe Bruse : on þis manere  
Said vnto sir Philip : al þir sawes þus sere:

ll. 55-56.

The presentation of what follows, through the introductory ‘said’ has the appearance of conversation. By logical inference what David ‘said’ must have been via a messenger or a letter: it is however nowhere so stated and a hasty reading could well give an impression that a face-to-face conversation took place if ‘forward’ is taken to mean the ‘vanguard’ of Philip’s army, and ‘fayled’ is construed to mean simply that he failed to arrive as a Conqueror. It is not until line 58: ‘þis es noght þe forward : we made are to 3ere’ that ‘forward’ is seen to mean ‘agreement’. It is therefore perhaps possible that the myth of the combined imprisonment may have originated with Minot.

of Scots converse.<sup>49</sup> It is well documented that Douglas fought for the Scots at Durham as he was captured and held until 1352.<sup>50</sup> However he could not have served David II for ‘this thirty winter and four’ (st. 20), as David (1324-1371) was twenty-two years old on the 25th of March, 1346 and thirty-four years prior to that Douglas was about twelve years old. This modification presents the Scottish king, not as a young man without the wisdom of experience, but as a middle-aged monarch whose iniquities may be presumed to be an integral part of his character. Also the question of age is focused on the speaker, Douglas, who in telling the audience something of his fighting experience is seen as a veteran.<sup>51</sup> He represents the qualities of all the noble knights who have been listed before him in the ‘rewarding’ sequence without much detail. Thus the author is creating a picture of a formidable invasion force to contrast with the inexperience of the resistance, and at the same time is laying the ground-work for an appreciation of Douglas’s defeat by the ‘comminaltye’ (st. 27) on his next appearance in the narrative.

b. *Conversation*

In that next appearance the text relates Douglas’s preliminary sortie, his defeat and subsequent conversation with the king.<sup>52</sup> Although the essentials of this dialogue are in *Lanercost*, the *Durham* poet expands the extent of Douglas’s defeat (st. 31) and details the site and nature of his wound (st. 28). He also reverses the order of the verbal exchange as given in *Lanercost*.<sup>53</sup> He includes the second repetition of the matter from which the moral will be drawn and the passage becomes a variant of the ‘Squires Warning’ of stanzas 7-10. However the humble squire is murdered for his pains but here the author contrives that the noble Douglas, expressing a similar opinion to the squire’s, reaps only a mild rebuke. This points up David’s different treatment of the humble and the noble and contrasts it with the attitude of the English king who ‘loved good yeomanrye’ (st. 65): a telling piece of propaganda to a yeoman audience.<sup>54</sup>

c. *Aggrandizement of the Commons*

An important modification relating to the text’s theme and moral and also part of the section under discussion, is that *PF 79* shows Douglas and his men as having been overcome by the ‘comminaltye’ acting alone — except for Christ’s

---

49. J. Taylor, *The Great Historic Families of Scotland* (London, 1889) I, 48.

50. *Calendar of Documents Relating to Scotland*, ed. J. Bain (Edinburgh, 1887), III, 272.

51. In choosing Douglas as his exemplar, the author is also calling upon the extra-textual knowledge of his audience with reference to the famous exploits of the ‘Knight of Liddesdale’.

52. No other source than *Lanercost* (p. 180), records any conversation whatever between Douglas and the king. It is interesting that this sole record of dialogue should also contain the essentials of the conversation in *PF 79*.

It is not impossible that the northern author of *Durham* had seen *Lanercost*. The Priory was situated in Cumberland, two and a half miles north-east of Brampton which is near Carlisle. It was on one of the main mediaeval highways between England and Scotland. The Priory owned various properties in the north-west of England and had frequent traffic with them: J. Wilson, ‘The Authorship of the Chronicle of Lanercost’, *S.H.R.*, 10, 2, No. 38 (1913), 138-55.

The date of *Durham*’s composition is discussed presently but there is no doubt that *Lanercost* — the last entry in which is the Battle of Durham — preceded *PF 79* which cannot therefore, have influenced the Chronicle.

54. The question of the audience for whom this text was intended is discussed later.

help of course (st. 27).<sup>55</sup> This is a foretaste of yeoman valour and lends weight to the text's repeated remarks concerning the quality of the English resistance.

a. Inventions: Their Relationship to the 'Facts' and their Purpose

The examination of the 'invented elements' and their purpose shows that first, the author has fabricated narrative sequences to facilitate logical linking between the historical 'facts' and the embroideries necessary to shape his text's theme and purpose. Secondly, the embroideries themselves are either inventions or fictional embellishments attached to a kernel of 'fact'. This is particularly so in the case of the longer of the verbal exchanges in which dialogue is used as a specific amplification of a preceding narrative generality. Finally, some of the invented elements are present to add 'light entertainment' to the narrative: for instance the *Squire's Warning* is a form of dramatic irony enabling the King of Scots's overconfidence in the *Rewarding Sequence* (which follows it), to be enjoyed by the audience who have advance knowledge that he will eventually receive his 'comeuppance'. A similar effect is achieved by *Douglas's Warning* and the king's rejection of it. There is also a comic aspect to the king's withdrawal from the battle with nosebleed.

a. *The Squire's Warning*

The episode of the Scottish squire's warning that David will not ride to London unhindered, and the lad's consequent death at the hands of his enraged monarch (sts. 7-10), is wholly fictitious.<sup>56</sup> The *Warning* brings forward the English yeomanry in more detail than is shown in stanza 5 — the first mention of 'sheperds', 'millers' and 'preists' — and reassures the audience that the 'husbandmen' are not as helpless as the Scottish king thinks. The king is

---

53. *Lanercost*, p. 180:

Now came William . . . crying aloud . . . "David! arise quickly; see! all the English have attacked us." But David declared that this could not be so. "There are no men in England," said he, "but wretched monks, lewd priests, swineherds, cobblers and skimmers. They dare not face me: I am safe enough". . . "Assuredly," replied William, ". . . by thy leave thou wilt find it is otherwise. There are diverse valiant men: they are advancing quickly upon us and mean to fight."

PF 79: sts. 32-35:

(The King of Scots is speaking):

"one Scott will beat 5 Englishmen  
if they meeten them on the plaine."

Douglas replies:

"in faith that is not soe . . .  
for they are as Egar men to fight  
as faulcon vpon a pray. . ."

"O peace thy talking!" said the King,  
"they be but English knaues,  
but shepards & Millers both,  
& preists with their staues."

55. The Chronicles vary as to the actual forces which defeated Douglas but *Lanercost's* 'the columns of my lord the Archbishop of York and Sir Thomas de Rokeby . . . and Sir Robert de Ogle . . . who . . . followed them . . . killing many of the enemy with his own hand' is a fair sample of the principal persons common to most accounts.

presented as an overconfident, arrogant villain who disdains the advice of the humble. The narrator terminates the scene by surfacing in a confidential aside to remark that the day (which would bring the Scots 'woe enough') had started badly. Thus the audience is prepared for the English to be victorious.

b. *The Rewarding of Knights*

The rewarding of the Scottish knights with lands not yet conquered is an invented episode using a convention designed to highlight the folly of unwarranted anticipation.<sup>57</sup> The sequence also serves to build up a picture of the might of the Scottish forces and thus add to the magnitude of the English yeomens' prowess — the poet's theme.

The list of unconquered lands which the King is blithely giving away to his Scottish knights, is significant and important to the poet's purpose. Much of the argument which supports this statement is related to points which have yet to be discussed.<sup>58</sup> For now it is sufficient to note that this passage is the most lengthy in the text and in view of the tautness of the remainder of the tale, stands out as an apparent lapse if its sole purpose is to show the King's overconfident folly and the quality of the Scottish opposition: such a purpose does not need the topographical detail given. However if, as I believe, the purpose of the passage is twofold, then (in line with the careful construction which I presently show to be a feature of this text), the author has not idly indulged in a lengthy diversion distracting from the essential story. It should be noted that the territories listed are mainly in the west or north-west — the area, it will be argued, in which the text was intended to circulate. I believe that the locations have been specifically chosen by the poet because they are familiar to his audience and he wishes covertly to remind them of a time when their homes were in jeopardy, and, at this point in the poem, to arouse an old ire against the Scots and pride in their fore-fathers who defeated them.<sup>59</sup>

---

56. The implication that the Scots could reach London is found as a bare mention in three sources: in two it is used as an argument to induce David to invade and only in one is it presented as a boast as in *PF 79* and that one is *Lanercost* p. 178:

'He declared that he would assuredly see London within a very short time.'

'þai said þat þai mycht richt weil fare to Lundyn. . . .'

Wyntoun, p. 177

' . . . usque Londensem pertransire poterimus'

*Pluscarden*: p. 292

Minot (poem IX, p. 31) is much closer to the passage in *Durham*:

Sir David þe Bruse : said he sul fonde  
To ride thurgh all England : wald he nocht wonde;  
At þe west minster hall : suld his stedes stond.

*Neuil cross*: l. 9-11

Because, as has been remarked, Minot is the *only* source other than *PF 79*, to relate a bitter comment from the captive Scottish king to the French king and is also the sole source to mention 'riding' to London and also incorporate the notion of parliament as implied in 'west minster hall', it is likely that the *PF 79* author was conversant with Minot or a lost common source.

57. A variation of this convention is also found in *PF 77: Agincourte Battell* and *PF 15: Musleboorrowe Feild*.
58. These points are covered presently in the section of this chapter headed *Dating*.
59. The reason why the poet desired to arouse these feelings is set out later under the heading *Dating*, sub-heading *The Theme of PF 79 and the Political Climate*.

c. *The Herald's Reconnaissance*

The Herald's news "Against one wee bee ten!" and "The Bishopp of Durham/is captaine of that companye" (sts. 36-37) is fiction.<sup>60</sup> It is a commonplace for the victors of any battle to magnify the numbers of the defeated: *Durham's* author is using this custom to build up the extent of the eventual victory and to link Part I of the text where he deals with the Scots, to Part II, where he turns to the English.

d. *The Establishment of 'Right'*

Having enlarged the opposing forces and presented the apparent impotence of the plebeian English, the poet has now to provide his audience with some reason why the shepherds, millers and priests — who by their nature cannot be thought to be martial champions — will prevail. He will use another convention. He will present them as being godly men who have 'Right' on their side and by implication, divine favour. Therefore he now turns to the English pre-battle preparations and writes a great deal of poetic fiction surrounding a very small core of historical fact.

He begins by establishing the English leader as the Bishop of Durham (untrue). The implication that the cause is good which has a Bishop leading it, is further embroidered with the (untrue) picture of the English army hearing mass before the battle and the (true) note that the priests fought (sts. 44-49). The image of the fighting clergy is continued during the battle scene itself, with the (untrue) description of the conduct of the Bishop who is shown correcting the archers' aim after their initial volley fails (untrue).<sup>61</sup> This fiction is an adaptation of the conventional 'first blow/second blow' scheme of formulaic single-combat: it highlights the natural talents of the untrained-man-with-God-on-his-side and it links the description of the English which precedes it and Scottish which follows it.

e. *The King's Nosebleed*

The wounding of the King of Scots and his subsequent capture by Copland,

---

60. The heralds are found only in Froissart (as 'coureurs'). The information they bring back is different: "nous ne les poons avoir tous nombres car il se sont couvert et fortetyet de la haie." Froissart, ed. Lettenhove, p. 130.

The numbers in *PF* 79 are much inflated: the nearest figure is from *The Brut* (l. 29, p. 299): 'thre fold so meny of hem as of Englysshe men'.

61. Only one account from the thirty studied states that the Scots successfully parried the first shower of arrows (it does *not* state that the archers missed). From Oman's study of the battle and my own survey of the remaining chronicles it would appear doubtful if even this much is true:

Restitit animose natio Scotica nescia fugae, et capitibus ferro tectis inclinatus, acies  
densa Anglicos invadens, cassidibus politis et umbonibus numero firmatis, sagittas  
Anglicorum in primordio belli frustravit, sed armatorum acies prima ictibus  
letalibus hostes salutavit.

Le Baker, p. 172.

On the other hand, Andrew of Wyntoun, p. 182:

Than baith þe first routtis rycht þare  
At þat assemble vincust ware,  
For of arrowis sic schot þare was  
That feill were woundit in þat place.

Oman, *Art of War*, p. 149ff.



is fact. The body wound, ‘thorowe his armorye’ (st. 50) was more severe than appears in *PF 79*’s passing mention.<sup>62</sup> However by focusing on a nosebleed (st. 51) as the (untrue) cause of the king’s withdrawal from the battle, the king is presented, in line with the humour agreeable to an early audience, as being neither pathetic nor brave in his defeat but a comic figure — in strong contrast to the initial picture of an arrogant monarch in all his power.

f. *Conversations*

Copland’s demand that the king should yield (st. 52), is present in all the detailed sources, but the verbal exchange which follows in *PF 79* is the author’s invention:

“Yeelde thee, Traytor!” saies Copland then,  
“Thy liffe lyes in my hand.”

“How shold I yeeld me,” sayes the King,  
“& thou art noe gentleman?”<sup>63</sup>  
“Noe, by my troth,” sayes Copland there,  
“I am but a poore yeaman.

What! art thou better then I, Sir King?  
Tell me if that thou can!  
What! art thou better then I, Sir King,  
Now we be but man to man?”

*PF 79*: sts. 52-4

That the poet is deliberately flouting chivalric tradition for his own purpose is likely: that the author is inviting the yeoman of his audience to identify with his hero is probable when it is noted that Copland’s social status is peculiar to *PF 79*.<sup>64</sup> Copland’s use of the familiar ‘thee’ and ‘thou’ when he addresses the king, underlines the message that Copland as a ‘yeaman of merry England’ (st. 52) and a ‘bold yeaman’ (st. 55) is the Scottish king’s equal in a ‘man to man’ situation. Furthermore, this message is spelt out in the invented conversation between the imprisoned King of Scots and Edward III in stanzas 58-59 when David himself says:

“There was never a yeaman in merry England  
but he was worth a Scottish knight”.

---

62. As noted earlier he was unable to be taken to London immediately after the battle due to their gravity:

Tua arrow heidis into his body buir:  
Ane in his leg, the kne sumthing abone. . . .  
Ane vther wes also in his foirhead. . . .

Stewart, p. 369

This is the most detailed of several source references.

63. The king’s indignation at the presumption of a commoner attempting to capture him and the implied loss of ‘face’ were he to succeed, is reflected in an episode which took place almost a century later, when the Earl of Suffolk knighted his captor so that it might be said that he had been taken by a knight:

Le conte de Suffort . . . se rendit à ung escuier d’Auvergne nommé Guillaume Regnault; lequel conte fist chevalier ledit Guillaume Regnault affin que l’on dist qu’il estoit prins d’un chevalier. [June, 1429].

Le herrault Berri, ‘Chronique’, *Procès de Condamnation et de Réhabilitation de Jeanne d’Arc dite La Pucelle*, ed. J. Quicherat (Paris, 1847), IV, 45.

The tense has changed abruptly from the simple present of the preceding stanza, to the perfect aspect of the present tense which extends the past reference into the present time of the audience — with the flattering implication that one English yeoman is *still* equal to a Scottish knight.

## b. Conclusions

### I. 'Durham' as a 'particular' text.

In my first chapter I listed a number of questions this thesis answers: here I have discussed the questions of what 'facts' appear in *Durham* and how the author's material has been manipulated. The results of my examination have led me to conclude that there is a strong probability that *PF 79* is the work of one man and was written with a specific purpose in mind. The poet's intention is to rouse patriotic feeling and cause his audience to believe that in the face of a Scottish threat the well-being of the realm depends on the English yeomanry and that they are well able to deal with any perfidious Scottish foe. This purpose is the principal *raison d'être* for the choice of 'facts', their manipulation and in fact, the entire work.

Thus looking at this Section as a whole, it is seen that the author has omitted episodes and details present in the historical accounts, the inclusion of which would have clouded his purpose and complicated his simple narrative. He has kept the principal events cited by the chroniclers, thus maintaining historical mediaeval continuity, but where necessary historical 'fact' has been modified towards his objective. He has invented the items which illustrate in detail a point he is trying to make and which is first seen in its broader aspect in a preceding general passage. Finally he has invented credible links between the factual and fictional elements of his text, with the result that the whole is bound together and appears to be an ingenuous but truthful celebration of an English victory achieved by the yeoman of England. It follows that the audience arrives at the conclusion the author intended and believes that conclusion to be historically valid.

### II. 'Durham' as a 'model' text.

The following items derived from my analysis to this point, are set out as a provisional paradigm tentatively relevant to other historical rhymed narratives:

- 
64. The nearest rank cited in the sources is in the *valettus* of Knighton. None of the sources make him a yeoman. The 'knycht of nobill blude' (Stewart); 'Duce' (Vergil) and the 'Dominus de Coupland' (*Pluscarden*) are patently wrong in view of his later Banneret awarded by Edward. See also the following entries from *Calendar of Documents Relating to Scotland*, pp. 238, 260:

'Feb. 24 1339: The king signifies that for his long and faithful service he has given his valet John de Coupland 20*l.* for life. . . .'

'Feb. 27 1339: The King commands a writ to be issued suspending a plea of novel disseisin arraigned before his justices by Johana, widow of Wauter Mautalent against his vadlet [sic] John de Coupland as the latter is in his service beyond seas.'

'Feb. 29 1344: The King has received a petition from Copland . . . who has served him both in the North and beyond seas, for a grant to him and his heirs of the lands of . . . ' &c.

From this it would appear that by 1346 Copland was not a young man and was a man of some standing — the entry for February the 24th continues with a grant of a list of estates to which the grant of February, 29th adds. That Copland was a 'poor yeoman' (st. 53) is patently untrue.

1. Complicated historical events occurring over a broad spectrum are simplified;
2. Specific historical details likely to distract from the 'action' of the narrative, unless present in a cheville, are absent or generalised;
3. Where the historic event concerned many characters, the narrative focuses specifically on one or two;
4. Some character nomenclature is inaccurate or absent;
5. Motivation is not detailed;
6. Fictitious material is not concerned with the direct action of the historic event itself;
7. Chronological sequences occur in the proper order but specific temporal locations may be inaccurate;
8. Dialogue is unsourced;
9. Dialogue expands 'character' or underlines the moral;
10. Dialogue may serve to remark the movement of characters but it does not greatly forward the principal event;
11. Links between scenes are likely to be fictitious;
12. Minor fictions are present to entertain the audience with 'light relief';
13. The topic relates to a single 'episode': that is to say a collection of 'scenes' organised in a chronological linear sequence;
14. The sequence of scenes resolves into a single grand climax;
15. The final climax is followed by a lesson or a moral;
16. During the narrative there is repetition of the substance of the matter from which the 'moral' is drawn;
17. The poet is partisan;
18. The party favoured has 'right' on its side;
19. The party favoured is outnumbered by the foe or otherwise handicapped;
20. The figures relating to the forces involved are inaccurate.

In the following chapters of this study, rhymed historical texts with varying dates of origin are compared with the structure of *Durham* as set out in this paradigm. The paradigm is found to be generally valid. It is shown that where there is disagreement, in the final analysis that disagreement stems from factors relating to the original date of composition of the subject text — the older the composition the higher the degree of concurrence. However it is also shown that even the most modern of the texts studied nevertheless maintain continuity with a *minimum* of 60% agreement with the paradigmatic items.

## **II. Organisation of Material and Date of Origin of 'Durham Feilde'**

## a. Introduction

Having examined the *Durham* poet's choice of matter and set down his apparent method in a tabular form which when compared with other works, will illustrate the extent to which his choice was governed by idiosyncrasy or by convention, the next step is to survey the manner in which the poet's matter has been assembled. The following analysis shows that leaving aside the requirements of the ostensible ballad form, the structure of *PF 79* displays a particular symmetry which is only compatible with the presumption that its composition was the work of an individual and single-minded author.

### A. *Systematisation of Narrative Units*

The essentials of the text of *Durham* has been previously set out divided into plot-units and complementary units (cu and pu). The symmetry within this division is considerable. First, I have found twenty plot-units and twenty complementary-units, even though four of the former have no complement. This number may be fortuitous but the second striking symmetry is so consistent that it would seem to be an authorial habit: I refer to the expansion of eighteen of the plot-units into tripartite complements. This is a sufficiently large number of triplets to indicate that this form is an integral part of the composition. However it might be assumed that tripartite division is a function of the four-line stanza, the first line comprising the plot-unit and the remaining three the complementary unit. This is so in only *one* instance of a tripartite complementary unit (pu/cu 15: st. 51) from a text of sixty-six stanzas. That the trebling pattern is not related to the stanzaic form is easily seen: apart from st. 50 and 51 (stanza 50 has a two-unit complementary unit) the author needs a minimum of two stanzas to complete a plot and complementary unit and a maximum of twenty-three stanzas in the case of pu/cu 4. This being so, tripartite division of the complementary-unit cannot be a function of the four-line stanza, and therefore, since it occurs throughout the text it must be either a manifestation of a convention or an authorial practice. Since I have nowhere found a consistent use of tripartite complementary- units such as would point to a convention, I conclude that the symmetry originating in this usage stems from authorial idiosyncrasy.

A further symmetry is that with the exception of pu/cu 4 mentioned above, the plot-unit is positioned in each case before the complementary-unit which expands it. This is by no means a universal scheme.

A certain symmetry is also seen in the manner in which the author has embedded his 'fictions' among his 'facts'. The units where both plot and complementary elements are invented (4, 7, 11, 15 and 19) are almost equally spaced among the units which are either wholly or partially true. There are five instances where both the plot and complementary units are 'false', six are 'true' (if units 5, 6 and 16 which do not have a complement are included) and seven 'mixed' — where either the plot-unit or the complementary-unit, but not both, are true. This is a very even division.

## a. Conclusions

It is not proposed that the author manipulated his sources and his embellishments to conform with any plan in which symmetry held a high and conscious priority. However it is quite apparent that he was aware of the fact that the deception which is

hardest to unravel is that which is wound around strands of accepted truth. As shown previously, the historicity of the basic narrative as seen in the plot-units is essentially true, while the complementary embellishment is in the main untrue. The careful choice of matters to be included and matters to be omitted and the consequent systematic, symmetrical and logical distribution of plot and complementary-units — in short the apparent thought and craft that seems to have been an integral part of the composition of this text, implies a single sophisticated and purposeful author.

## B. 'Durham' and 'Neuil cross' compared

### a. Introduction

It is relevant to a full appreciation of *Durham* to note how it compares with an English text which celebrates the same battle. The following discussion shows that the battle of Durham could be celebrated in another fashion and with a different emphasis but that the conclusions so far drawn in respect to *PF 79* remain valid and in fact are confirmed through a comparison of the different attitudes adopted by the respective poets.

### b. Comparison

The author of the only other English rhymed text on the Battle of Durham is Laurence Minot (fl. mid-14th century) whose surviving work is solely on the topic of the wars of Edward III. His poems are thought to be contemporary with the events about which he writes and it has been suggested that he was a camp-following minstrel — certainly his verses conform to most of Friedman's criteria for minstrel work, with the most noticeable trait being long passages of spirited and direct address to the discomfited enemy by the poet in his own persona as narrator.<sup>65</sup> *PF 79: Durham*, at the very least is a propaganda poem attempting to inspire patriotic emotion through the retelling of a glorious episode from the past. In *Neuil cross* Minot plugs patriotism through contemporary events.<sup>66</sup> As Pearsall says:

Minot is the first true national propagandist, violent, abusive, narrowly prejudiced, with a repellent glee, very appropriate to the genre, in gloating over the downfall of the enemy.<sup>67</sup>

The keyword in this description is 'gloating'. While, as is described presently, *PF 79* contains the motifemic element *gloat*, there it is part of the *histoire* and not, as is Minot's

---

65. J. Coleman, *English Literature in History 1350-1400* (London, 1981), p. 73; Minot (ed. Hall), p. xii; A.B. Friedman, *The Ballad Revival: Studies in the Influence of Popular on Sophisticated Poetry* (Chicago & London, 1961), p. 22; *The Viking Book of Folk Ballads of the English Speaking World*, ed. A.B. Friedman (Harmondsworth, 1963; rpt. 1982), pp. xxv-xxvi.

66. Minot's verses on Durham are entitled by means of a 'link' connecting them with the previous poem (on Calais):

Sir Daudid had of his men grete loss  
With sir Edward at þe Neuil cross.

Minot (ed. Hall), p. 30ff. I shall refer to this text as *Neuil cross*.

67. D. Pearsall, *Old English and Middle English Poetry* (London, 1977), p. 122.

general custom, present in the discours. The *gloat* in *PF 79* is used as a climactic component towards the end of the work whereas in Minot's *Neuil cross* the first 'gloat' occurs at the end of the first stanza and the remainder of the poem is likewise interspersed.

Unlike *Durham*, Minot's texts are not in 4-line stanzas and he does not use common-metre, but (and also unlike *Durham*) he makes much use of alliteration though little use of the cheville. He has few plot-units but a great many complementary-units, thus the poems themselves are not generally straightforward narratives and the historical detail appears to be a vehicle for the author's invective against the enemy. The poems are songs of triumph in no way subordinate to the events they celebrate.

In comparing *Neuil cross* with *Durham* the former is seen to be by far the more artistically contrived in its use of language: for instance the repetition of a phrase to link stanzas (sts. 2-3, 5-6, 7-8, 10-11); the use of both single and double alliteration, and metaphor. In that regard Minot appears to be the superior author. Nothing of his style appears in *Durham* whose originator was concerned with the presentation of his matter to an unsophisticated audience in a simple fashion. That the *Durham* poet's style is a deliberate choice may be deduced from the fact that the evidence previously noted, points to him having been acquainted with *Neuil cross*.<sup>68</sup>

### c. Conclusions

Minot's work is directed towards a reasonably cultured audience and probably a specific patron. His exceptionally violent denigration of the enemy suggests that he was writing to flatter in the hope of reward: his lack of anything but the bare outline of 'factual' detail and the abundance of partisan glee point towards an audience who needed no detail because they, or their relatives had been participants in the events. Because both poems celebrate the same topic the outline of events in both poems is naturally similar, but the poems read quite differently: the one is an outright paean of triumph with no hint of there ever having been any real danger: its attitude is transitive — the emphasis is on the result of the defenders' actions on the enemy. The other is intransitive: it is a narrative of peril overcome: the poet's tone being one of quiet approval of the actions of the English yeomen who have stoutly rallied round in a time of pressing need. The emphasis is on the defenders and the whole is overlaid with a calm nostalgia calculated to inspire the audience to prove that they can also behave as the yeomen in the poem. In short, although *Durham* has an appearance of naive simplicity it is in fact far from superficial.

## III. Summary of Findings: 'Durham' as a 'Particular text'.

My examination of the historical elements and their presentation in *PF 79*, is now

---

68. The *Durham* poet has utilised the matter of Minot's second stanza referring to the Scottish king's boast that he would ride to Westminster (*PF 79*: st. 6); the lack of experienced defence (Minot: st. 3; *PF 79*: st. 5) and the commiseration between the two captive kings (Minot: st. 10; *PF 79*: sts. 62-63). It is possible that the first two points may have been taken in *Durham*'s case, from Chronicles — as Minot is contemporary with the battle it is unlikely that he did so — but in the matter of the last point it is significant that the 'mutual commiseration' appears nowhere else but in Minot.

complete.

I now give a recapitulation of the findings set out in the discussions in this chapter and which relate to *Durham* as a poem in its own right. My final conclusion points firmly to the necessity of determining the date at which *Durham* was composed.

The text of *PF 79* shows how omission of the details of the sometimes complicated events which chronologically bracket an historical incident, is used to isolate the incident from the confusion of the interwoven pattern of cause and effect present in historical reality. The incident thus retains only a simplified association with the events which surround it. This is just sufficient to enable the audience to recognise the tale as 'history', but at the same time to perceive it as a whole: it has a clear beginning, middle and ending. The omission of many background details from the 'story' itself strengthens the narrative so that the story-line is clear-cut and easily understood. Where details are presented they are often the result of authorial alterations and additions to 'historical facts'. They are used as 'links' to maintain the simplicity of the narrative of the basic theme which the historical incident has been chosen to illustrate, and to keep this theme in clear focus.

The presentation of the theme is not achieved by a random technique; the patterning of the larger elements is brought about by a general narrative statement followed by an amplification through the means of dialogue. This pattern of presentation is also followed in the smaller elements of plot-unit where basic information is regularly followed by complementary expansion. Fictional elements are embedded in or linked with, genuine 'fact'. The result is a highly crafted tale which has the appearance of being a straightforward recapitulation of an historical event which lends all the authority of a past reality to the theme it illustrates.

Despite its simple stanzaic format the structural composition of *Durham* is too consistent, sophisticated and purposeful to be anything but the work of one man — a man with a specific purpose in mind: to denounce the Scots and promote national pride and martial self-esteem among English commoners. This is achieved by composing his text in an ostensible ballad form appropriate to an audience of yeomen and by utilising this familiar medium, to present a villainy which only nominally belongs to the past. The use of the domestic 'our' in 'our King' and the introduction of the present tense in some of the dialogue — notably when English valour is being discussed — invites a present audience participation. So also the list of towns and territories shown to be in jeopardy. The whole text exaggerates the part played by commoners in the battle and in the final stanza the prayer for 'good yeomanrye' and the repetition of 'our noble king' (only *this* time the phrase refers to the current king), gives a final immediacy to the text which reaches out to include the audience among the various yeomen ostensibly celebrated.

*Durham Feilde* as a 'particular text' is an example of the art of intelligent propaganda. Although the fact that the work 'presents and perhaps exaggerates the point of view of the "folk" rather than that of the leaders' has been noted, because the message is covert and no longer relevant to our times, scholars have, until now, mentioned the text, if at all, only in passing.<sup>69</sup> The next step therefore is to attempt to determine the times to which the poem's message *was* relevant and of which such a text is a product.

An allocation of a date of composition is also required when regarding *PF 79* as a

---

69. D.J. McMillan, 'Five traditional Medieval Historical Ballads and the Nature of Oral Transmission', Diss. University of Maryland 1963, p. 89; E.K. Chambers, *English Literature at the Close of the Middle Ages* (Oxford, 1945), p. 156; D.C. Fowler, *A Literary History of the Popular Ballad* (Durham, N.C., 1968), p. 164.

'model' text in order to discover whether the mediaeval or Middle English elements present in the poem (to be discussed presently), were contemporary with the society in which the text was originally written or whether they are the remnants of an earlier tradition which were still in occasional use in a transitional period. Thus if *Durham* can be dated it can properly be slotted into its position and used as a guide to the state of mediaeval continuity obtaining (in at least one instance) at a specific time, as well as serving as a 'model' for other popular rhymed historical texts.

### A. *Dating*

There is no one factor present in *Durham* which unarguably assigns a date of composition to the work. There is, however, a plethora of clues. None of these standing alone is definitive but each separate clue points in the direction of the same specific temporal location and therefore, taken together, they can be regarded as a very strong argument.

Because the evidence is diffuse and hinges on many factors, each requiring a background explanation for their significance to be made evident and their authority accepted, the section which follows is unavoidably lengthy. For this reason I now give a brief synopsis of the principal matters covered, together with the conclusion at which I arrive.

The poem's reference to Lord Hamilton and his royal kinship provides a date before which *Durham* cannot have been composed: 1474. The use of the word 'comminaltye' in a context of approval suggests the Tudor period (1485- 1603); however because of *Durham's* relationship to *Flodden*, it is unlikely to have been composed after 1513. The political climate during the period 1485-1513 permits of only two time-spans when the verses would have been acceptable: 1485-1487 or 1510-1513. It is improbable that Lord Hamilton's relationship to the throne of Scotland would have been known in England in the former period because the first Lord did not travel after his royal marriage and died in 1479 when the second Lord was but a child. He however, grew to manhood and was sent on Embassies to England where he became known through his reputation for jousting. He was acquainted with the Stanleys, a powerful family of the north-west. In view of the *Folio's* interest in the Stanleys and its north-west provenance, together with *Durham's* direction towards the west and north in the list of the 'reward' territories, it is probable that the poet had his knowledge of Hamilton's royal connection through the Stanleys. There is no evidence that the first Lord was acquainted with that House, thus the indications point to the time of the second Lord and therefore the period 1510-1513 for the composition of *PF 79*. This probability is strengthened because *Durham* is a propaganda poem intended to gain support against the Scots in the traditional recruiting areas covered by the list of 'reward' territories, and takes advantage of the fame of the King's Yeomen. The period when such support was most likely to have been desired and when all of the above factors merge into an optimum cohesion is therefore between 1510 and 1513.

#### a. *Historic Individuals*

Stanza 18 of *PF 79* contains the Scottish king's speech:

"My lord of Hambleton, where art thou?  
Thou art of my kin full nye."



As Child points out, this reference provides a date before which *PF 79* is unlikely to have been composed.<sup>70</sup> In fact it provides three dates. First, ‘Hambleton’ is an early form of ‘Hamilton’ but the family was not known by the later name until David of Hamilton assumed the surname in 1375: prior to this date the family followed the patronymic custom using ‘fitz’ (*filius*). Thus the ‘Hamilton’ who was at the Battle of Durham (and was in fact captured with the King of Scots), was David Fitz-Walter Fitz-Gilbert.<sup>71</sup> This suggests that *PF 79* was composed after 1375. Secondly, James Hamilton, by Royal Charter of 28th of June or 3rd of July, 1445, was created ‘LORD HAMILTON’ and an ‘hereditary Lord of our Parliament’, ‘all his lordships and baronies being erected into the Lordship of Hamilton’.<sup>72</sup> Prior to that event Hamilton was Lord of Cadzow and the Hamiltons are, before that date, so styled.<sup>73</sup> The *Durham* poet’s use of ‘My lord of Hambledon’ points to a date of composition later than 1375 through the use of the name and extends it to post 1445 because of the use of name and rank. The third fact which takes the possible date of composition to an even later date is that this same James Hamilton (c. 1415-1497) married the Lady Mary Stewart (daughter of James II and sister to James III) in 1473/4: the Hamiltons then became the nearest family to the throne.<sup>74</sup> Thus the text’s reference to Hamilton’s kinship with the king places the work subsequent to 1474.

b. *Lexis*

The vocabulary of *PF 79* is of little help in establishing a particular date but may point to a general temporal area.

The most ‘modern’ word used in ‘ancyent’ (st. 40) — a corruption of the earlier ‘ensign’: *OED* has as its earliest entry an occurrence dating from 1554.<sup>75</sup> However because ‘ancyent’ is the poem’s *sole* ‘modern’ term and there is some half-century or so between it and the next ‘modern’ word, if in fact it was *not* in use prior to 1554, it is probable that it occurs as the result of scribal emendation.

Emendation is also possible in the case of the word ‘vanward’ (sts. 21 &

---

70. Child, *ESPB*, III, 284.

71. ‘Manuscripts of the Duke of Hamilton, K.T.’, *Historical Manuscripts Commission*, 11th Report, Appendix, Pt. VI (London, 1887), 3, 13; Rymer, *Fædera*. V, 534, cited in R. Douglas, *The Peerage of Scotland* (Edinburgh, 1764), p. 327.

72. *The Complete Peerage*, ed. V. Gibbs, H.A. Doubleday, D. Warrand & H. de Walden, VI (London, 1926), 254ff; *Hist. MSS. Comm.*, Charter 12, p. 15ff.

73. *Hist. MSS. Comm.*, p. 15ff: ‘John de Hamilton, Lord of Cadzow’ (1395); ‘James of Hamilton, Lord of Cadoch [Cadzow]’ (1422); ‘Sir James Hamilton, knight lord of Cadzow’ (1422). The family held the barony of Cadzow after it was granted to them by Robert the Bruce after Bannockburn (1314): J. Taylor, *The Great Historic families of Scotland* (London, 1889), I, 209; *Hist. MSS. Comm.*, p. 3ff.

74. *Complete Peerage*, VI, 255. In Volume One of this work (*sb.*, 1st Earl of Arran, p. 219ff.), the author gives an earlier date for this marriage, but in the later volume — new evidence having come to hand — concludes (VI, 255, footnote c), that his former opinion was erroneous. Other standard references agree with the later date.

75. *OED*, *sv.* ancient, *sb*<sup>2</sup> arch.

Unless otherwise stated in this and following discussions on single lexemes, it can be assumed that if no entry is cited from *The Middle English Dictionary*, ed. H. Kurath & S.M. Kuhn (Ann Arbor, 1953 and continuing), either the word in question is not entered in the *MED* or the entry contains no relevant information.

34).<sup>76</sup> The *Durham* text uses three variant terms quite impartially to describe an identical concept: ‘vanward’, ‘vaward’ (st. 14) and ‘forward’ (st. 11). According to the *OED* ‘vaward’ is the oldest of these at about 1375.<sup>77</sup> This is followed by ‘forward’ at about 1400.<sup>78</sup> The use of ‘vanward’ is first positively recorded in 1513.<sup>79</sup> If, as the text’s reference to Hamilton’s royal kinship attests, *Durham* must have been written post 1474, there is no reason to assume that ‘vanward’ is an emendation — especially since neither ‘vaward’ nor ‘forward’ have been amended. If ‘vanward’ is an original term then its presence points towards a textual date within a decade or so either side of 1513.

c. *Lexis and Social Attitudes*

*Durham* uses the expression ‘the comminaltye’ (st. 27) to refer to the English ‘Third Estate’ in a context of approval. In the following discussion I show why this supports the suggestion that *PF* 79 stems from the early sixteenth century.

Hales, in his preface to *PF* 16: *Thomas Lord Cromwell*, remarks that because the long wars of the preceding centuries had weakened the ranks of the barons, the Tudor monarchs ‘leaned upon the people. . . . Accordingly in the ballads of the early part of the sixteenth century the “comminalty” is frequently heard of.’<sup>80</sup> Later writers confirm and elaborate the first part of Hales’ opinion.<sup>81</sup> The results of my own exploration of the second part of his view follows.

To find out whether ‘comminalty’ in its definition ‘the common people, the populace; also a social class’ is frequently used in Tudor ‘ballads’ but not in earlier or later ‘popular’ verses, I compared it with the occurrence of the alternative word ‘commons’ (or ‘commune’) in a large number of rhymed texts.<sup>82</sup> I included as many works as possible which like *Durham*, have an historical topic, and the corpus examined spanned the years from about 1300 to 1800: I searched 2,350 rhymed and mainly anonymous works not belonging to *belles-lettres* or cultured literature.<sup>83</sup> Such a large sample was taken because the words sought were thought unlikely to occur with great frequency: of the texts examined the words in fact presented in only thirty-two.<sup>84</sup>

---

76. The authors of the *OED* remark ‘In reprints of 16th cent. works *vanward* is sometimes substituted for *vaward*’. *Vanward*, *sb. Obs.* This comment refers to printed books of a much later period than *The Folio* and is unlikely therefore to be valid here.

77. *OED*, sv. *Vaward*. *Obs.* 1. (Barbour’s *Bruce*, VIII.48). It is to be regretted that at the time of writing the *MED* has not yet reached the letter ‘V’. F.H. Stratmann, *A Middle-English Dictionary*, rev. H. Bradley (London, 1940), provides no further information.

78. *OED*, sv. *Foreward*, *sb*<sup>2</sup>. *Obs.* (*Destr. Troy*, IV.1148); Stratmann, *MED*, sv. *fore-warde*, *sb.*, *vanguard*. (*Catholicon Anglium*, 139, c. 1483).

79. *OED*, sv. *Vanward*, *sb. Obs.* (Fabyan, *Chronicles*, VI (1516), 105, b/1): For accuracy the *OED* notes a possible earlier occurrence about which there is some doubt in the *Paston Letters*, III, 162 (1476).

80. *HF*, I, 129.

81. E.N. Simons, *The Reign of Edward IV* (London, 1966), p. 300ff; G.W.O. Woodward, *Reformation and Resurgence: England in the Sixteenth Century* (London, 1963), p. 30ff; E. Perroy, *The Hundred Years War*, trans. B. Wells (London, 1965), *Passim*; *The Cambridge Medieval History*, ed. C.W. Previt -Orton & Z.N. Brooke, VIII (Cambridge, 1936), 418-449; 807ff.

82. *MED*, Part C4, p. 436, col. 2, item 2a.(b); p. 437, col. 2, item 2.

When the respective dates of usage of 'commons' and 'commonalty' are placed in tabular form it is seen that Hales' assertion that 'comminality' becomes more frequent in later 'popular' rhymed texts is confirmed.<sup>85</sup>

*PF 79* refers to the commons with approval: this is important because it is a late development. In the early usage neither 'comminality' nor 'commons' when placed in the mouth of a character with rank or authority is used to refer to members of the Third Estate in anything but pejorative terms. They are not regarded as having any important contribution to make to the welfare of the country itself: they are required to support their lords' wars and feuds, pay their

- 
83. The 'modern' works were included because some of them have earlier origins than the date at which they were written down. The precise number of texts was 2,422, but some of these were included in more than one collection.
- 84.
- |               |  |
|---------------|--|
|               | Child, <i>ESPB</i> (305 ballads):  |
| 'commons'     | No. 154, 'A True Tale of Robin Hood' (st. 84, by Martin Parker, c.1632.<br>R. Palmer, <i>A Ballad History of England from 1588 to the present day</i> , (London, 1979). (36 ballads from 1588 - 1800).<br><i>The Roxburghe Ballads</i> , Vols. 1-3 ed. W. Chappell (London, 1869-75); Vols. 4-8 ed. J.W. Ebsworth (London, 1881-95: rpt. NY, 1966). (1800 ballads: volume and page numbers cited in brackets below, refer to this work): |
| 'comminality' | <i>Rox. Coll.</i> , I. 1 (I, 8): 'Yorke, Yorke, for my monie", (sts. 17 & 18) by (?)W. Elderton. 1584; <i>Rox. Coll.</i> , II. 468 (VII, 602): 'The True Lovers knot Untied' (ll. 41-2), anon., bn. 1612-1615.   |
| 'commons'     | <i>Rox. Coll.</i> , I. 460/1 (III, 80): 'Wat Williams Will', (line 155), anon., bn. 1607-1641; <i>Rox. Coll.</i> , III. 6 (VIII, 306): 'Maddei's Lamentation' (st. 8), by Robert Sempill, 1570.<br><i>Ballads from Manuscripts</i> , Vol. I ed. F.J. Furnivall, (London, 1868) Vol. II ed. W.R. Morfill (London, 1873; rpt. N.Y., 1968). (80 ballads: Volume and page numbers cited below refer to this work):                           |
| 'comminality' | I, 95: 'Nowe a Dayes', (lines 89-92), anon. c. 1520; I, 301 & 309: 'An Exhortacyon to the Nobylles and Commons of the Northe' (ll. 100 & 108), anon. 1536; I, 125, 128: 'Vox Populi, Vox Dei' (lines 57, 148), anon. 1547-48; II, 249: 'Elegy on the Earl of Essex' (line 153), anon. 1600.  |
| 'commons'     | I, 158, 163: 'Sorrowful complaynte for the Ruyn of a Realme' (sts. 1 & 23), anon. c. 1520; II, 124 and <i>passim</i> : 'Vox Populi, Vox Dei', anon. 2547-48; II, 135: 'An Answer to the Libell called the Commons Teares' (line 145), anon. bn. 1603 -1625.  |
| 'commonalty'  | <i>Political Poems and Songs Relating to English History</i> , ed. T. Wright, 2 Vols (London, 1859, 1861). (90 texts from between 1387 - 1483: Volume and page numbers cited below refer to this work). This anthology has no sample of 'commonalty'.  |
| 'commons'     | I, 416: 'On the Deposition of Richard III', anon. 1399; II, 239: 'On the Corruption of the Times', (st. 4), anon. c. 1461; II, 279: 'Recovery of the Throne by Edward IV', (st. 33), anon. 1471.   |
| 'commonalty'  | Minot, <i>Poems</i> (11 poems from 1333-52): no examples of 'commonalty'.  |
| 'commons'     | Poem VIIIc: (un-named), line 67, Minot, <i>supra</i> , p. 29.<br><i>Historical Poems of the XIV and XV Centuries</i> , ed. R.H. Robbins, (New York, 1959). 100 texts from the 14th and 15th centuries. This work has four examples of 'commonalty' and thirteen examples of 'commons': in view of the large number I am not citing these.  |
85. On reading the prose works cited in R. Mohl, *The Three Estates in Mediaeval and Renaissance Literature* (New York, 1933), I found that this conclusion is valid for them also.

taxes, refrain from 'sin' and keep to the degree in which it had pleased God to place them:

- 1382 þe Rysing of þe comuynes in londe,  
þe Pestilens and þe eorthequake:  
þeose þreo þinges I vnderstonde,  
Beo tokenes þe grete vengauce & wrake  
þat schulde falle for synnes sake. . . .  
*The Insurrection and Earthquake: 59-61.*<sup>86</sup>
- 1399 Some . . . [lords] . . . clappid more for the coyne  
that the kyng owed hem  
thanne For comfforte of the comyne  
that her cost paied. . . .  
*On the Deposition of Richard II: 1705-14.*<sup>87</sup>
- 1450 So pore a kyng was neuer seen,  
Nor richere lordes all by dene,  
þe commvnes may no more —  
þe Lord Say biddeth holde hem downe,  
þat worthy dastard. . . .  
*Advice to the Court, II: 25-29.*<sup>88</sup>

It must be remembered, as Robbins remarks, that 'The views of the middle or lower classes seldom enter into the manuscripts, written almost exclusively by those whose training and interests lie with one of the ruling groups'.<sup>89</sup> Where a cry is heard from the 'commons' it almost always belongs to the genre of 'Complaint' poems or 'Abuses of the Age', and confirms their oppressed position.

The status of the 'commons' prior to 1485 and the Tudors, as a topic is both interesting and complex but this is not the place to indulge in a full historical social excursion.<sup>90</sup> My overview is necessarily simplified but here it is sufficient to the purpose to remark that the early 'popular' rhymed verses, insofar as I have been able to discover, never represent a high-born character demonstrating a concern for or an appreciation of the 'commons' with no apparent ulterior motive other than a recognition of *noblesse oblige*.

Throughout the Tudor period there is a grumbling substratum of conventional admonitions to, or disapproval of, the mass populace:

- 1500: Ye that ar comons, obey yovr kynge and lorde  
obserue vnto hym loue and fydelite;  
avoyde rebellyon . . .  
*Advice to the Several Estates: II, 1-3*<sup>91</sup>

---

86. MS. Vernon, fol. 411<sup>r</sup>: BL. Add. MS. 22283, fol. 132<sup>v</sup>, cited in Robbins, *Historical Poems*, p. 59.

87. Univ. Camb. Lib., L.1.4.14, cited in Wright, *Political Poems*, I, 416.

88. Cotton Rolls, ii, 23, cited in Robbins, *Historical Poems*, p. 204.

89. Robbins, *Historical Poems*, p. xlff.

90. Mohl, *Three Estates*, although arguing from a subjective and rather muddled political viewpoint, nevertheless produces a comprehensively representative selection of extracts reflecting the condition of the estates as seen by the writers of the centuries she covers. However although a hortatory writer such as Langland might instruct his king 'his commune to love' it is never for an altruistic reason but because 'it is thi tresor . . . and tryacle', or with an eye to the 'comyn prouffit' — the standard by which the estates are judged in Caxton's *Game and Playe of the Chesse*. W. Langland, *The Vision of Piers Plowman* (B-text), ed. A.V.C. Schmidt (London, 1978), Passus V. '49, p. 43; *Jacobus de Cessolis: The Game of Chess, translated and printed by William Caxton, c.1483*, intro. N.F. Blake (facsim. 2nd edn. 1483, London, 1976).

1520: . . . the commynalte  
apply themselff ryght mervelouslye  
to lerne craftes and subtilite  
ther neybour to begyle. . . .

*Now a Dayes: 89-92*<sup>92</sup>

1603-25: Kings cannot comprehended be  
in Commons mouths. . . .  
deny not what the Kinge affirms.

*An Answer to the Libell called  
the Commons Teares: 144-47*<sup>93</sup>

However parallel to these sentiments is, for the first time, a growing recognition that laudable authority does not hold itself aloof from the people:

1496: Of thre thynges I praise the worshipful Cite:  
The firste, þe true faithe þat þei haue to þe kyng;  
The seconde, of loue to þe Comynalte. . . .

*Reconciliation of Henry VI and the Yorkists: 58-60*<sup>94</sup>

1554: God saue the good Earle of Cumberland . . .  
That maintaines Archerie through the land . . .  
Whose noble mind so courteously  
Acquaintes himself with the Communalte  
To the glorie of his Nobilitie.

*Yorke, Yorke for my Monie: 157-163*<sup>95</sup>

1600: Then for the Counsell prayed he  
and for the Clergy of the land  
and for the pore comunalte. . . .

*Elegy on the Earl of Essex: 151-53*<sup>96</sup>

*The Percy Folio* sustains this image of apparent solicitude:

Richard III speaks: "There is no riches to me soe rich  
as is the pore Comynaltye."

*PF 154: The Ballad of Ladye Bessiye: 197-98*

Henry VIII speaks: "If it be not touching my crowne," he said,  
"Nor hurting the poore comminaltey."

*PF 16: Thomas, Lord Cromwell, 3-4*

Earl of Derby speaks: "Sweete sonne Edward . . .  
euer haue pittye on the pore cominaltey."

*PF 39: Flodden Feilde, 233-34*

In summary then, the word 'comminalty' reaches the height of its popularity in the early Tudor period — by the time of Shakespeare it would appear to be in decline as in his entire corpus he uses it only twice as compared to twenty-eight references to the 'commons'.<sup>97</sup> Further, I have found no other period where it is used in a caring or laudatory context.<sup>98</sup> Therefore because it occurs in *Durham*, where the ordinary people are being spoken of with approval, and because the entire text is directed towards approbation of a section of such folk,

91. Sloane MS. 4031, fol.2<sup>f</sup>, Robbins, *Historical Poems*, p. 233

92. Lambeth MS. 159, fol. 261, Wright, *Political Poems*, p. 9.

93. Harl. MS. 367, fol. 151<sup>f</sup>, *Ballads from MSS*, I, 135.

94. Cotton MS. Vespasian B.xvi, fol. 4<sup>f</sup>, Robbins, *Historical Poems*, p. 195.

95. ? W. Elderton, *Roxb.*, I, 1.

96. Bodl. Tanner MS. 306, fol. 192<sup>f</sup>, *Ballads from MSS.*, II, 249.

97. Spevack, M., *A Complete and Systematic Concordance to the Works of Shakespeare*, Vol. IV (Hildesheim, 1969).

there is justification for suggesting that the use of ‘comminaltye’ strengthens the theory that the verses stem from a period in Tudor history which I shall go on to show is likely to have been early rather than late.

**Figure 1.**

*Chronological distribution of the words ‘Comminaltye’ and ‘Commons’ in the thirty-two ‘popular’ rhymed texts in which they occurred from a searched sample of 2,350 such texts covering the period 1300–1800.*

From 1300–1331: no occurrences.

<b>Commons</b>	<b>Comminaltye</b>	
1332		
1377		
1382		
1399		
1401		
1413		
1435		
1436		
1450	1450	
1454		
1456		
	1458	
1461		
1462		
	1464	
1471		
	<b>1485</b>	
	<b>1496</b>	
<b>1500</b>		<b>The Tudors</b>
<b>1515</b>		
<b>1520</b>	<b>1520</b>	
	<b>1536</b>	
<b>1547</b>	<b>1547</b>	
<b>1570</b>		
	<b>1580</b>	
	<b>1584</b>	
	<b>1600</b>	
	<b>1603</b>	
1607		
	1612	
1632		

From 1633–1800: no occurrences.

*Explanation:*

The number of individual occurrences of a subject word within a separate year or a particular poem is not given. It is nevertheless plain that ‘Comminaltye’ occurs more frequently during the Tudor years than does ‘Commons’.

98. The fact that it occurs in a ‘caring’ context in *popular* verse to emphasise the virtue of a given character, underlines the general absence of solicitude in reality which can be properly assumed from the proliferation of sober exhortatory works of an Utopian type: like the promulgation of laws, such essays do not appear unless there is thought to be a need for them. Starkey may well reflect something of the true situation:

Pryncys, lordys, byschoppes and prelatys, euery one of them loketh chefly to theyr owne profyte . . . and few ther be wych regard the welth of the comynalte . . . so that yf theyr subiectys do theyr duty . . . paying theyr rentys . . . they care not . . . whether they synke or swyme.

Thomas Starkey, *England in the Reign of Henry the Eighth*, 2 vols., ed. S. Herrtage (London, 1871 & 1878; rpt. 1 vol., New York, 1973), p. 85.

d. *The Theme of PF 79 and the Political Climate*

As Robbins remarks, ‘The employment by noblemen of poets as political propagandists is an old tradition’.<sup>99</sup> I have shown that *Durham* is ‘propaganda’ and I shall now relate the content of the text to the political situation prevailing *vis a vis* the Scots under the early Tudor kings.

*Durham* is concerned to praise English yeomen and emphatically disparage the Scots and their probably deliberately un-named king. Macmillan remarks about *PF 79*:

I do not think that the ballad contains evidence of an immediate reaction to the battle, but it does give evidence of intense participation in some event concerning a Scots king. It is likely therefore . . . that the ballad was composed soon after the [sic] event involving a Scots king.<sup>100</sup>

The following section looks at the relations between Scotland and England after 1474 and concludes that *Durham* was probably composed immediately *prior* to ‘an event concerning a Scots king’ — Flodden.

Following Lord Hamilton’s marriage in 1473/4, relations between England and Scotland were still poor. War broke out in 1480, pausing when the throne passed to Henry VII in 1485 but continuing intermittently until the truce of Aytoun in 1487.<sup>101</sup> Although punctuated by sporadic border raids a comparatively stable period then ensued until the ‘Barton affair’ in 1511 which ultimately led to Flodden in 1513.<sup>102</sup> In 1496 negotiations were begun for a marriage between Margaret, the twelve year old daughter of Henry VII, and James IV (1473-1513) — one of the Ambassadors being the second Lord Hamilton, Earl of Arran. The marriage took place by proxy in 1502 and in 1503 the bride joined her husband’s court.

The uneasy truce was observed only when it suited the respective parties: immediately prior to the opening of the marriage negotiations James had supported the claims of the Pretender to the English throne, Perkin Warbeck.<sup>103</sup> However the initiating of the marriage alliance demonstrates that by 1496 royal pacific intentions had firmed. Thus the atmosphere was not conducive to the composition or publication of scurrilous anti-Scottish verse. The political climate when such verse was acceptable and when *Durham* could have been composed is limited to the years following Lord Hamilton’s marriage, 1474 to 1487, or the shorter period after the accession of Henry VIII from about 1510 to 1513.

---

99. Robbins, *Historical Poems*, p. xlf.

100. McMillan, ‘Five Ballads’ p. 90

101. The Treaty was renewed by Henry VII in January, 1501, and again by Henry VIII in August, 1509: *Letters and Papers Foreign and Domestic of the Reign of Henry VIII*, 2nd edn., ed. R.H. Brodie, I, 1 (London, 1920), 74; J. Lingard, *The History of England*, 5th edn. (London, 1849), IV, 287, 313, 321. Although Lingard is not a modern historian, for an overview of the facts relating to constitutional history — while disregarding his Victorian value judgements — he is nevertheless reliable and still highly regarded. His account of the period discussed here is found in Volume IV of the above work under the appropriate regnal heading. See also G.W.O. Woodward, *Reformation and Resurgence in England in the Sixteenth Century* (London, 1963), p. 111f.

103. In 1495 James gave Warbeck an allowance of 1,200 pounds p.a. and the hand of the Lady Gordon, grand-daughter of James I, in marriage: *DNB*, X, 584.

There is no very hard evidence for either period but in view of the fact that the Hamiltons' relationship to the throne must have been well known to the scribe, the latter period seems to have a slight advantage. This is because the second Lord was politically active and had visited England with some frequency over a long period and was therefore better known to the English than his father had been.<sup>104</sup> Also, and perhaps a better reason for popular renown, he had had some fame for his jousting in formal pseudo-Arthurian tournaments.<sup>105</sup> An indication of his prestige is seen in a record of the funeral of Henry VII in London in 1509. The writer observes the presence of the Earl of 'Aroun' and remarks that he is 'otherwise called ye Scottish Lorde' and that he is in the company of the Earl of Derby — Thomas, head of the house of Stanley.<sup>106</sup> That Hamilton was not an unknown or unimportant visitor is seen in the scribe's designation of him not as 'a Scottish Lorde' but as 'the (ye) Scottish Lorde', thus implying a special singularity among the recording officials.

It is however, extremely unlikely that the *Durham* poet was among their number: it is not probable that his information was garnered from the environs of the Court. As has been mentioned previously — and I have found no material to support a contrary view — scholarly opinion believes that the contents of *The*

- 
102. The Bartons were Scots — Andrew, Robert and John — whom Henry VIII had declared to be pirates and who were attacked and defeated in a naval engagement by the Howards. James of Scotland regarded the loss of his Commanders as an affront and that, together with other grievances, led to the outbreak of hostilities in 1513. There is a connection between *The Percy Folio* and the Bartons: *PF* 168, *Sir Andrew Barton* rehearses the fatal encounter between the Bartons and their enemies from the viewpoint of the English — this poem is discussed presently. It is interesting to note that this work also states that Barton's nephew, his sister's son, is killed repulsing the English attempt to take Andrew and his ship. This nephew is named James Hamilton (st. 55). As Barton seems to have stood in the same naval relationship to the Scots King as Francis Drake was later to do to Elizabeth I, and Arran, the second Lord Hamilton, was the Admiral of Scotland and almost certainly knew Barton, it is not impossible that Barton's sister may have married a Hamilton (Letter of Lord Dacre to Henry VIII, Item 2443, in *Letters and Papers*, Hen. 8, I, 1079). As a glance at the Duke of Hamilton's manuscripts — *Hist. MSS. Comm.*, items 1-30, and in particular item 27 — will confirm, the Hamiltons' was a prolific house with abundant collateral septs and natural children. From Australia I am regrettably unable to pursue this further, but the possibility apparently exists through the information found in the *Folio* ballad, that there was a Hamilton killed with Barton who, through marriage, was distantly related to the Scottish king. This would account in part for the Scots' extraordinary ire over the matter of the Bartons — which James includes in a list of unredressed wrongs sent to Henry VIII three years later (*The Letters of James the Fourth: 1505-1513*, ed. R.L. Mackie and A. Spilman (Edinburgh, 1953), item 1560, p. 311ff).
104. His father, the first lord, had been on various embassies to England between 1461-1472, but this was prior to his royal marriage and he died in 1479 when his son was about four years old. *Complete Peerage*, VI, 255. A survey of the indices of Volumes IV and V of the *Calendar of Documents Relating to Scotland*, ed. J. Bain (Edinburgh, 1888), shows numerous entries concerning the second lord's activities and travels on behalf of his country.
105. J. Leslie, *The Historie of Scotland . . . translated in Scottish by Father James Dalrymple . . . 1596*, ed. E.G. Cody & W. Murison, II (Edinburgh, 1885), Bk. 8, 122-23; *DNB*, VIII, 1047f; Robert Lindesay of Pitscottie, *The Historie and Chronicles of Scotland*, ed. A.J.G. Mackay, I (Edinburgh, 1899), 243.
106. BL. Harl. MS. 3504, G.9, *Heraldic Treatises*, fol. 257<sup>v</sup> (old foliation 269<sup>v</sup>). The second Lord Hamilton became the Earl of Arran in August, 1493: *Hist. MSS. Comm.*, Charter 25, p. 20. The fact that the writer of Harl. MS 3504 in a remarkably long list of notables and others, is at pains to single out Derby's companion, indicates that it was thought sufficiently suspicious to be noteworthy. That Henry VII did not fully favour Thomas Stanley is seen in that noble's repeated efforts to be admitted to the Order of the Garter and his repeated rejection. He was a failed nominee in May, 1509, and this was the pattern for subsequent years until in April, 1514 he was again rejected but his second son, Sir Edward, who had fought well at Flodden, was accepted over his head: *Letters and Papers*, Hen. 8, pp. 24, 1234.



*Percy Folio* (other than the seventeenth century items taken from printed works with a wide circulation), originated in the northwest of England in the areas subject to the hegemony of the Percy and Stanley families. The *Folio* items show a consistent interest in the house of Percy — it is significant that the *sole* English knight actually named in *Durham* is ‘Erle Percy’ (st. 39) — and it has been pointed out that it is ‘the main repository of the verse of Stanley euology’.<sup>107</sup> It is probable that the scribe was a north-western man and wrote of matters that were current knowledge in his geographical location. These matters must include the somewhat esoteric fact for an English subject, of Hamilton’s relationship to the King of Scots. The most likely source for this information is through the Stanleys.

There is no evidence that the first Lord Hamilton (d.1479), knew the Stanleys but, as shown above, this is not so in the case of Arran, the second Lord. It is a tenable suggestion that Thomas Stanley, Earl of Derby, met the Hamiltons when he was sent on a Scottish mission by Richard III in 1484 and that their acquaintance was furthered through the mutual support of Perkin Warbeck — also supported, as I have remarked, by James and his court.<sup>108</sup> Hamilton would hardly have received his new Earldom had he upheld a belief in opposition to his sovereign. Thus I argue that there is a good case for thinking that the information known to the *Durham* poet may well have come to him indirectly through the Stanleys and the *second* Lord Hamilton, and that therefore the poem’s date belongs to the later period, i.e. between 1510 and 1513.

Another reason for so believing relates to the Battle of Flodden. The similarities between the battles of Flodden and Durham are remarkable. In both cases the French encouraged the Scottish invasion in order that the English forces in France might be compelled to return to the defence of England:<sup>109</sup> in both cases the English monarch was in France; in both cases there was an erroneous belief that England was devoid of effective military strength;<sup>110</sup> and in both cases the Scots were thoroughly defeated — their king was captured at Durham and

---

107. D.A. Lawton, ‘*Scottish Field: Alliterative Verse and Stanley Encomium in the Percy Folio*’, *Leeds Studies in English*, NS X, (1978), 42-57.

108. *DNB*, XVIII, 964.  
In 1494 Sir William Stanley, the Earl’s brother, was denounced as an advocate of Warbeck’s claim and was beheaded the following year: *ibid.* p. 969; University Library, Cambridge, MS. Ee.3.1.

109. From a letter from Louis XII to James IV, April, 1512:

Bien pry le dit roy trescrestien sondit bon frere le roy d’Escosse qu’il se face le plus fort qui’il pourra par la terre pour faire destourner le roy d’Angleterre de la guerre contra le roy trescrestien, . . . et ne luy pourroit jamais plus grant service faire que de commancer bonne guerre audit roy d’Angleterre par terre comme dit est.

*Flodden Papers*, ed. M. Wood (Edinburgh, 1933), pp. 38ff.

There exists a considerable number of other letters and messages with a similar tenor and which continue until the eve of Flodden.

110. Letter from the Bishop of Durham to Cardinal Wolsey, September, 1513, *Letters & Papers, Hen. 8, I*, 2020ff; ‘La Rotta de Scocesi’, trans. W.M. Mackenzie, *The Secret of Flodden*, (Edinburgh, 1931), p. 96; Letter from Henry VIII in France to James IV in Scotland, dated 12.8.1513, in which Henry upbraids James for having thought that because he, Henry was so far from his realm it was therefore destitute of defence: *Letters of James IV, 1505-1513*, ed. R.L. Mackie & A. Spilman (Edinburgh, 1953), p. 314.

killed at Flodden. More — in both cases the battles were fought by yeomen.<sup>111</sup>

If *Durham* were composed after Flodden then it is not unreasonable to think that the poet might have remarked the similarity of the two events. He does not. However in the case of *PF 25 Scottish Feilde* (Flodden), there is a reflection of *Durham*. *PF 79* has:

..... all England was gone:  
bowes and arrows they were all forth,  
at home was not left a man  
but shepards and Millers both  
& preists with shauen crownes.

*PF 79*: sts. 4-5

This compares with *PF 25*:

there is no leeds in that land  
sauwe Millers & Masse preists:  
all were faren into france  
that fayre were in armes.

*PF 25*: ll. 109-10<sup>112</sup>

- 
111. Sir Philip Tilney, Treasurer of Wars under the Duke of Norfolk, makes account on the 18th of February, 1514 and cites the Earl of Surrey ('lord Capteyn and Leiftenaunt Generall') as having under him 'capteyns xxvij every of them at iiij. peticapteyns every of them at ijs. lv demi-launces every of them at ix. and xj<sup>m</sup>ccccvj other souldiours . . . at viij. by the day.' Of these latter 11,406 men, the majority were yeomen. Indeed in the item set down prior to this but one, Tilney specifically refers to 'yomen'. *Exchequer Accounts*, 56(27), Public Record Office, cited by Mackie, J.D., in 'The English Army at Flodden', *Miscellany of the Scottish History Society* (Edinburgh, 1951), p. 77.
112. Since I am not at the moment concerned with the alliterative aspect of these lines I have kept to my normal custom and cited them as written in the *Folio*. However for convenience I use Hales' and Furnivall's numbering which means that the above four short lines are numbered as two long lines. The older Lyme MS. has:

there are no ledes in that lande to looke him against:  
all bene faren into Fraunce that fayre were in armes,  
but milners & massepreists there bene no men ells.

While as I have noted elsewhere, many of the primary sources relating the history of the Battle of Durham use such a description of the English defence, of the contemporary sources for the Battle of Flodden none at all use terms even remotely cognate.<sup>113</sup> It seems therefore that the *Scottish* poet may have been familiar with the *Durham* text as such close correspondence is unlikely to have been coincidental. Lawton remarks, and Baird agrees, that the date of *PF* 25 is generally accepted at 1515 or 1516.<sup>114</sup> If stanzas four and five of *Durham* influenced lines 109 and 110 of *Scottish* then it follows that *PF* 79 was composed before 1515-1516.<sup>115</sup>

There are two further circumstances which show that the period 1510 to 1513 was conducive to the composition of *Durham*. First, these years were more than usually favourable with regard to the reputation of yeomen as fighting men. In 1485 Henry VII had initiated the first standing army in the foundation of the King's Bodyguard. This corps of men was formed of 'yeomen', a position linked with the land but making no pretence to social status on a par with the nobility or gentry.<sup>116</sup> From their inception their reputation grew: the Field of Stoke (1487); Bologne (1492); Blackheath (1497); 'Spurs' (1513) and most notable of all Tournai in 1513.<sup>117</sup> The Yeomen were also allotted ceremonial State duties: they were much in evidence at Henry VII's coronation and bore the coffin at his funeral; they accompanied the sovereign about the countryside — to Lincoln with Henry VII and Dorset with Henry VIII, to name but two royal progresses: they were sent on missions, for instance, as a State Escort for Philip of Castile, shipwrecked near Weymouth in 1506.<sup>118</sup>

The point of this much curtailed recital is that this body of men in their practical russet or their ceremonial white and green uniforms were sufficiently remarkable to be known throughout the country and, because of their reputation and presence, 'yeoman' became a term with proud associations.<sup>119</sup> The *Durham* text reflects that pride and invites 'yeomen' vicariously to enjoy the fame currently pertaining to the Yeomen of the King's Guard.<sup>120</sup> Thus this text is more likely to be from the period 1510-1513 than 1474-1487.

---

113. The nearest comparable reference is by Robert Lindsay of Pitscottie who is not a contemporary source. He reports a speech supposedly given by his grandfather, Patrick, Lord Lyndsay. In it Lyndsay is being scathing about the English and says of the seventy-year old Earl of Surrey (Thomas Howard, 1473-1554), the English Commander and his troops:

Sua it is not decent nor semlie to that we sould ieopard our nobill King . .  
. witht ane auld cruikit cairll and ane certaine sowtaris and taillzouris  
witht him. . . .

Robert Lindsay, *Historie*, I, 268.

114. Lawton, '*Scottish Field*', p. 43; Baird, *SF & FF*, p. iiff.

115. If *Durham* was composed and circulated between 1510 and 1513 then it would still have been fresh in the mind of the *Scottish* composer. That both composers came from the same geographical area is probable (see Baird, p. ivff.).

116. Sir. J. Paget, *The Yeomen of the Guard: 500 Years' Service, 1485-1985*, (Poole, 1984), p. 20; T. Preston, *The Yeomen of the Guard: Their History from 1485 to 1885* (London, 1885), p. 30ff; Colonel Sir R. Hennell, *A History of the King's Bodyguard* (London, 1904), p. 3ff. The original guard was a fighting organisation primarily of archers who were 'hardy, strong and of agility': Preston, *supra*, p. 30.

117. Paget, *supra*, p. 45; Preston, *idem*.

118. Paget, *supra*, p. 59.

The second circumstance that supports this suggestion concerns the area from which the *Folio* stems — the north-west Midlands. For the two centuries preceding Henry VIII this area and in particular Cheshire and Lancashire, was renowned for the fighting quality of its archers.<sup>121</sup> They were present at the major battles of the early 14th century; the same families were much in evidence fighting for Richard III at Bosworth in 1485 and appear again at Flodden in 1513.<sup>122</sup> The State Papers of Henry VIII's early regnal years reflect the king's concern to maintain the numbers of fighting men available for his French wars and the keeping of his peace at home. Where better to recruit than the area from whence stout yeomen had always come? I have remarked that in *PF 79* the lands which the Scottish king has not yet conquered but which he is giving away are mainly in the west or north-west (sts. 11-24). That the propaganda text *PF 79*, should have survived in its sole extant version in the north-west midlands is perhaps no more than might be expected if the poet thought to circulate his work in this area. I suggest that he did, and I suggest that the lengthy list of towns and territories is present because it was intended that the residents should be reminded of the valour of their forefathers in the face of a past territorial threat and of their own present danger from the resurgent enemy.<sup>123</sup> Since the majority of the north-west midland men fought for Richard III against Henry VII it seems to me that commonsense requires that the latter — famous for his fear of treachery — would hardly be likely to recruit with enthusiasm from an area whose men (with the exception of the Stanleys) had opposed him.<sup>124</sup> On the other hand, the well-established Henry VIII could have no such misgivings. Taking this into account it seems to me that we have here another factor which points in the direction of the first years of Henry VIII's reign as being the period which saw the composition of *Durham Feilde*.

- 
119. They are sufficiently well known in the midlands for a 'yeman of the guard' to be given a fairly prominent rôle — including a recapitulation of how the king recruited him for his excellence as an archer — in *PF 39* and both the existing manuscripts of the same work (BL. MS. Harl. 367, fol. 123<sup>f</sup> and BL. MS. Harl. 293, fol. 59<sup>f</sup>).
120. It is interesting to note as Child points out, that in unlettered popular rhymed narrative, 'green is the regular attire for men who shoot with the bow' (Child, *ESPB*, V. 90). The significance of 'Lincoln-green' is too well known to need detailing here as is the connection between Robin Hood's green clad archers and yeomanry. The green of the ceremonial dress of the King's Yeomen and their prowess as archers may well have been sympathetically linked in the minds of the common people with their folk heroes.
121. For the historical details and sources confirming this statement, together with further discussion, see M.J. Bennett, *Community, Class and Careerism: Cheshire and Lancashire Society in the Age of Sir Gawain and the Green Knight* (Cambridge, 1983), pp. 162-91.
122. *PF 132: Bosworth Feilde* and its variants Bodl. Tanner 306/1, Bodl. Eng. Hist. e.185 and BL. Harl. 542, between them cite some 130 families from the north-west and west midlands who together with their yeomen, fought at Bosworth. (Only *one* southerner is recorded as having been killed at Bosworth: C. Ross, *Richard III* (London, 1981), p. 236). The accuracy of this listing is confirmed in sundry State Papers: See *Rotuli Parliamentorum*, VIII, 276 for the list of attainders; *Cal. Fine Rolls, Hen. 7, XXII*, 1-7 for writs of *diem clausit extremum*; *Cal. Inquisitions Post Mortem, Hen. 7, I, passim*, and *Cal. Pat. Rolls Hen. 7, I, 1485-1494 passim*, for further details of royal levies affecting the midlands. For Flodden see the list of names in the black-letter contemporary tract *Hereafter ensue the trewe encounter or Batayle lately don betwene Englande and Scotlande*, cited in *The Ballad of Flodden Field*, ed. C.A. Federer (Manchester, 1884), pp. 131-32. See also *Cal. of Letters and Papers: Hen. 8, I, 1509-1515*.
123. Whether the threat was historically accurate is of no importance if the yeomen could be induced to believe its reality and their territorial instincts roused.

If *Durham* originates from about 1510 and was written into *The Percy Folio* about 1650, then it had existed prior to that for some hundred and forty years. It might be argued that the skill evinced in its composition could be the fortuitous result of shaping and streamlining through the process of repeated transmissions. Although 140 years is certainly enough time for verses to be widely circulated and altered in the process, I do not believe that my findings point to any possibility of *Durham* being a variant of an earlier work. It may be assumed that *PF 79* can be looked at as one example of popular verse composition stemming from the end of the mediaeval period. Because the *Durham* paradigm is taken from a single text which may be atypical, it might be thought that the paradigm should only be seen as a tentative guide to mediaeval practice with regards to historical topics. My initial approach is indeed one of caution; however as the findings and discussions of this study presently show, all the paradigmatic items are valid criteria with which other texts can be compared.<sup>125</sup>

The next step then, is to examine the text in the light of its continuity of mediaeval form and tradition as exemplified in another set of conventions found in the early popular rhymed narrative. Because *Durham* is deliberately aimed at a 'folk' audience (as opposed to a 'learned' audience) this examination will determine, first, what earlier narrative practices were still familiar to, and perhaps expected by, such an audience, and secondly what aspects of traditional rhymed narration had by 1510 apparently fallen by the wayside.

#### IV. Form and Tradition

##### *Introduction*

In order to demonstrate vestiges of an earlier tradition present in later works it is first necessary to set out what that tradition was. The first part of this Section therefore analyses certain aspects of early rhymed 'popular' narrative texts and then sets out the conclusions with which *Durham* is compared in the second part. The result of this comparison then shows what aspects of tradition have survived, been discarded or altered in at least one work of the sixteenth century.

Early rhymed 'unlettered' narrative composed for entertainment falls loosely into two groups: Middle English Romance and the Ballad. *Durham* however is a hybrid: it has some of the features associated with 'folk' ballads but also conforms to Friedman's criteria for Minstrel work.<sup>126</sup> Furthermore, it has a structural relationship to the form of

---

124. There are many references similar to the following:

Kyng Richard more loued, more estemed & regarded the nothern [sic] men then any subiectes within his whole realme, which thyng to kyng Henry [VII] was no unknowen. . . . He studied to kepe them in dew obeisaunce . . . whome he knew of long custome to haue borne their hartes & fauourable myndes to his adeuersaties.

Edward Hall, *The Union of the Two Noble Families of Lancaster and York*, (London, 1550; facsim. Menston, 1970), The Second yere of King Henry the vii, fol. iiiij<sup>v</sup>.

125. It is noted that many paradigmatic items found in *Durham* were also found by McMillan in other texts: 'Five Med. Ballads', Diss. Univ. Maryland 1963, *passim*.

126. *The Viking Book of Folk Ballads of the English Speaking World*, ed. A.B. Friedman (Harmondsworth, 1982), pp. xxv-xxvi, p. 326.  
In further discussions 'accepted ballad criteria' are mentioned without accreditation or listing: the 'criteria' concerned unless otherwise stated, are Friedman's.

the Middle English Romance as set out by Wittig.<sup>127</sup> Because the extant written versions of ballads (most of which were collected in comparatively modern times) are likely to have been modified by oral descent from their place and time of origin, and because that origin in most cases is unknown other than in very general terms, information derived from the ballad cannot be shown to reflect unadulterated early narrative structures. The origins of many Romances are also obscure. However the manuscripts in which they are found generally ante-date *Durham* and the ballads. Therefore of the two genres, the Romance, while admittedly not perfect, is the better choice as material from which to take the fundamental information required.

For the purpose of this study paradigmatic features derived from early works should be aspects of composition common to the majority of the Romances. A lexical study would be valid only if the subject texts could be shown to be uninfluenced by regional dialect. They cannot, and therefore a larger unit of composition is required, not liable to variation through geographic causes; sufficiently flexible to be applicable to both simple and complex narratives; neither too large nor too small to be included within the scope of this study, and sufficiently broad-based to be amenable to tabular arrangement. The unit which best conforms to these requirements is the motifeme.

It will be shown that *Durham* is composed of three motifemes of *discours*: *exhortation*, *narrator's comment* and *valediction*. It has seven motifemes of *histoire*, some of which are (predictably) repeated. These seven, *scene-setting*, *departure*, *boast*, *bidding-to-battle*, *combat* and *terminal status-quo* reflect the simplicity of the basic narrative. The location of these motifemes is presently set out in the appropriate Table: I have not thought it necessary to discuss all of these motifemes in detail as some have already been analysed and documented by Wittig and some do not occur in more than a few of the Romances.<sup>128</sup>

In the first part of this Section which follows I analyse *valediction*, *boast* and *terminal status-quo* — *exhortation* will be briefly mentioned because it will be later examined in *Durham* but will not receive detailed attention immediately as it has been discussed by Wittig.<sup>129</sup> I have chosen these four motifemes because three of them, *exhortation*, *status-quo* and *valediction*, must occur at the beginning (*exhortation*) or the end (*status-quo*, *valediction*) of each Romance text to be considered.<sup>130</sup> Since the later texts to be studied must also have a beginning and an end any relationship to earlier methods of opening and closing is easily seen. *Boast* has been chosen for examination because for balance, I needed another motifeme of *histoire* besides *status-quo*. Also, because of the partisan nature of historical rhymed narratives the probability of some form of *boast* occurring is high and I therefore selected this motifeme for examination with a view to later critical comparison.

The analysis which follows will show the traditional Romance components of each motifeme and the allomotific aspects of each component. The large scope of Wittig's work did not permit her, as she acknowledges, to consider all the motifemes to be found

---

127. S. Wittig, *Stylistic and Narrative Structures in the Middle English Romances* (Austin & London, 1978).

128. Not surprisingly these are the motifemes required for the presentation of 'formal military engagements between armies': the Romances, on the whole prefer to depict the exploits of individual knights rather than acts of war by national armies. This will be further discussed presently.

129. Wittig, *Narrative Structures*, p. 54f.

130. Although some extant manuscripts are now unhappily acephalous and/or atelologic, a substantial number are sufficiently complete for there to be a practical corpus from which to work.

in the Romances.<sup>131</sup> Little has yet been done to show the structure of *valediction*, *boast* and *status-quo*. Therefore because the results of my analysis are important to a large proportion of this study, in order to show that these results are based on a firm foundation I have taken the space to present that foundation in some detail as follows.<sup>132</sup>

### A. *The Middle English Motifeme*

#### a. *Exhortation*

The nuclear compulsory component of this motifeme is the 'exhortation' itself. It may be accompanied by the peripheral and optional components *synopsis*, *prayer*, *source* and *moral*.<sup>133</sup>

#### b. *Valediction*

This motifeme is the unit of *discours* in which the narrator, having ended his tale, takes leave of his audience.

*Valediction* requires the obligatory nuclear slot to be filled by the motif *prayer*. This may be accompanied by one or more of the peripheral and optional motifs *source*, *explicit* and *moral*.

##### i. *Prayer*

This most frequently constitutes a request by the narrator that the deity should look favourably upon his audience and himself either in this world, the next world or both:

God 3eve vs grace wele to fare,  
& all þat have herde þis talkyng  
Jn heven-blys be his wonyng,  
Amen, Amen for charyte —  
Lord vs graunt þat it so be.

*Sir Orfeo*: ll. 505-509<sup>134</sup>

Another group of prayers relate to the author or his patron:

Forþi ich wolde biseken you  
þat hauen herd þe rime nu,  
þat ilke of you, with gode wille

---

131. Wittig, *Narrative Structures*, p. 62.

132. Where Wittig has fully discussed a topic and provided copious illustrations taken from her guiding texts I see no need to provide more. However where she has not fully touched on a matter, to establish an argument I give a minimum of one citation from a Romance and refer readers to the line reference of supporting passages in other works.

133. *Source* and *moral* (or perhaps *lesson*) are unattached or 'floating' components, and therefore Wittig (*Narrative Structures*, p. 58ff and p. 105) does not include them in *exhortation* as her purpose differs from mine. However since *source* appears in fifteen of thirty texts studied as a component of *exhortation*, and *moral* appears in eight, I feel that their presence is a genuine and frequently used option and therefore should be included in this study. *Source* and *moral* are examined under *valediction* where they also occur and are included there for a like reason. *Prayer* is also to some extent a 'floating' component: it occurs in *valediction* and elsewhere. However that it is traditional to *exhortation* is seen in *Emare* where the narrator says:

Menstrelles . . .  
Sholde at her bygynyng  
Speke of þat ryghtwes kyng  
That made both see and sonde.

*Emare*: 13-18

Seye a pater noster stille,  
 For him þat haueth þe ryme maked  
 And þer fore fele nihtes waked,  
 þat Iesu Crist his soule bringe  
 Bi forn his fader at his endinge.

*Havelok*: ll. 2994-3001<sup>135</sup>

A further allomotific component to *prayer* is an invocation on behalf of the characters present in the tale just told:

God on here saules haue pite,  
 & also for Arondel —  
 3if men for eni hors bidde schel.

*Sir Beues of Hamtoun*: ll. 4616-18<sup>136</sup>

These are the principal *prayer* groups although there is the occasional aberrant cry such as the plaintive:

Lord Gode in Trinite,  
 Gyff hem Heuen for to see  
 þat loues game and gle  
 And gestus to fede.

*Sir Degrevant*: ll. 1917-20<sup>137</sup>

This prayer seems to imply a concern only for the audience and the narrator: the following loyal prayer comments on the type of villainy in the story just narrated. Both of these quotations demonstrate an embedded *moral*: the first (above) being ‘hosts who are good to their guests and entertainers will have a heavenly reward’ and the second (below) being ‘that’s what happens to traitors — so be loyal!’

---

134. BL. MS. Harl. 3810, fol. 1<sup>r</sup>f: See also *Sir Degrevant*: ll. 1917-1920 (Lincoln. Cathedral Library MS. A.5.2, fol. 130<sup>r</sup>ff).

The citations given in support of my statements throughout this section, are those which make my point as briefly as possible and are chosen from a large number of possibilities. Where a citation is made from a work which has several extant copies, the manuscript quoted will be remarked in a footnote. For printed editions used for the above and other Romances cited, please consult the Bibliography. In cited excerpts, where the punctuation is mine, I have added or emended without comment unless the punctuation is specifically relevant to the discussion.

135. Bodleian MS. Laud Misc. 108, fol. 204: see also *Partenay* where La Couldrette, the early adaptor of the ‘Melusine Story’, uses some eighty lines (ll. 6427-6507) ‘in fourme of letany’ (l. 6427) to pray for his patron’s ‘noble line’ (l. 6428) before moving on to pray for ‘us’ in a further thirty-seven lines of elaborate orison (ll. 6545-6508) (Trinity Coll. Camb. MS. R.3.17, fol. 2<sup>r</sup>f.) This author’s prayer is presented in something more approaching ‘high style’ than the brief coverage of the patron seen in:

3e þat liken in loue swiche þinges to here  
 prei3es for þat gode lord þat gart þis do make. . . .

*William of Palerne*: ll. 5528-29; King’s Coll. Camb. MS. 13, fol. 4<sup>r</sup>f.’

However the significant fact is that regardless of the degree of sophistication present the author of *Partenay* has not deviated from customary motifemic structure.

136. Nat. Lib. Scot. Advocates 19.2.1. (Auchinleck), fol. 176<sup>r</sup>ff.

This prayer for a non-human character is rare in the Romances. ‘Arondel’, the hero’s horse, is given unusual preference since not only he is prayed for but the convention whereby the hero and his lady die on the same day is expanded: his horse expires on the same day too. He is not, however, recorded as sharing the same grave!

For less unconventional examples of prayer for characters see: *King Horn*, l. 1644, Camb. Univ. Ms. Gg.4.27.2; *Eger & Grime*, l. 1472, BL. Add. MS. 27879 (*Percy Folio*), fol. 61<sup>v</sup>.

137. Camb. Univ. Lib. MS. Ff.1.6, fol. 96<sup>r</sup>ff.

This prayer is almost identical to the text’s opening prayer in the *exhortation*.



Now Iesu pat is heuene kyng,  
 Leue neuere traytour haue betere endyng  
 But swych dome for to dye.

*Athelston*: ll. 809-812<sup>138</sup>

**Figure 2.** *lediction*<sup>139</sup>

Narrative	Slot 1.	Slot 2.	Slot 3.	Slot 4.
<i>Amadace</i>	Prayer			
<i>Athelston</i>	Prayer			
<i>Beves</i>	Prayer	Explicit	Prayer	Explicit
<i>Degare</i>	Explicit	Prayer		
<i>Degrevant</i>	Prayer			
<i>Eger &amp; Grime</i>	Prayer			
<i>Eglamour</i>	Source	Prayer		
<i>Emare</i>	Source	Prayer		
<i>Florence</i>	Source	Moral	Explicit	Prayer
<i>Floris</i>	Explicit	Moral	Prayer	
<i>Generydes</i>	Explicit	Prayer		
<i>Gowther</i>	Explicit	Source	Prayer	
<i>Havelok</i>	Moral	Explicit	Prayer	
<i>Horn</i>	Prayer	Explicit	Moral	Prayer
<i>Ipomedon</i>	Moral	Explicit	Prayer	
<i>Launfal</i>	Explicit	Source	Prayer	
<i>Lybeaus Desconus</i>	Prayer			
<i>Octavian</i>	Explicit	Prayer		
<i>Orfeo</i>	Source	Explicit	Prayer	
<i>Otuel &amp; Roland</i>	Prayer	Explicit	Prayer	
<i>Palerne</i>	Moral	Explicit	Source	Prayer
<i>Partenay</i>	Explicit	Source	Prayer	
<i>Partenope</i>	Explicit	Prayer	Explicit	
<i>Perceval</i>	Explicit	Prayer		
<i>Robert of Sicily</i>	Source	Moral	Prayer	
<i>Rowlande &amp; Ottuell</i>	Prayer			
<i>Torrent</i>	Source	Prayer		
<i>Toulous</i>	Source	Prayer		
<i>Tryamowre</i>	Prayer	Explicit	Source	Prayer
<i>Ywain &amp; Gawain</i>	Explicit	Source	Prayer	

138. Gonville & Caius, Camb. MS. 175, fol. 120ff.

139. The term 'slot' is used in Wittig's definition (*Narrative Structures*, p. 38): 'The *slot* then, is one functional position in a syntagmatically ordered sequence of such positions, while the individual set members are paradigmatically related by virtue of the fact that any one of the members could be substituted for any other without altering the functional nature of the slot itself.'

Some familiar narrative Romances will be seen to be excluded from this Table: this is because just as some manuscripts are acephalous some are regrettably atelologic.

The references for manuscript sources not previously cited are: *Beves*: Chetham Lib., Manchester, MS. 8009, fol. 122<sup>f</sup>ff; *Degare*: Bodleian MS. Rawl. F.34; *Emare*: BL. Cotton Calig. A.II, fol. 71<sup>f</sup>ff; *Ipomedon*: Chetham MS. 8009; *Launfal*: BL. Cotton Calig. A.II, fols. 35<sup>v</sup>-42<sup>v</sup>; *Lybeaus Desconus*: BL. Cotton Calig. A.II, fol. 50<sup>v</sup>ff; *Octavian*: Lincoln Cath. Lib. MS. A.5.2. (Thornton MS); *Orfeo*: Bodl. 6922 (Ashmole 61), fol. 151<sup>f</sup>ff; *Otuel & Roland*: BL. Add. MS. 37492 (Fillingham), fol. 30<sup>v</sup>; *Partenay*: the manuscript contains an epilogue (marked 'The translacioun' in the margin) which is a redactorial apology. As a later, added cauda it has not been included in the Table although in the interests of accuracy I am here noting it. *Partenope*: BL. Add. MS. 35288, fol.2<sup>f</sup>ff; *Perceval*: Lincoln Cath. Lib. MS. A.5.2. (Thornton); *Rowlande & Ottuell*: BL. Add. MS. 31042. fol. 82<sup>f</sup>; *Torrent*: Chetham MS. Manchester; *Toulous*: Camb. Univ. Lib. Ff.II.38, fols.63<sup>f</sup>-70<sup>v</sup>; *Tryamowre*: Camb. Univ. Lib. Ff.II.38, fol. 79<sup>f</sup>; *Ywain & Gawain*: BL. Cotton Galba, E.ix, fols. 4-45.

The Table shows that some works incorporate two *prayer* components into the motifeme *valediction*. These are never repetitions with regard to the subject for which a blessing is asked: the first prayer always has a specific focus for the desired benefaction, but the second is always a general benediction upon an undefined ‘us’.

The schematisation of the components of *valediction* demonstrates that whichever of the optional type patterns are included the *prayer* component is always present in the work and always occupies the final slot.<sup>140</sup> Thus *prayer* is seen to be the compulsory nuclear component of this motifeme.

With regard to the occurrence of *prayer* as a solitary component, Wittig argues on page 58 of her work, that ‘at least one of these optional elements must occur together with the nuclear component for the structure to be perceived as complete’. It is not clear from Wittig’s argument whether she is referring only to the motifeme *exhortation* or to all motifemes. If the latter then it will be seen from the Table that six of the narratives I have cited have an ‘incomplete’ motifeme because it consists solely of the nuclear component *prayer*. This is a quarter of my sample and implies that the usage of a solitary component, if infrequent, was not remarkably unusual.

ii. *Source*

The *source* component may be simple: a minor elaboration of the conventional ‘as the book sayeth’ formula with which the narrator sprinkles his tale:

In Rome þis gest cronycled ys.

*Sir Eglamour*: l. 1375<sup>141</sup>

It may be more detailed in its reference to an ‘original’ manuscript:

þis is wreton in parchemyn,  
A story boþe gud and fyn,  
Owt off a lai of Breyteyn

*Sir Gowther*: ll. 751-53<sup>142</sup>

*Sir Launfal* on the other hand, ignores any reference to an earlier version and claims immediate authorship:

Thomas Chestre made þys tale  
of þe noble knyȝt Syr Launfale.

*Sir Launfal*: ll. 1039-40<sup>143</sup>

The most detailed description is found in *William of Palerne* (ll. 5521-33) which includes the adaptor’s name, his source, a modest disparagement of

---

140. That *Partenope* and *Beues of Hamtoun* appear to be exceptions to this rule is probably misleading. The fact that the final slot in both cases is the *explicit* strongly suggests that the scribe has incorporated the conventional scribal ‘finis’ present in his source manuscript into his narrative. This would seem to be borne out in that this extra *explicit* is not present in other manuscript copies of *Beves*. Sadly the variant manuscripts of *Partenope* are atelagic and therefore their endings are not available for comparison.

141. BL. Cotton Calig. A.II, fol.5<sup>v</sup>ff.

142. Nat. Lib. Scotland 19.3.1., fol. 11ff.

143. BL. Cotton Calig. A.II, fols. 35<sup>v</sup>-42<sup>v</sup>.

his abilities, his patron's name and his patron's reason for commissioning the work. All of these items are subsumed as allomotif aspects of the component *source*.<sup>144</sup>

iii. *Explicit*

This is that part of the *valediction* where the narrator states unequivocally that the tale is finished: he has reached the end:

Nowe endyth thys gest nowe here.

*Firumbras*: l. 1831<sup>145</sup>

And þus endyth þys romance gode.

*Le Bone Florence*: l. 2185<sup>146</sup>

Nu 3e habbeþ iherd þane ende  
Of floriz and his lemman hende.

*Floris and Blancheflur*: l.l. 819-20<sup>147</sup>

And thus I make an ende of this processe.

*Generides*: l. 6990<sup>148</sup>

iv. *Moral*

The *moral* is a less frequently incorporated option which occasionally drifts into the motifeme which precedes *valediction*, the *terminal status-quo*. However since *moral* is an element of *discours* not *histoire*, it must be regarded when found in *status-quo* as being a function of *valediction* which is itself always a unit of *discours*.<sup>149</sup>

The *moral*, where it occurs, may occupy the better part of a stanza:

Whoso loffes God with all his myȝt  
And his moder þat virgyn bryȝt,  
Y dare hardly wele sey  
þoffe þei haue not als tyte her wyll,  
Yette shall þei cum sumtyme þertyll  
And passe full wele away.

*Sir Amadas*: ll. 773-78<sup>150</sup>

It may be reasonably succinct:

. . . of alle bales was he brouȝt [the hero] . . .  
& so schal euerich seg þat secheþ to þe gode,  
& giues him in goddes grace & godlich ay wircheþ.

---

144. A very similar lengthy description is found in the *source* component of the motifeme *exhortion* in *Partenay*.

145. BL. Add. MS. 37492 (Fillingham MS.).

146. Camb. MS. Ff.II.38, fol. 239ff.

147. Camb. MS. Gg.4.27, fol. 98ff.

148. Trinity Coll. Camb., MS. Gale 0.5.2., fol. 1ff.

149. However in the interests of precision, the *moral* element of the analysis of *valediction* in the Table relating to this motifeme is shown only when it occurs together with the other units that belong to *valediction*. Where it occurs embedded in *terminal status-quo* it is shown (in round brackets) in the table relating to that motifeme — it is interesting to note that in this table it always seems to occupy the third 'slot'.

150. Nat. Lib. Scot. MS. Advocates, 193.1; see also *Le Bone Florence*: ll. 2176-81.

Or it may be brief to the point of being perfunctory:

Nu 3e habbeþ iherd . . .  
hu after bale comeþ bote.

*Floris and Blancheflur*: ll. 819-21

Him stondes well þat god child strenes.

*Havelok*: l. 2983<sup>152</sup>

**Figure 3.** *Terminal Status-quo*

Narrative	Slot 1.	Slot 2.	Slot 3.	Slot 4.	Slot 5.	Slot 6.
<i>Amadace</i>	hero +	family	(moral)	associates	hero	
<i>Amadas</i>	hero +	family	(moral)			
<i>Amis &amp; Amiloun</i>	associates	hero +	family			
<i>Beves</i> (Chetham)	hero +	family	(moral)	populace		
<i>Cleges</i> (Ashmole)	populace	hero	associates	hero +	family	
<i>Degrevant</i>	populace	hero	hero +	family	hero	
<i>Eger &amp; Grime</i>	associates	hero				
<i>Eglamour</i> (Lincoln)	hero	associates	populace			
<i>Floris</i>	associates	hero +	family	populace		
<i>Generides</i>	hero	populace	associates	populace	hero +	family
<i>Gowther</i>	associates	hero	(moral)	populace	hero	
<i>Havelok</i>	hero	populace	hero +	family		
<i>Horn</i> (Harleian)	associates	hero +	family			
<i>Isumbras</i>	hero +	family	hero	associates	hero +	family
<i>Lybeaus Desconus</i>	populace	hero +	family			
<i>Orfeo</i>	hero +	family	associates			
<i>Partenope</i>	hero +	family				
<i>Perceval</i>	hero					
<i>Rowlande &amp; Ottuell</i>	hero +	family	hero			
<i>Sowdone of Babylon</i> <sup>153</sup>	hero	associates	(moral)			
<i>Torrent</i>	associates	hero				
<i>Toulous</i>	populace	hero	hero +	family		

c. *Terminal status-quo*

This is the motifeme in which the narrator presents the condition of the hero after the termination of the principal action of the Romance. It is a motifeme of *Histoire* and has four components. The nuclear obligatory component is naturally concerned with the state of the *hero*.<sup>154</sup> The peripheral optional components cover the welfare of *family*, *associates* and *populace*.

As the Table shows, *hero* may occur alone; as an integral part of *family* or in both components.<sup>155</sup> *Family* covers pre-existing kin who have not been ‘helpers’ or ‘associates’, or children born to the hero and his Lady subsequent to his successful adventure. *Associates* refers to those characters who have been ‘helpers’ in the course of the hero’s adventures, and the nature of their rewards.

151. See also *King Robert of Sicily*: ll. 438-40, Bodl. 3938 (Vernon MS), Eng. poet. A.1, fol. 300ff.

152. Bodl. MS. Laud Misc. 108, fol. 204ff.

153. Princeton: MS. Garrett (Baltimore), 140.

154. ‘Hero’ in the singular is understood throughout this study to represent the plural where the heroic rôle is shared.

155. *Hero* embedded in *family* is found in works where the hero marries his chosen Lady with consequential marital bliss.

*Populace* (the least frequently occurring type-pattern) is found in those narratives where the hero achieves high rank or where the accomplishment of the tale's objective results in the improvement of the lot of the common people. All of these components are always (with but one exception) of a happy-ever-after nature, even though the 'happy ending' may not be reached until the hero's death and his 'heavenly reward' — for example *Guy of Warwick*.<sup>156</sup>

The Table demonstrates that *hero* is the nuclear component whether or not it appears with *family*, but *family* always appears in conjunction with *hero*, never by itself.<sup>157</sup>

i. *Hero*

This motifeme often covers the hero's acquisition of a spouse, rank and/or riches:

And sir Otuell þat worthy es  
Now weddede he Belesent.  
*Rowlande & Ottuell*: ll. 1583-84<sup>158</sup>

There fell to hym so grete ryches . . .  
*Sir Cleges*: l. 568<sup>159</sup>

The Erl tok they thoo  
And made hym ther emperour  
For he was styff yn stour. . . .  
*Toulous*: ll. 1209-11

On the other hand *hero* may cover the spiritual reward achieved by the principal character through martyrdom attained by death in the Holy Land at the hands of a pagan:

[Degrevant] went in to þe Holy Lond:  
Heauen be his mede!  
At Port Gaff was he slon,  
For-iustyd with a soudon:  
þus to Gode is he gon.  
*Sir Degrevant*: ll. 1911-15<sup>160</sup>

Some heroes attain the 'heavenly reward' through a virtuous life as evinced by their foundation of a religious house and/or their devout Christianity:

And when he [Sir Gowther] dyed, þo sothe to sey,  
Was beryd at þo same abbey  
þat hym selfe gart make:

---

156. The exception is *Athelston* where the 'welfare' component is reversed when the narrator dwells on the far from happy ending of the villain. The hero's happiness and that of others, is implied in the downfall of the villain, the failure of his machinations and the consequent righting of wrongs.

157. *Family* never appears alone because it is a 'conditioned' component: it is always an integral part of the hero's good fortune subsequent to the success of his adventure — unfaithful or treacherous wives never survive to this point. *Family* always concerns either the hero's wife alone or his wife and those of the children who are 'non-helpers'. Other kin, including children who have been the hero's 'helpers' are subsumed under *associates* and appear in that separate 'slot' in the texts.

158. If the purpose of the hero's adventure was the acquisition of a spouse, then the wedding itself is not part of the *status-quo*, although the happiness and length of the marriage may be.

159. Bodl. Ashmole MS. 61. fol. 73<sup>ff</sup>. See also *Sir Amadace*: ll. 856-61; *Sir Ysumbras*: ll. 793-795, Caius Coll. Camb. MS. 175 (A.ix), fols.98<sup>v</sup>-107<sup>ff</sup>.

160. Camb. Univ. MS. Ff.I.6, fol. 96<sup>ff</sup>. See also *Sir Perceval*: ll. 2281-83.

And he is a varre corsent parfyt  
And with cryston pepull wele beloved. . . .  
. . . þat suffrd for goddus sake.

*Sir Gowther*: ll. 724-32<sup>161</sup>

Although it is most frequently found in *family*, the *hero* component may use an allomotif relating to the pleasant life led by the hero after the resolution of his adventures:

Haelok bi-lefte with ioie and gamen  
In Engelond, and was þer inne  
Sixti winter king with winne.

*Havelok*: ll. 2963-65

ii. *Family*

The component type-pattern *family* displays a greater potential complexity than any other so far discussed. It may incorporate the following allomotifs:

1. The happiness of the hero's marriage
2. The length of time the marriage endures.
3. The number of the hero's children.
4. The gender of the hero's children.
5. The worldly success of the hero's children.
6. The simultaneous death of hero and partner.<sup>162</sup>
7. The joint interment of hero and partner.
8. The soul of hero and partner translated to their 'heavenly reward' (or the narrator expresses the hope that they will be when *prayer* occupies the first slot in the following motifeme, *valediction*).

I have found no work which incorporates all of these allomotifs into the *family* component but where two or more are present they will always occur in the order given above regardless of which items have been omitted. There seems to be a general rule that where any items from 1 to 5 are present in *family*, items from 6 to 8 are not. Item 8 may be present in *valediction*.

Items 1 to 5: He [Toulous] weddyd þat lady to hys wife:  
Wyth yoy and myrth þey ladd þer lyfe  
Twenty yer and three.  
Betwen þem chyldyr þey had fyfteen —  
Doghty knyghtys all beden  
And semely on to see.

*Toulous*: ll. 1213-18<sup>163</sup>

Items 6 to 8: Boþ on oo day were þey dede  
And in oo graue were þey leide,  
þe kny3tes boþ twoo:  
And for her trewþ and her godehede

161. See also *Guy of Warwick*: st. 926, l. 5; st.929, ll. 4-6, Nat. Lib. Scot. Advocates 19.2.1. (Auchinleck), fols. 146-167.

162. Partner can be wife, brother or friend.

163. See also *William of Palerne*: ll. 5507-10.

þe blisse of heuyn þey haue to mede  
þat lasteþ euer moo.

*Amis & Amiloun*: ll. 2503-08<sup>164</sup>

iii. *Associates*

*Associates* covers the ‘rewards’ allocated to the hero’s ‘helpers’:  
this can be simple enrichment — the hero’s ‘largesse’:

His stuard and othir, þat with him were,  
He send aftur hom, as 3e may here,  
And gafe hom gold and fee.

*Sir Amadace*: ll. 847-49

Sometimes the associates are provided with a suitable spouse and/or  
enriched with lands (from which they will have a substantial income and  
sometimes rank):

Off Natanell, whiche he had founde so kynde  
And for his love hadde grete labour and payn,  
He thought he wold remember it ayeyn  
In suche a wise as hym thought honorable,  
And maryed hym to the made Mirabell.  
To hym and her he gave a faire Citee. . . .

*Generydes*: ll. 6949-54<sup>165</sup>

*Associates* may include helpful animals: Sir Beves’ horse ‘Arondel’ has  
been mentioned: here is Ywain’s lion:

In joy and blis þai led þaire live:  
So did Lunet and þe liown,  
Until þat ded haves dreven þam down.

*Ywain and Gawain*: ll. 4024-26

iv. *Populace*

The final optional component to the motifeme *terminal status-quo* is  
*populace*. If it is present it will be in those works where the termination of  
the adventure has resulted in a change in an area’s power structure because  
either the hero has become a king or lord or he has caused an usurped  
position to be restored to the rightful ruler. The subsequent improved  
condition of the populace may be implicit:

Vpon þe dettys þat they hyght,  
They payd als fast as þei myght:  
To euery man wer content.  
A gentyll steward he was hold;<sup>166</sup>  
All men hym knew, 3ong and old,  
In lond wer þat he went.

*Sir Cleges*: ll. 562-67<sup>167</sup>

On the other hand more exact details may be given although in general  
terms:

He was to them so lovyng and so kynd:  
The laughe abseruyd will bothe ferre and nere,

164. BL. MS. Egerton 2862. See also *Sir Beves* (Auchinleck): ll. 4605-16.

165. See also: *Amis & Amiloun*: ll. 2488-90; *Eger & Grime*: ll. 1433ff; *Generydes*: ll. 6968-74. This latter  
covers the ‘humble’ helper — here a laundress. Where a lady has neither rank nor fortune she is not  
always married off but is shown living a comfortable life with the hero and his Lady: see *Ywain &  
Gawain*: ll. 4014-17, for the disposition of the maid Lunet.

167. Bodl. Ashmole 61, fol. 67<sup>v</sup>ff; see also *King Horn*: ll. 1641-42, Bodl. Laud Misc. MS. 108.

No man had Wrong that eny man cowd fynde,  
 Fewe compleynts — or non that men myght here;  
 Gentill ther with; curtes in All maner . . .  
*Generydes*: ll. 6940-44<sup>168</sup>

*Populace* concerns itself with the hero's people *in toto*: it is relevant to both the rich and poor but relates mainly to the abstract concepts of Justice and Law. Unlike the pecuniary rewards found in *hero* and *associates*, reference to fiscal matters in *populace* is most often found by implication through an example of the hero's largesse at the ultimate wedding:

There was drowen in þat stownd  
 þe mowntans of a þowzand pownd —  
 Gete hyt wo so myȝt.  
*Sir Eglamour*: ll. 1360-62<sup>169</sup>

The mynstrellis had yeftys fre  
 that þey myght þe better be  
 to spende many a day.  
*Gawain & the Carl of Carlisle*: ll. 643-45<sup>170</sup>

It is well known that the narrator's suggestive depiction of largesse to minstrels is a formulaic convention. It does not however normally occur within this motifeme which is why I tentatively propose that in this position it may have a double function: it is both a timely reminder to the audience and also a description of the hero's generosity which, it might be inferred could imply good fortune for the people over whose lives he will henceforth have power. The minstrel who is an individual 'of the people' in this case might represent the whole of the people. The following, where the poor — the 'vn-wrest' — are mentioned in conjunction with the minstrel, may lend a little weight to this suggestion:

---

166. The title 'steward' which frequently appears in 'popular' narratives of this kind does not always imply a humble rank:

Appointment by John, abbot of St. Warburga, Chester, and the convent there, of Thomas, earl of Derby, to be their steward for life; with an annual fee of 40s. Dated 20 Nov. 1 Hen. VIII. [1509].

*Letters & Papers, Hen. 8, Pt. 1, p. 117.*

The relatively late date of the above quotation does not indicate that this was only a late practice. K.B. McFarlane, *The Nobility of Later Mediaeval England* (Oxford, 1973), p. 107ff., discusses the matter and cites examples from as early as 1334. I chose the quotation given above because it clarifies another term frequently found in early Romance — the word 'fee', as in the formulaic 'gold and fee'. The fee as a source of income is also discussed by McFarlane at the same reference.

168. See also *Sir Gowther* (Scot.): ll. 656-61.

*William of Palerne* contains the most detailed passage I have found: in twenty-seven lines (5469-5495) the author includes the hero's kingly attitude towards his subjects as well as that of his wife and mother. The hero rides through his empire 'to knowe þe cuntres as a king ouȝt' (l. 5473); he institutes 'Godes lawes' (l. 5476) so that 'robboures' and 'reuowres' (l. 5478) are hanged or 'with hors to-drawe' (l. 5479). Flatterers and 'fals men', 'Lieres' and 'losengeres' are discouraged (ll. 5480-1) and he seeks 'trewe cunsayl' (l. 5482). His Queen is 'pitevows to þe pore hem prestily to help' (l. 5488) and his mother is good and 'gracious to eche gomes paye . . . to wirche alle gode dedes' (ll. 5492-3). In short the status-quo of the populace is so good that 'eche burn hem blessed þat euer þei bore were' (l. 5464) and 'preide to heuen king to hold here liues' (l. 5495).

169. BL. Cotton Calig. A.II, fol. 5<sup>vff.</sup>

170. Nat. Lib. Wales: MS. Porkington 10, fols. 12-26.

It is noted that the variant *Carle of Carlisle*, PF 139, omits these lines, but see the almost identical verse in *Sir Eglamour*: ll. 1372-74 (Lincoln Cath. Lib. MS. 91 (A.5.2), fol. 138<sup>vff.</sup>). See also *Sir Degravant*: ll. 1893-95 (Camb. Univ. MS. Ff.I.6, fols. 12-26).



þe menstrales yn bour and halle  
 Hadde ryche yftes wyth alle,  
 And þey weryn vn-wrest.  
*Lybeaus Desconus* (Cotton): ll.2116-18<sup>171</sup>

d. *Boast*

*Boast* in the following discussion is related only to its use in Middle English Romances which incorporate a formal military encounter between arrayed armies: I have not attempted to cover the situations obtaining in the Single Combat where *boast* is sometimes seen as a component of the motifeme *challenge*.<sup>172</sup>

*Boast* is a motifeme of *histoire*. It has two components: *brag* (defined here as a ‘vaunting of intention’) and *gloat* (‘vaunting of achievement’),

i. *Brag*

*Brag* has two allomotific aspects: the *transitive-brag* (hereafter referred to as the *T-brag*) which relates the bragger’s actions to their prospective effect on the opposition — “I-will-mangle-them!”, and the *intransitive-brag* (the *I-brag*) which relates the action to the bragger himself — “I-will-fight-until-I-die!”.

The *T-brag* is a conditioned component tied to the situation in which it occurs: it can only be delivered by an individual to persons who are not, or are not connected with, the prospective opposition. If the *T-brag* is delivered with the intention that it should come to the notice of the antagonist it becomes a component of *challenge*.<sup>173</sup> The *I-brag* is similarly tied: it is delivered *pour encourager les autres*, and is in the formal battle situation never part of *challenge*.

A. *The T-brag*

With two exceptions the hero of the Romance, prior to a formal troop engagement, does *not* brag.<sup>174</sup> It is of some interest to note that the two exceptions are King Horn and Havelok the Dane, both of whom use the *T-brag*:

Horn sede on his rime.  
 “Iblessed beo þe time  
 Icom to Suddenne  
 Wiþ mine irisse menne.  
 We schulle þe hundes teche  
 To speken vre speche:  
 Alle we hem schulle sle  
 & al quic hem fle!”

171. It is noted that the variant *Libius Disconius* (PF 105), omits these lines.

172. ‘Armies’ here includes a company of men who, banded together, fight for their Lord’s cause in an engagement of opposing troops. It does not include ‘tournaments’ &c.  
 Because *boast* is here examined only in a selected situation, detailed allomotific structure is not given except insofar as it relates to my discussion.  
 Wittig (*Narrative Structures*, p. 95) points out that *challenge* may be a motifeme in its own right if it is a major plot-unit.

173. For an example of an indirect challenge through an overheard *brag* see *Degrevant* (Camb.), ll. 261-74; for a direct challenging *brag*: *Florence*: ll. 952-60.

“For shal i neuer more be blipe,  
 Ne hoseled ben, ne of prest shriuen,  
 Til þat he ben of londe driuen.  
 Nime we swiþe and do hem fle,  
 And folwes alle faste me;  
 For ich am he, of al þe ferd,  
 þat first shal slo with drawn swerd!”

*Havelok*: ll. 2597-2603

Scholars agree that *Horn* is the earliest extant English romance and dates from about the second quarter of the thirteenth century: *Havelok* is slightly later and was apparently in existence before 1300.<sup>175</sup> Both heroes are popular English heroes; both texts belong to the *Matter of England* and reflect the early English tradition in transition with echoes of the old heroic poetic elements. I suggest, in passing as this is not the place for a full discussion, that the heroic *T-brag* present in these two romances, and no other, is such an echo. The *boast* as used in the heroic literature includes aspects of honour, loyalty, ‘worth’ and Fate and emphasises the importance of the actual achievement of the stated objective.<sup>176</sup> With the passage of time ‘boast’, ‘brag’ and ‘gloat’ acquire a pejorative meaning and the importance of the fulfilment dwindles. Certainly it appears that in the romances following *Havelok* and *Horn* the

- 
174. An apparent *T-brag* occurs in the sole-surviving fragment of an English version of about 1400 of the *Chanson de Roland* (c.11th century):

“Ther is noþer kinge ne knyght in my thought  
 that me defithe, I shall his dethe wirche  
 And clef hym with my brond doun to his tethe!”

MS. Lansdowne 388: ll.164-66

However this is an elaboration of a false-brag present in the French texts as a sample of Roland’s self-control. The fragment follows the *Chanson*’s essentials fairly closely (see Bodleian MS. Digby 23 — 12th century). In both texts the brag comes about because it has been suggested that Roland should command the rearguard of the army as it goes through a narrow pass. This is a dangerous position: Roland’s enemy hopes he will be killed. (*Fragment*: 147-56; *Chanson*, *laisée* 61, 745-47). Roland’s apparent brag is a chivalrous reply to provocation: ‘The hero remains cool. He retains a proud mien and is able to confront the villain’. (*The Song of Roland: An Analytical Edition*, 2 vols., ed. G.J. Brault, (London, 1978), I. 166; II, 48-49). But this apparent brag is not directed towards a definite future situation but is a reaction to a present position. It does not therefore conform to the *T-brag* component of the motifeme *boast*. I also note that the equivalent passage in the French variants is mock-heroic in that Roland vows to defend the baggage animals:

“N’i perdrat Carles, li reis ki France tient,  
 Men escientre, palefreid ne destrer,  
 Ne mul ne mule que deiet chevalcher,  
 Ne n’i perdrat ne runcin ne sumer  
 Que as espees ne seit einz eslegeit.”

Digby 23: ll. 755-59

The English redactor has deleted this speech in favour of the old heroic tradition, further examples of which, and present in the French MSS, he does not give: (see Digby 23: ll. 1010-16; 1073-79 — either of these passages could have come from *Maldon*). If the *fragment* is a copy of an earlier English version then my comments concerning *Havelok* and *Horn* will be seen to be valid here also.

175. *King Horn: An edition based on Cambridge University Library MS Gg.4.27(2)*, ed. R. Allen (New York & London, 1984), p. 3ff.
176. The term ‘boast’ in the context of Old English is a wholly inadequate expression — the English language no longer has a word which encompasses the nuances of the early ‘vaunting of intention’ which in effect, once uttered became in honour, akin to a pledged vow.

component *T-brag* has become unacceptable when representing the behaviour of a hero and it is now seen and commented upon in the context of the behaviour of the enemy:

And Brademond wiþ al is ost  
Com after wiþ meche bost.  
*Beves* (Auchinleck): ll. 1787-88<sup>177</sup>

The component *T-brag* is used to heighten the villainy of the opposition and underline the extent of his eventual downfall:

[Sowdan] He swere be egur countynawns,  
That hange he wolde the kyng of Fraunce  
And brenne alle Crystyante!  
“I schalle neythur leve on lyve  
Man ne beste, chylde ne wyve,  
Wyth eyen that y may see!”  
*Octavian*: ll. 1072-77<sup>178</sup>

## B. *The I-brag*

The prototypical *I-brag* is old and stems from masculine warrior-societies: it demonstrates a cultural Ideal. It is seen in some Old English and Norse works and its essence is summed up in this extract from *The Battle of Maldon*:

He hæfde ðeah geforþod þæt he his frean gehet,  
swa he beotode ær wiþ his beahgifan,  
þæt hi sceoldon begen on burh ridan  
hale to hame — odde on here crincgan,  
on wælstowe wundum sweltan.  
*Maldon*: ll. 289-93<sup>179</sup>

Its purpose is to encourage others, to demonstrate the valour and honour of the speaker, and reflect the worth of his lord and his followers. It is essentially heroic and it is absent from those Middle English Romances which are *not* part of an ‘heroic cycle’.<sup>180</sup>

An *I-brag* occurs in the fragment from the *Song of Roland*, part of the ‘Charlemagne Cycle’: (it is embedded in the component *prayer*, here an element of the motifeme *battle-preparation*):

“ . . . and som will we seche  
or I of this ground go & the gost yeld.  
ther shall no hethyn hound þat I met with sheld  
Aftur this at hom hie on his benche  
but he fight right fell, but som I will teche:  
thoughe euery fre wer aferid, fle will we neuer.”  
*Song of Roland*: ll. 609-14

The anachronistic use of the word ‘benche’ (the speaker is

---

177. See also *Gowther* (Royal): ll. 534-35; *Beves* (Chetham): ll. 4187-88.

178. See also *Le Bone Florence*: ll. 853-55.

179. ‘The Battle of Maldon’, *Sweet’s Anglo-Saxon Reader*, 15th edn., rev. D. Whitelock, (Oxford, 1970), p. 125.

Where I refer to the ‘boast’ and its components with reference to the motifeme as used in Old English, unless otherwise stated, I am relating what I have to say only to that aspect of the older ‘boast’ which has a counterpart in the text or matter currently being discussed.

referring to the Saracens) is a *direct* association with the heroic and such passages as:

Gemunad þara mæla þe we oft æt meodo spræcon,  
þonne we on bence beot ahofon,  
hæled on healle, ymbe heard gewinn.

*Maldon*: ll. 212-14

The only other true *I-brag* which I have been able to find in the Middle English rhymed narrative is also from the ‘Charlemagne Cycle’. This example is particularly interesting in the context of the *I-brag* from *PF 79: Durham*, because here too the speaker is a fighting cleric: ‘Bishoppe Turpin’.<sup>181</sup>

“I sall neuer ette ne drynke  
Ne with myn eghe slepe a wynke  
Whate bale als euer I byde,  
To 3one Cite 3olden bee,  
Or ells þer fore in Batelle dye,  
The sothe is noghte to hyde.”

*Sege of Melayne*: ll. 1351-56

---

180. True, Guy of Warwick says:

“For þe ichil mi liif in periil do . . .  
& so ichil awreke þe:  
Dye ichil bot it so be.”

*Guy of Warwick* (Auchinleck): ll. 5983-86

However this passage is part of an internal soliloquy intended to show Guy’s resolution in the face of adversity — all his men have been killed or imprisoned. Its function has no relation to the reactions of other characters.

The only other examples I have been able to find which mention the possibility however obliquely, that the hero may meet his death in battle, are two:

“. . . so þat 3e wold lelli my lemman saue & loke . . .  
al my help holliche 3e schul haue at nede;  
feipli boutte feyntise 3ou faile schal ich neuer  
as long as any life me lastes, for soþe.”

*William of Palerne*: ll. 3166-70

“Broþer,” he seyde, “3if it bitide so  
þat þe bitide care oþer wo,  
& of min helpe hast nede . . .  
be it in periil neuer so strong,  
Y schal þe help in ri3t & wrong  
mi liif to lese to mede.”

*Amis* (Auchinleck): ll. 1444-52

With regard to the first of these two examples, William’s assertion is wholly between himself and the Queen: it is neither designed to hearten companions nor demonstrate heroic fortitude but show the extent to which a knight will pledge his ‘service’ for his ‘lemman’.

As William’s vow is not a true *I-brag*, neither is that heard from Amis in the second example. Amis is making a general vow of assistance in case of some future undefined need felt by his oath-brother Amiloun: the promise of mutual aid is the pivot upon which the plot turns and as such is a component of the motifeme *vow*, which in this tale relates to the largest structural unit — the episode, and therefore cannot function as an element of *boast* which is always a unit of the smaller structural unit, the scene.

181. In the *Chanson* ‘Bishop Turpin’ is an Archbishop (l’arcevesque) of Rheims. The *Vita Caroli Magni*, untruthfully purporting to be by Archbishop Turpin, has a close connection with the mediaeval interpretation of the *Chanson*: the English *Song of Roland* is partially founded upon incidents found only in the *Vita* (c. 1130). See *The Sege of Melayne*, ed. S.J. Herrtage (London, 1880), p. xxi and Brault, *Song*, p. 32ff.

It is interesting in view of *Durham*’s rejection of an archbishop and addition of a bishop, to note that Turpin is a Bishop in *Melayne*, *Otuel* and *Sowdone* and has no rank whatever in the *Song*.

It might well be argued that because the cycle narratives relating to Charlemagne's conquests naturally contain more battle-scenes of a formal military nature than the main corpus of the Romance genre, it follows that the opportunity for *boast* (as defined) to be present, is greater. This is certainly so but it is noticeable that where similar opportunities arise in the non-cyclic romances, for instance *Beves*, *Octavian*, *Partenope*, *Generides*, it does not occur. The presence of the hero's *I-brag* in the cyclic texts is due to the 'heroic' nature of the tales which are loosely based on 'real' places, characters and events stemming from historical legends having their origins prior to the Conquest and as such, may well be expected to contain early heroic and traditional elements. The appearance of the *I-brag* solely in such texts suggests an early dichotomy in the presentation of 'fact' and 'fiction'. The presence of the hero's *I-brag* may therefore be an item relevant to the structural tradition of historical rhymed 'popular' narratives. A further point relates to works which celebrate an historical attempt to achieve an end by a formal military encounter of armies: in these works the individual is peripheral to the battle.<sup>182</sup> In non-historically based tales, battles are peripheral to the hero.<sup>183</sup>

It might be thought that the *I-brag* could be permitted to the villain. I have found no example of this whatever. This is because the *I-brag* is associated with positive qualities and the 'right' cause. In the Middle English Romance the antagonists never have 'right' on their side.<sup>184</sup>

The sowdane Arabas the stronge  
Werreyde appon Crystyndome with wronge. . . .  
*Melayne*: ll. 13-14

"For if they were as many mo  
Agaynst vs shulde they haue no myght:  
They haue the wronge and we the ryght.  
*Beves* (Chetham): ll. 3028-30<sup>185</sup>

'Right' is always associated with victory: it is not possible for the army that is 'wrong' to triumph in the end. Therefore because the *I-brag* is an heroic concept, the image of a knight — be he a saracen or other — possessing sufficient chivalric worth to pledge himself to fight to the death, yet at the same time to be fighting for a 'wrong' cause, is a paradox which cannot be permitted: the *I-brag* is never put into the mouths of villains.

---

182. An individual may be shown promoting the notion of 'death or glory' but the purpose of his bravery is first, to encourage towards victory; secondly as an individual example of the composite valour of the speaker's 'side', and only thirdly as a reflection of the worth of a hero.

183. Battles are present as a means whereby the central figure might demonstrate his quality. The *I-brag* "I-will-fight-till-I-die" implies both a lack of assurance of a victorious outcome and imputes an impossible human weakness to a hero in whom the audience traditionally has every confidence.

184. The terms 'antagonist' and 'protagonist' are used in this study to refer to the opposing combatants: the hero and villain respectively. As with 'hero' the term 'villain' in the singular may encompass the plural.

185. See also *Partenope* (Rawl.): ll. 3171-72; *Generides*: ll. 3210-11.

ii. *Gloat*

Where the *gloat* (vaunting of achievement) aspect of the motifeme *boast* occurs it is seen to have two allomotif components: *right* and *enumeration-of-casualties*. It may be present directly or indirectly:<sup>186</sup>

There were slayn in þat batayl  
syxty thousand, wythoute fayl. . . .  
On the erlys syde þere were slayn  
but twenty. . . .  
false quarrel comes to evell end!  
Now the emperour ys full woo:  
he has lost men and lond also,  
sore then syghed hee . . .  
The emperes seyde . . .  
“Hyt ys gret parell, soth to tell  
to be agayn þe ryght quarell.”

*Toulous*: ll. 121-43.

Syxyte þousand þere loren here lyff  
þat þere were slawen & brouzt to ded. . . .  
Falsnesse can neuere to good endyng.

*Beves* (Caius): ll. 4509-13

These two examples are the only occurrences I have been able to find of a *gloat* following a corporate military victory in the Middle English Romances. The telling phrase is that in which the narrator condemns ‘falsnesse’ — the antagonist’s misguided support of ‘wrong’: in the context this is both a moral of *high sentence* and a component of *gloat* having the implications of a satisfied “I-could-have-told-you-so!”.

e. *Conclusions*

The motifemes discussed above are a selected few from the large number to be found in the Romances, but the examination of these few has produced a paradigm which is sufficiently firmly based to provide, when critically applied to later texts, a well-founded indication of the presence, absence or variation of traditional continuity. The following therefore covers the broad outlines of the named Romance motifemes and their components in the fairly general terms sufficient for my purpose.

1. **Exhortation**

- i) *exhortation*: Narrator requests the attention of his prospective audience:
  - a. He may designate them in flattering terms — ‘lordings’ &c.
  - b. He may request them to listen or hearken.
  - c. He may ask them to be still or quiet.

---

186. Where *enumeration* is included in a narrative focus relating to ‘pieces of bodies or quantities of blood’ (Wittig, *Narrative Structures*, p. 69f), then it is a component of *description-of-battlefield*: where the focus is on the number of defeated enemies and the poet is not immediately concerned with the presentation of a detailed visual image, then *enumeration* is an allomotif of the *gloat* component of the motifeme *boast*.

‘Right is also a ‘free’ unit and like *prayer*, may occur as a component of other motifemes such as *justification* — see lines from *Beves*, *Generides*, *Melayne*, cited above.

- ii) *synopsis*: Narrator mentions subject of his tale.
- a. He may mention only the principal character.
  - b. He may mention the principal character and his associates.
  - c. He may give a brief outline of the hero's qualities.
  - d. He may give a brief preview of the adventures to be described.
- iii) *prayer*: Narrator requests benediction on those present.
- a. He will address the Deity in His spiritual aspect — 'heaven-king', 'trinity'.
  - b. He may specify a benediction for those who appreciate stories, and (rarely) their tellers.
  - c. He frequently requests that his audience be assured of the ultimate 'heavenly reward'.
- iv) *source*: Narrator assures his audience that his tale has the authority of provenance.
- a. Simple anonymous:
    - He refers to a 'book', 'chronicle', 'clerkys'.
  - b. Complex anonymous:
    - He refers to the above but specifies one or more of: place of origin, original title, original language: gives a value judgement.
  - c. Simple named writer:
    - gives author or redactor.
  - d. Complex named writer:
    - as above b) and c) plus patron's name, reason for work; disparages his ability to do the work justice.
- v) *moral*: Narrator assures his audience that there is a lesson to be learned from his tale.
- a. He may point out that good examples were set by the 'elders' who lived prior to his audience.
  - b. He may point out that the characters' lives and deeds should be emulated.
  - c. He may point out that the story illustrates a specific lesson.

## 2. Valediction

- i) *prayer*: Narrator requests benediction on his audience.
- a. As item 1(iii) above, plus:
  - b. He may request a blessing for the characters in his tale.
  - c. He may call for God's curse on villains.
- ii) *source*: Narrator assures his audience that his tale has the authority of provenance:
- a. As item 1(iv) above.

- iii) *explicit*: Narrator signifies that he has reached the end of his tale.
- iv) *moral*: Narrator assures his audience that there was a lesson to be learned from his tale.
  - a. As item 1(v) b and c above.

### 3. Terminal Status-quo

- i) *hero*: After the termination of his adventure the hero is rewarded with one or more of the following:
  - a. Rank and/or riches and/or a spouse.
  - b. A long and pleasant life.
  - c. His 'other worldly reward' through martyrdom.
  - d. His 'other worldly reward' through his piety.
- ii) *hero+family*: The status-quo of the hero and his family will cover some of the following points:
  - a. The hero's marriage will be happy.
  - b. The hero's marriage will endure for a given time.
  - c. The hero will have a given number of children.
  - d. The children will be specified by gender but sons will be prominent.
  - e. The hero's children will achieve worldly success.
  - f. The hero and his partner will die simultaneously.
  - g. Their souls will go to heaven.
- iii) *associates*: The status quo of the hero's associates will cover some of the following points.
  - a. They will be enriched.
  - b. They will acquire a spouse.
  - c. They will acquire rank.
  - d. They will have a long and comfortable life.
  - e. They will be respected by all.
- iv) *populace*: The status-quo of the populace after the adventure is over is always good.
  - a. Implicit: they are ruled by a good and well-beloved king or lord.
  - b. Explicit 1: (General)  
Their ruler has a high regard for Justice, Law, Religion.
  - c. Explicit 2: (Detailed)  
Their ruler discourages specified injustices and villains and encourages specified good practices.
  - d. Their ruler is generous to the deserving and poor.
  - e. Especially minstrels!

### 4. Boast

- i. *brag*
  - T-brag: A character declares his intention of inflicting gross physical damage on the opposition.



- a. This is generally a function of the villain.
- b. When uttered by a hero the text will celebrate a corporate military encounter based on a 'real' battle.

— I-brag: A character declares that he will fight until he is killed.

- a. This is a function of the hero only.
- b. It will encourage others.
- c. It will demonstrate the valour of the speaker's 'side'.
- d. It will demonstrate the speaker's worth.
- e. All these points will be present.

ii. *gloat*

— right: The victorious are always right.

- a. It may be so stated by any character or the narrator.
- b. If stated it may be done explicitly or by implication.
- c. It may be present to explain the reason for an 'impossible' victory.

iii. *enumeration of casualties*: The numbers killed are stated after the battle.

1.

- a. This is a function of the protagonists.
- b. The numbers may emphasise the odds defeated.
- c. The numbers may emphasise the virtue of the protagonists.

\*\*\* \* \*\*\*

**TABLE 1.** *Stylistic Structure of ‘Durham Feilde’*

Motifeme	Allomotif	Scene	Theme (Episode)	
<b>Part I</b>				
1. <i>Exhortation</i>	a. “Lordinges, listen...” b. Synopsis	<i>Threat</i>	<i>Warfare</i> (invasion- resistance- ejection)	
2. <i>Scene setting</i> (Embedded: <i>Departure Prepared</i> )	a. Naming, Dating, Location. b. ‘Cheefe chualry’ readied. c. Best archers readied.			
3. <i>Departure</i>	a. Forces embark for war in France. b. Villains hear of departure. c. Result of departure: lack of defence.			
4. <i>Boast</i> (Villain’s <i>brag</i> made and answered)	a. Villain will hold his Parliament in London. b. Validity of boast doubted by Squire. c. Doubter slain out of hand by Villain.			
5. <i>Narrator’s Comment</i>	a. Narrator foretells Villain’s downfall.			
6. <i>Bidding to Battle</i> (Embedded: <i>Battle Preparation</i> )	a. Calling and naming of knight. b. Knight’s function in coming battle. c. Naming of guerdon: largesse of lands. d. a,b & c repeated thrice. e. Calling and naming of knight. f. Naming of guerdon. g. e & f repeated thrice. h. a, b & c repeated once.			
7. <i>Battle Preparation</i> (Villain’s)	a. Dubbing of new knights. b. General largesse. c. Knights ‘buske them bowne’.			
8. <i>Combat</i> (Preliminary skirmish)	a. Villain’s ‘Helper’ and men attack in a private enterprise. b. All but Helper killed. c. Pious attribution of victory.	<i>Battle</i>		
9. <i>Boast</i> (Villain’s <i>brag</i> made and answered)	a. Brag: 1 Villain = 5 Heroes. b. Answ: 1 Hero = 5 Villains. c. Brag: Heroic opposition is feeble.			
10. <i>Boast</i> (Villain’s new <i>brag</i> )	a. Villain’s herald reconnoitres. b. Villains outnumber Heroes. c. Heroes only led by a Cleric. d. Cleric making martial preparations. e. Scornful Villain will defeat him.			
<b>Part II</b>				
11. <i>Scene setting</i>	a. Disposition of heroes.	<i>Battle</i>		
12. <i>Battle Preparation</i> (Hero’s) (Embedded: <i>brag</i> )	a. Religious service (Mass). b. Priests prepare to fight. c. Individual Hero vows to fight to the death. d. c tripled.			
13. <i>Combat</i> (General)	a. First blow: Heroic archers miss target. b. Second blow: they hit — Villains die. c. Flight of remaining Villains.			
14. <i>Combat</i> (Single) (Embedded: <i>challenge</i> )	a. Villain (King) wounded. b. Hero (Yeoman) challenges to fight. c. Challenge refused. d. Hero’s second challenge to fight. e. Villain overcome. f. Led off to prison.			

'Durham Feilde' (continued)

Motifeme	Allomotif	Scene	Theme (Episode)
15. <i>Boast</i> (Hero's <i>gloat</i> : dialogue)	a. Villain taunted: how did he like the opposition? b. Villain yields : 1 yeomen Hero = 1 noble Villain. c. Pious attribution of victory.	Triumph	Warfare (invasion- resistance- ejection)
16. <i>Boast (gloat)</i> (Indirect: narrative)	a. Victor's son has captured French King. b. Brought him to Victor. c. Prayer for continued good fortune.		
17. <i>Boast (gloat)</i> (Indirect: dialogue)	a. Villain (Scottish king) bewails his fortune. b. Villain (French king) bewails his fortune. c. Wish that they had not acted against Heroes.		
18. <i>Boast (gloat)</i> (Indirect: narrative)	a. English Victory at Battle of Durham; b. Victory at Battle of Crécy; c. Victory at Battle of Poitiers — all in the same month.		
19. <i>Terminal Status-quo</i>	a. Prosperity for all. b. Pleasure for all. c. Mutual affection between each man, the King and his Yeomen.		
20. <i>Valediction</i>	a. God save the King. b. God keep good Yeomanry.		

B. Continuity and Development of Motifemes and the Model Text 'Durham'

The following will show that although the structural patterning of *Durham* is similar to earlier rhymed narrative texts, in *Durham* it reflects a more sophisticated conceptual audience ability: it has also been manipulated towards secular and conglomerate social interests with a substantial diminution of the earlier concentration on individuals and abstract idealistic values.

Because *PF 79* is relatively short it is possible to set out a schematic arrangement of the entire text, as a Table which shows the motifemes present in *Durham* and their distribution.

a. *Exhortation*

The motifeme *exhortation* present in *Durham* conforms to Wittig's criteria: it contains the obligatory nuclear component — the 'exhortation' itself — plus the peripheral and optional *synopsis*. Unusual, but not totally foreign to the earlier exemplars (*Amis*, *Horn*, *Launfal*) is the fact that *prayer* has been omitted. The components *source* and *moral* are not present but this is of little significance as these are, even in the exemplars, 'floating' or 'unattached' units. Despite the omissions, *exhortation* here as in the early works, conforms to the requirement of a full stanza for its completion.<sup>187</sup> *Synopsis* is very brief: the narrator will speak of 'the fairest battell/that euer in England beffell' (st. 1). Unlike its predecessors the narrator mentions no specific character. Nevertheless it is a *bona fide* allomotif component of this type-pattern — although it appears to be vestigial in that it demonstrates diminution and lateral manipulation.<sup>188</sup>

187. Wittig, *Narrative Structures*, p. 61.

188. 'Lateral manipulation' relates to an alteration to the proper sequential position of allomotif components of a motifeme through addition or omission. 'Vertical manipulation' refers to a type-pattern or component which has drifted from its proper sequence and has become embedded in another motifeme elsewhere.

The brevity of the opening *exhortation* precludes a leisurely approach to the tale: it grips the audience almost immediately. A minority of Romance models use this type of opening (*Horn, Launfal, Degare*) and therefore the beginning of *Durham* follows the early tradition with little deviation.

b. *Valediction, exhortation* and the component *prayer*.

The following will show that the motifeme *valédiction* is present in *Durham*; that the motifemic component *prayer* is also present and conforms to the early convention of closing the tale with a prayer for the welfare of the audience, but that a new allomotif has been substituted in place of the traditional desire for the ‘heavenly reward’.

*Durham* closes with the motifeme *valédiction* which consists solely of the nuclear obligatory component *prayer*.<sup>189</sup>

but God that made the grasse to growe  
& leaves on greenwoode tree,  
now saue & keepe our noble king  
& maintaine good yeomanry.

PF 79: st. 66

As previously shown it is not unusual for *prayer* to be the sole component of this particular motifeme. However the image of God as Creator of specific terrestrial objects is unusual in the early romances. The nearest comparable invocation is the portmanteau phrase ‘Now Iesu Cryst that all hath wrought . . .’ found in a ‘rather late fifteenth-century composition’.<sup>190</sup> This might be expected if the image of God as the Creator of material components of ‘this world’ is a sequential development from the earlier involvement with ‘other world’ concerns seen in 86% of the Romances studied. In these texts the Deity is invoked with reference to His mystical functions — ‘Jesus Christ, Heaven-King’, ‘Jesus Christ in Trinity’ — and/or the object of the prayer is the achievement of the ultimate ‘heavenly reward’. This latter spiritual preoccupation alone is present in 75% of the texts studied.<sup>191</sup> Thus this interest would appear to be an allomotif of *prayer* common to a very high proportion of Middle English Romances.

---

189. The component *explicit* — ‘thus ends the battell of Faire Durham’ (st. 64), is also present but has been subject to vertical displacement: it occurs embedded in the motifeme *boast* and thus has a double function.

190. *Torrent*: l. 2664. The *prayer* component of *exhortation* in the same text is more detailed: ‘God . . . Heauen and Erthe haue In hold/Fyld, watyr and wynde . . .’ (ll. 1-3). Even so *Torrent* is a rare example of God’s connection with the material specifics of this world: this connection may be a function of its relatively late date of composition, for which see L.A. Hibbard, *Mediaeval Romance in England* (New York, 1924), p. 279.

191. However these figures may not be a true representation as several of the subject works are either acephalous or atelagic and there is no means whereby the matter of the missing head or foot may be known. If the incomplete texts are subtracted from the population sample studied the revised figures are 91% and 82% respectively: these figures are extraordinarily high.

**Figure 4. ‘Other-worldly’ references in the motifemes *exhortation* and *valediction* in the texts cited.**

Title	Exhortation			Valediction		
	Heaven -king	Trinity	Soul's Fate	Heaven -king	Trinity	Soul's Fate
<i>Amadace</i>			Acephalous		+	
<i>Amadas</i>			Acephalous			+
<i>Amis &amp; Amiloun</i>		+				+
<i>Athelston</i>			+	+		
<i>Beves</i> (Chatham)					+	+
<i>Chevelere Assigne</i>						
<i>Cleges</i> (Ashmole)						+
<i>Degaré</i>						
<i>Degrevant</i> (Lincoln & Camb.)		+	+		+	+
<i>Eger &amp; Grime</i>						+
<i>Eglamour</i> (Cotton)	+		+			+
<i>Emaré</i>			+			+
<i>Firumbras</i> (BL.Add.MS.37492)			Acephalous			
<i>Florence</i>			Acephalous			+
<i>Floris &amp; Blancheflur</i>			Acephalous			+
<i>Gawain &amp; Carl of C.</i> (Pork.10)						+
<i>Generides</i>						+
<i>Gowther</i> (Royal)						+
<i>Guy of Warwick</i> (Caius)						+
<i>Havelok</i>						+
<i>Hornchild</i>					Atelologic	
<i>Ipomedon</i> (Chetham)						+
<i>Isumbras</i>	+		+	+		
<i>King Horn</i> (Camb. & Harl.)				+		+
<i>King of Tars</i> (Vernon)						+
<i>Lay le Freine</i>						
<i>Launfal</i>				+		
<i>Landevale</i>						+
<i>Lybeaus</i> (Cotton & Lambeth)						+
<i>Octavian</i> (Camb. & Lincoln)	+			+		+
<i>Orfeo</i> (Harl. & Ashmole)						+
<i>Otuel &amp; Roland</i>				+	+	+
<i>Partenay</i>			Acephalous		+	+
<i>Partenope</i>			+			
<i>Perceval of Galles</i>				+		
<i>Reinbrun</i> (Auchinleck)					Atelologic	
<i>Robert of Sicily</i>						+
<i>Sege of Melayne</i>					Atelologic	
<i>Sowdone of Babylon</i>						+
<i>Torrent</i>			+			+
<i>Toulous</i>	+					+
<i>Triamour</i>			+			+
<i>William of Palerne</i>			Acephalous			+
<i>Ywain &amp; Gawain</i>						+

The *Durham* allomotifs *god-save-the-king* and *god-save-yeomen* have no place in the Romance where the request that everyone might be ‘well to fare’ or ‘well to spede’ (*Degaré*, *Degrevant*, *Reinbrun*) is the nearest approach to considerations of worldly prosperity in the component *prayer*.<sup>192</sup> The units of *discours* in which *exhortation* and *valediction* occur are those items in which the narrator is free to attempt to establish a *rapport* with his audience and direct his comments towards the personal. It is therefore not unreasonable to suppose that the Romance audience were concerned with their future well-being in the ‘next world’. By the sixteenth century it appears from the paucity of such references in new works intended for the entertainment of the ‘comminality’ that the convention has not survived the circumstances of its original production: the personal concerns of the creators and consumers of such fiction have changed from those of earlier audiences.<sup>193</sup> The frequent allusions to the State in the person of the king points to a diminution in the importance of personal long-term spiritual ambition and a growth in the importance of the maintenance of the stability of the realm and consequent terrestrial prosperity.

c. *Terminal Status-quo*

The following will show that although the function of ‘hero’ is undertaken by a collective body, the appropriate conventional allomotifs relating to the traditional ‘happy ending’ are present together with a new allomotific emphasis on

the cordial relations among the members of the populace and between the populace and the king.

This motifeme in *Durham* occupies one stanza:

Then was welthe & welfare in mery England,  
solaces, game & glee;  
& every man loved other well  
& the king loved good yeomanrye.

PF 79: st. 65

As has been established, the ‘hero’ of *Durham* is a compound figure: ‘the yeomen of England’.<sup>194</sup> Nevertheless PF 79 maintains continuity with tradition as the author has contrived to include the nuclear obligatory component of the motifeme — *hero*. Because the ‘hero’ consists of a section of the ‘comminality’ the component *family* cannot be present, nor can the component *associates* as the ‘associates’ *en masse* fulfil the heroic function. This being so the component ‘hero’ is merged with the component *populace*: *populace* covers the condition of the whole people and naturally includes the heroic element among the people.

---

192. The allomotif *god-save-the-king* is present in, or is the entire prayer component in six of the narrative *Folio* items, all of which are historical in topic and all of which are copies, variants or consciously derived from originals which date from no earlier than the first few decades of the sixteenth century:

PF 39:	<i>Flodden Feilde:</i>	God . . . saue our Noble prince that wereth the crowne. (l. 512)
PF 48:	<i>Cheuey Chase:</i>	God saue our King & blesse this land with plentye, Ioy & peace. (ll. 253-54)
PF 87:	<i>Buckingham betrayd by Banister:</i>	Now god blesse our king & counsell graue. (l. 129)
PF 96:	<i>White rose &amp; red</i>	God saue our Prince & king & Land, & send them long to raigine in health, in welth, in quietnesse. . . . (ll. 201-03)
PF 124:	<i>Murthering of Edward the Fourth his sonnes:</i>	Iames . . . whose happy dayes our Lord preserue. (ll. 125-27)
PF 154:	<i>Ladye Bessiye:</i>	God . . . saue and keepe our comelye king and the pore comminaltye. (ll. 1081-82).

The emphasis is on *this* world not the next. I have found no early usage of *god-save-the-king* as an allomotif of *prayer* but for a very few examples in hortatory political pieces, such as:

God kepe our kyng ay, and gide hym by grace;  
Save hym fro Southefolkes and from his foois alle.

*On Bishop Booth*: st. 15

This is thought to be from about 1450. (Cotton Rolls, ii, 23, cited in Wright, *Political Poems*, p. 228.)

The only other example of *god-save-yeomen* I have found is also from *The Percy Folio* but it relates to their ‘heavenly reward’ and is from an undated text of pre-Tudor times:

Thus endeth the liffe of these good yeomen:  
god send them eternall blisse,  
& all that with a hand-bow shooteth,  
that of heauen they may neuer misse.

PF 115: *Adam Bell, Clime of the Clough &  
Willam off Cloudeslee*: ll. 679 - 82.

194. The nearest approach to a collective hero elsewhere is seen in the ‘Charlemagne Cycle’, but even there where the function may be shared, the principal topic is generally the prowess of the individual. The ‘hero’ in *Durham* is at times represented by an individual — the Bishop, Copland, Edward III, but the author never permits his audience to forget the concept of composite heroism. On the other hand the ‘villain’ is represented by the King of Scots with only the rare excursion into the idea of composite villainy.

Thus in the first three lines of stanza 65 the collective 'hero' is included in *populace* but emerges as 'the yeomanrye' to stand alone in the fourth line. The *Durham* author has conformed to tradition in that after the 'adventure' the people as *hero*, have achieved riches, a pleasant life and good fellowship: the people as *populace*, have the same and as in the conventional allomotif, reference is made to a quality of their king which implies that he maintains their good fortune.

The novelty of *Durham's* presentation of this motifeme first relates to the fact that the 'hero' is composite and yet the author has contrived in this difficult situation to fulfil convention, and secondly that at the expense of the cold abstracts of Justice and Law, he has emphasised the warmth of universal good fellowship. Traditionally it is not unusual for the king to be 'well-beloved' by his subjects, but the notion presented in *Durham* that the king might return their affection and love his subjects, is a concept which is not part of this motifeme in any of the Romances I have studied.

d. *Boast*

The discussions which follow will show that *boast* and its components by and large conform to tradition. However it will be noted that *boast* has undergone more alteration in the form of expansion than any of the other motifemes examined in *Durham*. Because this manifestation of *boast* is therefore relatively complex it will be discussed in the light of its several components. It will be concluded that in *Durham*, *boast* encompasses a wider significance and greater depth than could be achieved had the author adhered only to previous conventions.

i. *I-Brag*

The *I-Brag* component present in *Durham* (sts. 45 & 46) reflects the heroic attitude seen in some Old English works as previously mentioned. Its primary purpose is to encourage others and demonstrate the valour of the Bishop and his party. It would therefore appear that the early heroic and formulaic *I-brag* is continued in *Durham*. Furthermore it is seen that its use is perpetuated in association with the same kind of topic as in earlier works where it occurs (as I have previously noted) in texts which like *Durham*, relate to 'real' events — however apocryphal. The appearance of the *I-brag* in *PF* 79 shows that this early tradition although seeming by and large to have by-passed the Romance has not entirely disappeared by the sixteenth century.

ii. *T-brag*

In *Durham* the pre-battle *T-brag* component of *boast* is a token of villainy: in that regard the romantic tradition is unchanged.

There is but one example of the traditional *T-brag*:

"I sweare by St. Andrewes bones," saies the King,  
"Ile rapp that preist on the crowne."

*PF* 79: st. 38

When the *T-brag* occurs in the Romances it retains at least a hint of the early heroic masculine tradition: in comparison with the few examples I was able to find and cite, the king's intention to 'rapp' the priest is mild.<sup>195</sup> It demonstrates in *Durham* a diminution of the earlier apparent

need for horrific detail. Emphasis of the *T-brag*'s 'vaunting of intention' is obtained not through detailing the prospective slaughter but through the introduction of an allomotific component *assessment-of-strength*:

"One Scott will beate 5 Englishmen. . . ."

st. 32

"They be but English knaues;  
but shepards & Millers both  
and preists with their staues."

st. 35

The brag is less direct than the outright "I" (or "we") "will-mangle-them" and relies for its interpretation, particularly in the second quotation, on the audience's appreciation of the villain's expectation of an easy victory. It nevertheless relates to a 'future intention' and is therefore a component of 'vaunt' and therefore 'boast'.

iii. *Gloat*

A. *Right*

The notion that the victor emerges triumphant because he has 'right' on his side is still an important theme in *Durham* — *assessment-of-strength* in *PF* 79 is a function of 'villainy' because it implies that the villain (mistakenly) regards 'might' as 'right'. The allomotific *right* in *Durham* wholly conforms to tradition: it is presented as a component of *gloat* when (the captive villain having been forced to concede English superiority), the victor says laughing, "I, by my troth . . . for you fought all against the right!" (st. 59).

B. *Enumeration of Casualties*

This component is not present in *Durham*. 'They fell in heapes hye' (st. 49) is a comment made during the battle and is a vestigial *carnage* component of the motifeme *description-of-the-battlefield*.

C. *New Components*

*Durham* introduces two other allomotific elements into the *gloat* component of *boast*: *enumeration-of-victories* and *villain's-lament*. Neither of these are found in the Romances as a part of this motifeme in the context of corporate military engagements. The *gloat* in *Durham* is much longer and more complex than any found in the Romances as it occupies eight stanzas (57-64). The *enumeration-of-victories* (Crécy, Poitiers and *Durham*) enlarges the scope of the direct *gloat*: the *villain's-lament* takes the *gloat* into an area unknown in the Romances — the 'indirect' *gloat*. The *villain's-lament* is a 'vaunting of achievement' by *implication*. The purpose of the inclusion of the scene where the captive kings lament their folly is to emphasise the completeness of the glory

---

195. This is so even though here 'rapp' has the meaning of a 'severe blow with a weapon' (*OED*, *sv.*, *rap*, *sb<sup>1</sup>*) as 'rapp . . . on the crowne' has considerably less impact than for instance, 'clef hym with my brond down to his tethe!' (MS. Lansdowne 388, ll. 164-66).



and the validity of the *gloat* through an admission of the villain's 'wrongness' from his own mouth. *Villain's-lament* is specifically directed towards audience imagination. Without audience interpretation it is a tidying up of loose ends and nothing more, but to a partisan audience involved in the tale, the picture of the captured enemy foiled in his presumption and cast down from his arrogance is an opportunity for their participation: here it is the *audience* who gloat over the achievement set before them.

## V. Conclusions

- I. *Durham* has not included any new motifemes which are not present in the earlier exemplars. Although all four motifemes discussed lack some of the traditional but optional components, they are presented without significant difference from their sequential organisation in the Romance.

There are however differences in the motifemic components. *Valediction* sees the introduction of two new allomotifs — *god-save-the-king* and *god-save-yeomen* — into its component *prayer*. *Terminal status-quo* conflates *hero*, *associates* and *populace* into one component in accordance with the requirements of a composite 'hero'. The *brag* component of *boast* has a new dimension with *assessment of strength* and the *gloat* is expanded with the introduction of *enumeration of victories* and *villain's lament*.

- II. This study shows that differences in the allomotific details of the motifemic patterns serve first to manipulate audience response in a new way and secondly to reflect change in the attitude of the author (and perhaps of the audience) away from individual concerns and towards a more collective goal.
  - a. *Durham* does not primarily address an aristocratic audience but relates a tale praising the 'comminality' to the 'comminality'. Therefore the incorporation of much formulaic detail relating to chivalric confrontation and knightly prowess is irrelevant. It seems that the author expects the yeomen members of his audience to respond independently to matters within their own cognisance as he makes no substitutions for the omission (previously noted) of a blow-by-blow description of combat, the omission of details of slaughter in the *T-brag* and *carnage* or the omission of *enumeration of casualties*. The effect is that audience interpretation of detail is free and subject only to the limits of individual extra-textual knowledge of the topic and individual capacity for imaginative pictorial imagery. The inclusion of *assessment of strength* and *villain's lament* both of which require active audience participation, indicates an authorial expectation of a more sophisticated audience than the Romance authors who by and large, lead their audience by the hand.<sup>196</sup> Thus *Durham* as a model, indicates that in one instance at least, by the sixteenth century an author by confining his narrative to limited specifics could paradoxically encourage unlimited audience interpretation — presumably in the

---

196. J. Coleman, *English Literature in History 1350-1400: Mediaeval Readers and Writers* (London, 1981), p. 160ff.

confidence that the audience could make such an interpretation and that it would not diminish but add to the scope of his work.<sup>197</sup>

- b. With reference to ‘changing attitudes’, the motifemes *terminal status-quo* and *valediction* have two interesting features. First, although they conform in outline to the earlier practices in the former motifeme, the component *populace* drops the emphasis on the coldly distant concepts of Justice and Law in favour of a more general and rather warmer mass prosperity. Secondly, in both motifemes the ‘cominality’, represented by yeomanry, is seen as a specific group of some integral value to the kingdom and as such are held in good regard by the monarch. This contrasts with the Romances where any representation of persons below the ‘gentry’ gives rise to a vague image of an amorphous mass of insignificant individuals — only one or two may be singled out, usually anonymously, to perform a minor function necessary to the tale.<sup>198</sup> In these texts a monarch has no personal relationship with the more humble of his subjects.<sup>199</sup> *Durham* follows this tradition but through the linking of ‘king’ and ‘yeomen’ (sts. 65 & 66) makes some progress towards the hitherto unstressed idea that esteem between sovereign and subject need not be one-sided: that mutual support can contribute to mutual prosperity through the actions of a group rather than a single hero.

This progress away from the concentration on rather ‘unreal’ individuals and their interests is also seen in the *prayer* component of *valediction*. I have already shown that in the Romances this component centres on the abstract idealism of eventual immaterial and other-worldly reward for the individual and appeals are made to those aspects of the Deity which can potentiate that reward. *Durham*, specifying God as the Creator, introduces the theme of *god-save-the-king*. This, linked with *god-save-yeomen*, mirrors a change to secular, concrete and social practicalities. The desire for the collective well-being of the king and the yeomen is an aspiration which belongs to *this* world. It replaces the older religiously based attitude derived from the theological teaching, with a perhaps less uplifting but more immediate and essentially pragmatic outlook — perhaps the language now admits what had always been there.

---

197. Because it is not relevant here, I am not prepared to enter the argument as to whether formulaic oral tags are features of a text intended for recitation, or whether they are simply ‘a literary convention designed to create an atmosphere of lively recitation.’ (C. Fewster, *Traditionality and genre in Middle English romance* (Cambridge, 1987), pp. 22-38.

Throughout this study I refer to a text’s ‘audience’: this term is understood to apply equally to readers or listeners.

198. There are a few exceptions amongst female characters: the ‘lavender’ (*Generides*) and the Lady’s-maid (*Ywain*) have important roles. It is of interest to note that *males* from the general populace are always minor characters such as porters (*Floris*), foresters (*Degrevant*), messengers (*Partenay*) and so on.

199. Hence the perennial popularity of those improbable texts with the motif ‘King-and-Subject’ where 1), the monarch is forced by circumstances to receive a night’s hospitality from a low-born and undistinguished subject or, 2), the said subject, for redress of grievance, goes to Court to confront the monarch in person. The essential point of these narratives is always the element of personal contact and the humour found in the situation when it is seen that, in the first example, the king has no notion of the subject’s life-style or, in the second example, vice-versa.

III. My final conclusion is that I have established a paradigm to act as a standard for the composition of narratives specifically based on antecedent events or texts. Comparison of later texts with this paradigm clearly demonstrates the existence of structural or topical modifications which may significantly affect the presence, absence or metamorphosis of traditional Middle English or Mediaeval constructs used by the author or redactor. I have also established the details of a selection of prominent motifemic constructions common to the early popular Romance. These can be used as a scale against which an aspect of mediaeval continuity in later works can be estimated. By examining their presence, function and modification in *Durham* I have shown that such a usage is both practical and productive. These two standards complement each other and used together in the following chapters establish that mediaeval continuity is preserved in popular rhymed entertainment long after it has virtually vanished from other literary genres.

The following Chapter begins my examination of the preservation or development of earlier tradition seen in other battle-texts in *The Percy Folio*.

## CHAPTER THREE

### THE HISTORICAL ITEMS — NATIONAL BATTLES

#### THE BATTLES OF AGINCOURT AND BOSWORTH

##### I. Utilisation of Primary Material: PF 77 *Agincourte Battell*

###### a. Introduction

*Agincourte Battell*, item 77 in *The Percy Folio*, presents a view of both the circumstances preceding the event and the event itself.<sup>1</sup> The battle took place on the 5th October, 1415 between the English under Henry V and the French. The English had an overwhelming victory against superior odds. Over the years the field of Agincourt has been the topic of many rhymed narratives: Child No. 164 discusses some of these and mentions *PF 77* in passing.<sup>2</sup>

*PF 77* is not wholly unique to the *Folio*: twenty-five of its forty-five stanzas (with the addition of another two not present in *PF 77*), comprise the whole of a broadside variant. The oldest extant copy of this broadside text is in the Pepys Collection of Ballads (*PB I.90-91*), and is printed by S.W. This is probably Simon Waterson (fl.1584-1634). It is likely that *PB I.90-91* and *PF 77* are derived from a common source as each contains matter not present in the other but lexically the texts are virtually identical. *PB 90-91* has twenty-seven stanzas: the two not present in *PF 77* are stanza 15 and the last stanza. This terminal stanza is a later addition to the body of the work:

The Lord preserue our Noble King,  
and grant to him likewise,  
The vpper hand and victorie  
of all his Enemies.

*PB I.90-91*

Stanza 15 of *PB I.90-91* is not present in *PF 77* — although the preceding stanza to which it relates, and which concerns the numerical force of the French, *is* included (*PF 77*: st. 18). *PB* stanza 15 sets out the numbers of the English. Because the relative size of the armies caused the victory of the heavily outnumbered English to be surprising, it is probable that the omission of the stanza which makes this feature clear is accidental.

*PF 77* has forty-five stanzas: 12-15, 23-29 and 37-45 inclusive, are unique to *The Percy Folio*. They contain complementary-units relating to the siege of Harfleur; the behaviour of the French on the night prior to the battle; part of Henry V's address to his

---

1. *HF*, II, 166; BL. Add. MS 27,879, fol. 120<sup>v</sup>-121<sup>v</sup>

2. Child, *ESPB.*, III, 320 ff.

troops; the robbing of the English baggage tents by the French and Henry's marriage to a French Princess. It is probable that these matters were omitted from the Pepys broadside as the printer believed them to be peripheral to the main story and he was restricted by considerations of length. It is probable that *PF 77* is a variant of the older and fuller broadside original of which *PB I.90-91* is a condensed version. This conclusion is reached because the shorter Pepys text in its stanza 24 refers back to a matter which is set out in a stanza missing from that text:

The Horse-men tumbled on the Stakes,  
and so their liues they lost. . . .

*PB I.90-91*: st. 24

The omitted stanza explaining the 'stakes' to which this stanza refers, is present in *PF 77* as an example of a cunning English tactic:

“yett let euerye man provide  
himselpe a strong substantiall stake,  
& set it right before himselpe,  
the horsmans force to breake.”

*PF 77*: st. 29

The vocabulary of *PF 77* is of the latter half of the sixteenth century: it presents no solid evidence to show that this text is older than *PB I.90-91* although the former's use of 'dint', 'brave' and 'sware' (sts. 1 & 3), against the latter's use of 'dent', 'grave' and 'swore', may suggest it. Rollins believes that the typography of the Pepys text together with the form of the colophon and the reference to 'Our Noble King' point to a date no earlier than 1603 and that its printing suggests about 1610.<sup>3</sup> However *PB I.90-91* states that 'Agincourt' is to be sung to the tune called 'Flying Fame': this tune makes its first recorded appearance in 1578.<sup>4</sup> Because 'Agincourt' is almost certainly a *contrafactum* (as will be shown), and because the Percy and Pepys texts are variants of one original, it can be assumed with some confidence that *PF 77* was also sung to 'Flying Fame'. Therefore the earliest credible date for the composition of the original text is likely to be somewhere in the region of 1578.<sup>5</sup>

The stanzas of *PF 77* rhyme a b c b. The rhymes remain true although unlike *Durham*, there is one instance of masculine assonance when 'white' is rhymed with 'buy itt' ('by it', st. 25). There are 280 lines with irregular metrication but with common metre predominating. On comparing *PF 77* with *PB I.90-91*, it is obvious that at some stage in the transmission of the former there has been an oral element. It conforms to all the criteria for verbal transmission set out by Sinclair and in addition many of the lexical differences between the two texts are homophonic; also there is stanzaic omission and linear transference where the transmitter, forgetting a line, has taken a line from a

---

3. *The Pepys Ballads* (Camb. Mass., 1929), ed. H.E. Rollins, I, 11. The earliest mention of 'Agincourt' in the Stationers' Register is an entry for the 14th of May, 1594. However it is not known if this refers to the *PF* text. *A Transcript of the Register of the Stationers' Company*, ed. G. Arber, 8 vols. (London, 1875-94; rpt. NY, 1950), II, 648.

4. C. Simpson, *The Broadside Ballad and its Music* (New Brunswick, N.J., 1966), p. 97

5. It is possible of course that 'Flying Fame' replaced an earlier tune, but this is unlikely because, as will be shown, the *Agincourte* poet used Hall's *Chronicle*, (*The Union of the two noble and illustre famelies of Lancastre & Yorke*), first published in 1548. Furthermore the poet's language and broadside style is more appropriate to the latter half of the century than the earlier.

preceding but not adjacent stanza and inserted it to make good his lapse of memory.<sup>6</sup>

The following brief lexical and stylistic survey shows that *Agincourte* achieves a similar effect to earlier narrative verse of a like nature through the amalgamation or modification of earlier methods. It appears to have originated at the latter end of a degenerating process in the composition of narrative verse directed towards an unsophisticated or generally unlettered audience. Despite chronological and other differences, in *Agincourte* as in *Durham*, the 'story' element has not been allowed to falter — the poet has been concerned to maintain narrative flow and the interest of his audience. It will however be shown that *Agincourte*'s lexical and stylistic form relate to the fact that *PF 77* is a commercial piece motivated by neither patriotism nor poetic inspiration but by the author's need to earn a livelihood.

*PF 77* is written in approximately standard English: it displays no real evidence of geographic origin through lexical form.<sup>7</sup> Analysis of the total population of verbs, nouns and adjectives shows, in comparison with a similar analysis of *Durham*, a falling away of the use of lexemes immediately derived from Old English (from a 70% component in *Durham* to approximately 40% in *Agincourte*). There is a corresponding increase in the use of polysyllabic or ornate lexemes not found in earlier 'unlettered' narrative.<sup>8</sup> It is not therefore surprising to find that the first hundred lines of *PF 77*, omitting pronouns and verbal tense-signifiers, contain only seven lexemes which are currently obsolete in either form or meaning whereas *PF 79* has eighteen.<sup>9</sup> Neither is it unexpected to find only a vestigial presence of the formulaic line, phrase or syntagmeme proper to the Middle English Romance.<sup>10</sup> However this text does have a few conventional phrases on their way to becoming the cliché of a later period — 'a mightye host' (st. 18), 'as fast as they might gone' (st. 41), 'safe and sound' (st. 10).

Thus it is seen that *Agincourte*'s vocabulary owes less to tradition than the earlier *Durham*: that it is generally more 'modern'. This is likely to be the result of a natural lexical trend developing over the period between the composition of the two texts, but it is also possible that the lexical differences *in part* stem from the fact that *PF 79* was composed for a different audience and for a different purpose which, for full audience acceptance, required the authority of an archaic element. This is not so in the case of *Agincourte*, where the language reflects the author's attempt to present the story clearly in terms familiar to his times, in order that his work might be understood and bought by as many people as possible.<sup>11</sup>

- 
6. J.M. Sinclair, 'When is a poem like a sunset?', *Review of English Literature*, 6 (1965), 76-91.  
S.T. Knight, 'The Oral Transmission of *Sir Launfal*', *Medium Aevum*, 38, 2 (1969), 164-69.  
Because the question of oral transmission is only peripheral to this thesis, I do not propose to discuss its occurrence in detail; it is mentioned because not to do so may imply that it is not present and thus introduce an avoidable inaccuracy.
  7. There is however a doubtful possibility of Northern influence in the use of 'tane' (sts. 34, 35) although 'taken' appears in stanzas 20 and 38. There is only one example of the present indicative third person plural in -en: 'lyen' (st. 23). This compares with *Durham* where this usage is the rule rather than the exception.
  8. These are:- *disdaine* (st. 16), *recompensed* (st. 7), *gracious* (st. 14), *withstand* (st. 64) *presumptuss* [sic] (st. 22), *triumphe* (st. 23), *coragious* (st. 27), *inforced* (st. 27) *regard* (st. 28), *multitude* (st. 28), *provide* (st. 29), *substantiall* (st. 29) *vouchesafe* (st. 30), *discharged* (st. 33), *prance* (st. 36), *apparent* (st. 43) *attire* (st. 43), *repayre* (st. 43), *desiring* (st. 44), *therupon* (st. 45).
  9. The seven are:- *sort*, *dint*, *way*, *eke*, *amaine*, *apace* and *groat*.
  10. For instance:- 'many a . . . and . . . ' (st. 1), 'by dint of sword' (st. 3), 'he waxed wrath in his hart' (st. 8), 'both . . . and . . . ' (st. 9), 'the chronicle sayes . . . ' (st. 18), 'kneeled on . . . knee' (st. 44) and so on.

Because *PF 77* is a broadside ballad intended for song or recitation, some kind of *aide memoire* might well be expected. The chevillistic tag which traditionally performed this function is vestigial in *Agincourte*: there are only three examples.<sup>12</sup> Traditionally the *aide memoire* is a 'weak' second or fourth line of a four-line stanza.<sup>13</sup> *Durham* fulfils this tradition in 77% of its stanzas but the usage has dwindled to only approximately 27% of the stanzas of *Agincourte*. However the poet has provided another mnemonic handle to promote the recitation of his work: he uses alliteration. *Agincourte* owns to at least one attempt at alliteration in slightly over half its stanzas. One third of these are in one of the conventional positions, (i.e. the 2nd or 4th lines of a stanza). Unlike *Durham*, which derives alliteration in 36% of its stanzas fortuitously through the use of traditional formulaic tags, the increase of this figure in *PF 77* is deliberate. However the poet in no way follows the careful patterning of the formal alliteration of tradition.<sup>14</sup> Rarely does he utilise a full line; most frequently he alliterates words in a single phrase and occasionally a leading consonant in an alliterative phrase in one line is echoed in a single word in the next.<sup>15</sup> His most ambitious excursion into alliteration occurs over an entire stanza:

& not to shrinke from fainting foes  
whose fearful harts in Feeld  
wold by their feirce couragious stroakes  
be soon in forced to yeeld.

*PF 77*: st. 27

*Agincourte* is the product of a degenerating poetic standard for narrative verse designed for an unsophisticated market. This is seen in the poet's frequent use of the auxiliary 'did' to form a preterite that will maintain his rhythm.<sup>16</sup> The interpolation of 'did' in *Agincourte* wrenches the narrative from the 'natural' to the artificial and pseudo-poetic language of doggerel. Similarly the poet's use of anastrophe demonstrates a 'hack' status:

- 
11. In exactly the same manner that the popular press today avoids esoteric vocabulary and complex ornament.
  12. They are: 'with many a lord and knight' (st. 1), 'that was both good and strong' (st. 9), and 'as it was his chance' (st. 17).
  13. The *Agincourte* ballad frequently has 'weak' lines in these positions. This is because they are rhyming lines: the poet demonstrates his 'hack' status by his reliance (in nine instances), on the word 'then' as a single-word 'end-filler' to make good his deficiency in rhyming ability.
  14. See *PF 25: Scottish Feilde* which is discussed presently.
  15. Phrases:- 'battell brave' (st. 30), 'in pride did prance' (st. 36), 'proud presumptuss [sic] prince' (st. 22), 'stumbled on our stakes' (st. 34)-*PB I.90-92* — 'tumbled'.  
Line to line:-

'& not a Frenchman For his liffe  
durst once his Force withstand'.

*PF 77*: st. 16

There are two examples of eye-alliteration: 'waxed wrath' (st. 8) and 'their woefull hands did wringe' (st. 14). There are also several phrases where the alliterating consonant is present in the centre of a word according to the metrical stress: 'who recompensed his *paine*' (st. 34); 'he *marched up amaine*' (st. 10).

the cheerfull day at last was come:  
our King with noble hart,  
did pray his valliant soldiers all  
to play a worthye part.

*PF 77*: st. 26

This inversion of the common order of words contributes to a spasmodic and artificial effect, but this and the use of 'did' to form a preterite, is probably the result of the necessity of fitting the words to a well-known tune to promote sales.<sup>17</sup>

Nevertheless the integrity of the 'story' element is similar in both *Agincourte* and *Durham*. However where *PF 77* achieves narrative continuity through a high percentage of stanzas with reciprocal dialogue and a small percentage of conjunctively linked stanzas, *PF 77*, with proportionally less dialogue, leans more heavily on the continuity provided by commencing a stanza with a conjunction or protastic phrase.<sup>18</sup>

## b. Synopsis of the Tale

The method used for this synopsis is the same as that used for *Durham* in the previous chapter.

- 
16. The only occurrence of 'did' in *Durham* is present in the section re-written into the *Folio* by Bishop Percy. Because the other verbs in the stanza where 'did' occurs, are in the present tense, and because the line where it occurs is metrically dislocated, I suspect that 'did' is a later alteration. I have not here discussed the use of abrupt change of tense in *PF 77*. There are eight instances but only two are common to *PF 77* and *PB I.90-91* (*PF 77*: sts. 9 and 19). These two occur in the same kind of narrative circumstances as those mentioned for *PF 79*, and have the same effect. However four other examples occur in stanzas which show unmistakable evidence of scribal confusion and are therefore not wholly reliable.
17. See also 'A councell brave our king did hold' (st. 1); 'his lawfull wright [sic] to yeeld' (st. 2); 'this message plaine' (st. 4); 'more fitter are' (st. 6); 'an army great our King prepared' (st. 9) and similar examples throughout the text.
18. These are:- 'and' (10 instances); 'then'(3); 'but then'(2); for(1); 'thus'(1); 'there vpon'(1); 'there for'(1); 'till'(1); 'this being done'(1); 'when'(1).



<b>Plot Unit</b>	<b>Complementary Unit</b>
<i>pu 1</i> Our king holds a council at which it is made clear that France withholds his rights: st. 1	<i>cu 1</i> Many lords and knights were present: st. 1
<i>pu 2</i> An Ambassador is sent to the French king: st. 2	<i>cu 2</i> He is asked to yield our king's rights or have them taken in battle: st. 3
<i>pu 3</i> The French king answers disdainfully: st. 4	<i>cu 3a</i> He says our king is young: st. 5
	<i>3b</i> He reckons nothing for our king's wars: st. 5
	<i>3c</i> He cares not for our king's rage: st. 5
	<i>3d</i> He says our king is not skilled in feats of arms: st. 6
	<i>3e</i> His youth fits him better for tennis than battle: st. 6
	<i>3f</i> This said, he sends Henry a tun of tennis balls: st. 7
	<i>3g</i> (Our king got his own back — paid him for his trouble: st. 7)
<i>pu 4</i> Our king becomes angry: st. 8	<i>cu 4</i> He says he will provide balls to hurt all France: st. 8
<i>pu 5</i> He prepares an army: st. 9	<i>cu 5</i> It is good and strong: st. 9
<i>pu 6</i> He leaves from Southampton: st. 9.	<i>cu 6</i> He takes the navy too: st. 9
<i>pu 7</i> He and his men land in France: st. 10	
<i>pu 8</i> They march to Harfleet: st. 10	
<i>pu 9</i> They besiege Harfleet: st. 11	<i>cu 9a</i> The English king sends balls to beat down the walls: st. 11
	<i>9b</i> He bids them yield or be razed with cannon: st. 12
<i>pu 10</i> The 'Great Gun of Calais' is set up: st. 13	
<i>pu 11</i> It shoots down the strongest steeple: st. 13	
<i>pu 12</i> The Governors surrender the town's keys: st. 14	<i>cu 12a</i> French are evicted: st. 15
	<i>12b</i> 300 Englishmen installed: st. 15
<i>pu 13</i> Our king marches up and down the land: st. 16	
<i>pu 14</i> He comes to Agincourt: st. 17	
<i>pu 15</i> He meets the French king and his army: st. 17	<i>cu 15a</i> The French army is a mighty host of armed men: st. 18
	<i>15b</i> (The Chronicle says there were 600,000 men: st. 18)
	<i>15c</i> The French king knows our numbers:

- st. 19
- 15d In boastful pride a Herald is sent to our king: st. 19
- 15e The Herald asks what will our king's ransom be when he is taken? st. 20
- 15f Our king says their hearts will ache before that happens: st. 21
- 15g He will pay with his heart's blood — nothing else: st. 22
- pu 16* The French pass the night in revelry: st. 23
- cu 16a* They count on destroying our army in the morning: st. 23
- 16b They dice for our king and lords: st. 24
- 16c They risk little on our common soldiers' coats: st. 24
- 16d 8d for a red coat: st. 25
- 16e Only a groat for a white because they do not like the light colour: st. 25
- pu 17* The day of battle dawns: st. 26
- pu 18* Our king addresses his army: st. 26
- cu 18a* He tells them to be worthy: st. 26
- 18b Not to shrink from the foe who will soon yield to their blows: st. 27
- 18c Not to worry about being outnumbered as each can easily beat three Frenchmen: st. 28
- pu 19* He orders each man to plant a sharp stake before himself to break the force of the cavalry charge: st. 29
- pu 20* The Duke of York is given command of a 'battell': st. 31
- pu 21* The King commands the remainder: st. 31
- pu 22* Battle is joined: st. 32
- pu 23* The archers shoot: st. 33
- cu 23a* Their arrows are as thick as hail: st. 33
- 23b Many Frenchmen die: st. 33
- pu 24* The French cavalry, stumbling on the stakes, are killed or captured: st. 34
- cu 24a* 10,000 French die: st. 35
- 24b Nearly that many are caught: st. 35
- pu 25* Our King is victorious over France: st. 36
- cu 25a* His enemies, lately prancing in pride are brought beneath his feet: st. 36
- pu 26* However while the main battle was taking place the English tents were robbed: st. 37
- cu 26a* The Duke of Orleans and his men came to our tents: st. 38
- 26b They took our treasure: st. 38
- 26c They killed our boys: st. 38
- pu 27* Angered, our king commands the soldiers to kill their prisoners: st. 39
- cu 27a* The Duke's action is against the law of

			arms: st. 39
		27b	200,000 French are prisoners: st. 39
		27c	Some soldiers have two prisoners each: st. 40
		27d	Some have one: st. 40
		27e	All are commanded to slay their captives: st. 40
pu 28	The [unencumbered] soldiers join the main battle: st. 41		
pu 29	The French flee: st. 41	cu 29a	Towards Paris: st. 41
		29b	As fast as they can: st. 41
		29c	No French noble dares approach King Harry: st. 42
pu 30	Katherine, the French king's daughter, comes to our king: st. 43	cu 30a	Katherine is the French king's heir: st. 43
		30b	She comes with her maidens: st. 43
		30c	They are dressed finely: st. 43
pu 31	She asks him to stop fighting and be her love: st. 43	cu 31	The nobles of both lands agree: st. 45
pu 32	They are married: st. 45		
pu 33	In Paris Henry is crowned king: st. 45.		

The conclusions derived from the foregoing will be set out after the author's sources have been examined.

#### A. The 'Agincourte' poet's sources

I have examined thirty-five primary and secondary source accounts of the Battle of Agincourt.<sup>19</sup> I have also read transcriptions of manuscripts unavailable to me, cited by Nicolas — whose analysis of the event and source documents remains the most comprehensive.<sup>20</sup>

Carefully comparing these accounts of the battle with *PF 77*, it becomes apparent that the author's source was first and primarily, either a manuscript edition of *The Brut* or the printed edition put out by Caxton.<sup>21</sup> The poet's secondary source was Hall's *Chronicle*.<sup>22</sup> The following passages demonstrate that there is a lexical correspondence between Hall and *The Brut* which is so marked that it is probable that the *Agincourte* poet has not only used Hall as an original source but has referred to it during his process of

20. N.H. Nicolas, *History of the Battle of Agincourt*, 2nd edn. (London, 1832; facsim., London, 1970).

21. In view of the apparent 'hack' status of the poet I felt it unlikely that *Agincourte* would be found to have its provenance in any of the Latin, Old French or Old Dutch accounts. However in order to prove this assumption each of the non-English texts received the same attention as those available to the poet in the English language.

Caxton, *Chronicles*, ca. ccxliiij; *The Brut*, pp. 374-81; 553-57.

On comparing *PF 77* with Caxton's printed edition and the variant manuscripts of *The Brut*, I found no firm evidence to identify the exact source of his 'Brut' material.

22. Hall, *Chronicle*, pp. 57-73; Hall, 'The second yere of Kyng Henry the v', *Union*, fols. iii<sup>r</sup>-xxi<sup>r</sup>.

composition. It is also shown that there is a similar frequency in the repetition of material which, due to the exigencies of rhyme or metre, have been paraphrased. It is also shown that there is a topical correspondence between *PF 77* and Hall: the historical incidents found only in Hall but which reappear in *Agincourte*, — lengthily set out in the former — have been abbreviated in the latter but echo Hall's vocabulary and recognisably show their derivation.

---

19. *Primary Sources*

- Annales Monasterii de Bermundeseia*, ed. H.R. Luard (London, 1886).  
*The Brut*, Pt. II, ed. F.W.D. Brie (London, 1908; rpt. 1960).  
*The Chronicles of London*, ed. C.L. Kingsford (Oxford 1905; Gloucester, 1977).  
*Gesta Henrici Quinti*, ed. F. Taylor & J.S. Roskell (Oxford, 1975).  
*The Great Chronicle of London*, ed. A.H. Thomas & I.D. Thornley, (London, 1938; facsim. Gloucester, 1983).  
'Grey Friars Chronicle', *Monumenta Franciscana*, ed. R. Howlett, Vol. II (London 1882).  
*Kronyk van Vlaenderen*, ed. C.P. Serrure & P. Blommaert, Vol. II (Gent, 1840).  
'Untitled poem on Agincourt', BL. Harl. MS. 565; BL. MS. Cotton Vitellius D, xii, cited in H. Nicolas, *History of the Battle of Agincourt*, 2nd edn. (London, 1832; facsim. 1970).  
'Y<sup>e</sup> Batayle of Egyngecourte', *Remains of the Early Popular Poetry of England*, ed. W.C. Hazlitt, Vol. II (London, 1886).
- John Capgrave, *Chronicle of England*, ed. F.C. Hingeston (London, 1858).  
\_\_\_\_\_, *Liber de Illustribus Henricis*, ed. F.C. Hingeston, (London, 1858).  
*Chronicles of England: Westmynstere 1450* (William Caxton's edn. facsim. rpt. Amsterdam, 1973).  
\_\_\_\_\_, 'Continuation of the Polychronicon', *Polychronicon Ranulphi Higden*, ed. J.R. Lumby, Vol. VIII (London, 1882).  
Thomas of Elmham, 'Liber Metricus de Henrici Quinto', *Memorials of Henry the Fifth*, ed. C.A Cole (London, 1858).  
*Vita et Gesta Henrici Quinti*, ed. T. Hearne (Oxford, 1727).  
William Gregory, 'William Gregory's Chronicle', *The Historical Collections of a Citizen of London*, ed. J. Gairdner (London, 1876).  
Jean Juvenal des Ursins, *Histoire de Charles VI, Roy de France*, ed. D. Godefroy (Paris, 1653).  
Jean le Fevre, *Memoires de Jean Lefevre, Seigneur de Saint-Remy*, supplement to *Chroniques de Monstralet*, in *Collections des Chroniques Nationales Françaises*, ed. J.A. Buchon, Vols. VII, VIII (Paris, 1826).  
Enguerrand de Monstralet, *Chronicles*, trans. T. Johnes (London, 1809).  
Jean Raoulet, 'Chronique de Jean Raoulet', *Chroniques de Charles VII*, par J. Chartier, ed. V. de Viriville, Vol. III (Paris, 1858).  
Robert Redman, 'Vita Henrici Quinti', *Memorials of Henry the Fifth*, ed. C.A. Cole (London, 1876).  
John Strecche, 'Chronicle of John Strecche for the Reign of Henry V', ed. F. Taylor, *Bulletin of John Rylands Library, Manchester*, 16,1 (1932), 137-55.  
'Translator of Livius'. *The First English Life of King Henry the Fifth*, ed. C.L. Kingsford (Oxford, 1911).  
Adam of Usk, *Chronicon Adae de Usk*, ed. E. Maunde-Thompson, 2nd edn. (London, 1904).  
Thomas of Walsingham, *Ypodigma Neustriae*, ed. H.T. Riley (London, 1876).  
Jehan de Waurin, *Recueil des Chroniques et Anchiennes Istories de la Grant Bretagne*, ed. W. Hardy (London, 1868).

*Later Sources*

- Robert Fabyan, *The Chronicle of Fabian whiche he nameth the Concordaunce of Histories* (London, 1559).  
John Foxe, *Acts and Monuments of John Foxe*, ed. G. Townsend, Vol. III (London, 1844).  
Edward Hall, *Hall's Chronicle* (1548; rpt. London, 1809).  
\_\_\_\_\_, *The Union of the Two Noble Families of Lancaster and York*, (1550; facsim., Menston, 1970).  
John Hardyng, *The Chronicle from the firste begynnyng of Englande* (1543; facsim., Amsterdam, 1976).  
Raphael Holinshed, *Chronicles of England, Scotland and Ireland*, Vol. III (1587; rpt. London, 1808).  
William Martyn, *The Historie of the Lives of the Kings of England*, (1615; London, 1638).  
John Stow, *The Chronicles of England from Brute unto this present yeare of Christ, 1580* (London, 1580).  
Polydore Vergil, *Anglicae Historiae* (1555; facsim. rpt. Menston, 1972).

a. 'The Brut'

The author of *PF 77*, despite the omission of two incidents (to be discussed presently), has nevertheless carefully followed the order of events as set out in this account up to the point where Harfleur has been taken, and the king has moved on to meet the French at Agincourt (pu 15, st. 17).

To this stanza the two texts show a very marked similarity in either individual lexemes or, where copying has not been possible, in paraphrased meanings, as in the following brief sample:

i. Vocabulary

	<i>Agincourte</i>	<i>Brut</i>
st. 1.	counsell did holde France witheld right many a lord	counsel he hilde Fraunce withhilde ryȝt alle þe lordes
st. 2	embassador king sent entente	ambassetours king sende entent
st. 3	desiring him wright yeeld or else by dint of sword win	requiryng hem riȝt yelde or ellis by dunt of swyrde wynne

ii. Paraphrase

st. 1	many a lord & knight	alle þe lordeȝ
st. 6	[our king's] knowledge eke in feats of armes, whose sickill [is] but verry small. . . .	þe kinge . . . was not like yett to be no good warryor to make such a conqueste.
st. 7	in pride and greate disdaine he sends . . .	yn scorne & despite he sente . . .
st. 8	he waxed wrath. . . .	he was wonder sore agrevyd. . . .
st. 15	the Frenchmen out they threw	put out alle þe Frensch peple
st. 17	all the power of France	alle þe ryall power of Fraunce.

The above is a sample of the shorter paraphrases, but together with the list of some of the matching lexemes, it is sufficient to illustrate my argument. It may be thought perhaps, that since both texts are discussing the same topic it is no great wonder that the vocabulary should be similar: this argument might be valid were it not for the fact that such a high proportion of matching lexemes and paraphrased meanings does not occur in any of the other English source documents which are also discussing this topic. Other

features which are common to *Agincourte* and *Brut* are set out later.

b. Hall

The *Agincourte* poet's presentation of the actual battle, while still using *Brut*, incorporates details — noticeably in passages of dialogue — which are either absent from *Brut* or sketchily presented.<sup>23</sup> Because Hall is somewhat prolix these details have necessarily had to be paraphrased in *PF 77* but, as the following example shows, there is again a similarity of vocabulary. I must also point out that in no other English chronicle do the details which the *Agincourte* poet takes from Hall occur in the same form, if at all.<sup>24</sup>

	<i>'Agincourt'</i>	<i>Hall</i> <sup>25</sup>
st. 16	'not a Frenchman . . . durst once his Force withstand'	[a list of French knights] . . . 'durste not once touche his battailes.' <sup>26</sup>
st. 19- 20	' . . . sends one of his heralds then to vnderstand what he wold giue for the ransome of his life.'	' . . . sent a herault to Kyng Henry to inquire what ransome he wold offre.'
st. 26	'the cheerful day at last was' come . . .	'now approached the fortunate faire day . . .'
st. 27	'not to shrink . . .'	'nor once to shrink . . .'
st. 28	""Regard not of their multitude, tho they are more than wee"".'	""Let not theyr multitude feare yure heartes nor their great nombre nombre abate your courage"".'
st. 39- 40	' . . . comands euerye souldier on paine of death, of a trompet that euery man to slay euery prisoner then. . . euerye one was commanded by	'he commaunded bi the sounde vpon paine of death should incontinently sley his prisoner.'

- 
23. Hall has himself used *The Brut* but since *PF 77* includes matter from the latter not present in the former, it cannot be concluded that the *Agincourte* poet obtained his *Brut* related passages at 'secondhand' from Hall.
24. For instance, in several other English accounts the only mention of ransom is made as an integral part of Henry's pre-battle address:

'for me þis day schalle never Inglonde rawnsome pay.'

MS. Cleopatra C IV, cited in *Chronicles of London*, p. 119.

The story of the herald being sent prior to the battle to enquire what ransom might be expected when the English king is captured is taken by Hall from Redman's *Vita*, p. 45:

. . . regem Angliae redimi volunt, antequam in vinculis esset.  
Mittunt qui de pretio redemptionis agat cum rege nostro. . .  
Gallorum nuntio Henricus . . . respondet . . . " . . . aut armis jus  
regni inique retentum recuperare et Gallos subiugere, aut  
praeclare in eorum terris occumbere."

This story is in no primary source in English that I have been able to see.

25. These extracts are taken from Hall, *Chronicle* (1548; rpt. London, 1809). All future references to Hall, unless otherwise stated, will be from this text.
26. This statement is only found in Hall — probably because in its context of Henry's march from Harfleur to Agincourt, it is untrue. All the primary sources (and in especial the French authors), which remark this journey, cite several encounters and much opposition.

sound of trumpet  
to slay his prisoner then.'

c. Conclusions

The examples of corresponding matter which I have given here are, for reasons of space, necessarily only a brief sample taken from a much larger number. In the discussions to follow others are given which illustrate a particular point. However the above is sufficient to demonstrate that these two sources are clearly reflected in *PF 77*. I do not conclude that they were certainly the only accounts from which the poet obtained all his 'facts'.<sup>27</sup> I do however think that there is a strong probability that they were the documents to which the poet made physical reference during the process of composition and from which he drew the major events he chose to incorporate into his ballad: there are no episodes which he has included which are not present in either *Brut* or *Hall* and which are not reported in one of them in a markedly similar fashion to the account given in *PF 77*. Naturally many of these events are covered in other source documents but none

---

27. It is possible for instance, that the poet may have heard the probably contemporary ballad (now in BL. MS. Harl. 565), which is the only place where I have discovered a reference to the 'steeple' of 'Harfleete':

The strongest steepele in the towne  
he threw down — bells & all!

*PF 77*: st. 13

The stepyll of Harflete & bellys also,  
. . . he did downe blowe.

Harl. 565:st. 20

of these use either a similar wording or arrange the minor events in a similar order.<sup>28</sup> The plot and complementary units set out in my synopsis lack the startling symmetry of these units as set out in *Durham*. Their positioning is a direct reflection of their location within the poet's sources. I therefore conclude that in the following discussion, because these works are the poet's source of information, it would be superfluous to set out omission and alteration of fact present in accounts other than *The Brut* and Hall's *Chronicle* unless my argument positively requires such a step.

## II. The 'Durham' paradigm and *Agincourte Battell*

At this point in my earlier examination of *Durham*, the author's use of his historical sources and his own imagination was studied in great detail. The results of that enquiry were set out in a paradigm which, for the sake of convenience, is restated below. I do not propose to present long discussions of the major omissions, inventions and authorial modifications of 'fact' seen in *Agincourte*, but to turn immediately to the established paradigm and determine its degree of compatibility with the composition of *Agincourte*.

The following section will show that there is virtually no 'sourced' fiction present in *Agincourte*. The unsystematic sequencing of plot and complementary units which unlike *Durham*, displays no symmetry of arrangement, reflects the order of their occurrence in either *Brut* or Hall. The author unimaginatively relies on his sources. It will be shown that nevertheless there is a definite line of continuity linking the construction of the matter of *PF* 79 as set out in the paradigm and *PF* 77. It will also be shown that the few disparities found relate to the poet's dependence on his source and his 'hack' status. In short, it will be seen that these minor paradigmatic changes mirror the rising presence of a new class of professional balladeers who write for a new commercial market.

### A. Examination

The general principles tentatively generated from the study of *Durham* in Chapter II were:

1. Complicated historical events occurring over a broad spectrum are simplified.
2. Specific historical details likely to distract from the 'action' of the narrative, unless present in a cheville, are absent or generalised.
3. Where the historic event concerned many characters the narrative focuses specifically on one or two.
4. Some character nomenclature is inaccurate or absent.
5. Motivation is not detailed.
6. Fictitious material is not concerned with the direct action of the historical event itself.
7. Chronological sequences occur in their proper order but specific temporal locations may be inaccurate.

---

28. Some of the secondary sources do of course, reflect *The Brut* as one of their own sources, but either they are too late to have been available to the *Agincourte* poet, or they do not include the whole of the *Agincourte* material taken from *The Brut*.



8. Dialogue is unsourced.
9. Dialogue expands character or underlines the 'moral'.
10. Dialogue may serve to remark the movement of characters but it does not greatly forward the principal event.
11. Links between scenes are likely to be fictitious.
12. Minor fictions are present to entertain the audience with 'light relief'.
13. The topic relates to a single 'episode': that is to say a collection of 'scenes' organised in chronological linear sequence.
14. The sequence of scenes resolves into a single grand climax.
15. The final climax is followed by a 'lesson' or a 'moral'.
16. During the narrative there is repetition at intervals of the matter from which the 'moral' will be drawn.
17. The poet is partisan.
18. The party favoured has 'right' on its side.
19. The party favoured is outnumbered by the foe or otherwise handicapped.
20. The figures relating to the forces involved are inaccurate.

*Agincourte* does not agree with *Durham* with respect to five of the paradigmatic items (nos. 6, 8, 12, 15, and 16). However before these are discussed I look at the items which agree with *Durham*, show how they agree and where appropriate discuss their function.

The poet's manipulation of these items is connected with the fact that *Agincourte* is written for popular entertainment or, more specifically, the sixteenth century broadside ballad market. The narrative functions relating to this, and which become evident when the conforming items are examined below, are first, an general simplification of the narrative and secondly the transformation of Henry V into a conventional 'hero'. Thirdly, it is shown that the poet, leaning heavily on his sources, exhibits only a simple talent which he single-mindedly directs towards fashioning his tale into a saleable commodity with an entertainment value acceptable to an uncritical audience.

The narrative is simplified into a single episode: a collection of scenes organised in chronological linear sequence by the omission of events taking place either concurrently elsewhere or extraneous to a straightforward tale (Item 13: *Episode*).

The *Agincourte* poet has used only the essentials of the complicated series of events which occurred prior to the actual battle at Agincourt (Item 1: *Simplification*). As in *Durham* this achieves two things at the outset: the 'villain' and his 'villainy', the 'hero' and his 'right' are established and the narrative is free to move on towards the central battle and the resolution of the plot.<sup>29</sup>

Initially the audience is presented with a simple summary of the historical events prior to Henry's departure for France. The lengthy meetings, their constitution and the advice given are reduced to 'A counsell brave' 'with many a lord & Knight' (st. 1); the nature of the hero's 'rights' withheld by the villain is not given.<sup>30</sup> There is only one ambassadorial visit to France with the English ultimatum. Later the poet omits the period of grace granted by the hero to the inhabitants of Harfleur during which they were to seek relief. This relief did not eventuate and the town surrendered. The poet garrisons the town in a single stanza with no hint of Henry's invitation to the 'crafti' men of England to

---

29. It is noted that unlike *Durham* which has a composite hero, in defiance of fact, the *Agincourte* poet concentrates on King Henry as an individual hero.

30. *Brut*, p. 374: 'þe titile & þe ryȝt þat he hadde to Normandy, Gasquoyne & Guyenne, þe which . . . þe gode King Edward of Wyndesore and his ansetryeȝ . . . hadde holde alle hir lyues tyme'. The *Agincourte* poet has extracted the keyword 'ryȝt' and left it at that.

come and 'ynhabit . . . ynne þe towne' and have 'hous and householde' for 'euymore'.<sup>31</sup> Likewise a single stanza suffices to move the English from Harfleur to Agincourt:

. . . our Noble King  
marched vp & downe that land,  
& not a Frenchman For his liffe  
durst once his Force withstand,  
till he came to Agincourt. . . .

*PF 77*: sts. 16-17.<sup>32</sup>

The poet omits all reference to the route taken by the English and the privations they endured on the way.<sup>33</sup> He is concerned to move his hero to Agincourt as quickly as possible.

Simplification is also seen in the motivations given in *Agincourte* which are minimal and never more than are required for credibility and cohesion (Item 5: *Motivation*). The reason for the initial invasion is, in *PF 77*, very basic: the king understands that France witholds his 'right' and 'therfor' he presents an ultimatum. Other motivations are few: the king 'waxed wrath in his hart' (st. 8) — and decided to invade; the French 'mad full accompt/our Armye to destroye' (st. 23) — so they dice for the soldiers' coats; 'much greeued' was the king at the robbing of the English tents ('this was against the law of arms': st. 39) — so he orders the prisoners to be killed.

The concatenation of scenes in *Agincourte* is almost simplicity carried to extremes (Item 11: *Links*).<sup>34</sup> Only two scenes are 'linked' in *PF 77* and both links are fictitious. Between Harfleur and Agincourt the king 'marches vp and downe' France unopposed (st. 16). In reality the English were journeying to Calais and, as I have previously pointed out, their passage was not unhindered by lack of resistance. The other link bridges the scene of the English victory and the advent of the Princess Katherine. The poet states that:

ther was neuer a peere with in France  
durst come to King Harry then.

*PF 77*: st. 42

These lines contrast with the resolute approach of Katherine which leads to the ultimate

---

31. *Brut*, p. 377.

32. That the poet is using Hall is seen in his 'not a Frenchman/. . . durst once his Force withstand' which echoes Hall's 'his enemies were afraid once to offre him battaill' and 'durste not once touche his batailles'. Hall, p. 64.

33. *The Brut* does not discuss the matter other than to note that the French demolished the bridges that lay across the route (*Brut*, p. 377). However since other sources, and notably the French account given by Waurin (*Recueil*, pp. 188-200), remark a consistent if disorganised and easily overcome, opposition to the English advance, it would appear that Hall's statements are here, untrue. Because he is the only source which discusses the matter to aver directly that the 'Frenchmen made no semblance to fight' and because the phraseology of *PF 77* so closely echoes Hall's, it is probable that the *PF 77* poet was aware of Hall's lengthy mention of the 'discomodities' suffered by the English: lack of 'vitaile', lack of 'reste'; 'daily it rained and nightly it freded', 'of fuell was skacenes and of fluxes was plenty'. These privations led to a starving English soldier entering a church, stealing a pyx and eating the 'holy hostes' - for which crime he was strangled on the king's orders. Hall, p. 64; see also *Gesta Henrici Quinti*, p. 59 ff

34. The poet prefers to use the technique of 'leaping and lingering'. This technique was discussed in the previous chapter.

royal marriage. That the remnant of the French nobility was reluctant to approach the conqueror is not surprising but that *no-one* came to him is false, as Mountjoy, the French King of Arms and others came to arrange burial for the slain.<sup>35</sup> The poet has simplified and made his narrative more palatable by omitting this unpleasant aftermath and inventing a straightforward link between the English victory and the ‘happy ending’.

The absence or generalisation of minutiae (Item 2: *Details*), in *Agincourte*, quickens the narrative but at the same time keeps the tale’s focus on the hero. This is best seen in the preparations to invade:

an army great our King prepared,  
that was both good and strong:  
& from Sowthampton is our King  
with all his Nauye gone.

PF 77: st.9

The focus of the source account is on the actual power readied:

þe King and his lorde3 were accorded þat þay schulde be redy yn armys with hir power, in þe best aray þat my3t be [done] and gete men of armes and archers [that myght be goten] and alle oþer stuff þat longed þerto [to weare] & to be redy with alle hir retynu to mete at Southampton be Lamesse next folouyng, without eny delaye [wher]for the King ordeyned his Nauye of schippe3 with al maner stuff & vitaille þat longid to such a werriour, of al maner ordinaunce . . . in to þe nowmbir of iiiij<sup>c</sup> xx<sup>ti</sup> sayle.

Brut, p. 375<sup>36</sup>

Another example of the omission of detail which would if included, distract from the hero, relates to the legend that in reply to his ultimatum the English king was sent tennis balls to play with, the implication being that he was still a child.<sup>37</sup> Henry was naturally angry and the sources, with some glee, report that the cannon-balls which conquered Harfleur were the English king’s reciprocal ‘tennis balls’.<sup>38</sup> In *PF 77* the initial despatch of the French balls and their reception is well covered but the dénouement of the jest at Harfleur is only hinted at in the weak fourth line:

---

35. Hall, p. 70; Nicolas, *History*, p. 137. See also Le Fevre, *Memoires*, VIII, 15: ‘En apres . . . il appela avec lui [Henry V] aucuns princes au champ ou la bataile avoit été.’

36. The words in square brackets are the additions present in Caxton, *Chronicles*, ca. ccxliij (n.p.). Hall, p. 58:

Henry assembled a great puissance & gathered a greate hoste through all his dominions and for the moe furniture of his nauie, he sent into Holand, Zeland and Frizeland to conduct and hire shippes for the transportyng and connueighing ouer his men and municions of warre, and finally prouided for armure, vitaille, money, artillery, carraiges, tentes and other thinges.

37. The French king (in actual fact the French were under the Dauphin at the time — the king being subject to bouts of mental illness) also passed some rude remarks concerning Henry’s martial knowledge and adds ‘whose sickill [is] but verry small’ (st. 6). ‘Sickill’ is probably ‘skill’. but since this stanza (unique to *The Folio*) is corrupt, there is a possibility that ‘sickill’ is ‘sickle’ -in this context meaning his penis. This euphemism was not unknown with reference to animals (see Edward Topsell, *The Historie of Fovre-Footed Beastes*, London, 1607, p. 634), and therefore a greater depth of insult in this passage is possible.

38. *Brut*, p. 376: ‘he played at tenys with his harde gune stone3. The inhabitants of Harfleur ‘whanne þey schulde plai, þai songyn "welawaye and allas þat eny such tenye3-ballis were made."’

to batter downe their statelye towers  
he sent his English Balls.

PF 77: st. 11<sup>39</sup>

The source's focus on the lamentations of the inhabitants is absent. The poet is only interested in reactions to his hero's 'deeds' insofar as they affect the story, and even then details are never given.

*Agincourte's* presentation and concentration on its hero, Henry — although he is not actually named until stanza 39 — is seen in the poet's selection of subordinate players (Item 3: *Character focus*). Three minor characters are mentioned by name although the historical incidents in which they played a large part are given little space and are described only by their functions, inasmuch as their functions are the cause of their connection with the hero: for instance, an ambassador (st. 1), the King of France (st. 4 and *passim*), governors (st. 14), soldiers (st. 18) and so on.

Although not focusing on Henry to the exclusion of others, the *Brut* author, who names nine characters, is nevertheless orientated towards 'King as Hero' to a greater extent than Hall who mentions over fifty characters by name.<sup>40</sup> As in *Brut*, the poet is partisan.<sup>41</sup> Eighteen instances of the domestic 'our' resolves the poet's viewpoint which is also seen in the use of laudatory adjectives to describe the English and his description of the battle as 'that happy day' (st. 132) (Item 7: *Partisan*).<sup>42</sup>

A 'hero' must of course be shown to be heroic. This can be done by contrasting his character with that of the villain as well as by spelling out the hero's worthy qualities. The *Agincourte* poet utilises both methods through the speech of the characters themselves (Item 9: *Dialogue: Character and moral*). The first two passages of speech (the 'tennis balls' and 'king's ransom' episodes: sts. 5, 6 and 8 and 21-22), are designed to contrast the conventionally overconfident character of the enemy's leader with the stout resolution of 'our King'. The second two passages (the English king's pre-battle address and the Duke of York's request, sts. 27-29, 30-31) further establish 'our King' as a worthy warrior capable of initiating new tactics (his idea of cavalry stakes), and demonstrating leadership and personal bravery (he himself will lead part of the army into battle). The Duke of York's request and the hero's reply: "March you on couragiously/and I will guide the rest" (st. 31), also moves the king and his force into battle array but like the other spoken passages, it does not forward the main event as (st. 32) it is the French who initiate the conflict (Item 10: *Dialogue: Character movement*).

The 'moral' of this narrative is implicit: 'Right will Overcome'. The overconfidence of the villain is a signal to the audience that the French are 'wrong' and the praiseworthy qualities of 'our King' reflect the English 'right'. In *Durham* the poet first establishes that the villain is 'wrong' (Item 18: *Right*). The *Agincourte* poet also does this, but here it is incidental to his presentation of his hero as 'right' (st. 1): 'desiring him [the French king] his [Henry's] lawfull wright to yeeld' (st. 4).

As soon as it has been established that Henry has the right, the audience knows that

---

38. It is possible that if 'sickill' is a euphemism, the poet has resolved the jest with another — an English reply to the French insult.

40. Three of whom are concerned with the treasonous plot discovered at Southampton which *PF 77* omits.

41. *Brut* uses the 'domestic our' in reference to Henry V almost as frequently as *PF 77*.

42. Domestic 'our': our king — sts. 1, 8, 9, 14, 16, 21, 24, 26, 32, 36 & 44; our lordes — st. 1; our boyes — st. 38; our men — st. 19; our army — st. 23; our tentes — sts. 37 & 38; our iewels — st. 38.

he will eventually vanquish the villain.<sup>43</sup> However, inherent in the concept of heroism is the principle of great difficulties to be overcome before achievement. Historically the greatest obstacle to an easy victory at Agincourt appeared to be that the French force was the larger (Item 19: *Outnumbering*). The *Agincourte* poet uses this fact but in order to magnify the English victory he increases the size of the opposing army, the numbers of prisoners taken and the enemy slain (Item 20: *Figures*). The actual numbers given by the historians vary. As Nicolas remarks: 'On no occasion do chroniclers differ so much from each other as in the account of forces brought into the field.'<sup>44</sup> However here they are unanimous in agreeing that the English force, initially small but further depleted by losses at Harfleur and the effects of dysentery, was heavily outnumbered.<sup>45</sup> Nevertheless the *Agincourte* figure of 600,000 men is an abnormally exaggerated number to which no other account approaches.<sup>46</sup> The *Agincourte* figure of 200,000 prisoners taken (st. 40) is both inflated and incompatible with the poet's earlier figure (st. 35) of 'neere' 10,000 captives.<sup>47</sup> The figure of 300 Englishmen to garrison Harfleur (st. 15) is unique to *Agincourte*.<sup>48</sup> The 10,000 Frenchmen slain (st. 35) is also the figure in *PB* I.91-90; *Brut* has 'moo þan a xj.M' and Hall has 'above ten thousande persones'.<sup>49</sup> Since this entry in Hall is at the end of his account and since the *Agincourte* poet followed Hall in the latter half of his text it seems that this figure copies the source.

Outnumbered, the English nevertheless win the battle. However the poet ends his

- 
43. Hall (p. 57), underlines the notion that 'victory for the most part foloweth wher right leadeth'. Also (p. 67):

[God] is not accustomed to ayde and succoure suche people whiche by force and strength contrary to right & reason detain and kepe from other their iust patrimony and laful inheritance, with whiche blotte and spotte the French nacion is . . . defyled and distained so that God of his iustice wyll scourge and afflicte them for their manifest iniuries and open wronges to vs.

*Brut* (p. 377) agrees: 'þankyð be God þat so saued his owne knyȝt & King [Henry V] yn his riȝtfull tytyl'.

44. Nicolas, *History*, p. 78.
45. In stanza 18, *PF* 77 notes that the French had 'noe less . . . then 600000 men'. The following stanza setting out the number of English has been omitted from the *Folio* text: taken from *PB* I. 90-91. It is:

Which sight did much amase our King  
for hee in all his Hoste,  
Not passing fyfteene thousand had.

*PB* I. 90-91: st.15

Thus the original text apparently emphasised the relative sizes of the armies to a greater extent than *PF* 77 now does.

46. *Brut*, p. 379, cites 'of Frenschmen yn the feelde, mo þan vj xx M'. Hall (p. 65) has: lx.M horsemen . . . beside footemen pages and wagoners'; *PB* I.90-91 says 'fortie thousand men' (st. 14). For a discussion of the various estimates of troop numbers see Nicolas, *History*, pp. 74-8, 108-10, who concludes that the English had no more than 9,000 men. Since the *Agincourte* poet prefaces his figure with his authority, 'the chronicle sayes' (st. 18), and both his sources cite 60,000 men it is possible that his reference to a source is not merely the conventional tag but that 600,000 is a scribal error. *PB* I. 90-91 makes no mention of a chronicle and substitutes 'by iust account' (st. 14).
47. Hall gives no figures for prisoners and *Brut*, p. 557, cites 'viij C.'
48. *Brut* and *PB* I.90-91 are silent: Hall, p. 62 cites 'xv.C' men and 'xxxv knights'.
49. *Brut*, p. 379; Hall, p. 73

text, not with the victory but with the climax of the hero's conventional reward (Item 14: *Climax*). The 'happy ending' is provided through Henry's marriage to the French Princess, Katherine and his subsequent coronation (Propp's Function XXXI — *Marriage*).<sup>50</sup> The poet has deliberately altered fact to enable him to end his tale in this way (Item 7: *Chronology*). Throughout *Agincourte* the temporal order of events is correct but here there is chronological telescoping as Henry did not marry Katherine until five years later in 1420 when the ceremony took place at Troyes after the ratification of the peace.<sup>51</sup> Unlike *Durham* where telescoping of time is present to underline the hero's martial glory, here it is a function of the poem as a saleable commodity: the poet has provided an immediate conclusion to round off his tale and provide the expected 'happy ending'.

The *Agincourte* poet's authorial status as a 'hack' writer for a commercial market is seen on the one hand because his work shows little originality — his reliance on his source is very clear- but on the other hand he has sufficient ability to keep his narrative as straightforward as possible.<sup>52</sup> In line with his simplification he names only three characters other than his hero — like *Durham Agincourte* does not name the king of France: his function is an adequately villainous identity (Item 4: *Nomenclature*). From *Brut* the poet correctly names the Duke of York and cites his relationship to Henry V.<sup>53</sup> Likewise, despite chronological inconsistency the princess is rightly named. However the reference to the 'Duke of Orleance' (st. 38) is inaccurate. The episode of the baggage/tent plundering is not in *Brut*, although its sequel, the king's order to slay the prisoners, is given and Orleans heads the list of French prisoners which shortly follows.<sup>54</sup> Orleans also heads this list in Hall who does cite the 'plundering' episode but names Robinet of Borneuile, Riffart of Clamas and Isambert of Agincourt as being the raiders.<sup>55</sup> This trio is composed of persons of whom it is probable that the English public has never heard; furthermore their names are difficult to pronounce and to a poet of mediocre skill not easy to incorporate into rhyme. The *Agincourte* poet has therefore moved on a few paragraphs to the list of prisoners and abstracted the leading name: 'Charles duke of Orleance nephew to the Frenche kyng'.<sup>56</sup> From the point of view of *Agincourte* as an unsophisticated broadside ballad aimed towards the general populace, Orleans (1394-1465), as leader of the raiders, is a good choice: he is nephew to the Villain, and therefore capable of performing an action 'against the law of arms'; he has a manageable name; he is 'Somebody'; since he was captured and brought to England (where he remained until 1440), he was proof of the poem's 'moral' that 'right will overcome', and finally, the reduction of three persons to one person simplifies unnecessary detail.<sup>57</sup>

---

50. V. Propp, *Morphology of the Folk Tale*, trans. L. Scott, ed. L.A. Wagner, intro. A. Dundes, 2nd edn. (Austin & London, 1968).

51. Monstralet, *Chronicles*, p. 277; Hall, pp. 94-97; *Brut*, p. 390.

52. It is too well known to need detailing here that contemporary references to the composers of broadside ballads are in general, disparaging. With a few notable exceptions (such as Elderton and Parker — and even they had their detractors), such writers were not praised for the literary qualities of their work, their places of work, or their persons. For a contemporary opinion see John Earle, *The Autograph Manuscript of Microcosmographie*, (facsim., Leeds, 1966), p. 102 ff. Also Henry Chettle, *Kind-harts Dreame* (1593; facsim., rpt. NY, 1973), sig.C<sup>r</sup> & C<sup>v</sup>.

53. *PF* 77: st. 31: "god amercy, cozen yorke," sayes hee.  
*Brut*, p. 378: "gramarecy, Cosyn of Yorke".

54. *Brut*, p. 379.

56. Hall, *Chronicle*, p. 71

The items which do not agree with the *Durham* paradigm differ for one of two reasons: either they are a reflection of the poet's 'hack' status and his reliance on his sources, or they are present because willy-nilly the poet has been compelled to alter history to conform with the conventions of fiction and create a saleable work.

The *Agincourte* poet's reliance on his source is seen in the fact that the dialogue in his text is *not* unsourced (Item 8: *Dialogue and source*). All of the passages reporting or quoting speech (sts. 5-6 & 8, 21-22, 27-29, and 30-31 relating to the 'tennis balls' episode, the 'king's ransom', his 'address to the troops' and the 'Duke of York's request'), are, with respect to their matter, present in either *Brut* or Hall.<sup>58</sup> As has been shown, the *Agincourte* poet frequently repeats actual lexemes present in his sources in these passages. Similarly the 'amusing' episodes of the 'tennis balls' and the 'soldiers dicing' are not fiction (Item 12: *Light relief*). The former is very adequately sourced (as has been shown), and the latter is an embroidery of source material with the probability that the embroidery is either a convention or taken from *PF* 15.<sup>59</sup> The poet has not needed to invent.

However the poet has been compelled to alter history and imagine a plausible

---

55. The *Agincourte* poet's source for the episode is Hall (*Chronicle*, pp. 66 & 69). Compare *PF* 77: sts. 38-9:

a crye came From our English tents  
that we were robbed all them;  
for the Duke of Orleans . . . /  
all our Jewells & treasure that they haue taken  
& many of our boyes haue slaine.

Hall: (the French king is giving his pre-battle address to his forces):

"behold . . . the tentes of your enemies with  
treasure, plate & Jewels."

The outcry of the lackeys and boyes whiche  
ran away for feare . . . was heard.

No other source which mentions this incident uses the terms 'Jewells', 'treasure' or 'boyes'.

57. *The Poems of Charles of Orleans*, intro. S. Purcell (Cheadle [Cheshire], 1973), pp. 16-19.

58. The manuscript of *The Percy Folio* does not of course contain quotation marks: I do not agree with their introduction by Furnivall in stanza 8 which, I think, is simply reported speech. However my opinion here does not affect my argument since the matter of this stanza is present in *Brut*.

59. Unlike *PF* 77, where the sources refer to this episode they nowhere refer to the soldiers' garments but to their persons, and the sum involved is a 'blanke' - a small coin of the period. It is interesting to note a reference remarkably similar to the embroidery of *PF* 77, in *PF* 15: *Muselboorrowe Feild* (HF. I, 125: Add. MS. 27879, fol. 25<sup>v</sup>):

they carded for our english mens coates . . .  
a white for 6<sup>d</sup>, a red pro 2 groates.

*PF* 15: st. 3

This compares with:

8 pence for a redd coate  
& a groate was sett to a white

*PF* 77: st. 25

*PF* 15 is thought by Friedman to have been written in the reign of Edward VI (1547-1553). It was still popular in 1656 as it was included in a miscellany, *Choyce Drollery*, of that date. It may therefore be that the scene in *PF* 77 owes something to *PF* 15. A.B. Friedman, 'A New Version of "Musselburgh Field"', *Journal of American Folklore*, 66 (1953), 74-77.

fiction (Item 6: *Fiction and action*). I refer to the motivation given as Henry's reason for ordering the slaughter of the prisoners. The poet says that the plundering of the baggage was 'against the law of arms then' and Henry was therefore righteously outraged (st. 39).<sup>60</sup> The sources, for the most part, are agreed that the raid on the baggage was thought by the English to be part of a renewed onslaught: the prisoners (of whom there were very many) would have been an encumbrance to resistance.<sup>61</sup> Hall has the story of the raid and then says: 'fearyng least his enemies beyng dispersed and scattered abroad should gather together againe and beginne a new felde' Henry commanded the killing of the prisoners.<sup>62</sup> The *Agincourte* poet has taken this episode from Hall and, perhaps thinking the given cause to be a weak motive for an action which did not comfortably accord with his presentation of Henry as 'Hero', has invented a better. He has attributed Henry's behaviour to customs prevailing in a, by implication, less enlightened period. It seems that historically the English troops at this event were reluctant to lose ransoms. Therefore two hundred archers were ordered to act as a firing squad: the resultant massacre was horrific.<sup>63</sup> That the *Agincourte* poet felt awkward about this atrocity on the part of his hero is likely in view of the fact that other writers appear also to have had difficulties with it: Caxton has the French withdraw to save the prisoners' lives after the order for their death has been given; Labreur has the killing stopped the instant the French flee; Capgrave, Walsingham, Gregory and others beg the question and exclude the incident entirely and later versions of *PF 77* itself omit the event and end the poem at stanza 36.

I have discussed this single-line fiction at some length because it reveals something of the poet and his purpose. On the one hand he quite slavishly follows his sources — in all of which the episode occurs, as it does in *PF 77*, almost as an afterthought.<sup>64</sup> On the other hand the *Agincourte* poet, having kept to his sources is then faced with the problem of excusing his hero's less-than-heroic action in line with the sixteenth century belief that history, whether in rhyme or prose, should be edifying as well as entertaining.<sup>65</sup> By modifying the impact of Henry's apparent lapse from acceptable standards and in effect saying, "Henry existed a long time ago when things were different, but all the same he was a virtuous man who adhered to the laws of his time," the poet has striven to conform to current practice and produce an inoffensive ballad which contains nothing to impede its sale.<sup>66</sup>

Unlike many broadside ballads *PF 77* does not have an explicit moral in a caudal position (Item 15: *Post-climactic moral*). The poet has contrived a 'happy ending' which

---

60. Whether this plundering was or was not against the law of arms is not relevant to this argument, but insofar as I have been able to discover, chivalric codes did not cover the possibility of baggage raids.

61. This explanation — though without mention of the baggage raid — is present in *Brut*, p. 379.

62. Hall, p. 69.

63. Waurin, *Receuil*, p. 216; Redman, *Vita*, p. 46-7; Le Fevre, *Memoires*, VIII, 14; Holinshed, *Chronicles*, p. 81; Nicolas, *History*, p. 124-5. Hall, whom our poet follows (see *Chronicle*, p. 70), gives specific details of the slaughter.

64. In the sources it always follows the writers' variously expressed cries of jubilation at the English victory when readers believe the narrative to be all but finished.

65. H.S. Bennett, *English Books and Readers*, 2nd edn. (Cambridge, 1969), p. 134: 'History was a mirror wherein men might gaze and see reflected the successes and failures of the past and from these they could learn'. See also L.B. Wright, *Middle Class Culture in Elizabethan England* (NY, 1958), pp. 236-38; A.B. Friedman, *The Ballad Revival*, 2nd edn. (Chicago and London, 1967), pp. 120-23; C.H. Firth, 'The Ballad History of the Reigns of Henry VII and Henry VIII', *Transactions Royal Historical Society*, 3rd series, II (1908), 22.



itself conveys the message that the 'good' are rewarded. There is no attempt to make a further point as the text conforms to the lesson that 'virtue will overcome' inherently: the fact that the French are 'bad' and the English 'good' is frequently underlined by the use of laudatory or derogatory adjectives (Item 16: *Moral: repetition*).<sup>67</sup>

## B. Conclusions

In view of *Agincourte*'s agreement with the greater part of the paradigm it seems that there is a greater similarity of plot technique between *PF 77* and *Durham* than might be supposed at first sight — the *Durham* poet, probably motivated by patriotism, addresses a specific audience whereas the *Agincourte* poet, probably motivated by financial need, addresses a wide public. Nevertheless in respect to the poetic manipulation of historical 'fact', continuity would appear to be maintained. However both the continuity and what few divergences from the paradigm there are, are related to the poet's commercial purpose and standing. In an effort to avoid offence and appeal to as many people as possible the *Agincourte* poet tailors his narrative where he can, towards the familiar conventions; hence the textual agreement between the two texts in fifteen paradigmatic points. The disagreement in five points occurs where history requires re-arrangement to conform with the conventions of fiction. The composer's poetic talent is mediocre. From his almost slavish adherence to his sources — by and large it can be said that if it is not in a source then it is not in the ballad — it can be deduced that either he has little time for imaginative embroideries or that he lacks the necessary skill. Thus he produces a bland and unremarkable work. The general conclusion is that *Agincourte* was written by an author who seized upon an historical episode which could be transformed into a marketable commodity. Thereafter, without much personal interest in his topic, he appears to have worked doggedly through his sources until he reached the conclusion of the episode, added a 'happy ending' and then perhaps turned away to begin the next piece of work.

---

66. That the poet was a purist who was reluctant to omit a discreditable fact is unlikely: greater men than he — notably Shakespeare — felt no compunction in altering their source material to their own ends. This episode is probably included in *Agincourte* for a pragmatic reason relating to the saleable length of his work.

67. Henry is called 'noble' four times (sts. 7, 16, 30, 32); he is 'gracious' (st. 14) and he has a 'noble hart' (st. 26). The English troops are 'good & strong' (st. 9), 'warlike' (st. 10), 'valiant' (st. 26) and give 'courageous stroakes' (st. 27). On the other hand the French king has 'vaunting pride' (st. 19), is a 'proud presumptuss prince' (st. 22). The French are 'fainting foes' (st. 27) with 'fearful harts' (st. 27); they are 'bragginge' (st. 32) and 'cruell' (st. 32). Finally one Englishman equals three Frenchmen (st. 28).

**TABLE 2.** *Stylistic Structure of 'Agincourt Battell'*

Motifeme	Allomotif	Scene	Theme (Episode)
1. Scene setting	a. Naming of Hero b. Naming of Villain (implied) c. Naming of Misdeed: withholding of rights.	Threat	Warfare (invasion-resistance-occupation)
2. Departure	a. Messenger leaves		
3. Challenge (Hero's)	a. Narrative statement: Redress wrong or fight. b. Reply (dialogue): Hero is young, weak and without martial skill c. Reply (action): tennis-balls as present d. Hero says he will make France smart.		
4. Battle Preparation (Hero's)	a. Narrative statement: Forces made ready.	Battle	
5. Departure	a. Narrative statement: Hero <i>et al.</i> leave.		
6. Journey	a. They march through France.		
7. Arrival	a. They arrive at Harflete.		
8. Combat	a. 1st action: bombardment. b. Threat: "Yield or be razed" c. 2nd action: bombardment.		
9. Victory	a. Governor wrings hands. b. Yields town keys.		
10. Triumph	a. French thrown out. b. English garrison town.		
11. Departure	a. Implied: This being done . . .		
12. Journey	a. March through France. b. No resistance offered.		
13. Arrival	a. Find Villain at Agincourt.		
14. Battle preparation (Hero's)	a. Narrative statement: Forces prepared.	Battle	
15. Challenge (Villain's)	a. Villain: "What ransome will you pay when captured?" b. Reply: "I will die first!" c. Hero: "Before I die I'll make you ache." d. Reply (indirect): Dicing for prospective prisoners.		
16. Pre-battle address (Embedded: <i>Boast</i> )	a. "Enemy is cowardly. b. We are fierce and brave." c. Boast: 1 Hero = 3 Frenchmen.		
17. Battle-preparation (Hero's)	a. Ruse: Stake to impede cavalry. b. Disposition of leadership.		
18. Combat	a. French approach. b. Battle is joined. c. 1st action: archers shoot. d. Result: French die. e. 2nd action: cavalry impeded. f. Result: French die/captured.		
19. Victory (Embedded: <i>Perfidy</i> )	a. Narrative statement: victory. b. Boast vindicated: proud humbled. c. Baggage tents rifled. d. Hero's 'helpers' killed. e. Result: Hero kills prisoners. f. Unencumbered attack. g. French flee. h. Villain's daughter (princess) makes submission.	Triumph	
20. Terminal status-quo (Hero's reward)	a. Hero marries princess. b. Coronation in Paris.		

### III. Form and Tradition: *Agincourte Battell*

The following will examine the continuity of the motifemic composition of *PF 77*.

However it is first necessary to examine its constituent structural units. The Table shows the basic scheme.

A. *The Motifemes*

a. *Exhortation and Valediction*

*PF 77* has neither of these motifemes.

b. *Terminal Status-Quo*

This motifeme is present in its obligatory component *hero*: Henry is crowned and marries a princess (st. 45). The optional components *family* and *associates* are not used. The element *populace*, often present when as a result of an adventure an area has changed its power structure, is present. However here *populace* is solely represented by the ‘English Lordes’ and ‘the Peeres of France’ (st. 45), and their betterment in condition is merely implied in that they agree to a cessation of war and the ratification of peace through a royal marriage.

c. *Boast*

i. *Brag*

*PF 77* has neither *T-brag* nor *I-brag* that accords with traditional usage.<sup>68</sup> However it does contain the non-traditional *T-brag* component *assessment of strength*:

Henry V:            Regard not of their multitude,  
                              tho they are more than wee,  
                              for eche of vs well able is  
                              to beate downe Frenchmen 3

*PF 77*: st. 28

In *Durham* a similar pronouncement was present to show the overconfidence of the Scots: here, included in the king’s pre-battle address to the troops, it shows the assurance of the hero.

---

68. The vaunting of the hero’s intentions as below are not *T-brags*:

he sware by dint of sword  
to win the same in field.

*PF 77*: st. 3

. . . & said he wold such balls provyd  
that shold make all France to smart.

*PF 77*: st. 8

he sware vnto the earth  
with cannon to beate them downe.

*PF 77*: st. 12

many of their harts shold ake.

*PF 77*: st. 21

The first, second and last examples are not *T-brags* because they are addressed to the villain and therefore become *challenge*: the third is in its context, an optional component of *combat*, the *boastful threat*: Wittig, *Narrative Structures*, p. 93.

The hero’s statement that before his capture ‘shold come to passe, my owne harts blood shall pay the price’ (sts. 21-22), is a reply to *challenge*: it is not specifically intended to hearten his companions and therefore it is not an *I-brag*.

ii. *Gloat*

1. *Right*

This component is present in its indirect form, examples of which were given in the previous chapter. The observation that 'he brought his foes vnder his Feete/that late in pride did prance' (st. 36) is a vaunting of achievement and the attribution of the 'deadly sin' of Pride to the enemy points to the righteousness of the English and reinforces the reference to 'right' (st.1) with which the poet establishes his hero at the outset.

2. *Enumeration of Casualties*

This allomorphic component is present as part of *gloat* and not as a part of *carnage* (which is lacking): '10000 Frenchmen there were slaine' (st. 35).

B. *Conclusions*

- I. The motifemic structure is less marked in *Agincourte* than in *Durham*. There is no introduction of new motifemes or motifemic components, and what motifemes there are lack detail to such an extent that they are almost vestigial.

The lack of *exhortation* and *valediction* is interesting: both of these motifemes are elements of *discours*. This is quite absent from *PF 77*, both in the omissions of its structural units and also insofar as the narrator nowhere addresses his audience directly: it is true that he achieves a certain presence by the use of the domestic 'our' and comments such as 'the chronicle sayes' (st. 18), but he makes no use of the second person or a collective noun such as *Durham's* 'Lordinges' to address anyone outside his tale, and nowhere does he refer to himself.

*Agincourte's* lack of intimacy of direct address is probably due in part to the inadequacies of what Friedman terms a 'Grub Street rimer', and in part to the practical typographical requirements of the presentation of a printed broadside.<sup>69</sup> The poet's principal source uses the domestic 'our' which he therefore copies and lacking either time or talent fails to elaborate his material. The omission of the two stanzas of *exhortation* and *valediction* is related to the amount of space available on a broadside sheet: the story of *Agincourte* is quite long when compared to the essential matter of other broadsides which do have one or both of these motifemes.<sup>70</sup> Therefore the inclusion of stanzas which are not wholly necessary to the story depends upon the availability of free space: where there is no such space the tale must be shortened and unnecessary stanzas omitted.

The *terminal status-quo* is Propertian in its conventions and its bald statement is perfunctory: its simplified style has a nearer connection with the *Reward* of the folk-tale rather than the Romance. Its laconic brevity is probably also in part, due to the requirements of space, but again partly due to authorial

---

69. Friedman, *Ballad Revival*, p. 60

70. On examining the earlier texts of the Roxburghe and Euing Ballad Collections, I note that these motifemes are normally only present in the shorter single pieces or in texts printed in two parts. *Agincourte* is a rather long single text.

limitations. The chronicles recount the aftermath of the battle in some detail and cover the attention to the wounded, the English dead, the French prisoners, the journey back to England and the rapturous greeting of the English amidst lavish festivities on their eventual arrival in London. Such descriptions would condense neither simply nor shortly. Therefore the *Agincourte* poet has taken the easier way out: collapsed time and moved the king's wedding forwards, added the conventional coronation and produced a traditionally satisfactory ending without much trouble to himself and with no regard for historical truth.

The *boast* is also almost vestigial. This is because although the poet has used Henry and the French king as his nominal hero and villain, because he never ventures far from his source he never develops them as characters *per se*. As might be expected in this situation the general tone of the text is 'reportage': unlike the *Durham* poet, the *Agincourte* poet lacks the talent to make his figures live — and it is living people who boast, brag and gloat.<sup>71</sup>

- II. *PF 77: Agincourte Battell* reflects the change in rhymed popular historical narratives brought about by the rise of a commercial market for the broadside ballad. As I have previously noted, neither the writers contemporary with broadside ballad production nor modern commentators are lavish in their praise of the poets who composed these texts. *PF 77* does not in any way contradict these assessments.

*Agincourte* does not address any specific audience; it adopts no particular attitude; it teaches no overt lesson with intent: it is a bland regurgitation of source material with no added syntactic embellishments or semantic embroideries — it contains nothing that is not present in its sources. The poet has not manipulated the order of events in order to give his work a symmetrical shape or effect a gradual climax. The general tone of the ballad is one of pedestrian doggedness. Despite a certain continuity in the paradigmatic agreement between *PF 79* and *PF 77*, the items that do not agree or have been modified, are those which require invention on the author's part. Ability in invention of fictitious matter is the cement which in *Durham* mortars the factual bricks of history in a pleasing design. In this later text the decoration of poetic fiction appears to be subordinate to the demands of stark reportage. Throughout *Agincourte* the poet gives the impression that he has begun at the beginning of the sequence of events as laid down by his source, and desires to reach the end as soon as possible. This impression, caused mainly by the lack of 'decoration', is heightened by his unimaginative vocabulary, as witness for instance, the frequent use of 'then' as a filler or rhyme-word: the poet's determined use of the auxiliary 'did' to form an unnatural preterite, has the same effect.

The lack of the intimacy provided by the narrator's voice inhibits close audience participation — as does the fact that the poem addresses no-one in particular: the theme that injustice will meet with retribution, that virtue will overcome, is a general maxim with no specific application made. The lack of design, ornament or efforts at characterisation are almost certainly due to the technical necessity of maintaining the text at a length suitable for broadside publication. However these deficiencies are also due to poverty of authorial

---

71. He has omitted passages in the sources which show Henry fighting and praise his personal bravery as he fought 'with his owne honde' (*Brut*, p. 379) and personally overcame the Duke of Alençon and some of his men (Hall, p. 69).

imagination and the necessity of appealing to as many potential buyers as possible and offending no-one.

Thus *Agincourte* is a clear example of the process of poetic deterioration in at least one sample of rhymed popular historical narrative, which is later finalised in the impersonal voice of Deloney's historical ballads. The poor quality of *PF 77* is plainly traceable to its composition for a mass market with whom the poet need have no personal contact. In short, the diminution of the necessity for the 'popular' poet to acquire an income through individual interaction between him and his audience, has resulted in an impersonal and uninspired text.

## IV. Utilisation of Primary Material: PF 132 *Bosworth Feilde*

### a. Introduction

*Bosworth Feilde*, item 132 in *The Percy Folio*, relates the events immediately prior to the battle and tells of the battle itself.<sup>72</sup> This took place on the 22nd of August, 1485 at Ambien Hill, near Market Bosworth in Leicestershire. It was between King Richard III and Henry Tudor, Earl of Richmond: the latter became the victor and King Henry VII.

*Bosworth* is not unique to *The Folio*: I have discovered another copy of the text — hitherto apparently unknown to either scholars of history or literature since it plays no part in their discussions. This copy is the Bodleian MS. Tanner 306/1 (fol. 164<sup>r</sup>-172<sup>r</sup>).<sup>73</sup> There is also a prose synopsis of *Bosworth* in BL. MS. Harley 542 (fol. 31<sup>r</sup>-33<sup>v</sup>), in the hand of John Stowe (?1525-1605).<sup>74</sup> Both of these variants were unknown to Hales who remarks that *PF* 132 ‘was produced, as the last line shows, in the reign of James I. But the original composition may well belong to an earlier period.’<sup>75</sup> This speculation is validated by a difference in the last line in the Tanner MS: instead of ‘to Iames of England that is our King’ (*PF* 132: st. 164), Tanner has ‘to Elizabeth of Englande our Queene’ (Tanner: st. 82).<sup>76</sup> Because the final word in this line in both texts is meant to rhyme with the word ‘spring’, it is apparent that ‘king’ was the original terminal word. This is also borne out by the fact that the last line is also a ‘refrain’ line. These, with the exception of a small cluster in the centre of the narrative, all end with the word ‘Kinge’. Therefore the text must have been composed prior to the reign of Elizabeth I, i.e. during the reigns of either Henry VII, Henry VIII or Edward VI: in short between 1485 and 1553.

72. *HF* II, 233; BL. Add. MS. 27879, fol. 216<sup>r</sup>-220<sup>v</sup>.

73. The provenance of the Tanner MS. (insofar as I have been able to trace it), is probably northern. Bishop Tanner acquired it from the collection of antiquities made by Archbishop William Sancroft (1617-1693). Sancroft resided in Durham from 1662 to 1664 when he became Dean of York. According to the *DNB* (XVII, 734), Sancroft was an avid collector and whilst at Durham he ‘made large collections concerning . . . antiquities’. That he collected the Tanner MS. at this period is probable as after York he became Dean of St. Paul’s, where he was so thoroughly involved in architectural matters that he refused the Bishopric of Chester. However, patronised by the Duke of York, he became Archbishop of Canterbury. He appears to have followed the pattern (later seen in Bishop Percy), of pursuing an antiquarian interest in youth, relinquishing active collecting on preferment and arranging his collection on his retirement in his old age.

74. Harley MS. 542 has been printed in W. Hutton’s *The Battle of Bosworth Field between Richard the Third and Henry, Earl of Richmond, August 22, 1485*, ed. J. Nichols, 2nd edn. (London, 1813), pp. 204-19. The capitalisation and punctuation of the original has been emended. It is noted that MS. Harley 542 as printed by Hutton has been the source of some historians’ knowledge of that manuscript (see P.M. Kendall, *Richard the Third*, (London, 1955), p. 492; C.A. Halstead, *Richard III* (1844: rpt. Dursley, Gloucester, 1977), p. 586 ff; M. Bennett, *The Battle of Bosworth Field* (New York, 1985), pp. 11 & 171.) This is unfortunate as Hutton’s printing is not reliable. As an example the ‘Sir Iohn Neuill of bloud soe hye’ (*HF* st. 83; Tanner st. 45) is cited as ‘Sir John Nevil of Bloodfallhye’ whereas Harley 542 actually has ‘sir Iohn nevill of blood full hye’ — meaning that his ‘blood’ is ‘noble’. Halstead, claiming to reproduce part of the poem from the Harley MS., has copied Hutton’s errors — which makes her assertion doubtful.

75. *HF*, III, 232.

76. The 164 4-line stanzas of *PF* 132 are written in the Tanner MS. as 82 8-line stanzas: that this is correct is probable because every eighth line is a repeated burden with some internal variation, but in each case ending with the word ‘kynge’ — ‘. . . to be our kyng’, ‘. . . Richard our kyng’, ‘or hee bee kyng’.

In discussing the dating of this text, because isolated lines and couplets as well as entire stanzas, occur in another text known to be of a later date than *PF* 132 (*PF* 154: *Ladye Bessye*), Dr. Lawton concludes that *Bosworth* originated within the first three decades of the sixteenth century.<sup>77</sup>

The historical evidence for a likely date of composition for *PF* 132 is discussed by Ross.<sup>78</sup> The historical accuracy of the text appears to be more reliable than is usually the case in rhymed popular narratives. Although no eyewitness report of the encounter has yet been found, various State Records (pardons, attainders, inquests *post mortem* &c.), provide reliable information about the personnel involved. Ross cites six instances of verifiable historical detail given in *PF* 132 which leads him to conclude that the author existed contemporary with events, although a line referring to a combatant — ‘men said that day that did him see’ — (st. 118), implies that the author was not himself present. This is borne out by the few errors of allocation the poet makes when he cites among the ninety-five named supporters of Richard III, five knights whose allegiance to the Yorkists is questionable or negative. However *PF* 132 is part of the collection of items which comprise the Stanley Eulogy within *The Folio*. If *Bosworth* were composed and circulated between 1495 and the end of the reign of Henry VII in 1509, then its praise of Sir William Stanley (sts. 17, 18, 118 and 142), as Ross remarks ‘would have been impolitic in the extreme’ as Stanley was executed for treason in 1495.<sup>79</sup> From the above and from linguistic evidence provided for him by Professor V.J. Scattergood, Ross concludes that *Bosworth* was composed within ten years of the battle, that is, between 1485 and 1495.<sup>80</sup> Nevertheless it is also possible that the text could have been composed in the early part of the reign of Henry VIII (1509-1547), when the composer would not yet have forgotten the details of the relationships between the minor gentry which he cites in his poem, but when he may have become a little unsure of whom each individual had supported.<sup>81</sup> A further reason for dating the text in Henry VIII’s reign may lie in the lines:

---

77. D.A. Lawton, ‘*Scottish Field*: Alliterative Verse and Stanley Encomium in the Percy Folio’, *Leeds Studies in English*, NS 10 (1978), 47.

78. C. Ross, *Richard III* (London, 1981), p. 235 ff. Ross’s introduction to his specific discussion of *PF* 132 states: ‘The Ballad was printed in *Bishop Percy’s Folio Manuscript*, III (1868), edited by J.W. Hales and F.J. Furnivall, pages 233-59, from a British Library manuscript, now Harleian 542’. This is erroneous. *PF* 132, as printed by Hales and Furnivall, is from BL. Add. MS. 27879. It is Stowe’s précis of the text which is found in Harl. 542. However despite Professor Ross’s initial confusion it is *PF* 132 he discusses, *not* Stowe’s précis.

79. Ross, *Ric. III*, p. 237. However there is a possibility that two of the stanzas that praise Sir William *may* (although they are in all three texts), have been subject to later alteration or insertion as those stanzas do not have the refrain (8-line sts. 45 & 46, [*PF* sts. 89, 90, 91, & 92]). Likewise the 8-line st. 18 (*PF* sts. 35, 36), concerning Lord Stanley’s support of Henry and 8-line sts. 69 & 70 (*PF* sts. 137, 138, 139 & 240), which praise the conduct of Henry and his knights, Oxford, Talbot and Pearsall, during the battle. These stanzas are the *only* stanzas which omit the refrain. It is interesting to note (and will be discussed in detail later on), that this poem is very coy about those families which rose for Henry: it names only six knights as fighting for him and is specific about only two (other than the Stanleys). This compares very oddly with the ninety-five named knights shown doing their best for Richard.

80. Ross, *Ric. III*, p. 237. To Scattergood’s literary evidence can be added the fact that *PF* 132 uses ‘vaward’ throughout and not ‘vanward’- used after 1513. (See the discussion present in my previous chapter).

81. This is quite likely to have happened because, as the *Calendar of Patent Rolls* and other State Documents show, a number of Richard’s supporters received an early pardon and thenceforward flourished in northern administration and were responsible for the defence of the marches with Scotland as had always been the custom.



how many lords haue been deemed to die,  
young innocents that neuer did sinn.

PF 132: st.6

If this reference should relate to the murder of Richard's nephews (Prince Edward and his brother Richard, Duke of York), then the later date is the more probable. I am not proposing to enter the vexed argument as to whether Richard III caused the princes to be killed, but merely to point out here that the scandal of their disappearance was not general public knowledge early in Henry VII's reign. It is not possible to pinpoint the date of composition for *PF* 132 more closely than to suggest that possible dates are between 1485 and 1495, or the early part of the reign of Henry VIII — perhaps from 1509 to about 1520, this latter period being marginally the most probable. However, *Bosworth's* origin is certainly temporally close to that of *Durham*.

The author is unknown.<sup>82</sup> However, he was undoubtedly a northerner. The ninety-five Ricardian fighters named are, with a single exception, northern men. Many of them are minor gentry of little fame outside their own area, but nevertheless in many cases the author is able to cite their relationship one to another. Such information implies personal knowledge of the families concerned.<sup>83</sup> The ballad's vocabulary has a strong northern bias and as Scattergood reports 'it is clear that in various parts of the text the original rhymes could have been perfect only in northern form'.<sup>84</sup> In addition there are a few non-rhyming lexemes which in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries are most often found in northern texts.<sup>85</sup>

The manuscript of *PF* 132 (BL. Add. MS. 27879) has no stanzaic divisions: for ease of reference, unless otherwise stated, I shall utilise Hales' 164 4-line stanza presentation. *PF* 132 has 656 lines with irregular metricality but with the long metre (4.4.4.4) common to the ballads predominating.<sup>86</sup> The rhyme is a b a b b c b c. If allowance is made for the fact that rhyme-words no longer represent northern phonetic

---

82. Bishop Percy suggests (HF, III, 233, fn. 1), that in view of the close lexical and topical similarity between *PF* 132 and *PF* 154: *Ladye Bessiye*, one author may have written both texts. Several writers, and notably I.F. Baird in his *Scottish Feilde and Flodden Feilde: Two Flodden Poems* (New York & London, 1982), p. 65, have assigned the composition of *Bessiye* to a Cheshire man, Humphrey Brereton. I have found nothing to suggest that *Bosworth* is not by Brereton — but pending a close analysis I have found nothing to prove the reverse.

83. On the question of geographic location see Ross, *Ric. III*, pp. 236-37.

84. Ross, *Ric. III* p. 237.  
'young' (orig. 'ying') to rhyme with 'king' (sts. 2, 98);  
'floode'/'good' (st. 11) (Tanner: 'gude');  
'far'/'more' (orig. 'mair') (st. 24);  
'neere' (Tanner: 'nye') to rhyme with 'vnwittylye' (st. 25);  
'heyre'/'sore' (orig. 'sair') (st. 43);  
'neere' (Tanner: 'nee') to rhyme with 'degree' (st. 55);  
'tree'/'neere' (Tanner: 'nee') (st. 64);  
'gone' (orig. 'gane') to rhyme with 'tane' (st. 93);  
'taken'/'stone' ('tane'/'stane') (st. 97);  
'dread' (Tanner: 'drede') to rhyme with 'steeds' (st. 119);  
'hye' (Tanner: 'hee') to rhyme with 'mee' (st. 125);  
'speare'/'warr' (Tanner: 'weare') (st. 140);  
'sore' ('sare') to rhyme with 'far' (Tanner: 'fare') (st. 143);

85. 'ont' (st. 1); 'mickle' (st. 18 & *passim*); 'more & min' (st. 100); 'thringe' (st. 124); 'raught' (st. 131); 'swee' (st. 144); 'dree' (st. 147).

86. J.W. Hendren, *Ballad Rhythm*, p. 78 ff.

pronunciation, then the rhymes remain true.

Unlike *Durham* or *Agincourte*, *Bosworth* has a refrain in which the end-word of each 8-line stanza is, with five exceptions, either 'kinge' or 'crowne'. Hales refers to *PF* 132 as a 'song': the refrain may lend weight to this assertion, but if so the text is a minstrel ballad.<sup>87</sup> The narrator's units of *discours* are traditional even to the exhortation at the approximate half-way point which indicates that it was possible to repeat the work in two sittings if necessary:

Freinds & yee will hearken me right  
I shall tell you how . . .

*PF* 132: st.86

*Bosworth* is a transcription from an earlier copy. This is evident when the two other variant manuscripts are examined and are seen to contain small changes in individual lexemes to form an alliterative figure no longer present in *PF* 132, or to represent a word which the *folio*-scribe has mistaken.<sup>88</sup> The most interesting disparity between texts is in the names cited in the Battle Roll. The list of names in the Tanner manuscript is close to that of *PF* 132 but the Harley MS., while citing most, but not all, of the names given in the other two manuscripts, also adds some names peculiar to itself. In none of the three texts are there any gross lacunae which disrupt the narrative.

The following brief lexical and stylistic survey shows that as might be expected, *Bosworth* is closer to *Durham* than *Agincourte* although there are some interesting differences. It will be shown that the stylistic variations for the most part, directly result from the poet's use of an 8-line stanza terminating with a refrain: the lexical differences are probably due to the poet's idiosyncrasies related to his view of what would be acceptable to his patrons.<sup>89</sup>

Examination of *PF* 132 shows that approximately 59% of verbs, nouns and adjectives in *Bosworth* are derived from Old English: this compares with the 70% in *Durham*. The first hundred lines of *PF* 132 contain eighteen lexemes currently obsolete in form or meaning — identical to the figure from *Durham*.<sup>90</sup> However unlike *Durham*

87. HF, III, 233.

88. Lawton, *Scottish Field*, p. 48 ff, notes that the prose précis of the poem present in Harley MS. 542, was apparently taken from a more alliterative variant of *Bosworth* than is now extant. With regards to the Tanner MS., the following sample shows that it too is more alliterative, if only minimally so, than *PF* 132, and that it (or the text from which it was taken), is probably older than the *PF* 132 copy text;

<i>PF</i> 132	<i>Tanner MS</i>
'God that shope both sea and Land'	'. . . both sea and sannde'
'how had wee need . . .'	'Had we not nede . . .'
'Marry mild thats full of might'	'Marye his mother : full of myghte'
'In yonder country I haue been sent'	'. . . haue been lent'
	('lent' — 'dwell' 'stay' is in <i>PF</i> 132 at st. 25).
'Stanley . . . might be called Flower of Flowers man dye'	'. . . myghte be called flowres of flowres munndi'

I conjecture that 'munndi' is 'mundi' — 'of the world': 'man dye' - 'must die', makes no sense whatever in the context of a past Stanley victory at which he did *not* die. The rarer form probably belongs to the older text: V.A. Dearing, *The Principles and Practice of Textual Analysis* (Berkeley, 1974), p. 54.

89. The identity of the people for whom *PF* 132 was written will be discussed later.

archaic lexemes occur in *Bosworth* because, for the most part, they are a component of an earlier syntagmemic phrase and seldom because the poet has utilised them in newly invented constructions.<sup>91</sup> Many of the formulaic tags used in the Romance to describe heroes: ‘sterne & stoute’, ‘doughtye in deeds’, ‘fierce to fight’ &c. are so used in *Bosworth*. It is probable that the poet’s steady repetition of traditional formulae in his description of named knights — men who actually existed — reflects the taste of his audience, probably those self-same knights, their families and households. In short, people who like to hear themselves and their relatives described in the heroic terms of the Romance with which they are almost certainly familiar.<sup>92</sup>

The following shows briefly that because the poet uses an 8-line stanza, the relationship between formulae, alliteration and ‘weak’ line is more complex than that seen in *Durham*. Examining *Bosworth* as Hales has presented it in a series of 4-line stanzas, shows consistent patterning of traditional tags, alliteration and ‘weak’ lines only approximately in every other stanza. However if the ‘refrain’ is taken to signal the end of an 8-line stanza and the text is then so divided, a stanzaic pattern becomes evident.

**Figure 5. Stanzaic Patterning in *Bosworth* and *Durham***<sup>93</sup>

<i>Bosworth</i>			
Stanzaic Line	Traditional Formulae	Alliteration	‘Weak’ lines
1	27% *	39%	-
2	7%	15%	63% *
3	21%	33%	26%
4	16%	22%	36%
5	18%	36%	4%
6	18%	40% *	55%
7	10%	22%	18%
8	7%	38%	-

90. Obsolete lexemes:

right-wise, grounded, wend, sith, dowted, fee, can, winne, vmstrode, mickle, worshipp, deere, wightly, jorney, Fare, comintye, vnwittylye, lent.

Pronouns and verbal tense-signifiers are omitted.

91. Traditional tags (I have cited only sufficient to demonstrate their presence):

‘dowted & dread’ (st. 7); ‘gold & fee’ (st. 9); ‘Marry mild that full of might’ (st. 15); ‘sterne & stout’ (st. 21); ‘maine & might’ (st. 27); ‘kneeled . . . knee’ (st. 27); ‘nobler knight at neede’ (st. 28); ‘bale & blunder’ (st. 34); ‘bold . . . of bone & blood’ (st. 37); ‘breme as beare’ (st. 57).

92. I note that in speaking of one of the men he is praising, the poet says:

vntill with dints hee was driuen downe  
& dyed like an ancye[n]t knight.

*PF* 132: st. 156

93. The figures given are rounded off to the nearest whole percentage. Line 8 is the ‘refrain’. The asterisk denotes the highest figure.

<i>Durham</i>			
Stanzaic Line	Traditional Formulae	Alliteration	'Weak' lines
1	11%	11%	-
2	35% *	12% *	59% *
3	8%	6%	1%
4	14%	9%	35%

In the following discussion it will be necessary to refer to the above figure which presents my findings in tabular form.

Authorial habit in *PF* 132 is not as clear cut as in *PF* 79 where, as can be seen from the analysis of line 2 (above), formulaic tags and alliteration are linked to the traditionally 'weak' or mnemonic line. In *Bosworth* the majority of 'Romance' phrases occur in the opening line of each stanza (line 1), because of the presence of a lengthy 'Battle Roll' where the poet names a character and then qualifies him with a formulaic tag.<sup>94</sup> This Roll also accounts for the relatively high number of first lines containing some alliteration, although, unlike *Agincourte*, both the *Bosworth* and the *Durham* poets seem to have liked to emphasise the opening line of a stanza with this figure.

As in *Durham* the second line (line 2), of each stanza is also weak in *Bosworth*, but it differs from *Durham* in that it does not have a large formulaic component or an end-filler of the poet's own devising.<sup>95</sup> In *Bosworth* the weak lines are usually an expansion of a preceding line, or a repetand which does not stem from the Romance but rather owes something to the Traditional Ballad.<sup>96</sup> Because of this (as the Figure shows), although the second line in each stanza is the line which is most frequently 'weak' in both *Durham* and *Bosworth*, in the latter this frequency is not matched in alliteration. However the sixth line is also 'weak' and is also the line which contains the highest proportion of alliteration even though, here, there is no relationship between alliteration and formulae.<sup>97</sup> That the traditional tag *does* influence alliteration in *Bosworth* is seen when it is noted from the Figure that line one of each stanza, which has the highest proportion of formulaic tags, also has the second highest proportion of alliterative content. In the

94. For instance:-

'The Lord Stanley sterne & stout . . . '

*PF* 132: HF st. 87; Tanner st. 44.

'Sir Henerey Percy sterne on steede . . . '

*PF* 132: HF st. 67; Tanner st. 34.

95. Such as the 'then' and 'thoe' of which the *Agincourte* poet is so fond.

96. Examples of 'Expansion':

They banished him ouer the Flood,  
ouer the Flood & streames gray

*PF* 132: st. 11; Tanner: st. 6

& saith, "the Lord Stanley is his enemye nye,  
that are but a little way From him."

*PF* 132: st. 102; Tanner: st. 51

Examples of 'Repetand':

'soe Fare into the west countrye'

*PF* 132: sts. 23, 27, 35; Tanner: sts. 12, 14, 18.

'these were the wordes he said to him'

*PF* 132: sts. 24, 30, 32, 36, 48, 94; Tanner: sts. 12, 15, 16, 18, 24, 47

case of the sixth line, textual examination shows that much of the alliteration here owes little to traditional phrase but originates with the poet himself. His own alliteration shows familiarity with the traditional form but he is not punctilious in his observance of strict style.<sup>98</sup>

Unlike *Durham* the *Bosworth* poet uses the auxiliary 'did' to form an unnatural preterite in approximately 8% of 8-line stanzas: this compares to *Agincourte*'s 13% but the 'doggerel' effect found in the latter is minimised in *Bosworth* due to its greater length.

Several new elements attributable to the presence of a 'refrain' in *PF* 132 have influenced the poet's manipulation of the continuity of his tale from stanza to stanza. Unlike both *PF* 79 and *PF* 77 — where approximately half the stanzas are syntactically closed — *all* the stanzas of *PF* 132 are so closed because the refrain terminates the stanza both metrically and lexically. Concatenation between the topic of one stanza and the topic of the next is therefore achieved not only by conjunction but also by the repetition of an essential word carried over from one stanza to the next, or by commencing a new stanza with a pronoun referring to a character named in the previous stanza.<sup>99</sup> A further form of linking by repetition is seen in the 'Battle Roll' where each stanza from 30 to 42 (inclusive), commences with 'There was [name] [adjectival phrase]'. A final linkage, not seen in *Durham* or *Agincourte*, is provided by the narrator's voice as he interpolates a comment on the action of his tale or a direct address to his audience about the direction of the story.<sup>100</sup>

In conclusion, the lexical and stylistic patterning so far examined in *Bosworth*, reflects the hybrid nature of this text. The use of formulaic phrase, alliteration and traditional lexemes point to an influence relating to the Middle English Romance; the use of refrain and internal repetend point to the Traditional Ballad; the use of the auxiliary preterite 'did' points to the Broadside Ballad — as perhaps does the diminution of enallage and vocabulary immediately derived from Old English. All of these points in turn contribute to a strongly parochial effect: the poet is concerned not so much to tell a story as to praise the gentry of his area. This he does with a good strong, thumping rhythm that never varies: he utilises whatever stylistic or lexical structure will be most like to please with their familiarity and, at the same time, to help him mirror his probable audience to themselves in gratifying heroic attitudes.

---

97. It should be noted that the sixth line of the 8-line stanza would be a 'second line' were the stanza to be divided into two 4-line stanzas. Because second lines are traditionally 'weak', the 'weakness' of the sixth line may be an echo of its position as an ersatz 'second line'.

98. For instance the variety in the following:

'that time Raigned Richard with royaltie'(HF: st. 12);  
'that was well seene at streames stray'(HF: st. 13);  
'in a studye still the lord can stande'(Tanner: st. 20);  
'here is thy horsse att thy hand readye'(HF: st. 148);  
'he wold mee & mine into bondage bring'(HF: st. 40);  
'he lowted low & took his hatt in his hand'(HF: st. 111);  
'Spryngalls spred them spedilye'(Tanner: st. 72).

99. Reciprocal dialogue links 24 stanzas.

Conjunctive links are as follows: 'then' links 33 stanzas; 'for', 'after', 'at that' and 'and' link two stanzas each.

Repetition of line (sts. 1 and 2), or word (sts. 50-51) and reference to the subject of a previous stanza (sts. 46-47, 56-57, 61-62) links 14 stanzas.

100. For instance:

'alas that euer he cold soe say' (st. 17, line 1); 'of itt heere is noe more to say' (st. 18, line 1);  
'remember' (st. 78, line 1); 'Now leave wee . . .' (st. 10, line 1).

The following examines the poet's manipulation of the historical facts to determine whether his choice and usage follow the paradigm or whether continuity has been governed by considerations not present in *Durham* or *Agincourte*.

b. Synopsis of the Tale

The method used for this synopsis is the same as that used previously, and as before, the conclusions reached will be presented following the examination of the poet's use of the historical 'facts'.<sup>101</sup>

---

101. The unit employed is the 8-line stanza; units in the extrinsic voice are shown in parentheses as before.

<b>Plot Unit</b>	<b>Complementary Unit</b>
	<i>cu 1a</i> (Narrator's prayer: st. 1 <i>1b</i> Narrator's address to audience: sts. 2-5)
<i>pu 1</i> During the reign of Richard Henry was banished: st. 6	
<i>pu 2</i> Returning, he lands at Milford Haven: st. 7	<i>cu 2a (i)</i> His right in England is good: sts. 6-7 <i>2a (ii)</i> He brings followers: st. 7 <i>2a (iii)</i> England is his Heritage: st. 7 <i>2a (iv)</i> He will be king if he dies in the attempt. st. 7 <i>cu 2b (i)</i> He prays for the love of the Lord Stanley: st. 8 <i>2b (ii)</i> Lord Stanley had married Henry's mother: st. 8 <i>2b (iii)</i> Henry has not seen her for a long time: st. 8 <i>2b (iv)</i> He will maintain her honour when he is king: st. 8 <i>cu 2c (i)</i> He hopes for the love of Sir William Stanley: st. 9 <i>2c (ii)</i> There is no better knight than Sir William: st. 9 <i>cu 2d (i)</i> (I will leave Henry and talk of Richard: st. 10 <i>2d (ii)</i> Richard caused his own death: st. 10 <i>2d (iii)</i> He had wicked men to counsel him: st. 10) <i>cu 2e (i)</i> (Lord Stanley won Barwick: st. 11 <i>2e (ii)</i> No other man could: st. 11 <i>2e (iii)</i> Was there any other man who ever did such a thing for his king? st. 11
<i>pu 3</i> King Richard sends messengers to comfort his people and give them good laws: st. 12	
<i>pu 4</i> Wicked counsellors warn him the Stanleys are stronger than he: sts. 12-13	
<i>pu 5</i> They advise him to capture some of them: st. 13	
<i>pu 6</i> Messengers are sent to Lord Stanley — the king wishes to see him: st. 14	
<i>pu 7</i> Stanley sets out but he falls ill on the way: st. 15	<i>cu 7a</i> (This was the will of God: st. 15)
<i>pu 8</i> Richard sends for Lord Strange: st. 15	
<i>pu 9</i> He comes: st. 16	
<i>pu 10</i> Richard says no one is more welcome to him than Strange:	

st. 16		<i>cu 10a</i>	(Alas that he should have said such a thing: st.17
		<i>10b</i>	He always had a perverse heart: st. 17
		<i>10c</i>	His wickedness cost him his life and his crown: st. 17
		<i>10d</i>	Falsehood comes to a bad end! st. 17
		<i>10e</i>	I have no more to say about that: st. 18
<i>pu 11</i>	Messengers are sent to Lord Stanley: st. 18		
<i>pu 12</i>	He is asked to bring all the power he can: st. 18	<i>cu 12a (i)</i>	“Richmond is coming: st. 19
		<i>12a (ii)</i>	He brings a foreign army: st. 19
		<i>12a (iii)</i>	He challenges the crown: st. 19
		<i>12a (iv)</i>	Bring all your power or never see Lord Strange again: st. 19
		<i>12a (v)</i>	Strange is in the hands of the king!” st. 19
		<i>cu 12b (i)</i>	Lord Stanley stands and thinks: st. 20
		<i>12b (ii)</i>	He asks God to witness that he has never dealt with treachery: st. 20
		<i>12b (iii)</i>	He says Richard has no mercy: st. 20
		<i>12b (iv)</i>	“Richard wants to subjugate me and mine” st. 20
		<i>cu 12c (i)</i>	He declares that he will be against Richard: st. 20
<i>pu 13</i>	Richard sends a man to Sir William: st. 21		
<i>pu 14</i>	He asks Sir William to bring his power to help Richard: st. 21	<i>cu 14a (i)</i>	Richard’s trust is in him: st. 21
		<i>14b (i)</i>	Sir William marvels at his effrontery: st. 21-22
		<i>14b (ii)</i>	Richard has Lord Strange captive: st. 22
		<i>14b (iii)</i>	He will be sorry for that: st. 22
		<i>14b (iv)</i>	Richard must raise his men, fight, flee or die! st. 22
		<i>14b (v)</i>	Sir William swears to prepare a breakfast for him such as no knight has made for a Christian king before: st. 23
<i>pu 15</i>	Sir William replies that Richard must fight, flee or die: st. 23		
<i>pu 16</i>	Messenger returns to Richard: st. 24		
<i>pu 17</i>	He tells Richard that men are grieved over his captivity of Strange and therefore he must fight, flee or die: st. 24		
<i>pu 18</i>	Richard smiles with contempt: st. 25.	<i>cu 18a (i)</i>	He swears that if he fought the Great Turke, Prester John or the Sowdan of Surrey [Syria] he could beat them: st. 25
		<i>cu 18b (i)</i>	He swears he will kill all knights and



- squires from Lancaster to Shrewsbury:  
st. 26
- 18b (ii)* He'll give their land away: st. 26  
*18b (iii)* They'll be sorry they rose against their  
king: st. 26  
*18b (iv)* He'll lay waste from Holyhead to St.  
David's Land: st. 27  
*18b (v)* Widows will weep: st. 27  
*18b (vi)* Men will be sorry they rose against  
their king: st. 27
- pu 19* Messengers are sent to all  
English nobles: st. 28
- cu 19a* (You never heard of such a company:  
st. 28  
*19b* I'll tell you a few of their names: st. 28
- pu 20* Ninety-five knights muster:  
sts. 29-42
- cu 20a (i)* (We needed to pray: st. 43  
*20b (i)* Only two shires to fight against all  
England! st. 43)  
*20b (ii)* (I'll tell you how Henry got his crown:  
st. 43)
- pu 21* On Monday, Lord Stanley sets  
out from Latham with his men:  
st. 44
- cu 21a* Their banners glitter in the sun: st. 44  
*21b* They are fierce: st. 44  
*21c* They intend to maintain Henry: st. 44
- pu 22* He goes to Newcastle:  
st. 45
- cu 22a* He pays his men in advance: st. 45
- pu 23* Sir William goes from Holt  
to Nantwich: st. 45
- cu 23a* He pays his men in advance: st. 45  
*23b* He brings the men of North Wales:  
st. 46  
*23c* He brings the Cheshire men: st. 46  
*23d* There are none better: st. 46
- pu 24* Tuesday Sir William goes from  
Nantwich to Stone: st. 46
- cu 24a (i)* Henry arrives at Stafford: st. 46  
*24b (i)* Sir William goes to meet Henry: st. 47  
*24b (ii)* Henry says he is glad of William: st. 47  
*24b (iii)* William welcomes Henry: st. 48  
*24b (iv)* He will fight for him: st. 48  
*24b (v)* He asks Henry to remember this when  
he is king: st. 48  
*24c (i)* Wm. returns to Stone: st. 49
- pu 25* Saturday Sir William goes to  
Lichfield: st. 49
- pu 26* He sees Henry at Woosley  
Bridge: st. 49
- cu 26a* With Henry is an army: st. 50  
*26b* (It was a good sight to see: st. 50)  
*26c* Guns salute him as he rides through  
the town: st. 50  
*26d* His knights are pleased: st. 50
- pu 27* Sir William rides through  
Lichfield: st. 51
- cu 27a* He waits on the other side of the town:  
st. 51

- pu 28* A messenger comes: st. 51
- pu 29* He says that Lord Stanley is near the enemy and will fight within three hours: st. 51
- pu 30* Sir William takes the Tamworth road to Hattersey and halts near Lord Stanley: st. 52
- pu 31* They stay there all night: st. 53
- pu 32* They prepare their battle array: st. 53.
- pu 33* Morning comes: st. 56
- pu 34* Sir William moves onto a hill: st. 60
- cu 29a* Sir William replies that he doesn't want that: st. 51
- cu 30a* There are trumpets and tambours: st. 52
- 30b* (It was a fine sight to see: st. 52)
- cu 31a* Sunday they worship God: st. 53
- cu 32a (i)* Lord Stanley has the vaward: st. 53
- 32a (ii)* Wm. Stanley, the rerward: st. 53
- 32a (iii)* Edward Stanley, a wing: st. 53
- 32a (iv)* They wait for Richard: st. 53
- cu 32b (i)* They look at a forest: st. 54
- 32b (ii)* Hear trumpets & tabours: st. 54
- 32b (iii)* They think it is Richard but it is Henry: st. 54
- cu 32c (i)* Henry rides to the Stanleys over a river: st. 54
- 32c (ii)* (Their meeting was a fine sight to see: st. 54
- 32c (iii)* It made a stir among the troops: st. 55
- cu 32c (iv)* You never saw such a fierce army so eager: st. 55)
- cu 32d (i)* With his lords Henry comes on a fine horse: st. 55
- 32d (ii)* He thanks everyone: st. 56
- 32d (iii)* He hopes to requite them: st. 56
- cu 33a (i)* (I'll tell you the truth of the battle: st. 56)
- 33a (ii)* Henry wants the vaward: st. 57
- 33a (iii)* He has it: st. 57
- cu 33b (i)* Lord Stanley says Henry's army is small: st. 57
- 33b (ii)* He calls four knights: st. 57
- 33b (iii)* (I'll mention their names: st. 57
- 33d (iv)* He orders them to go with Henry: st. 57
- 33b (v)* They are Tunsall, Savage, Persall and Sir Humphrey Stanley: st. 58
- cu 33c (i)* Lord Stanley has two battalions: st. 59
- 33c (ii)* (Sir. Wm. was hindmost at first: st. 59
- 33c (iii)* But men said who saw, that he came up with the king in good time: st. 59
- cu 34a (i)* He sees the land is thronged with men and horses for five miles: st. 60
- 34a (ii)* Their armour glitters: st. 60
- 34a (iii)* They are in four battalions: st.60
- cu 34b (i)* Norfolk raises his banner: st. 61

- 34b (ii)* Shrewsbury raises his: st. 61  
*34b (iii)* So does Oxford: st. 61
- cu 34c (i)* (To count the array was hard for me so you shall hear of Richard's ordnance: st. 61)  
*34c (ii)* He has 140 sarpendines chained in a row: st. 62  
*34c (iii)* As many stout bombards: st. 62  
*34c (iv)* They fire like thunder: st. 62  
*34c (v)* They have 10,000 morespikes and harquebusyers: st. 62
- pu 35* Richard sees Lord Stanley's banner: st. 63
- pu 36* He sends for Lord Strange: st. 63
- cu 36a* He swears all the gold in the land won't save his life: st. 63
- pu 37* He tells Lord Strange to prepare to die: st. 64
- cu 37a (i)* Lord Strange begs for mercy: st. 64  
*37a (ii)* He swears he has never been traitor: st. 64
- cu 37b (i)* He calls a man to him: st. 65  
*37b (ii)* (Men said his name was Lathom: st. 65)  
*37b (iii)* Strange asks Lathom to greet his household as he thinks he is about to die: st. 65  
*37b (iv)* He gives a ring to Lathom for his wife whom he'll meet at Doomsday: st. 66  
*37b (v)* His son is to be taken abroad if Henry loses so that he can avenge his father when he is a man: st. 67
- pu 38* A knight tells Richard there is no time for Strange as battle has been joined: st. 68
- cu 38a* Richard is told he can kill all the Stanleys when he has them: st. 68  
*38b* (Thus Strange escapes death: st. 68)
- pu 39* Both sides come together eagerly: st. 69
- cu 39a (i)* Henry and Oxford fight manfully: st. 69  
*39a (ii)* Savage and his white hoods: st. 69  
*39a (iii)* Talbot & Persall: st. 70
- cu 39b (i)* Richard stands with his army of 40,003: st. 71  
*39b (ii)* Sir William remembers the breakfast he promised Richard: st. 71
- pu 40* Sir Wm. charges down the hill and attacks Richard: st. 71
- pu 41* They fight: st. 71
- pu 42* The archers shoot: st. 72
- pu 43* Guns are fired: st. 72
- cu 43a* Yew bows are bent: st. 72  
*43b* Springalls shoot: st. 72  
*43c* Harquebusiers' pellets strike: st. 72
- pu 44* Many banners waver on Richard's side: st. 72

- pu 45* The archers take to their swords: st. 73
- pu 46* Many knights die: st. 73
- pu 47* A knight advises Richard to fly: st. 74
- pu 48* Refusing to fly a foot while he is alive, Richard calls for his battle-axe and crown: st. 75
- pu 49* The foe press about his standard: st. 76
- pu 50* They hew the crown from him: st. 76
- pu 51* He falls dead: st. 76
- pu 52* The army moves to a hill to acclaim Henry: st. 80
- pu 53* Stanley crowns Henry: st. 80
- pu 54* That night they ride to Leicester: st. 81
- pu 55* They bring Richard's naked body with them: st. 81
- pu 56* He is laid out at Newark for all to see: st. 81
- cu 45a* Brands ring on basenets: st. 73
- 45b* Battle-axes strike helms: st. 73
- cu 47a* He says no man can endure the Stanleys' blows: st. 74
- 47b* He offers him a horse: st. 74
- cu 51a* Lord Ferrers is killed with Richard: st. 76
- 51b* Ratcliffe, Conyas, Brackenbury and Chorlton died with Richard: st. 77
- 51c* (But remember two in particular who were brave: st. 78
- 51d* One was Sir Wm. Brandon — Henry's standard bearer, who upheld it until he was killed like a knight of old: st. 78
- 51e* The other, Sir Percival Thriball, upheld Richard's until his legs were cut off — but even then he kept it from the ground while he lived: st. 79
- 51f* Pray for those two: st. 79)
- cu 52a* The crown was given to Lord Stanley: st. 80
- cu 53a* He thought he was the man most worthy to be king: st. 80
- cu 56a (i)* (Thus fortune rules both Emperor and King: st. 81
- cu 56b (i)* The story of this day is now done: st. 81
- cu 56c (i)* Jesus have mercy on the souls of the Stanleys: st. 81
- 56c (ii)* Keep their kin as lords with royalty where truth and conscience is: st. 82
- 56c (iii)* Let them be close counsellors to the monarch who is our sovereign: st. 82

### A. *The 'Bosworth' Poet's Account and the Historical Sources*

I have examined thirty-nine accounts of this battle.<sup>102</sup> There are no known eyewitness accounts: the earliest reports we have are few and appear to be hearsay.<sup>103</sup> Secondary sources may have had access to earlier accounts no longer extant, but modern studies are essentially speculative, though based on available evidence. Close comparison between the primary and secondary accounts and *Bosworth* shows that there are no points of similarity sufficient to demonstrate a special affinity between any one of them and *PF* 132.

## V. The 'Durham' paradigm and *Bosworth Feilde*

Because only *some* facts about the battle are indisputable, there is difficulty in determining what is 'fact' and what 'fiction'. However the following account shows that *Bosworth* seems to contain very little fiction relating to actual events: fiction is mainly used to magnify the Stanleys and present their actions in a good light.

In short the following discussions show that the differences between the construction of this text and the basic paradigm relate solely to the poet's view of what will please his audience and his principal patrons. The poet's manipulations tell us by inference, something about the poet's own status since, as in *Durham* and *Agincourte*, the composition of plot and complementary unit in relation to the paradigm reflects the poet's purpose in writing the work. It is also possible to see that the poet writes for a specific audience and to deduce something of the nature of that audience.

### A. *Examination*

In both *Agincourte* and *Bosworth* items 6 and 8 (*Fiction and Action* and *Dialogue and Source*), do not follow the paradigm. In addition *Bosworth* also differs in three other items. The following examines first, the items which follow the *Durham* pattern and shows how they conform and where applicable what purpose is achieved. Following this the aberrant items are discussed and conclusions drawn.

The events of *Bosworth* are initially simplified — as in the two previous texts — to set the scene (Item 1: *Simplification*). Further smoothing of complexity is present later in the text because the poet is almost solely concerned with those aspects of the tale which are connected directly or indirectly to the Stanleys who form the composite 'Hero' of the narrative.

The narrator, setting the scene, sums up a long story: historically, the Earl of Richmond was banished to the continent where he was a focus for disaffected English elements. The English authorities tried, without success, to remove him through negotiation with the continental powers with whom he had sought shelter. The *Bosworth* poet reduces this to:

---

103. For a full discussion see Hanham, *Ric. III*; Kendall, *Ric. III*, Appendix II, p. 419 f; Ross, *Ric. III*, p. 216.

when Henerye was in a Far cuntrye

---

102. *Primary Sources — Manuscripts*

Bodleian MS. Tanner 306/1, fols. 164<sup>r</sup>-172<sup>v</sup>  
British Library MS. Harley 542, fols. 31<sup>r</sup>-33<sup>v</sup>  
British Library Add. MS. 27879 fols. 216<sup>r</sup>-220<sup>v</sup>

*Primary Sources — Printed Books*

*Chronicles of London*, ed. C.L. Kingsford (Oxford, 1905; rpt. Gloucester, 1977).  
*The Great Chronicle of London*, ed. A.H. Thomas & I.D. Thornley, (London, 1938: facsim., Gloucester, 1983).  
*Ingulph's Chronicle of the Abbey of Croyland . . . with the Continuations*, trans. H.T. Riley (London, 1854).  
*The Crowland Chronicle Continuations 1459-1486*, ed. N. Pronay & J. Cox, (London, 1986).  
André Bernard, *Historia Regis Henrici Septimi*, ed. J. Gairdner, (London, 1858).  
Philip de Commines, *Memoires*, ed. A.R. Scoble (Vol. I, London, 1855, Vol. II, London, 1889).  
John Major, *A History of Greater Britain*, ed. A. Constable (Edinburgh, 1892).  
Dominic Mancini, *The Usurpation of Richard the Third: De Occupatione Regni Angliae per Riccardum Tercium Libellus*, trans. C.A.J. Armstrong, 2nd edn. (Oxford, 1984).  
Jean Molinet, *Chroniques de Jean Molinet*, 3 vols., ed. G. Doutrepont & O. Jodogne (Brussels, 1935), I.  
Thomas More, *The History of King Richard III*, ed. R.S. Sylvester (London 1557: rpt. London, 1976).  
John Rous, 'John Rous's Account of the Battle of Bosworth', *Richard III and the Early Historians: 1483-1535*, ed. and trans. A. Hanham (Oxford, 1975), 120-24.  
Diego de Valera, 'A Spanish Account of the Battle of Bosworth', trans. E.M. Noakes & G. Wheeler, *The Ricardian* (March, 1972), pp. 1-5.  
Polydore Vergil, *Three Books of Polydore Vergil's English History*, ed. H. Ellis (London, 1844).

*Later Sources*

Sir George Buck, *The History of King Richard the Third (1619)*, ed. A.N. Kincaid (1646: Gloucester, 1979).  
Robert Fabyan, *The Chronicle of Fabian which he nameth the Concorduance of Histories newly perused* (London, 1559).  
John Foxe, *Actes & Monuments*, ed. G. Townsend, Vol. II (London, 1844).  
Edward Hall, *Hall's Chronicle* (London, 1548: rpt. London, 1809).  
\_\_\_\_\_, *The Union of the Two Noble Families of Lancaster and York* (London, 1550: facsim. Menston, 1970).  
Raphael Holinshed, *Chronicles of England, Scotland and Ireland*, (London, 1578: rpt. London, 1808), Vol. III.  
Robert Lindesay, *The Historie and Cronicles of Scotland*, ed. A.J. Mackay, Vol. I (London, 1899).  
William Martyn, *The Historie of the Lives of the Kings of England* (1615) (London, 1638).  
John Speed, *The Historie of Great Britaine* (London, 1632).  
John Stow, *The Annales or General Chronicle of England* (London, 1615).

*Modern Sources*

M. van C. Alexander, *The First of the Tudors* (London, 1981).  
M. Bennett, *The Battle of Bosworth Field* (New York, 1985).  
S.B. Chrimes, *Lancastrians, Yorkists and Henry VII*, 2nd edn. (London, 1966).  
J. Gairdner, *The Battle of Bosworth* (1895: rpt. Upminster, Essex, 1975).  
A. Goodman, *The Wars of the Roses* (London, 1981).  
A. Goodman & A. Mackay, 'A Castilian Report of English Affairs, 1486', *English Historical Review*, 88, 346 (1973), 92-99.  
C.A. Halstead, *Richard III*, 2 vols. (1844: rpt. Dursley, Gloucester, 1977).  
A. Hanham, *Richard III and his Early Historians* (Oxford, 1975).  
W. Hutton, *The Battle of Bosworth Field*, 2nd edn., ed. J. Nicols (London, 1813).  
P.M. Kendall, *Richard III* (London, 1955).  
J.R. Lander, *Crown and Nobility, 1450-1509* (London, 1976).  
E. Wyn-Jones, 'Wales and Bosworth Field — Selective Historiography?', *J. National Library of Wales*, 21, 1 (1979), 43-75.  
C. Ross, *Richard III* (London, 1981).  
D.T. Williams, *The Battle of Bosworth: 22 August, 1485* (Leicester, 1973).  
D. Williams, 'A place mete for two battayles to encountre: The siting of the Battle of Bosworth, 1485', *The Ricardian*, 7, 92 (1986), 86-96.

. . . 3 times he was bought and sold.

PF 132: HF st.9<sup>104</sup>

The tale proper begins with Henry’s landing in Wales: the invader’s connection with the Stanleys is shown and then he is left: ‘now leave wee Henery . . . and tell of Richard’ (HF st. 19). he next appears at Stafford (HF st. 92). This ‘leaping’ obviates the necessity for the poet to describe Henry’s journey and the events of that journey.<sup>105</sup> Similarly, apart from Richard’s seizure of Lord Strange, the audience is not shown the king or his actions prior to his sudden appearance from nowhere at the battlefield — incidentally the battlefield itself is never named.<sup>106</sup>

Examination of the poet’s manipulation of history results in a clear picture of the extent of his concentration on his ‘Hero’. The omission or generalisation of detail directs attention to the magnitude of the eventual victory and the Stanleys’ part in it (item 2: *Details*).<sup>107</sup>

The details of the discovery of Richard’s crown after the battle are generalised: the poet simply notes that it was ‘delivered’ to Lord Stanley.<sup>108</sup> The details of the non-English forces who accompanied the Earl of Richmond are omitted: there is no reference to the French or Scottish troops:

. . . prince harie . . . saill to England . . . with . . .  
xxx schippis with . . . ten thowsand inglis men, of  
frenchmen sex thowsand, of Scoittis men ane thowsand.

. . .<sup>109</sup>

Nor is there reference to the Welsh who were certainly present.<sup>110</sup> The poet names very few of Henry’s supporters (other than the Stanleys), and generalises their strength: ‘but

---

104. Kendall, *Richard*, pp. 158 ff., 485n. and Chrimes, *Lancastrians* p. 152, set out well-attested incidents at foreign courts where Henry might well have been ‘bought and sold’. It is of interest to note how these lines (cited above), echo the rhyme first quoted by Hall (*Chronicle*, p. 419), allegedly sent to warn the royalist Duke of Norfolk the night before Bosworth:

Iack of Norffolke be not to bolde,  
For Dykon thy maister is bought and solde.

Here it is Richard III who has been ‘bought and sold’. There is no evidence one way or another but if Hall’s unknown source was reliable and the warning rhyme existed — and I cannot see good reason why such an insignificant and peripheral detail should have been invented — then the possibility arises that the *Bosworth* poet may have known of it and incorporated the key phrase into his own work.

105. For details of that journey see Vergil, *Three Books*, p. 216 ff; *Croyland*, p. 500 ff; Wyn-Jones, ‘Wales and Bosworth’, *J. National Library of Wales, passim.*; Ross, *Ric. III*, p. 210 ff.

106. This may be a point relating to an early date for the composition of PF 132 as there was considerable uncertainty in the early years following the battle, as to the precise name of the location of the conflict: see Bennett, *Battle*, p. 13 and p. 140.

107. Because the primary sources contain few details, it is sometimes possible to say that a detail in *Bosworth* has been generalised, but it is not always possible — as for instance in troop numbers — to know what fact the generalisation has replaced.

108. *The Great Chronicle* (p. 238) states that William Stanley found ‘kyng Rychardys helmnett wyth the Croune beyng upon it’. Vergil (*Three Books*, p. 226), says it was ‘found among the spoyle in the feilde’. The well-known story of the crown in the thorn-bush ‘is not found in any contemporary or early Tudor source . . . but it is hard to see why it became a common element of Tudor iconography if there is no truth in it: it appears on Henry VII’s tomb, in the windows of Henry VII’s chapel . . . and on contemporary representations of Tudor badges. It is . . . unlikely . . . to have been the subject of pure heraldic invention.’ Ross, *Ric. III*, p. 225n.

small is your companye' (HF sts. 105-106). He makes no mention of Henry's fire-power either in terms of bowmen or ordnance — but lists Richard's.<sup>111</sup> He lists the Stanleys' positions as Commanders (HF sts. 105-106), but omits any reference to Richard's though citing the numbers of his men in detail — '40000 and 3' (HF st. 141) — and in general:

5 miles compasse no ground they see  
For armed men and trapped steeds —  
theyr armour glittered as any gleeed —  
in 4 stronge battells they could forth bring

8-line st. 60<sup>112</sup>

The heroic status of *Bosworth's* composite hero, 'The Stanleys', is underlined from time to time by the deeds of one or another of them as an individual. A simple enumeration of the stanzas relating to specific characters shows the *Bosworth* poet's priorities quite plainly (Item 3: *Character focus*. Although many individuals are named in *PF* 132, the focus is first on the Stanleys, secondly on Richard III, and only thirdly on Henry Tudor. Of the eighty-two 8-line stanzas, thirty-two concern the Stanleys either in narrative or in dialogue, eighteen concern Richard and only eleven relate directly to Henry. No other individual is the subject of sustained authorial focus: in the Battle Roll the poet briefly names ninety-five Ricardian supporters, but they are not brought forward and most of Henry's followers are ignored.

Henry of course, has 'right' on his side (Item 18: *Right*). This is made clear in the opening stanzas where the refrain is 'welcom Henerey right-wise King' (8-line sts. 1-3), and the narrator also specifically states that 'his right in England was good' (8-line st. 6). The Stanleys, the 'Hero', support Henry and they are themselves all that is virtuous (Item 9: *Dialogue: character and moral*). The poet takes pains to show the excellence of the Stanleys through the media of dialogue and moral lesson. Indeed the moral *is* that the Stanleys are praiseworthy — the embodiment of 'truth and conscyence' (HF st. 164): monarchs who permit themselves to be guided by the Stanleys will be safeguarded against the fickle vacillations of Fortune. To show the Hero's character and actions in the best possible light, in twenty-six passages the poet uses the authority of words spoken by the characters themselves. All but one of these passages represent a Stanley either speaking, being spoken to or being spoken about.<sup>113</sup> Since the 'moral' relates to the character of the Stanleys, that which supports or expands the one also supports or expands the other.

Henry praises the Stanleys in strong terms: 'proued his manhoode', 'a better

---

109. Lindsay, *Historie*, p. 397. See also Valera, 'Spanish Account', *Ricardian*, p. 2; Commines, *Memoirs*, p. 397.

110. For the presence of the Welsh see Wyn-Jones, 'Wales and Bos.', *JNLW*, *passim*. There is a possibility that Sir John Savage's followers- 'many a white hood' (HF st. 138), may have been Welsh. *PF* 154: *Ladye Bessiye* (lines 80 and 815), refers to Savage's 'white hoods'.

111. Commines (*Memoirs*, p. 397), notes that Henry was given artillery; Lindsay (*Historie*, p. 194), says that after landing Henry brought 'all the arteilzerrie pouldar and bullatis' from his ships. See also Ross, *Ric. III*, p. 220-21.

112. The 'bring' in the last line of the quotation should properly be 'thringe' as the Tanner MS. has it and as HF st. 124 has it.

113. The exception expands Henry's character when he thanks those who have come to support him (HF st. 111).



Knight neuer vmstrode steede' (HF st. 18), 'much . . . worshipp', 'a more nobler knight' (HF st. 18). Lord Stanley is shown as loyal: hastening to obey Richard's summons he falls ill (not through any physical weakness of course, but because it is the 'will of god' — HF st. 29), so he dutifully instructs his son, Lord Strange, to go in his place:

In goodlye hast now ride must yee  
to witt the will of Richard our Kinge

HF st. 30

Strange is held hostage and Lord Stanley is shown in a state of virtuous indignation: 'I neuer dealt with no treacherye' (HF st. 39). William Stanley also refuses to submit to Richard's threats and attempts at coercion when the king's messenger reports on the effect that the capture of Strange has had in the Stanley 'cuntrye' (HF sts. 47-48). The strength of the Stanleys' powerful following is brought forward together with the information that they are much loved. The implicit message to the audience is that the Stanleys are responsible for many people who hold them in affection — therefore they must be admirable.

Despite the poet's concentration on the Stanleys, for the most part they, as perhaps befits their position, are set apart from others, their emotions are formal. For instance when the newly captured Lord Strange is shown sending what he believes to be a final farewell to his family, the poet couches it in his 'high style':

there he tooke a ring of his Fingar right,  
& to that Squier raught itt hee,  
& said, "bere this to my Lady bright  
for shее may thinke itt longe or shее [me] see;  
yett att domes day meete shall wee —  
I trust in Iesu that all this world shall winne —  
In the celestyall heauen vpon hye  
in presence of a Noble King."

8-line st. 66

Strange's grief is manfully concealed. There is however, one passage in which a Stanley momentarily touches a mundane level. Sir William's vow that he will make a breakfast for King Richard such as he has never before received (HF sts. 45 and 142), is a homely culinary metaphor (Item 12: *Light relief*).<sup>114</sup> It produces an entertaining effect, occurring as it does in the middle of an impassioned tirade couched in more formal terms: the humour arises from the concept of 'breakfast' in a situation where at first sight it is incongruous. Sir William through the use of a metaphor taken from the ordinary round of non-belligerent life, also reminds his audience that even kings and Stanleys have something in common with the most humble.

The poet's attention to the characters of Richard and Henry through dialogue is minimal: Richard's outburst in which he promises to devastate the country from 'holy

---

114. It is interesting to note that the *Croyland* continuator (p. 503), specifically remarks that Richard did not have breakfast on the morning of the battle as none had been prepared: 'Neque jentaculum ullum paratum'. (*Crowland*, p. 180). That Stanley could have spoken with reference to this some days before the event is impossible and as a coincidence unlikely. The metaphor is almost certainly fiction but relating to a truth derived from hindsight.

It is also interesting to note that this reference also occurs in *PF* 154: *Ladye Bessiye*, where, prior to the battle of Bosworth, Sir William says:

"such a breakeffast I him hett  
as neuer subject did to Kinge!"

*PF* 154: ll. 877-78

head to St. Davids land' (HF st. 53), where 'widdowes shall weepe & their hands wringe' (HF st. 54), is ostensibly present to show how merciless and vindictive he is (this subject is one to which I shall return presently). This contrasts with Henry's nobility when, hat in hand, he bows humbly, thanks his supporters and promises to reward them (HF st. 111).

The achievement of a grand climax is related to the *Bosworth* poet's desire to magnify the position of the Stanleys (Item 14: *Climax*). *Bosworth*'s culminating event is not as might be expected, the death of Richard nor yet the victory of Henry, but Henry's physical crowning by Lord Stanley. The lines 'methinkes ye are best worthye/to weare the crowne and be our Kinge' (HF st. 160), elevates Stanley to the status of 'King-maker'. This has an association with the moral (Item 15: *Post-climactic moral*).

Ostensibly the moral of *Bosworth* is the conventionally Bœthian sentiment:

thus Fortunes raignes most meruellouslye  
both with Emperour & with king.

HF st. 162<sup>115</sup>

However, as I have previously noted, the implication in the following terminal 8-line stanza (82) is that Fortune is assisted by the Stanleys — custodians of 'truth and conscyence':

saue stanleys blood where soeuer they bee,  
to remaine as Lords with royaltie  
when truth & conscyence shall spread & springe,  
& that they bee of counsell nye  
to Iames of England that is our king.<sup>116</sup>

The narrator sets out the idea that Fortune is responsible for the sudden changes that have taken place in England, quite early in his narrative (Item 16: *Moral: repetition*):

welcome Fortune that hath befall,  
which hath beene seene in many a place:  
who wend that England as itt was  
soe suddenlye changed should haue been?

8-line st. 2

A variant of the moral is also touched on when the narrator first speaks of Richard: 'a great misfortune did him befall. . . . Wicked counsell . . . bringeth downe both Emperour & King' (8-line st. 10) — Richard did not have the benefit of the Stanleys' advice: therefore he fell. A further implication that the king's good fortune relies on his treatment of the Stanleys, is present when, after Richard has met Lord Strange (whom he will capture), with a deceptively cordial greeting, the narrator exclaims at Richard's duplicity and adds that it 'cast him & his crowne assunder' (8-line st. 17). The Stanleys' connection with Henry's fortune is made clear when Sir William tells Henry:

---

115. Scribal error is responsible for 'Fortunes': the Tanner MS. has 'fortune'.

116. The Tanner MS. (as has been previously remarked), has 'Elizabeth' which, like 'Iames', is also an alteration of a previous monarch's name.

“challenge thy Herytage & thy Land  
that thine owne is & thine shall bee.  
. . . & remember another day who doth For thee  
of all England when thou art Kinge.”

8-line st. 48

That Henry owes his position to the Stanleys is again underlined, not only in the ‘crowning’ scene, but also when Richard is advised to flee the battle because:

“yonder stanleys dints they bee soe wight  
against them no man can dree!”

8-line st. 74

Thus the implication in the ‘moral’ that while ‘Fortune’ may be responsible for the rise and fall of general kings and ‘emperours’, the Stanleys are the Nemesis of English kings who do not follow ‘truth and conscyence’, is present throughout the text.

Heroes are of course, able to overcome tremendous odds: the Stanleys are no exception (Item 19: *Outnumbering*). It is made abundantly plain that Henry is not well supported: only a handful of his knights are named but ninety-five of Richard’s are described.<sup>117</sup> Lord Stanley tells Henry he thinks “but small is your companye” (8-line stanza 57), and sends four of his own followers together with their men to join Henry’s force — thus incidentally emphasising the power of the Stanleys. Finally Henry overlooks the assembled opposition and ‘For 5 miles compasse no ground they see/For armed men and trapped steeds’ (8-line st. 60). Besides fighting men there is also the implication (as I have previously remarked), that Henry does not have the ordnance that Richard has (described in some detail in HF sts. 122 to 124), because the poet is silent on the topic of Henry’s arms.

Sufficient evidence has already been provided to show the poet’s partisan allegiance to the Stanleys in general (Item 17: *Partisan*). That he himself is probably part of the Stanley barony is shown in his use of the possessive ‘our’ when talking of Sir William Stanley’s meeting with Henry: William

brake the ray & rode to him —  
itt was a comely sight to see  
the meeting of our Lord and Kinge.

8-line st. 54

I think that the use of this pronoun here is more specific than the casual use of a general domestic ‘our’, and that the *Bosworth* poet is himself in all likelihood, a Stanley dependant of some kind.<sup>118</sup> Nevertheless it is improbable that the poet was an eyewitness of the battle (item 4: *Nomenclature*). Many of the errors in *Bosworth* with respect to the spelling of names are probably scribal and not authorial. For instance amongst the knights cited in the Battle Roll there is ‘Persall’ (‘Pearsall’), ‘Marcomfild’ and ‘Murkenffeilde’ (‘Markenfield’); ‘Matterevis’ (‘Maltravers’) and ‘Strelley’ (‘Sturley’) and so on.<sup>119</sup> However errors in association indicate that the poet was not only not present at the events which he describes, but has either been misinformed or misremembered some of what he was told. For instance Henry says to Sir William:

---

117. Each knight brings his own followers with him so the description of ninety-five knights relates to ninety-five actual companies of men.

through the helpe of my Lord thy Father and thee  
I trust in England to continue Kinge

HF st. 94

As Adams points out: 'this should be "*brother*": Thomas, Lord Stanley, the father of Sir William, and the then (1485) Lord Stanley, having died in 1458'.<sup>120</sup>

When, prior to the battle, the Stanleys overlook the opposing force, the Duke of Norfolk, the 'younge Erle of Shrewsburye' and the Earl of Oxford, are shown together (HF st. 121). Norfolk was indeed Richard's man; about the allegiance of Shrewsbury, a minor, there is some scholarly argument, but there is no doubt at all that Oxford was Henry's commander.<sup>121</sup>

That the *Bosworth* poet was not himself at the battle but received his information from persons who had themselves participated, is suggested when the numbers covering troops and armaments cited in *PF* 132 are examined (Item 20: *Figures*). *Bosworth* quotes only one set of figures:

- 
118. Whether the poet himself favours Lancaster or York is surprisingly, not quite as clear. True, when he has cause to mention Henry he does so in terms of praise — and yet it seems to me that there is a certain restraint. For instance, when he describes Henry's personal valour in the field, compared to the descriptions given to Henry's companions, Savage, Talbot and Pearsall (who each get a full 4-line stanza), the description of Henry is laconic: 'Kinge Henry Fought soe manfullye' (HF st. 137). This is one of the passages previously mentioned as lacking the refrain and which may be interpolated — certainly the use of 'King' at this point in the narrative is anachronistic. In view of the topic it is not at all odd that Richard is not described in glowing terms. However it is of interest that *Richard's* conduct in the battle receives three 4-line stanzas; he is given an 'heroic' speech (which is discussed presently as an *I-brag*); his death is achieved with 'dilful dints' and the crown is 'hewed' from him — emotive terms? A further point to suggest that the poet's sympathies may have been Ricardian, lies in the possible slip in 8-line stanza 61, where Richard is referred to as 'our kinge', and the definite error in 8-line stanza 78, where Henry's standard bearer 'dyed like an ancyent knight/with Henerey of England'. It was *Richard* who died, and who, according to the poet's description could be said to have died in the chivalric manner. That there is a possibility, that 'ancyent' may here mean either 'ensign' or 'ensign bearer' — which in context seems unlikely, does not affect the main argument that Richard it was who died and not Henry. Finally the descriptions in the long list of knights who all swore 'that Kinge Richard shold keepe his crown' (8-line st. 42), are couched in terms of the highest chivalric praise. This is probably because the poet expected to recite his work to them, but that implies that he had the *entrée* to their halls — which might not have been the case had he not supported their cause. The details of his description of them and their relationship one to another, he may have had from a third party, but on the other hand, he may have been utilising his own knowledge of the Ricardian supporters and perhaps been one of them.
119. I have identified seventy-six of the ninety-five knights named in the Battle Roll. Many of them were attainted subsequent to the conflict, or died and were named in inquisitions *Post mortem*; received pardons, or were mentioned in other matters recorded in State Papers, County Histories or genealogical works which I have consulted. Comparison between *The Folio* MS. and the two other manuscripts sometimes helped to establish correct names. There were nineteen persons to whom I could find no reference whatever: they may have been very minor gentry and therefore not recorded in sources available to me, or their names may be distorted to such an extent that they are unidentifiable. For instance 'Sir Robert Utridge (Harley MS: 'Owtrege'), may have been the 'Ughtred' I found in a writ of *Diem clausit extremum* (*Cal. Fine Rolls*, XXII (London, 1962), p. 69), but it is not possible to tell if this is the same family. Likewise 'Sir Alexander Fawne' (Harley MS: 'Fryne'): 'Vaughan' perhaps? Bennett (*Battle*, pp. 11 and 171), suggests 'Baynham' but Bennett's suggestions for amendment falter on his assumption that the names listed in the Harley MS. are recorded in the same order as those in the *Folio* — they are not. Furthermore he has followed Hutton's printed version, which is inaccurate, and cited the Harley manuscript's folio number taken from Hutton — which is also inaccurate.
120. HF, III, 249n. It is possible that this could well be a scribal error. However both the Tanner and the Harley MSS. have 'the Lord my father and thee'. Unless Henry is referring to 'God the Father', which in context is possible but unlikely, this version is also incorrect as his father, Edmund Tudor, Earl of Richmond, died in 1456. See Ross, *Ric. III*, Appendix, Table I.

King Richard did in his army stand  
he was numbred to 40000 and 3

HF st. 141

This figure is exaggerated, but by how much is not known with exactitude: none of the primary sources are eye-witness accounts and their estimates vary considerably, while the secondary sources follow convention and magnify the numbers of the losing side in order to make the victory greater. The general consensus of opinion among modern historians seems to average out at about twelve thousand men in Richard's nominal army.<sup>122</sup>

That numerical inaccuracy is present in *Bosworth* is not surprising as victories were conventionally enlarged, but it is unusual to find no figures concerning Henry's forces. If the poet's source was a Yorkist participant, it may well be that there was opportunity to assess the number of his fellows prior to the battle, but that he had no time to estimate the strength of the Lancastrians during the encounter. It is noted with interest that Harley MS.542 cites Richard's forces as being 'xx thowsand & thre'. This manuscript also states (as neither *PF* 132 nor Tanner do), that 'Richard on a marris dyd stand'. This reference to a marsh is also found in Vergil.<sup>123</sup> It is therefore possible that the Harleian MS. — if transcribed accurately — may have been taken from an early original which has undergone less exaggeration than *PF* 132. Thus *Bosworth* poet's informant may have made a reasonably accurate assessment given the circumstances.

Another set of figures cover the armaments belonging to the Yorkists: 140 'sarpendines', 140 'bombards', 10,000 'morespikes' and 'harquebusiers' (8-line st. 62). Since no source has a comparable list it is not possible to say whether these figures are accurate.<sup>124</sup> However because of the detail given in this passage (the guns were chained and locked in a row and their explosions were very loud), it is probable that the poet has his information from a Yorkist fighter — the technical detail of the anti-recoil precautions sounds as though his informant may have been a gunner, and therefore the figures here may be only slightly exaggerated. It is noted that nothing is said of Henry's artillery — which is perhaps to be expected if the poet's source was Ricardian. Further points which suggest that this was so, are discussed presently, but here I note that the chronological sequences of the narrative are accurate (Item 7: *Chronology*). So also are the specific temporal locations: the days of the week upon which given actions took place prior to the battle are named correctly. This of course proves little, but it does suggest that the poet's

---

121. Ross, *Ric. III*, p. 212, n.8. The other mention of Oxford in *PF* 132 shows him fighting alongside Henry (HF st. 137). However this stanza occurs among the group which I earlier suggested may be interpolated. This contradiction of the poet's earlier picture of Oxford's allegiance may lend further weight to this suggestion.

There is a possibility that at least three men listed in the Battle Roll of knights who fought for Richard, in fact fought for Henry — Wells, Berkeley and Arundell: *Croyland*, p. 502. However as the exact identity of all the knights is not clear and as it was by no means uncommon for families to have a representative in each camp, I have not pursued the matter further than to note the possibility of error.

122. Ross, *Ric. III*, p. 215, 8,000 — 10,000; Bennett, *Battle*, p. 103, 10,000 — 15,000; Hutton, *Battle*, p. 75, 12,000; Kendall, *Richard*, p. 361, about 9,000; Williams, *Battle*, p. 9, 12,000.

I say 'nominal army' because some contingents, notably that of Henry Percy, the Earl of Northumberland, did not fight, although they were present, *Croyland*, p. 503; Vergil, *Three Books*, p. 224; *Crowland*, p. 180-81.

123. Vergil, *Three Books*, p. 223. This marsh certainly existed though now drained.

124. It is known that Richard did have guns — and therefore gunners — as they were mentioned in a subsequent attainder and cannon-balls have been found on the site of the battle: Ross *Ric. III*, p. 221; Bennett, *Battle*, p. 156; Hutton, *Battle*, p. 82.

informant was close to the events described.

The following discussion shows that the items in *Bosworth* which do not coincide with the paradigm, deviate because of (one), the poet's need to support the reputation of his 'Hero'; (two), enlarge their glory; (three), establish his credibility, and (four), please a specific audience.

Detailed motivation is present in this text (Item 5: *Motivation*). It is there solely to support the reputation of the Stanleys. Because the Stanley family is the poet's collective 'Hero' and because some of the Stanleys' actions could look dubious, the poet has to explain clearly why they take the stance they do. Richard's actions have to be motivated insofar as they concern the Stanleys in order to show that the causes underlying their reactions are such that their actions are justified. Lord Stanley's motivation in opposing Richard is that he believes the king is attempting to 'bring me and mine' into 'bondage' (HF sts. 39-40); William is enraged, as are his men, because the king holds Strange hostage (HF sts. 43-48) — he also hopes for a reward from Henry when he becomes king with Stanley help (HF st. 96). Richard takes Strange because the Stanleys are growing too powerful (HF sts. 24-26). His grounds for *not* executing his hostage are designed to show an unpleasant side to his character which justifies Stanley opposition: he accepts the proposition put to him that he should wait until he has captured *all* the Stanleys, when he can, at leisure, decide the manner of their death (HF sts. 135-36). Richard's reason for not fleeing the battle when offered the opportunity, emphasises his personal bravery, sets forth the notion that he is the King — he will not 'worshipp win' by running away therefore he will do his duty and not flee 'one foote' while 'the breath is my brest within' (HF sts. 147-50). This presents Richard in an heroic light at odds with the ignoble figure opposed by the Stanleys. However the poet has been careful to present Richard's previous conduct as resulting from advice given by others: twice, before the tale gathers momentum, the poet states that Richard was influenced by 'wicked councell' (HF sts. 20 & 24). The audience is shown these counsellors in action when they suggest the taking of Strange and the postponement of his death until all the Stanleys have been captured. Thus not only does the poet hint that Richard would not have come to grief if he had had the Stanleys to advise him, but also hints that the Stanleys' quarrel is not really with their anointed king but with his advisers.<sup>125</sup> This is brought out at Richard's demise, when for the first time, he chooses to reject proffered advice, abjure cowardice and die heroically.

Besides providing motivation to justify the Stanleys, the *Bosworth* poet has inserted a fiction connected with the direct action of the historic event which achieves the same purpose (Item 6: *Fiction and action*). William Stanley directs the king's messenger to inform him that he, William, will stand against him (8-line sts. 23-24). In short, Richard becomes aware of William's antagonism through the reception of William's defiance. As a direct result of William's action, Richard declares his intention of resisting and sends messengers to bid his followers to battle (8-line sts. 25-28).

William's declaration is almost certainly untrue. With the exception of the *Croyland* continuator (who states that Richard discovered William's intentions from Strange and then had William publicly proclaimed traitor), the earliest sources agree that

---

125. This accords with the contemporary belief that because a king's rulership was sanctioned by divinity — a king became 'the Lord's anointed' at his coronation — his errors were always due to 'evil counsellors' or an 'evil queen'. Thus to oppose the sovereign was high treason and particularly heinous. See W. Ullman, *Medieval Political Thought* (Harmondsworth, 1975), p. 85 ff and *Passim*; E. Peters, *The Shadow King: Rex Inutilis* (New Haven 1970), pp. 103-04; J.T. Rosenthal, 'The King's 'Wicked Advisors' and Medieval Baronial Rebellions', *Political Science Quarterly*, 82 (1967), 595-618.

until the actual battle neither Richard nor Henry were certain of the Stanley's ultimate allegiance.<sup>126</sup> Whether Richard was uncertain because he knew of William's Lancastrian sympathies through Strange, or was merely suspicious because Lord Stanley had married Henry's mother, it is highly improbable that at any stage is he likely to have received from William Stanley a formal defiance burning the Stanley bridges.

*Bosworth* mentions neither Strange's disclosure nor the proclamation. If however it is true that William was a proclaimed traitor, then by omitting the fact and substituting a chivalric declaration of frank intent, the poet adds to the Stanley stature: he is no underhand renegade but an heroic figure openly standing against wrong. Likewise if the proclamation story is *not* true, then William's overt declaration of hostility removes all suspicion of his hero's not wholly honourable behaviour when, at Bosworth, he 'sett vpon' his lawful king. (HF st. 142). Thus the Stanleys are presented as being of spotless moral worth in addition to having the martial prowess appropriate to their 'heroic' status.

I believe that there is a high probability that the *Bosworth* poet drew his information from an authentic, albeit unilateral, source, which was almost certainly the ninety-five Ricardian knights (or their families), cited in the poet's Battle Roll. I have previously noted that the details of their relationships given imply a personal acquaintance on the poet's part — in which case the poet has a ready source of information to hand. I can see no other reasonable cause for the careful enumeration of so many regional knights other than that the poet hoped to relate his tale to the families cited, please them and accordingly receive a gratuity. The following shows that the matter of *Bosworth*, in its apparently insignificant details, goes some way to clarify the composition of the audience, the poet's relationship to it and his historical veracity.

In examining the links between scenes it is seen that the poet has only three methods of changing the focus of his tale from one scene to another (Item 11: *Links*):

- a) By narrator's comment: 'Now leave wee . . . & talke of . . .'  
(HF st. 19);  
'friends . . . I shall tell you how . . .'  
(HF st. 86);
- b) By messenger: 'Then another messenger he did appeare  
to . . . & saith . . .'  
(HF st. 41);  
'A messenger came to him straight . . .  
and saith . . .'  
(HF st. 101)
- c) By journey: 'then the lord busked him . . .  
to ride to . . .'  
(HF st. 29)  
'Towards . . . he tooke the way.'  
(HF st. 103).

The poet uses the narrator to link scene changes in nine instances, 'messengers' in seven and 'journeys' in six.

The 'messenger' and 'journey' linkages occur for the most part prior to the battle itself. They cover changes in focus between the sender and the recipient of a message or change the location of a character enabling him to meet a 'new' character or situation. It is known that each historical character in *Bosworth* did in fact (and as might be expected in the circumstances of an invasion through Wales), send a great many messages and

---

126. *Croyland*, p. 501-02. Some writers (for instance Bennett, *Battle*, p. 94), accept that Strange confessed that William Stanley was against Richard but that Lord Stanley was loyal. However the evidence for this relies wholly on *Croyland*: (*Crowland*, p. 178) For the opponents' uncertainty regarding the Stanleys see Ross, *Ric. III*, p. 218n

make journeys.<sup>127</sup> There is no evidence that the messengers mentioned in *Bosworth* did not genuinely perform their duties as there stated, or that the journeys said to have been made were not undertaken. Indeed, because the sources, between them, cover most of the journeys to or from the towns and villages named in *PF* 132, there seems to be at least the possibility, to put it no higher, that the majority of connections between the scenes in *Bosworth* are grounded in fact.

I have already stated that the *Bosworth* poet confines himself to the above three methods of making a transition in his narrative from one scene to another. A reason for this may lie in lack of authorial skill but a more probable explanation is seen in the possibility that the poet is being careful to include the basic information he has received because his poem is intended for the families and supporters of those from whom he received it, or people to whom the facts were well known. It seems logical to suppose that enlargement of the Stanleys' personal merits would not be likely to be subject to audience correction, whereas misrepresentation of facts not currently of a delicate political nature — such a news heard, journeys undertaken, towns visited — might well be unpleasing to an audience that knew the truth — perhaps through personal involvement.

It is noted that from the beginning of the battle to its end (HF sts. 112-58), the poet uses the narrator's voice for linkage. This is significant because, as I have previously remarked, the Stanleys' behaviour at that event, could be construed as doubtful.<sup>128</sup> A detailed and truthful account of their movements would not accord with the noble picture of the Stanley family that the poet has been at pains to draw, and furthermore, would almost certainly have been politically rash.<sup>129</sup> Indeed it is noticeable that *PF* 132's description of the actual battle is in general terms and there is no mention of Lord Stanley's part in it at all.<sup>130</sup> The supposition that the poet's linkages are connected with his source and his audience is also upheld when it is noted that the only *detailed* journeys and messages used as 'links', are those concerning the Stanleys.<sup>131</sup> It is very noticeable that *none* of Richard's journeys are mentioned at all: even at the battle he is suddenly

---

127. *Croyland (passim)*, for instance, mentions six occasions when letters, orders or information were despatched or received; *Vergil Three Books, (passim)*, notes nineteen. Similarly *Croyland* notes eight journeys and Vergil mentions twenty-three.

128. *Vergil Three Books*, p. 221, states (as does *Bosworth*), that prior to the battle Henry met the Stanleys as they 'enteryd in cownsayll in what sort to darraigne battayll with king Rycherd'. However at the conflict Lord Stanley was 'in the mydde way betwixt the two battaylls'. When Henry ordered him to join him he made excuse, stayed where he was and committed himself to neither side — 'Henry wer no lyttle vexyd'. This behaviour may have been prudent but it was *not* heroic. The idea that the Stanleys probably 'stode stil & loked on, entendyng to take part with the victors and ouercommers' (Hall, *Chronicle*, p. 416), has occurred to modern historians: Chrimes, *Lancastrians*, p. 147; Ross, *Ric. III*, p. 218. Certainly it seems certain that the Stanleys did not intervene until the battle had been under way for some time: Ross, p. 222 ff; Bennett, *Battle*, p. 116.

129. Bennett, *Battle*, p. 6 ff, remarks the 'virtual impossibility of composing a narrative which would preserve the honour of all the participants, particularly those still alive or those whose families were still powerful. . . . a deep reluctance to open up old wounds by probing too deeply into their motives and manoeuvres'. In the case of the Stanleys it would have been foolish to remind Henry that people who fail to support one lawful king in his hour of need, might well fail to support another.

130. As I have previously noted, the stanzas relating to William Stanley's part in the battle may have been a later insertion: even if they are not, they accord with the 'defiance' he has made, and in reality may not have had potential for political damage to the House of Stanley as William was not its head. He was, as I have pointed out, executed for treason in 1495, therefore if the poem was composed after this date, then William has already been established as having been disloyal to his king and has paid the penalty: his apparent propensity to regard the king as less than 'God's anointed', has already been terminally quashed.



shown as being there surveying the assembly (HF st. 125). Apart from the landing at Milford Haven, the only journeys Henry makes are those which result in a meeting with a Stanley: apart from a general 'bidding to battle' (HF st. 55), Richard sends no message that does not concern a Stanley — neither does Henry. The obvious conclusion is that the poet had his information from a member of the Stanley camp: that he had no access to detailed knowledge of actions occurring out of the Stanley ambit — other than matters of general fame, such as the initial invasion and the king's call to arms.

The poet's relationship to his audience is also seen in a study of *Bosworth's* chronology (Item 13: *Episode: linear sequence*). Historically the capture of Strange occurred a 'little before the landing' of Henry Tudor in Wales.<sup>132</sup> The poet recounts the landing and then states that he will leave Henry and turn to Richard (HF st. 19). He then backtracks to the Siege of Berwick (HF sts. 21-22), a 'Stanley victory' occurring in 1482 under King Edward IV. Following this he moves on to the beginning of Richard's reign when he was trying to establish himself as a good king and 'set good rule amongst his comintye' (HF st. 28): bad counsel is given him and Strange is taken hostage. A message is then sent to Lord Stanley saying that Richmond 'cometh' (HF st. 37). The poet does not repeat the landing scene (which chronologically occurred at this point), but from then on the narrative proceeds in correct temporal sequence.

The two 'Berwick' stanzas describe Stanley achievement in fulsome terms but they are out of chronological order, are not linked into the narrative and read like an insertion.<sup>133</sup> They give the impression that since the poet's patrons were the Stanleys and since the victory is an event which magnified the Stanley name, the poet felt it should be included to establish their heroic prowess early in his tale and to please them as prospective members of his audience.

With regard to the chronological shift to an event which takes place prior to Henry's landing — the capture of Lord Strange — if the audience is composed of men to whom the events of which he speaks are well known, then again any poetic diversion from the truth may well be poorly received: thus the poet is careful not to lay himself open to correction of mistakes in historical fact and recounts the event in its proper time-sequence.

That the *Bosworth* poet was careful not to wrench well known 'fact' is also shown in some of the poem's dialogue (Item 8: *Dialogue and source*). The spoken word present in both the early sources and also in *PF* 132, concerns matters relating to the actual battle. Such public dialogue might therefore be thought to have a higher likelihood of historical veracity than *Bosworth's* private conversations between Stanleys and other characters

---

131. Note for instance that Strange's message to his household (HF sts. 129-34), is carried by a squire who is named. He is the *only* minor character who merits this attention: 'men said Lathom was his name'. In the context of my argument that the poet was close to the persons involved from the districts under the Stanley hegemony, the poet's careful naming of the ninety-five regional knights should also be considered.

132. *Croyland*, p. 501.

133. The transmitters of the text appear to have had difficulty making the sense of the passage fit as it has no connection with the sense of the matter which surrounds it. In the description of Stanley, the *Folio* scribe, who perhaps was no Latin scholar, has altered the 'mundi' of 'the flower of flowers mundi' (retained in the Tanner MS.) to 'man dye' — which does not help the meaning a great deal. Hales has, in his marginal synopsis reduced the stanza to 'He [Richard], condemned to death Lord Stanley who won Berwick for him'. This is wrong on two counts: 'man' ['maun'] is present tense and the stanza does not refer to Richard but to Stanley's un-named 'Kinge'. The synopsis, as wrenched by Hales, makes sense — but it is not what the text says.

which take place before the conflict. As the poet is concerned to laud the Stanleys, it makes sense to expect to find ‘sourced’ dialogue in areas where Stanley fame was genuinely noteworthy and at moments of high drama publicly performed. Such is the *Bosworth* episode where Lord Stanley, crowning Richmond, Henry VII, on the battlefield before the troops, says “methinke ye are best worthye/to weare the crowne and be our Kinge” (HF st. 160). This is paralleled in *The Great Chronicle of London* where it is William Stanley who speaks ‘sayinge sir here I make you kyng of Engeland’.<sup>134</sup>

*PF* 132 contains two 8-line stanzas (sts. 74-75), where Richard, offered a horse and urged to escape from the battle, declares:

“by him that shope both sea and Land,  
King of England this day will I dye:  
one Foote will I neuer Flee  
whilst the breath is my brest within.”

8-line st. 75

This statement can be matched in both Valera and Vergil.<sup>135</sup> Because these speeches were made at moments of crisis — and in Richard’s case at least, by public figures — it is probable that they were true, or commonly held to be true, and that the poet’s audience knew of them.

### B. Conclusions

In the synopsis of the tale, it is immediately noticeable that the plot-units are basically simple, but that unlike either *Durham* or *Agincourte*, there are a large number of complex complementary-units with more than one subdivision and a large increase in units of the extrinsic voice. The tale’s complexity is thus seen to lie almost wholly in the complementary-units — many of which expand plot-units relating to the ‘Hero’, the Stanleys. Thus my synoptic system as applied to *PF* 132, suggests that narrative embellishments will mainly concern the Stanleys and because the basic tale is simple and for the most part, confined to historical facts, the essentials of the narrative may be historically accurate. This preliminary picture is confirmed in my later discussion of the poet’s manipulation of his matter.

Of the twenty paradigmatic items concerning the construction of a rhymed historical popular text, there are five which the poet does not follow. The reason for this divergence has been shown in the poet’s desire to laud the Stanleys and to please the members of his audience who are well acquainted with the facts. In short, this examination has found that the *Bosworth* poet’s deviation from the paradigm reflects his

---

134. *Great Chronicle*, p. 238. The sources are undecided as to whom the words can be attributed, but the sentiment itself is not questioned.

135. Now when Salazar . . . saw the treason of the King’s people, he went up to him and said: “Sire, take steps to put your person in safety, without expecting to have the victory in today’s battle, owing to the manifest treason of your following.” But the king replied: “Salazar, God forbid I yield one step. This day I will die as a King or win.”

Valera, ‘Spanish Account’, *Ricardian*, p. 2

On being urged to fly Richard ys sayd to have answeyrd that that very day he wold make end either of warre or lyfe.

Vergil, *Three Books*, p. 225

purpose and his *milieu*. The analysis of *Agincourte* showed that poem's commercial destination and that poet's disinterest in the battle: to him it was simply a saleable topic to be 'got up' from a prose account. The examination of *Bosworth* also shows an orientation of the work towards a probable pecuniary return: the poet attempts to please his patrons and his countrymen by celebrating a battle of personal interest to his audience, with a nice balance of factual accuracy and acceptable flattery.

The poet's desire to laud the Stanleys is seen first in the fact that he makes them his collective Hero despite the presence of Henry VII who is a more obvious candidate for the position. Secondly the poet tailors his narrative: motivation is detailed in order to justify the Stanleys' actions and to present them as an honourable and praiseworthy House. Similarly the interleaving of a fictional event and the direct narrative in William Stanley's 'defiance' shows him as being a chivalric character. The inclusion of a Stanley triumph not associated with *Bosworth* does the same for Lord Stanley — only the righteous are victorious. The linking of scenes through 'journey', 'messenger' or narrator's comment, both protects the Stanley reputation by using the extrinsic voice when too much detail might be embarrassing to the family, and also avoids offending the audience by respecting the facts and linking scenes through messages or journeys which are probably historically true. This respect for the audience's knowledge of the truth is also seen in the sourced dialogue. Here the poet apparently repeats an approximation of what was actually said at moments of high historical drama, which speeches, being of note, were probably well known to those whom he addressed.

An apparent respect for historical fact which is not confined solely to *Bosworth*, is also made clear through two exceptions to the paradigm seen in both *PF* 132 and *Agincourte*. First, both poets have *only* introduced spurious 'facts' into their accounts of direct action when historically their 'hero' behaved in a way which could be construed as being less than 'heroic'. Secondly, both poets have included some speech which is also found in other early accounts. Thus Item 6 of the paradigm (*Fictitious material will not be concerned with the direct action of the historical event itself*), is modified by both poets towards distorting unacceptable 'fact' concerning their 'hero', but Item 8 (*Dialogue will be unsourced*), is modified by both poets towards historical credence. Both texts illustrate the idea that untruths or exaggerations are more likely to be credited by an audience when mixed with matters the audience knows to be accurately presented — albeit within the well understood confines of poetic convention.

There are several areas in which *Bosworth* has a close affinity with *Durham* which are not present in *Agincourte*.

Both *Bosworth* and *Durham* have a composite 'hero'. In both texts the hero is praised collectively but a single individual (Sir William Stanley, Yeoman Copland), is shown acting heroically as an exemplar of the function. Both texts, as part of their presentation of the hero, include a short indication of their Christian piety and place it immediately prior to the battle. In *Durham* conflict is not entered into before mass has been heard; in *Bosworth* the Stanleys 'Gods service did see' (HF st. 105).

In both texts dialogue is used to expand character and underline the moral as well as highlight the hero. In *Durham* this is done through conversation designed to show the villain as a thoroughly reprehensible character. With the exception of a single passage — Richard's recitation of his intentions towards his foe which parallels the *Durham* approach — *Bosworth* adopts the opposite tactic towards the same end. Here the dialogue reveals various praiseworthy aspects of the Stanley's moral or physical character.

Both texts introduce a lessening of tension through laughter. In both, in the midst of a serious passage an expression is introduced ('breakfast', 'nose bleed'), which is incompatible with the current register. The poet momentarily descends from the formal to the informal to reduce the villain to a mundane level whence he can be the subject of the audience's superior amusement. In *Bosworth*, but not in *Durham*, this is expanded so that the hero and the audience share their mirth and for a moment the hero is less remote.

Finally, both texts reveal that they are not eye-witness accounts through errors in association: some characters are linked to others with whom they were not historically connected in the context of the events described by the poem.

The discussion of *Bosworth's* traditional content which follows, will show whether *PF 132* has any further affinities with *Durham* and whether the *Bosworth* poet is likely to have been a 'professional' Stanley minstrel or merely a dependant with a turn for verse.

**TABLE 3.** *Stylistic Structure of ‘Bosworth Feilde’*

Motifeme	Allomotif	Scene	Theme (Episode)
1. <i>Exhortation</i>	a. Prayer: God save England b. Prayer: Thank God for Hero c. Moral	Challenge	Revenge (expulsion- retribution- restoration)
2. <i>Scene Setting</i>	a. Naming of Hero b. Naming of Wrong: <i>Exile &amp; Lost Heritage</i> c. Naming of Villain		
3. <i>Transgression of Prohibition</i>	a. Hero arrives in homeland		
4. <i>Boast (Hero’s Brag)</i>	a. “I will be king or die” b. Naming of Helpers		
5. <i>Reprisal</i> (Villain’s)	a. Hero’s helper made hostage	Battle	
6. <i>Bidding to Battle</i> (Villain’s) (Embedded: Villain’s <i>Brag</i> )	a. Call to specific knights b. “I will crush resistance” c. Call to all knights		
7. <i>Battle Roll</i> (Villain’s)	a. Knights named		
8. <i>Departure</i>	a. Hero’s first Helper b. Hero’s second Helper		
9. <i>Journey</i> (Embedded: <i>Meeting</i> ) (Hero’s <i>Boast</i> )	a. Helpers travel b. Helpers meet Hero c. “I will be king”		
11. <i>Battle Preparation</i> (Hero’s) (Embedded: <i>Pre-Battle Address</i> )	a. ‘Battells’ arranged b. Hero thanks Helpers c. Hero promises reward d. Disposition of leadership		
12. <i>Battle Roll</i> (Hero’s)	a. Knights named		
13. <i>Battle Preparation</i> (Villain’s)	a. Forces assembled b. Ordnance arrayed c. Hostage brought forward		
14. <i>Combat</i> (Embedded: Villian’s <i>Brag</i> )	a. General: Battle is joined b. Specific: Hero fights c. Specific: Named Helper fights d. c) above is tripled e. General: Forces fight f. Specific: Villain asked to flee g. Specific: Refusal: “I will fight or die” h. Specific: Villain overcome		
15. <i>Enumeration of Casualties</i>		Triumph	
16. <i>Victory</i>	a. Hero acclaimed king b. Hero crowned		
17. <i>Boast: (Gloat)</i> (Indirect: narrative)	a. Villain’s body humiliated b. Villain’s body displayed		
18. <i>Valediction</i>	a. Moral: None can avoid Fortune b. Explicit: This is the end c. Prayer: God save the Stanleys		

## VI. Form and Tradition: *Bosworth Feilde*

On examining the episodic structure of *PF 132*, it becomes apparent that although *Durham* and *Agincourte* belong to type-episode category *Warfare* (*invasion-resistance-ejection*, and *invasion-resistance-occupation*), although nominally about a battle,

*Bosworth* is an example of the type-episode *Revenge* (*expulsion-retribution-restoration*). The hero has suffered *exile* ('banishment', HF sts. 11/12), and *loss-of-property* (his 'heritage', i.e. the throne (HF st. 14)).<sup>136</sup> His motive in transgressing the prohibition to return, is to overcome the usurper (the villain), thus inflicting *retribution* on his ejector and gaining *restitution* of his 'rights': the 'battle' is the means whereby *Revenge* is achieved.

The following will examine the continuity of the motifemic composition of *PF* 132. However it is first necessary to determine its constituent structural units. The basic overall representation is shown in the Table.

## A. *The Motifemes*

### a. *Exhortation*

This motifeme is present in an impaired form as it lacks the nuclear compulsory component — the *exhortation* itself. However it does have the peripheral optional components, *prayer*, *synopsis*, *source* and *moral* — all of which, although definitely present, differ in some way from the Middle English convention.<sup>137</sup>

The *prayer* commences by addressing God as the 'Creator': 'God that shope both sea and Land'.<sup>138</sup> Unconventionally it continues with an invocation to St. George (8-line st. 1), and the tenor of the whole prayer is 'God save England'. Unlike the Romance, this text does not request a blessing on the audience.

The prayer is followed by a loose variant of the conventional *synopsis* in which the hero is named, his qualities given and his establishment as a monarch applauded. The synopsis itself is unusual in that the narrator gives a précis of events *prior* to the hero's current adventure. However, because it is made clear that the current adventure succeeds, on consideration I do not think that this précis properly belongs to the motifeme *scene-setting* unless it is defined as an example of *assimilation* where a component fills several functions at the same time.<sup>139</sup>

The synopsis is as brief as possible and gives only the outline of a few principal and undeniable facts: the poet is neutral and presses on with his narrative as quickly as he can, taking pains to avoid matters open to partisan interpretation and argument — such as the details of the hero's banishment or reasons why he was 'bought and sold', and by whom.

The *source* 'with tounge I haue heard it told' (8-line st. 5) is positioned according to the traditional placement of this component but it is not at all clear whether it refers to the entire text or merely the stanza which follow.

Finally there is a *moral* component: the hero's ancestor and the hero 'serued Iesus Full hartlye' (8-line sts. 4 and 5), therefore they were successful and this

---

136. The actual historical status of Richard and Henry as 'hero' and 'villain' is not relevant in this discussion where their status is designated as it is set out in the text of *PF* 132.

137. For which see Chapter II of this study.

138. 'Land' is a scribal error: the Tanner MS. has the conventional 'sannde'.

139. Wittig, *Narrative Structures*, p. 153

should be an 'example' to us.<sup>140</sup>

b. *Valediction*

This motifeme contains the obligatory *prayer* and the optional components *moral* and *explicit*. There is no *source*.

*Prayer* does not specifically request a blessing on the audience but does direct the Deity's attention to the characters of the narrative. Since I have shown that some of the characters — the Stanleys and their followers, and probably some of the Ricardian men named in the Battle Roll — were likely to have been in the poet's audience, then some of the audience at least, is included in the narrator's request for the well-being of the characters' souls. Insofar as I know, this 'doubling' is unique. It is noted too that early convention has been followed in the request for 'spiritual mercy': the 'heavenly reward' is hoped for for all the characters before the narrator moves on to pray specifically for the Stanleys' worldly prosperity (8-line st. 82).<sup>141</sup>

The *moral* component differs from that in the *exhortation*: here it is a reminder that even emperors and kings are subject to the vagaries of Fortune — it is hinted however that kings will do well if they have the Stanleys to counsel them.

The *explicit* is conventional: 'now this doubtfull day is brought to an end' (8-line st. 82).<sup>142</sup>

c. *Terminal Status Quo*

This motifeme is not present in *PF* 132. This may be because the theme of 'general rejoicing' at Henry's succession has been touched upon in the *synopsis* component of the the *exhortation* motifeme.

d. *Boast*

i. *T-brag*

This brag, conventionally made by the villain, is present in *Bosworth* where the villain, Richard, in a very long speech is shown promising to inflict wholesale damage on his enemies (8-line sts. 25-27). However, the composition of this brag is interesting. Richard begins by wishing he could fight against the Turks, the Sultan of Syria, or Prester John: he continues by swearing he will kill knights and squires from Lancaster to Shrewsbury, and finishes with promising devastation for Wales.<sup>143</sup> The chances of him fighting the Turks *et cetera*, are nil and 'knights and squires' are legitimate troops. The real menace is directed against the Welsh, and the fate of the relatively distant Welsh — frequently at odds with the English — is not likely to upset the poet's audience very much.

The *T-brag* component *assessment of strength* is not present in *PF*

---

140. Tanner: 'Theis examples may we take by him . . .'  
*PF* 132: 'These examples may be taken by him . . .'

141. It must be noted though, that in asking for 'mercy' on the characters' 'soules', the narrator may have been thinking only of the dead — though this is not stated.

142. The Tanner MS. has 'dowtefull' and the meaning, 'valiant', is more obvious.

132.<sup>144</sup>

ii. *I-brag*

There are two passages which appear to be modified *I-brag* components of *boast*. The first follows convention in that it is uttered by the hero and demonstrates the hero's worth:

he said to them that with him weare,  
"Into England I am entred heare,  
my heritage is this Land within:  
they shall me boldlye bring & beare  
& loose my liff but Ile be King."

8-line st. 7

However this flouts tradition in that it is not said prior to imminent battle (the hero has just landed at Milford Haven). It is, I think, not said to hearten his companions because the hero immediately goes on to demonstrate something less than confidence in his present company by wishing for the Stanley's help (8-line sts. 8-9); it does not particularly demonstrate the valour of the hero's 'side', and the notion that he will personally *fight* until he is killed is only implicit.

The second passage is:

"one Foote will I neuer Flee  
whilst the breath is my brest within."

8-line st. 75

This is spoken during the battle and while the speaker is losing: it is therefore 'heroic' in the traditional manner both in the situation in which it is uttered and its wording (cf. *The Battle of Maldon*). The audience is not told if it encourages others or shows the valour of the speaker's companions because, against all tradition, here the 'heroic' speech is made by the villain and he *must* lose. Therefore his followers and his 'side' cannot be shown as being valorous.<sup>145</sup> Traditionally the *I-brag* is *never* a function of villainy. Here the poet has defied tradition. If it is postulated that the poet did not know of the convention, since, whichever way the

---

143. It is interesting to note here that during this speech Richard wishes 'I wold I had the great turke against me to fight' (HF st. 25). It is just possible that Richard may actually have said something like this because Nicholas von Poppelau, a Silesian noble, visited Richard in May, 1484 and records in his journal that in a private audience with the king, he gave Richard news of a victory the Hungarian king had just had over the Turks. Poppelau reports that Richard said:

"Iche wünschte dass mein Königreich an der Türkischen Grenge läge. Ich wolte gewiss mit meinum Volk allein, ohne Hülfe andrer Fürsten, nicht nor den Türken, sondern auch all meine Feinde leicht austreiben."

"I wish that my kingdom lay upon the Turkish border. With my people alone, without the support of other princes, I would certainly easily expel not only the Turks but also all my enemies."

My translation: 'Scriptores Rerum Silesiacarum', iii, 365, in Mancini, *Usurpation*, p. 137.

144. Because the apparent *T-brag*, spoken by the hero's 'helper' William Stanley when he declares his intention of inflicting damage on Richard (8-line sts. 22-24), is delivered to a messenger, it is in fact part of the motifeme *challenge*. The *T-brag* is not a function of the hero or his 'helpers'.

145. This compares with the *I-brag* from *Maldon*, cited in Chapter II of this study, where the brag-maker loses: however in that work the losers are the 'heroes': here the loser is the villain — villains never win and are not permitted to demonstrate 'heroic' quality.



speech is examined, it remains heroic and thus 'admirable', it must be concluded that at the very least the poet was willing to concede his villain some heroic qualities - thus mitigating his villainy and demonstrating some measure of authorial partiality.<sup>146</sup> Because Richard loses the battle he *has* to be a villain: God would not give victory to the unrighteous. The poet resolves his dilemma by making Richard a *pseudo-villain*: a villain in-spite-of-himself: hence the poet's insistence that Richard is motivated by 'wicked counsellors', (8-line sts. 10 and 12). If it is postulated that the poet did know the convention but nevertheless still gives the speech to his villain, then it may be, as I have previously argued, that he does so because historically Richard actually spoke it, or something like it. Since as is well known there is a corpus of rhymed narratives which extol the deeds of the Stanleys, it is likely that, in the old warrior tradition, they actively encouraged the propagation of their 'fame'. *PF* 132 is part of that corpus of Stanley eulogy and I conclude that the *Bosworth* poet had the difficult task of perpetuating Stanley glory whilst at the same time not departing too far from the historical events of the recent past and known to his listeners. By including the tenor of an actual speech he adds to the credibility of the whole narrative. That this speech contradicts tradition is unfortunate but to omit it would help to undermine the veracity of the poem which must be upheld if the Stanleys' deeds are to have any credence.

iii. *Gloat*

1. *Right*

This motifemic component is present in the traditional allomotif:

'thus Falshoodd endeth in shame & wonder'.

HF st. 34

The narrator, speaking in the extrinsic voice, is referring to Richard: the implication is that if he and his are 'false', then those opposing him must be 'true', and therefore 'right'.

2. *Enumeration of Casualties*

This component is not present.<sup>147</sup>

3. *Humiliation of Dead Villain*

This is a new component of *gloat* not present in the texts hitherto examined. It consists of the motifemes *despoiling of body* and *displaying of body*. The first involves stripping the villain's corpse 'naked as he hee borne did bee' (8-line st. 81). The second is:

in Newarke Laid was hee

---

146. It is interesting that earlier in the text Stanley advises the hero: "Be Eger to Fight & lothe to Flee," (HF st. 48), but it is the villain who fulfills the injunction.

147. Dead knights are listed (8-line sts. 76-79), but they are described by formulaic tags denoting worthiness: 'noble knight', 'Full doughtye', 'hardy & therto wight'. The tone is one of regret and the list is part of the narrative. Casualties are nowhere numbered.

that many a one might looke on him.

8-line st. 81

Since this stanza continues and ends with the ‘moral’ concerning Fortune, it is clear that the people are to be made aware of the victors’ achievement and their virtuous connection with Fortune in accomplishing this example of a fall of a prince who listened to wicked counsel.<sup>148</sup> However these allomotifs are present in all the primary sources which do more than simply record the king’s death. They reflect a ‘real life’ *gloat*. Again the poet has been bolstering his poem’s historical veracity. Because these new allomotifs are derived from fact it is probable that *humiliation of dead villain* is an aberrant component. No component can properly belong to a conventional system of stylistic narrative structure unless it is part of a recognisable tradition.<sup>149</sup>

## VII. Conclusions

I. My examination of the motifemic structure of *PF* 132, confirms the conclusions already reached through my scrutiny of the poet’s use of syntagmemic phrase and formulaic tag: the poet is familiar with Romance tradition. However it is now seen that in composing *Bosworth* there were two considerations which the poet had to take into account and which necessitated modification to the customary motifemic pattern. First, the fact that his topic covered an actual occurrence in which there was a high probability that the audience had played some part, and secondly, the necessity of praising the Stanleys. The poet had to juggle these two points and arrive at a result which would, on the one hand, not offend the Yorkist members of his audience or those listeners who knew what happened and wanted to hear themselves celebrated, while on the other, he had to laud and magnify the deeds of the Lancastrian Stanleys.

To that end therefore, the poet modifies the *synopsis* component of *exhortation* to exclude a *précis* of the battle itself: his audience is familiar with it and he need only briefly record carefully chosen introductory events and the undeniable fact that Henry is now king. He can praise his hero’s Christianity, call him ‘right-wise King’, and use his piety in the moral without argument as Henry would not have been victorious had he not had those qualities. The poet avoids the *terminal status quo*. This is probably because first, he has already covered the hero’s crowning in the narrative and secondly, his hero’s marriage to Elizabeth of York did not win universal approval. To laud the post-battle condition of the Lancastrian *associates* would have carried an implied contrast relating to the condition of some of the Yorkists — dead or attainted. Also, if the text was written post 1495 and William Stanley’s execution for treason, the position of the Stanley associates may have been uncomfortable and perhaps little improved by Henry’s accession. Historically the state of the common *populace* after the battle was miserable due in part, to an epidemic of the sweating sickness (already raging at the time of the battle), followed by various uprisings and, with the inception of the infamous Star Chamber, harsh laws.<sup>150</sup> In short, prudence and truth required this motifeme to be

---

148. Peters remarks (*Shadow King*, pp. 23-24), that the *rex inutilis*, i.e. a monarch perversely controlled by strong-willed men, ‘often came to be linked to the role of Fortune in the falls of princes.’

149. I have found no example of this motifeme in the Middle English Romance. Examples of *post mortem* humiliation in the Broadside Ballads are components of *punishment* — they are not part of *gloat*.

omitted. The *valediction* focuses on the vagaries of Fortune — an unexceptionable topic — prays for the characters of the tale (thus neatly covering both camps), and finishes with a prayer for the Stanleys and the current monarch — also unexceptionable. The *boast* motifeme sees the poet covering all his options by giving the *I-brag* to both hero and villain: the *T-brag* given to the villain refers to the damage he will inflict on traditional Romance enemies he is unlikely to encounter, legitimate fighters, and the Welsh. The brag is a remarkably muted piece of bloodthirstiness with the real savagery reserved for a relatively distant people about whom his audience is not likely to feel strongly. The *gloat* component *right* supports the idea that the ‘righteous’ always win: Henry is the ‘right-wise’ king and therefore Richard must be ‘false’. In attributing this ‘falseness’ to Richard through his capture of Lord Strange by a ruse, the poet underlines the Stanleys’ innocence — they did not see the trap — and does not offend the Yorkists since a ruse is inherently ‘false’ but if successful, also has an element of estimable intelligence or cunning. It is very noticeable that the poet nowhere judges the comparative rights and wrongs more exactly. The exception of *enumeration of casualties* is probably a pointed omission. Any recital of numbers of Yorkists killed will invite the listeners either to rejoice or deplore. If the audience is composed of men of both camps, conflict could result. Therefore the poet avoids general statistics, choosing instead to name a handful of particular knights and emphasising, not their deaths, but their bravery.

The examination of the poet’s manipulation of motifemes in *Bosworth* makes plain that the purposes governing his manipulation of historical fact are also evident in the text’s motifemic structure. The poet has utilised a high degree of skill: the text achieves the poet’s purpose by arranging tact, truth and Stanley eulogy in a nice balance. This is not the work of an inexperienced versifier. Neither is *Durham*. However whilst my previous examination of the two texts showed that there are certain affinities between them, my discussion of the motifemic structure does not reveal any similarities which cannot be accounted for by the fact that these poems are approximately contemporary works from roughly the same geographic area and belonging to the same genre. They may therefore be expected to exhibit some analogous features.

**II.** That the *Bosworth* poet’s object is to praise the Stanleys and at the same time to please other members of his audience, is evident throughout the text. The audience is seen to be conservative. They are familiar with traditional formulae from the Middle English Romance: this is reflected in the poet’s use of conventional tags to describe the knights of the Battle Roll. The motifemic structure of the poem is designed to follow familiar patterning: it opens and closes with traditional components, and the poet includes them in the customary order within the narrative where he can. The text is not an imitation Romance — the end-refrain is in the style of the Traditional Ballad — but there is an general Romance ‘dressing’ both in motifeme and lexis. It is concluded that the poet considered his audience would be best pleased (and perhaps flattered), to hear themselves described as if they were an integral part of a continuing Romance tradition.

The audience is made up of both Yorkists and Lancastrians: since *PF* 132 is an accepted item in the corpus of ‘Stanley’ literature it is quite plain that the poet expected the Stanleys to listen to it. Likewise the poet’s long description of Yorkist knights is quite evidently written for the pleasure of the characters concerned — the majority of whom can be shown to have been at Bosworth, as were the Stanleys.

Having shown that the poet was probably not an eye-witness of the battle, I

---

150. J. Lingard, *Abridgement of the History of England*, ed. J. Burke, 15th edn. (Dublin, nd.), p. 309 ff.

conclude that he obtained his information from people who were. I further conclude that his informants were his prospective audience because first, the information needed to compile the long list of knights almost certainly came from the knights themselves: secondly, although the poet's knowledge of historical fact appears to be accurate, it is curiously patchy and detail is present only in areas which come within the field of knowledge which could best be obtained from the Stanleys themselves, their close supporters or, as in the matter of Richard's ordnance, a Ricardian source which had participated in the battle.

The known fictional content of *Bosworth* is small and is solely related to the poet's magnification of the Stanleys. Where the poet has been unable to obtain information (such as the details of the actions of Richard and Henry immediately after the initial Lancastrian landing), he has declined to invent it. I therefore conclude that the methods used here for textual examination have revealed what cannot be determined by comparing *Bosworth* with the extant historical sources; namely that there is a very high probability that *PF* 132 is a primary historical document in its own right and that it is at least as reliable as its fellows.

## CHAPTER FOUR

### THE HISTORICAL ITEMS — NATIONAL BATTLES

#### THE BATTLE OF FLODDEN

#### I. Utilisation of Primary Material: PF 25 *Scottish Feilde*.

##### a. Introduction

*PF 25: Scottish Feilde* covers some of the events prior to Flodden and the battle itself. The engagement took place on the 9th of September, 1513, between the Scots under James IV and the English under the Earl of Surrey. They fought at Flodden — a hamlet situated on the river Till in northern Northumberland — a little south of the present Scottish border. The encounter was won by the English.

I propose in the following introduction, to give only a very brief description of the text as the topic has been carefully discussed in the editions of the poem issued by Oakden and most recently by Baird, with further information present in an article by Lawton and an additional work by Oakden.<sup>1</sup>

*PF 25* is not wholly unique to *The Percy Folio*.<sup>2</sup> There is one other copy known as *The Lyme Manuscript*.<sup>3</sup> This manuscript omits lines 255-277 present in *The Folio* although it is the older of the two: it was written down in the late sixteenth century. The poem's original date of composition is generally thought to be about 1515.

Baird believes that the poem 'is chronologically the last poem in the unrhymed alliterative style which had for a short time flourished as the so-called Alliterative Revival'.<sup>4</sup> Although in both mss the text is written in half-lines, Furnivall and Hales have printed it with the a-lines and b-lines forming one long-line punctuated with a colon at the caesura.<sup>5</sup> For ease of reference I use their linear numeration; for lexical quotation I refer to *The Folio* manuscript itself unless otherwise stated — although I write the a- and

- 
1. 'Scottish feilde', ed. J.P. Oakden, in *Remains Historical and Literary Connected with the Palatine Counties of Lancaster and Cheshire*, NS 94, Chetham Society (1935), [i-viii], 1-31; *Scottish Feilde and Flodden Feilde: Two Flodden Poems*, ed. I.F. Baird, (London, 1982); D.A. Lawton, 'Scottish Field: Alliterative Verse and Stanley Encomium in the Percy Folio', *Leeds Studies in English*, NS, 10 (1978), 42-57; J.P. Oakden, *Alliterative Poetry in Middle English* (Manchester, 1935: rpt. Hamden, Conn. 1968), *passim*.
  2. British Library Add. MS. 27,879, fol. 39<sup>f</sup>-44<sup>v</sup>.
  3. Presently in a damaged condition in the John Rylands Library, University of Manchester, with a more complete facsimile in the Bodleian Library, Oxford as MS.2a, Dep.c.129-30.
  4. Baird, *SF & FF*, p. xxi. This work will henceforward be referred to solely as 'Baird'.
  5. HF II, 212-34.

b-lines as one long-line. There are 422 long-lines and the poem is divided into two fitts, 190 lines in the first and 232 in the second.

Baird and Lawton argue convincingly that the text of *PF 25* originated in the north-west of England.<sup>6</sup> Baird adds that it perhaps ‘belonged to an oral tradition’.<sup>7</sup> Lawton disagrees but notes that the poem is ‘heavily indebted in style and phraseology to earlier alliterative poems’.<sup>8</sup> The vocabulary reflects the formulaic use of synonyms to maintain alliteration. For this reason the first hundred lines of the text contains thirty-nine lexemes now obsolete in either form or meaning: this compares with the eighteen in *Durham* and *Bosworth* and the seven in *Agincourt*.<sup>9</sup> It is not surprising to find that an analysis of the total population of verbs, nouns and adjectives shows a large number of lexemes immediately derived from Old English — approximately 78%. This is higher than the approximately 70% in *Durham*, but the slight increase is due to the high proportion of alliterative tags derived from an earlier tradition. It is perhaps a little surprising that the difference between *Scotish* and *Durham* is no larger, but this can be accounted for through the greater use of repetition in the former (a function of the formal alliterative style), where the poet fills a syntagmemic ‘slot’ from a necessarily limited number of alliterating synonyms.<sup>10</sup> That the two texts, in this area, do not differ more is probably related to their similar origins in chronology and geographic area.<sup>11</sup>

Leaving aside the large number of lexemes derived from earlier alliterative poetry and which probably tended towards the archaic even at the time of the text’s original composition, the poet’s style is consistent — with perhaps one exception:

then Phebus full faire : flourished out his beames  
*PF 25: 1.308; Lyme MS: 1.310*

I found this line slightly surprising in that it seems inappropriate to the text’s overall character. Nevertheless the general vocabulary of *Scotish* (other than the archaisms), is not dissimilar to *Durham*: the earlier ‘vaward’ (*PF 25*: ‘waward’ l. 89; *Lyme MS*: ‘vaward’ l. 90), is present as well as the later ‘vanward’ (*PF 25*: ‘vanwarde’ l. 262; *Lyme MS*: ‘vanwarde’ l.264).<sup>12</sup> As in *Durham* there is a solitary occurrence of the use of periphrastic conjugation with the auxiliary ‘did’ at line 420.<sup>13</sup> That the *Scotish* poet was

---

6. Baird, p. iv ff; Lawton, *SF*, p. 43 ff.

7. Baird, p. ix ff.

8. Lawton, *SF*, p.43 and *Middle English Alliterative Poetry and its Literary Background* (Cambridge, 1982), p. 5ff.

9. ‘carpe’ (line 5); ‘lite’ (9); ‘sege’ (12); ‘meanye’ (13); ‘worshipp’ (16); ‘behappen’ (17); ‘sith’ (18); ‘proued’ (20); ‘burne’ (21); ‘mold’ (22); ‘raked’ (23); ‘dearfe’ (25); ‘adread’ (25); ‘rayled’ (26); ‘bickered’ (27); ‘freshlie’ (30); ‘formen’ (30); ‘beronen’ (31); ‘dungen’ (32); ‘capull’ (33); ‘mine’ (34); ‘droughten’ (35); ‘fell’ (39); ‘told’ (40); ‘makeles’ (46); ‘freake’ (50); ‘besought’ (52); ‘nicked’ (53); ‘greathes’ (57); ‘leede’ (58); ‘saddest’ (59); ‘wends’ (68); ‘glenten’ (71); ‘selcoth’ (72); ‘witt’ (75); ‘delven’ (82); ‘tilden’ (91); ‘fooder’ (94); ‘halched’ (98).

10. In my analyses of lexemes deriving from OE, regardless of repetition each specific word has only been counted once.

11. I note that in both poems there is a high frequency of the use of the present indicative third person plural in -en.

12. See Ch. II of this study.

13. Also like *Durham*, this solitary occurrence is present in a section of the text which may not now be as it originally appeared.

in fact familiar with *Durham*, is very evident from the fact (mentioned in the previous chapter) that both works contain remarkably similar passages (*PF* 79: sts. 4-5; 35; 58: *PF* 25: ll. 109-10; 123-24) where the Scots invade because they believe that the strength of England currently lies only in ‘millers’, ‘priests’ and the like. It will be shown presently that in addition to the above similarities there are others. These similarities may be a function of the fact that the events of Flodden were historically a virtual repetition of those at Durham, or, despite the overt difference in the styles of the two texts, they may point to a possibility that both the texts — which are contemporary — were composed by the same author.

## b. Synopsis of the Tale

There are no stanzaic divisions in *Scottish* and, by and large, the poet follows an alliterative tradition in qualifying the matter of the a-line within the b-line and/or subsequent lines.<sup>14</sup> For instance:

then he sent with his companye : a knight that was noble,  
Sir Iohn Stanley, the stout knight : that sterne was of deeds,  
— there was neuer bearne borne : that day bare him better.

*PF* 25: ll. 293-95

Thus the plot-unit of the above is ‘he sent . . . Sir John Stanley’: the remainder of the information is complementary. This patterning, with minor variations, is consistent throughout the poem: the plot-units are present in the a-line to such an extent that the erasure of the b-lines would leave the narrative itself almost undisturbed. Because it is a function of the b-line to expand the a-line the text contains a great deal of complementary matter — frequently repetitive. The synoptic method I have hitherto used, is, in *Scottish*, frustrated by the poem’s alliterative form and for this text is therefore suspended. For this reason a short précis of the tale based on Hales’s marginal abstract, now follows:

### **The first fitt:**

The narrator prays for God’s assistance. He sets out a short synopsis of the happenings which led to Bosworth and the death of Richard III. Briefly he précis the reign of Henry VII. The story begins with Henry VIII who, leaving the Earl of Surrey as the Lord Lieutenant of England, invades France with Buckingham, Derby, Shrewsbury and Northumberland. They land at Calais, and, calling a council of war, Henry vows to take ‘Turwine’ which is besieged.

Meanwhile the French King — at Paris — is advised to incite the Scots to invade England, and, taking some gold, Sir Delamont is sent on the errand. The King of Scots agrees to invade. He summons his army. Lord Maxwell, with a force of 10,000, is sent on a reconnaissance into England. He proceeds to the Millfield. The English commons fly (Lord Dacres stayed inside Carlisle); Sir William Bulmer goes against the Scots — 900 English against 10,000 Scotsmen. At dawn battle is joined and the Scots fly — more than 240 are killed and a like number are made prisoner.

### **The second fitt:**

The Lord Maxwell flees back to the Scottish king and reports his defeat. The king,

---

14. T. Turville-Petre, *The Alliterative Revival* (Cambridge, 1977), pp. 69-71, and Ch. III (pp. 48-68); Baird, p. xiii ff.

calling him a coward, says he will avenge him, and advances. He besieges Norham Castle, and Surrey hearing of this, summons an army: the Bishop of Ely [James Stanley], Edward Stanley (with 10,000 knights); Sir John Stanley (with 4,000 tenants) muster — these men wear the ‘eagle badge’ of the Stanleys. Assembling at Boulton they move forward until the Scots can be seen on a high hill. The English make camp and stay there for four days. They are cold, hungry and short of water, so the captains tell the lords that if battle is not soon begun they are going to go home.

Surrey prepares: Lord Howard commands the van with 14,000 men, Sir Edward Howard has the left wing of Cheshire men — who are not used to being commanded by anyone but a Stanley. Lord Lumley has the right wing with Lord Clifford; Sir William Percy came and Sir William Bulmer too. Surrey leads the rearward with Lord Scroope on its right wing with the Bishop of Ely (who is now alas, dead). Sir John Stanley (Lord Mouteagle) leads the left wing with the men from Lancashire. Night falls and they camp near Berwick.

Day dawns. The Scots are seen to be moving. Battle is joined: trumpets sound, guns shoot, archers let fly. The Scots charge with spears and swords: the English counter with bills. Following Lord Dacres, the Shire-men fly: *they had no Stanley to command them!* Many squires die: Sir John Booth, Sir William Warkhop, Rotherham, Kinderton, ‘Hauford’, Savage and Laurence.

The Scots see the English scatter: the king now asks whose are the banners belonging to the men who have not fled. A herald says that they belong to the Stanleys — Lord Stanley’s banner is there though he is not — under Keighley, Gerrard and Molyneux. In plain view is the banner of ‘St. Towder’ [‘St. Audrey’ — belonging to James Stanley], also that of Mouteagle and young Lord Dacres. The Scottish king says he will fight them and advances.

Battle is joined and lasts four hours. Yorkshire, Derbyshire and Lancashire fight very hard and save the day. In sight of the banner of Bishop Stanley [Ely] the King of Scots is killed; then the remainder of the Scots fly. They are followed by the English who kill them. The Scots lose 15,000 men.

Surrey sends the news to Henry VIII, in France. He provides a ‘sowle knell’ for the Scottish king with a 1,000 gun salute.

The narrator announces that this is the end of his story, adds that the men had to return home on foot because the borderers had stolen their horses, identifies himself as a gentleman of Baguley and finally prays for his listeners.

north-west of England.<sup>15</sup> Baird adds that it perhaps ‘belonged to an oral tradition’.<sup>16</sup> Lawton disagrees but notes that the poem is ‘heavily indebted in style and phraseology to earlier alliterative poems’.<sup>17</sup> The vocabulary reflects the formulaic use of synonyms to maintain alliteration. For this reason the first hundred lines of the text contains thirty-nine lexemes now obsolete in either form or meaning: this compares with the eighteen in *Durham* and *Bosworth* and the seven in *Agincourt*.<sup>18</sup> It is not surprising to find that an analysis of the total population of verbs, nouns and adjectives shows a large number of lexemes immediately derived from Old English — approximately 78%. This is higher than the approximately 70% in *Durham*, but the slight increase is due to the high proportion of alliterative tags derived from an earlier tradition. It is perhaps a little

---

15. Baird, p. iv ff; Lawton, *SF*, p. 43 ff.

16. Baird, p. ix ff.

17. Lawton, *SF*, p.43 and *Middle English Alliterative Poetry and its Literary Background* (Cambridge, 1982), p. 5ff.



surprising that the difference between *Scotish* and *Durham* is no larger, but this can be accounted for through the greater use of repetition in the former (a function of the formal alliterative style), where the poet fills a syntagmatic 'slot' from a necessarily limited number of alliterating synonyms.<sup>19</sup> That the two texts, in this area, do not differ more is probably related to their similar origins in chronology and geographic area.<sup>20</sup>

Leaving aside the large number of lexemes derived from earlier alliterative poetry and which probably tended towards the archaic even at the time of the text's original composition, the poet's style is consistent — with perhaps one exception:

then Phebus full faire : flourished out his beames

*PF* 25: 1.308; *Lyme MS*: 1.310

I found this line slightly surprising in that it seems inappropriate to the text's overall character. Nevertheless the general vocabulary of *Scotish* (other than the archaisms), is not dissimilar to *Durham*: the earlier 'vaward' (*PF* 25: 'waward' l. 89; *Lyme MS*: 'vaward' l. 90), is present as well as the later 'vanward' (*PF* 25: 'vanwarde' l. 262; *Lyme MS*: 'vanwarde' l.264).<sup>21</sup> As in *Durham* there is a solitary occurrence of the use of periphrastic conjugation with the auxiliary 'did' at line 420.<sup>22</sup> That the *Scotish* poet was in fact familiar with *Durham*, is very evident from the fact (mentioned in the previous chapter) that both works contain remarkably similar passages (*PF* 79: sts. 4-5; 35; 58; *PF* 25: ll. 109-10; 123-24) where the Scots invade because they believe that the strength of England currently lies only in 'millers', 'priests' and the like. It will be shown presently that in addition to the above similarities there are others. These similarities may be a function of the fact that the events of Flodden were historically a virtual repetition of those at Durham, or, despite the overt difference in the styles of the two texts, they may point to a possibility that both the texts — which are contemporary — were composed by the same author.

### c. Synopsis of the Tale

There are no stanzaic divisions in *Scotish* and, by and large, the poet follows an alliterative tradition in qualifying the matter of the a-line within the b-line and/or subsequent lines.<sup>23</sup> For instance:

- 
18. 'carpe' (line 5); 'lite' (9); 'sege' (12); 'meanye' (13); 'worshipp' (16); 'behappen' (17); 'sith' (18); 'proued' (20); 'burne' (21); 'mold' (22); 'raked' (23); 'dearfe' (25); 'adread' (25); 'rayled' (26); 'bickered' (27); 'freshlie' (30); 'formen' (30); 'beronen' (31); 'dungen' (32); 'capull' (33); 'mine' (34); 'droughten' (35); 'fell' (39); 'told' (40); 'makeles' (46); 'freake' (50); 'besought' (52); 'nicked' (53); 'greathes' (57); 'leede' (58); 'saddest' (59); 'wends' (68); 'glenten' (71); 'selcoth' (72); 'witt' (75); 'delven' (82); 'tilden' (91); 'fooder' (94); 'halched' (98).
  19. In my analyses of lexemes deriving from OE, regardless of repetition each specific word has only been counted once.
  20. I note that in both poems there is a high frequency of the use of the present indicative third person plural in -en.
  21. See Ch. II of this study.
  22. Also like *Durham*, this solitary occurrence is present in a section of the text which may not now be as it originally appeared.
  23. T. Turville-Petre, *The Alliterative Revival* (Cambridge, 1977), pp. 69-71, and Ch. III (pp. 48-68); Baird, p. xiii ff.

then he sent with his companie : a knight that was noble,  
Sir Iohn Stanley, the stout knight : that sterne was of deeds,  
— there was neuer bearne borne : that day bare him better.

PF 25: ll. 293-95

Thus the plot-unit of the above is 'he sent . . . Sir John Stanley': the remainder of the information is complementary. This patterning, with minor variations, is consistent throughout the poem: the plot-units are present in the a-line to such an extent that the erasure of the b-lines would leave the narrative itself almost undisturbed. Because it is a function of the b-line to expand the a-line the text contains a great deal of complementary matter — frequently repetitive. The synoptic method I have hitherto used, is, in *Scottish*, frustrated by the poem's alliterative form and for this text is therefore suspended. For this reason a short précis of the tale based on Hales's marginal abstract, now follows:

#### **The first fitt:**

The narrator prays for God's assistance. He sets out a short synopsis of the happenings which led to Bosworth and the death of Richard III. Briefly he précis the reign of Henry VII. The story begins with Henry VIII who, leaving the Earl of Surrey as the Lord Lieutenant of England, invades France with Buckingham, Derby, Shrewsbury and Northumberland. They land at Calais, and, calling a council of war, Henry vows to take 'Turwine' which is besieged.

Meanwhile the French King — at Paris — is advised to incite the Scots to invade England, and, taking some gold, Sir Delamont is sent on the errand. The King of Scots agrees to invade. He summons his army. Lord Maxwell, with a force of 10,000, is sent on a reconnaissance into England. He proceeds to the Millfield. The English commons fly (Lord Dacres stayed inside Carlisle); Sir William Bulmer goes against the Scots — 900 English against 10,000 Scotsmen. At dawn battle is joined and the Scots fly — more than 240 are killed and a like number are made prisoner.

#### **The second fitt:**

The Lord Maxwell flees back to the Scottish king and reports his defeat. The king, calling him a coward, says he will avenge him, and advances. He besieges Norham Castle, and Surrey hearing of this, summons an army: the Bishop of Ely [James Stanley], Edward Stanley (with 10,000 knights); Sir John Stanley (with 4,000 tenants) muster — these men wear the 'eagle badge' of the Stanleys. Assembling at Boulton they move forward until the Scots can be seen on a high hill. The English make camp and stay there for four days. They are cold, hungry and short of water, so the captains tell the lords that if battle is not soon begun they are going to go home.

Surrey prepares: Lord Howard commands the van with 14,000 men, Sir Edward Howard has the left wing of Cheshire men — who are not used to being commanded by anyone but a Stanley. Lord Lumley has the right wing with Lord Clifford; Sir William Percy came and Sir William Bulmer too. Surrey leads the rearward with Lord Scroope on its right wing with the Bishop of Ely (who is now alas, dead). Sir John Stanley (Lord Mouteagle) leads the left wing with the men from Lancashire. Night falls and they camp near Berwick.

Day dawns. The Scots are seen to be moving. Battle is joined: trumpets sound, guns shoot, archers let fly. The Scots charge with spears and swords: the English counter with bills. Following Lord Dacres, the Shire-men fly: *they had no Stanley to command them!* Many squires die: Sir John Booth, Sir William Warkhop, Rotherham, Kinderton, 'Hauford', Savage and Laurence.

The Scots see the English scatter: the king now asks whose are the banners belonging to the men who have not fled. A herald says that they belong to the Stanleys — Lord Stanley's banner is there though he is not — under Keighley,

Gerrard and Molyneux. In plain view is the banner of 'St. Towder' ['St. Audrey' — belonging to James Stanley], also that of Mouteagle and young Lord Dacres. The Scottish king says he will fight them and advances.

Battle is joined and lasts four hours. Yorkshire, Derbyshire and Lancashire fight very hard and save the day. In sight of the banner of Bishop Stanley [Ely] the King of Scots is killed; then the remainder of the Scots fly. They are followed by the English who kill them. The Scots lose 15,000 men.

Surrey sends the news to Henry VIII, in France. He provides a 'sowle knell' for the Scottish king with a 1,000 gun salute.

The narrator announces that this is the end of his story, adds that the men had to return home on foot because the borderers had stolen their horses, identifies himself as a gentleman of Baguley and finally prays for his listeners.

A. *The 'Scottish' Poet's Account and the Historical Sources.*

Unlike *Bosworth*, the events at the battle of Flodden are the subject of many contemporary accounts.<sup>24</sup> The *Scottish* poet does not seem to have been indebted to any source now extant. It is not possible to say whether the poet was himself present at the action: Oakden feels that 'judging by his misrepresentations and confused account, he was not present': Baird however, thinks that he may have been there, as does Robson who bases his belief on the fact that the narrator sometimes speaks in the first person plural.<sup>25</sup> The occurrence of the domestic 'our' and 'we' is a well-known narrative convention and does not necessarily signify authorial involvement in the event described. As I have shown in my previous examination of 'fact' in the rhymed historical narrative — and as will shortly be shown in relation to *Scottish* — suppression or distortion of events frequently relates to the poet's purpose in composing his work: it does not follow that he was always unaware of the truth. The *Scottish* poet has for instance, shown the episode of Lord Maxwell's disastrous foray as being an immediate reason for the main Scottish advance (due to the King of Scots' desire for revenge.<sup>26</sup> However this episode, known to the Scots as the 'Ill Road', was a separate event. It was a preliminary raid and not part of

---

24. *Primary Sources*

'Gazette of the Battle of Flodden, Sept. 1513', in J. Pinkerton, *The History of Scotland* (London, 1797), II, 456-58.

'La rotta di Scocesi', trans. W.M. Mackenzie, in *The Secret of Flodden*, (Edinburgh, 1931), pp. 95-123.  
'The trewe encountre or Batayle . . . betwene England and Scotland', in John Skelton, *A Ballade of the Scottysse Kynge*, ed. J. Ashton, (London 1882), pp. 63-78.

*A Source Book of Scottish History*, 2nd edn., ed. W.C. Dickinson & I.A. Milne, 2nd edn. (London, 1958) Vol. II.

*Flodden Papers: Diplomatic Correspondence between the Courts of France and Scotland 1507-1517*, ed. M. Wood (Edinburgh, 1933).

*Letters and Papers Foreign and Domestic of the Reign of Henry VIII*, ed. J.S. Brewer, revised R.H. Brodie (London, 1920: rpt. Vaduz, 1965) Vol. I, Pt. II.

*Original Letters Illustrative of English History*, ed. H. Ellis, Vol. I (London, 1824).

*Later Sources*

*The Mirror for Magistrates*, ed. L.B. Campbell (Oxford, 1938: rpt. London, 1960).

Edward Hall, *Hall's Chronicle* (London, 1809).

\_\_\_\_\_, *The Union of the Two Noble Families of Lancaster and York: 1550*, (facsim. Menston, 1970).

Raphael Holinshed, *England*, Vol. III of *Chronicles of England, Scotland and Ireland*, 6 vols., and *Scotland*, Vol. V of the same work (London, 1808).

John Leslie, *The Historie of Scotland wryten first in latin by . . . Jhone Leslie . . . and translated . . . by James Dalrymple . . . 1596*, 2 vols., ed. E.G. Cody and W. Murison, *Scottish Text Society*, 5, 6 (1888-95).

Robert Lindsay of Pitscottie, *The Historie of and Cronicles of Scotland*, 3 vols., ed. Ae.J. Mackay, *Scottish Text Society*, 42, 43, 60 (1899-1911), I.

W.M. Mackenzie, *The Secret of Flodden*, Edinburgh, 1931.

J.D. Mackie, 'The English Army at Flodden' in *Miscellany of the Scottish History Society*, 8 (1951), 35-85.

William Martyn, *The Historie of the Lives of the Kings of England*, (London, 1635).

John Skelton, *A Ballade of the Scottysse Kynge*, London 1513, intro. J. Ashton (facsim. London, 1882).

Polydore Vergil, *Historia Anglica (1555)* (facsim. Menston, 1972)

*Editions of 'Scottish Feilde'*

'Scottish Feilde', ed. J.P. Oakden, in *Remains Historical and Literary Connected with the Palatine Counties of Lancaster and Chester*, Chetham Society, NS 94 (1935), 1-13.

*Scottish Feilde and Flodden Feilde: Two Flodden Poems*, ed. I.F. Baird, (New York, 1982).

*Scottish Field*, ed. J. Robson, *Chetham Miscellanies*, Chetham Society, 2 (1856), [iii]-26.

25. Robson, p. iv; Oakden, p. x; Baird, p. xx.

the on-going Flodden campaign as the poet shows it.<sup>27</sup> Furthermore, it was led by Lord Home not Lord Maxwell. Because the *Scottish* poet seems to have erred here, it does not necessarily follow that he was not at Flodden. Therefore I conclude, with Baird, that the poet's source *may* conceivably have been personal experience: if he were present among the Shire-men who fled, he may have had to conflate what he himself knew with information from other sources amongst the forces who did not retreat.

## II. The 'Durham' Paradigm and *Scottish Feilde*

### A. Examination

Some aspects of the poet's treatment of this battle have been discussed in the literature.<sup>28</sup> Lawton concludes that 'the real *raison d'être* of *Scottish Field* is Stanley eulogy'.<sup>29</sup> Baird agrees: 'The Battle of Flodden was clearly an opportunity to sing the praises of the Stanleys and their friends'.<sup>30</sup> I will however, argue that Stanley eulogy is not the poem's sole *raison d'être*. I show that the defence of the Shire-men is parallel to the exaltation of the Stanleys and has equal prominence. Nevertheless, because I agree substantially with Baird's discussion of the *Scottish* poet's manipulation of some of the historical facts, I keep my own examination brief when surveying a topic he has covered.<sup>31</sup>

The following demonstrates that *Scottish Feilde* is not simply a celebration of a famous historical event, but is a logical and carefully reasoned text intended to refute any charge of cowardice which might be made in respect to the Shire-men's flight from battle. The presentation of the Stanleys as being of great importance, power and valour is essential to the poet's exculpation of the Shire-men: but the magnification and praise of that family *as such* is not the poet's sole major consideration.

All but four of the items taken from the *Durham* paradigm (nos. 5, 6, 11 and 15), are valid in *Scottish*. The following discussion commences with those items which are least important in relation to the poet's purpose; continues to those which the poet has clearly used to further the poem's intention, and closes with the items which the poet's reasons for writing have required him to alter so greatly that they no longer agree with the paradigm.

The chronological and linear sequences are accurate (Item 7: *Chronology*; Item 13: *Episode: linear sequence*). At first sight it seems that the picture of Henry in France is not properly part of the 'Flodden' episode. Historically the connection is tenuous, but since this analysis relates to the poet's view of events and since he has incorporated it into his tale as an inherent part of his story — both through the initial linkage and four

---

26. *Lyme MS.* l. 202: This line in *PF* 25 is corrupt.

27. Hall, *Chronicle*, p. 556; Holinshed, *Historie*, V, 472; III, 591.

28. Baird, pp. xv-xxi; Lawton, *SF*, pp. 43-46.

29. Lawton, p. 45.

30. Baird, p. xv.

31. Baird, *SF* & *FF*, pp. xv-xxi. All subsequent references to Baird in the course of the following discussion are to these pages.

subsequent mentions later in the work — it has become, in this text, part of the whole episode and not a ‘floating’ scene as was the Siege of Berwick in *Bosworth*.

The sequence of scenes resolves into a grand climax when Henry, in France is told that the realm is ‘restored’ and ‘the King of Scotts is killed : with all his cursed Lords’ (l. 407) (Item 14: *Climax*). He rejoices and shows his pleasure with a grim joke appropriate to a warrior-king (Item 12: *Light relief*):

When the king of his kindnesse : hard these words  
he saith: “I will sing him a sowle knell : with sound of my gunnes.”  
PF 25: l. 407

This breaks the tension caused by the uncertainty of how the king would receive the news — hinted at in ‘of his kindnesse’ — and the rocks ring with a thousand-gun salute (ll. 410-12).

There is very little dialogue in *PF 25* and what there is has no parallel in the original accounts (Item 8: *Dialogue and source*). Neither does the dialogue forward the action of the essential tale. As in the paradigm, it remarks the movement of characters: ‘I am bound to goe : as ye me bidd wold’ (l. 116), ‘I am beaten backe. . . .’ (l. 194), ‘bid him enter into England : & venter him seluen’ (l. 107), (Item 10: *Dialogue & movement*).<sup>32</sup>

*PF 25* agrees with the paradigm in that it focuses on a few characters taken from a large number (Item 3: *Character focus*). Because the poet concentrates the character of principal villain on the King of Scots and to a lesser extent, his *mandateur*, the French king, as leaders of their respective peoples, he names neither (Item 4: *Nomenclature*). He refers to the Scots collectively: ‘many Scots & Ketherickes’ (l. 135), ‘all these scaclech Scotts’ (l. 170). He names only one subject of the Scottish king, ‘Maxwell’, and one Frenchman: ‘Delamont’.<sup>33</sup> He presents a faceless enemy without specific identity and which contrasts with the individuality given to the English. The poet names twenty-five of the English fighters — but only once.<sup>34</sup> Multiple citations are reserved for Surrey (who commanded the battle), Sir William Bulmer [‘Bawmer’] (who commanded the force which defeated the sortie of the ‘Ill Road’), and of course, various Stanleys.<sup>35</sup>

The poet’s aim is to stress, and where necessary magnify, the importance of Stanleys and *through this*, exculpate their followers from the charge of cowardice following the report that ‘Cheshyre men and other dyd flee’.<sup>36</sup> To do this he presents

---

32. This speech is part of the French Council’s advice to Louis to incite James’s invasion: the direct action is not yet affected as here it is only a suggestion towards future action. The offering of the the French bribe, the acceptance of which forwards the action, is presented later as part of the narrative (ll. 116-28).

33. As Lawton notes in detail, the poet has confused Lord Maxwell with Lord Home: Lawton, *SF*, p. 43-44. ‘Delamont’ (l. 112) was historically the ‘La Mothe-Fénélon’ referred to as ‘De la Mot’ or ‘De La Mothe’ in the sources: the *Lyme MS.* has ‘Sir de la Mote’ (l. 114) and therefore it can be seen that the *Folio*’s ‘Delamont’ is a scribal error peculiar to that manuscript. HF I, 218, n.1; Holinshed, ‘Scotland’ p. 472-73; *Flodden Papers*, p. 44.

34. As might be expected many of these names are from families cited in *Bosworth*.

35. As Baird points out, little mention is made of Sir Edward Stanley who historically played a prominent part in the battle. Baird suggests that this surprising omission may be ‘due to the quarrel between Sir Edward and the 2nd Earl of Derby.’ Baird then cites detail of the Earl’s will in which he disinherits Sir William with regard to a particular bequest. Baird then continues ‘If the poem was to be recited before the Earl too much praising of Sir Edward would not be welcome’: Baird, p.xxi.

first, the Stanleys as part of the composite 'Hero', secondly the King of Scots is shown as the principal 'Villain' and thirdly, as Baird points out, he selects the Howards, and to a lesser extent Lord Dacres, as 'scape-goats' to take the blame for the defection of the Shire-men.<sup>37</sup>

The poet directs attention towards his hero, the Stanleys, through the omission of matters peripheral to the essentials of the actual event. These either did not include a Stanley or could not be used in his exculpation of the Shire-men because they played no part in the expected event (Item 1: *Simplification*). The principal omissions lie in the early part of the narrative. Historically, events had been shaping towards Flodden for some time but this is not evident from the text of *PF* 25.<sup>38</sup> After a scene-setting preamble which deals with the Stanleys' valour at Bosworth and a quick resumé of the exploits of Henry VII, the poet turns to Henry VIII's expedition to France. He covers Henry's siege of 'Turwine', the French king's successful attempt to instigate the Scottish invasion and the story proper commences with the King of Scot's martial preparations. The poet omits the story of the Scottish monarch's lengthy dalliance with Lady Heron of Ford who seduced him, discovered his secrets, and diminished his army which, at a stand while their leader tarried, suffered attrition through a growing shortage of victuals and an increase in desertion.<sup>39</sup> Lady Heron may also have hoped to save her castle but Ford, like Wark, Etal and Norham was eventually razed.<sup>40</sup> The poet omits all mention of the former fortresses except Norham which he leaves at a crucial point in the siege:

without succour come soone : their sorrow is the more

*PF* 25: 1. 208

The poet then continues with a description of the English martial preparations leaving an unspoken implication that the men of Norham were probably rescued after the victory at Flodden. They were not. The poet also avoids the journeys and adventures of the Heralds, 'Rouge Croix' and 'Islay', who were involved with lengthy negotiations between the opposing forces.<sup>41</sup> After the forces begin to move together, the poet omits only a few scenes because the participation of his Hero and the Shire-men becomes greater: however he does omit the difficulty the English encountered in their efforts to entice the Scots down from their impregnable position on the mount of Flodden and their use of a smoke-screen to hide troop-movements.<sup>42</sup>

Historical detail is generalised in order to avoid diverting attention from the poet's

---

36. *Trewe encountre*, p. 73; Hall, *Chronicle*, p. 562; 'Articles of the bataill betwix the K. of Scottes and therle of Surrey', item 2246 in *Letters and Papers*, p. 1005; Letter from Thomas Ruthal, Bishop of Durham to Thomas Wolsey, item 2283, *ibid.*, p. 1021; Letter from Lord Dacres to Henry VIII, item 2836, *ibid.*, p. 1055.

37. Baird, p. xvii-xviii.

38. M. Wood (ed.), *Introduction to Flodden Papers*, pp. xvii-lxix.  
Where I give only one or two source references it is not to be assumed that there are no others. For brevity I give the most detailed. Where details are spread over several accounts, or where the accounts vary widely I give more.

39. Lindsay, *Historie*, p. 263 ff.

40. *Trewe Encountre*, p. 64; Leslie, *Historie*, p. 144; Lindsay, *Historie*, p. 262; Letter from Bishop of Durham to Wolsey dated 19.9.1513, item 2279 in *Letters and Papers*, p. 1513-14.

41. *Gazette*, p. 456; *Trewe Encountre*, p. 64 ff.

42. *Trewe Encountre*, p. 71 ff; Mackie, 'English Army', p. 38 ff; Vergil, *Anglica*, p. 640; Hall, *Chronicle*, p. 561.

purpose (Item 2: *Details*). For instance, his description of the battle — apart from the flight of the Shire-men (ll. 330-36) — is dealt with in a conventional manner. He does not refer to the ordnance or other weapons specific to Flodden except as part of a general picture: ‘we blanked them with bills’ (l. 328). It has been suggested that the English ‘bills’ played a large part in the English victory, but the poet gives no hint of this: the upper hand was gained, as far as the poet is concerned, solely through the valour of the Stanleys and their men.<sup>43</sup>

The English, as ‘Hero’, are the only characters who can be permitted to have heroic qualities and therefore the poet is specifically concerned to shun details which reflect credit on the King of Scots. No mention is made of the fact that the King of Scots led his men on foot, fought bravely and before he was killed, hacked his way to within a spear-length of Surrey: ‘le d.Roy d.Escosse fut tue dedens la longueur d’une lance du d.Conte de Surrey’; ‘O what a noble and triumphant courage was thys for a kynge to fyghte in a battayll as a meane souldier!’ exclaims Hall. The poet has not included details of tactical manoeuvres for position, amongst which was the necessity for the English to pass the river Till in full view of the Scots.<sup>44</sup> Although it is possible that the poet did not know that the Scottish king is alleged deliberately to have withheld his gunfire during the crossing, it is possible that it is not included because neither here nor in the manner of his dying, is it part of the poet’s intention to attribute anything ‘heroic’ to the enemy king.<sup>45</sup>

The narrator is of course partisan — as witness the fifteen uses of ‘our’ and the five of ‘we’ (Item 17: *Partisan*).<sup>46</sup> That he thought highly of the Stanleys and the Shire-men is evident from the purpose of the text, and the laudatory adjectives bestowed upon them. However this is especially highlighted in the poet’s heartfelt and lengthy eulogy for James Stanley, Bishop of Ely whose death in 1515 fell between Flodden and the time when the poet composed his text (ll. 281-92).<sup>47</sup>

The ‘Hero’ has right on his side (Item 18: *Right*). The *Scottish* poet chooses to use

---

43. Mackenzie, *Secret of Flodden*, pp. 91-93.

43. *Gazette*, p. 456; Hall, *Chronicle*, p. 562.  
‘non longius latitudine lancea’: Letter from Dr. William Knight to Cardinal Bainbridge, dated 20.9.1513, cited in *Original Letters*, I, 163-64.

44. *Gazette*, p. 456; *Trewe Encountre*, p. 71.

45. Lindesay, *Historie*, p. 269-70; Holinshed, ‘Scotland’, p. 478.  
The crossing of the Till is reminiscent of the crossing of the ‘Panta’ in the Old English heroic poem *The Battle of Maldon* — though there it is the heroes who permit the villains to approach unmolested.

46. These are: ‘Henery the 8th : our most dread Lord’ (l. 49); ‘our most valiant realme’ (l. 62); ‘our most dread king’ (l. 63); ‘our lord’ (ll. 64, 269); ‘our king’ (ll. 74, 83, 96, 102); ‘our tentes’ (ll. 91, 253); ‘our standards’ (l. 314); ‘our enemies’ (l. 315); ‘our men’ (l. 351); ‘our Englishmen’ (l. 390). ‘wee tilde’ (l. 253); ‘wee busked’ (l. 314); ‘wee seene’ (l. 315); ‘wee blanked them’ (l. 328); ‘wee mett him’ (l. 377).

47. Scholars have suggested that the apparent colophon to *PF 25* in which a ‘gentleman’ from ‘Bagily’ identifies himself as the author, may have been added by a later minstrel. (See Baird, p. v). However while noting the argument, I am of the opinion that the probability that the attribution is genuine is higher than the possibility that it is not. Because the eulogy for the Bishop, in its length and depth of feeling, seems excessive to the requirements of the narrative, it appears likely that the poet may have been motivated to include it for personal reasons — I note in this context that he cites the Bishop’s birthplace, which implies an intimate connection. If this is so then the reason why the deeds of Sir Edward Stanley are muted in favour of Sir John Stanley of Handforth, may lie in the quarrel between the Earl and Edward, but may also lie in the fact that John was the natural son of the Bishop and perhaps a friend of the author. If the author was the gentleman from Baguley then this seems almost certain as Baguley and Handforth are neighbouring estates.



the method of informing his audience of this which stresses the iniquity of the 'Villain'. The Scots are defamed: 'then they fettled them to flye : as false beene the[y] euer' (l.183). 'loe what it is to be false : & the Feende serve, they haue broken a bookothe. . . .' (ll. 394-95).

The Heroes are, of course, outnumbered (Item 19: *Outnumbering*). In the affair of the 'Ill Road':

The English were numbered 900<sup>d</sup> : that was the highest Number  
& the[y] were 10000 by tale : vpon the the other partye.

PF 25: ll. 164-65

At the battle of Flodden, figures are given for the followers of the individual English commanders (Edward Stanley — 10,000; John Stanley - 4,000 and Howard — 14,000), which total 28,000 fighters. These men are matched against '9 score thousand' (180,000) Scots (l. 137).

The figures for the 'Ill Road' appear to be a reasonable estimation if the numbers may be judged from the original accounts. Unfortunately few sources mention numbers in connection with this engagement and may well be erroneous themselves (Item 20: *Figures*). However they agree that the English at the 'Ill Road' had less than a thousand men while the Scots had between seven and ten thousand at least.<sup>48</sup> With regard to the numbers at Flodden we are on slightly stronger ground since the Treasury accounts for wages and expenses incurred with respect to this battle are available. Mackie has thoroughly examined the accounts of the King's Treasurer, Sir Philip Tilney, and has concluded that the English had about 20,000 men who opposed about 30,000 Scots.<sup>49</sup> Thus it is seen that in *PF 25* the numbers of the enemy are enormously exaggerated — presumably to make the Shire-men's retreat seem less cowardly as well as adding to the Stanleys' glory in the final victory. That the English army is *also* inflated is unexpected. The result of this inflation is that the Stanleys are shown with large numbers of men in their service which emphasises the family's standing. It also accents the loyalty of the marcher shires that had mustered so many men for the defence of England.

*Scotish Feilde* has no post-climactic lesson (Item 15: *Moral*). The substance of the poet's message is reiterated throughout the text (Item 16: *Repetition*). The lesson to be learned from *PF 25* is that the Stanleys epitomise the sixteenth century notion of ideal lordship, and that the men of their shires are doughty fighters. The unstated lesson is of course, that the Stanleys are the effective rulers of their area, that the Shire-men trust and depend upon the Stanleys' invincible leadership, and that so long as the Stanleys remain in power that part of England will be safe.

The poet establishes these points immediately. In his initial presentation of the situation he states that the Earl of Derby is 'deare' and 'doughty' (l. 10); Savage, his sister's son is a 'Sege that was able' (l. 12) and that these two with 'Gylbert the gentle' (l. 11) led 'all Lancashire at their will' '& Cheshyre hath them chosen : for their cheefe Captaine' (l. 15). 'Much worshipp haue the[y] woone in warre' 'sith Brute heere abode : & first built vp houses' (ll. 16-18). The poet goes on to name minor magnates who 'bowed to their hands' (l. 19) and joined with the Stanleys so that they have a 'royall retinewe' (l. 23). It is noted that later in his text the poet uses the phrase 'bowed to his

---

48. Hall, *Chronicle*, p. 556; Holinshed, 'England', p. 591; Letter from the Bishop of Durham to Wolsey cited in *The Source Book of Scottish History*, p. 65.

49. Mackie, 'English Army', pp. 47-49, 60-69.

hand' again and in respect to royal power when the Scottish king summons his subjects (l. 135).

These points are expanded by further references throughout the text. One method that the poet uses to depict the martial prowess of the Stanleys and underline his lesson is through conversation (Item 9: *Dialogue: character and moral*). There is little dialogue present in *PF 25* but there is one lengthy speech made by a herald as he explains the armorial bearings of the assembled English standards which the King of Scots can see in the valley below. In this speech the power and valour of the Stanleys and their men is emphasised by the customary laudatory phrases but also by direct statement. Referring to the Stanley eagle and James Stanley's banner of St. Audrey, the king's herald says:

loe how he battes and beates : the bird with his wings,  
we are feard of yonder fowle : soe feircely he fareth,  
and yonder streamer full straight : that standeth him beside,  
yonder is the standard of St. Towder : trow ye no other,  
that neuer beaten was in battell : for bearne vppon liue.

*PF 25: ll. 365-369*

Item 5: *Motivation*, does not agree with the paradigm because the poet has to explain the Shire-men's defection. To that end he gives a reason for all the major actions of the poem in order that each event might be seen as an inevitable part of a chain of actions leading to the men's flight as the inescapable result of a linked series of episodes which began with Henry's invasion of France.

His chain of reasoning is as follows:-

Because Henry invades France, Derby must, as a knight, join him;  
Because Henry is successful, the French king, Louis, is afraid;  
Because Louis is afraid, he bribes James to invade England;  
Because James needs the gold and there is little risk, he invades;  
Because James invades, the English must defend;  
Because the English must defend, the Shire-men assemble;  
Because Derby is in France, they are commanded by a stranger;  
Because they are commanded by a stranger, they are not confident;  
Therefore when Dacres flees they follow him.

This chain of causality shows three things: first, that the Stanleys are loyal and dutiful subjects who prosecute the king's wars; secondly, (and most importantly), that the Stanleys are powerful — only they can control their own, and thirdly, that the ultimate responsibility for the Shire-men's flight lies with the king himself: had he not invaded France then their leader would have been available and the defection would not have occurred. The Shire-men are the helpless victims of Fortune.

The poet begins the tale proper with Henry VIII besieging 'Turwine'. This scene encompasses thirty-six lines (ll. 63-96). It is present in such length for two reasons: first, the poet needs carefully to show that Lord Derby, the head of the house of Stanley, with other northern lords, is manfully doing his duty by the king's side in France, and secondly that Henry's invasion is being so successful that the French king (Louis XII), is motivated to ask the King of Scots (James IV), to invade England. It is not stated, but the implication is that the threat to his domestic defences will distract Henry from his current investments. James, moved by 'a present of pounds many thousand' (l. 120) and the fact

that 'all were faren into France : that feirce were in armes' (l. 124), invades. The Scottish Lord Maxwell, sent as the result of a lottery — no volunteer he — takes an army to England. His motivation is 'to see wether any seege : durst sett him against' (l. 142). Lord Dacres, told of their inroads, remains within Carlisle, '& keire wold no further/he wold not Meddle withose [sic] Men : for noe mans will' (ll. 154-55). The implication is that he is motivated by fear and as Baird says (p. xviii), 'he does not relish combat': the audience will not be surprised when later, he flees and the Shire-men follow him. Defeated by William Bulmer, Maxwell returns to the King of Scots and he, moved by revenge ('Ile wynde you to wreke : wees I you heete' — *Lyme MS.* l. 202), prepares to invade.<sup>50</sup> The English (notably the Stanleys) assemble, and in due course the commands are assigned. Sir Edward Howard has the left wing of Cheshire men and at this point the poet inserts a long and detailed piece of information which provides the ultimate motivation (and some of which he will repeat), for their later defection:

the left winge to that ward : was Sir Eward Howarde,  
he chose to him Cheshire : their chance was the worse;  
because they knew not their Captaine : their care was the more,  
for they were wont att all warr : to wayte vppon the stanleys,  
much worshipp they woone : when they that way served,  
but now lanke is their losse : our lord itt amend!

*PF 25: ll. 264-269*

The combat begins and 'the shire men fledden' (l. 330). The poet emphasises their motive: they followed Lord Dacres who was in their wing:

he fledd att the first bredd : & the[y] followed after,  
then their Captain was keered away : there comfort was gone,  
they were wont in all warrs : to wayt on the Stanlyes,  
they neuer fayled at noe forward : that time that they were,  
now lost in their loofe : our lord itt amende!

*PF 25: ll. 330-336*

The poet then cites a list of men from the northern shires who do *not* retreat but are killed 'lik Conquerors : in their Kings seruice' (l. 350). However the Scots, motivated by seeing 'our men scatter' (l. 351), press forward. Their king is told that the forces which remain in the valley are flying the Stanley banners though their leader is in France.<sup>51</sup> Nevertheless other Stanleys are present with their men. The Scots admit that they are afraid of the Stanleys but their king believes that '& I beate these bearnes : the battle is ours' (l. 375). Therefore he attacks fiercely. He is resisted:

- 
50. *PF 25* has 'Ile wend you to worke : wayes I you sett' (l. 200). This is corrupt. Note the similarity between this passage and the scene in *Durham* where the defeated Douglas flies to the King of Scots who promises to revenge him (sts. 28-32).
51. The king asks a herald to explain the banners flying in the valley below: this is paralleled in *Durham* where the same scene takes place (sts. 36-41).

yorkshire like yearne men : eagerlye they foughten'  
soe did darbyshire that day : deered many Scotts;  
Lancashire like Lyons : Laid them about -  
All had been lost, by our Lord : had not those leeds beene.

PF 25: ll. 381-384

Thus the poet tries to mitigate Cheshire's flight by pointing out that if it had not been for the bravery of their neighbouring shires (each of which were part of the Stanley hegemony be it noted), the English would have lost the battle.

The poet's method of linking his scenes consists principally (15 instances), of indicating that his characters journeyed to a new place (Item 11: *Linking*). Where he wishes to turn to a different set of actors elsewhere, he uses the narrator's comment, 'now leave wee', or explains that he will 'meddle with this matter noe more att this time' and then turns to the new topic (6 instances). He introduces the two battles ('Ill Road' and 'Flodden'), with a lyrical description of the rising sun and the 'dawn chorus' reminiscent of the *tempus amœnum* of the Romance. To his description of the daybreak at Flodden he has added scenic detail to make a *locus amœnus*:

then dauned the [da]y : soe deere god ordayned;  
Clowdes cast up full cleerlye : like Castles full hie,  
then Phebus full faire : flourished out his beames  
with Leames full light : all the land ouer.  
all was damped with dew : the daysies about,  
flowers flourished in the feild : faire to behold;  
birds bradden to the boughes : & boldlye the[y] songen -  
it was solace to heare : for any seege liuing.

PF 25: ll. 306-13

I have cited this passage in its entirety because it is a delightful but wholly fictitious embellishment. The weather was historically atrocious: 'mervoulous fowle wethyre'.<sup>52</sup> The poet's lyrical description compares strangely with the pre-battle passage where the men complain to their lords:

bidd them fettle them to fight : or they wold fare homeward -  
there company was clem[m]jed : & much cold did suffer.

PF 25: ll. 257-58

The dawn 'links' (in an oddly mixed style), are essays into the archaic present as conventional scene-changes appropriate to the alliterative tradition the poet has revived. However the other 'links' insofar as can be ascertained, are factual and do not conform to the paradigm. As in Bosworth the poet has included as much fact as he can in order to give added credence to his tale. In the Scottish poet's case this is especially necessary, since part of the purpose of his poem is to persuade his audience of the truth of a fiction — presented to excuse the pusillanimity of the Shire-men.

Because of the poet's need to explain that the Shire-men were not cowards, he has had to introduce fiction into the direct action (Item 6: *Fiction and action*). This item does

---

52. Letter from Bishop of Durham to Wolsey in *Source Book of Scottish History*, p. 65; Holinshed, 'Scotland', p. 479-80; *Trewe Encountre*, p. 76).

not agree with the paradigm. Insofar as I have been able to discover, Lord Dacres was *not* asked to come to Bulmer's assistance in the matter of the 'Ill Road'. None of the source accounts mention him in this connection at all. He may have been at Carlisle — I have been unable to trace his movements — but since Carlisle, on the opposite side of the country, is some 700 miles from the site of the 'Ill Road' battle, it is not at all likely that he stayed within its walls from timidity. Likewise, far from fleeing Flodden, it seems that after the Shire-men fled, leaving their commander, Howard, virtually alone on the field, it was Dacres who came up to his rescue: 'Edmund Howard was on the right wing of Lord Howard with 1,000 Cheshire and 500 Lancashire men . . . who were defeated by the Lord Chamberlain of Scotland. . . . Dacre came to his relief.'<sup>53</sup>

## B. Conclusions

Both the *Bosworth* and *Scotish* poets have introduced detailed motivation to account for an historical action which is not compatible with heroism. For the same purpose, in both poems — and also in *Agincourt* — fictitious material has been included which affects the direct action of the narrative. In *Agincourt* the hero's doubtful action is peripheral to the tale; in *Bosworth* the action which could be censured, though not central to the narrative, has to be explained in order that the hero's ultimate achievement is not marred; in *Scotish* the exculpation of the perpetrators of the non-heroic action is part of the poet's purpose and equal in importance to the laudation of the Stanleys. Because (in the flight of the Shire-men), the 'doubtful action' is more prominent than in the other two texts, the poet has had to expand motivation and fiction to a greater extent so that almost all the events chosen for inclusion in the poem have a part in a syllogism which logically concludes that the Shire-men were blameless. Because fiction is an ingredient necessary to the fulfillment of the poet's purpose, like *Bosworth*, he has where possible included factual 'links'. In *Scotish* this is done because mention of a journey or a message can be effected briefly while giving an authentic air to the more lengthy description of the scenes which follow. This compares with *Bosworth* where factual links are present mainly because various members of the audience were probably themselves involved in the journeys, or sent or received the messages.

The unseen presence of an audience is not so evident in *Scotish*. The 'moral', as in *Agincourt*, is never directly stated but is implicit within the narrative. However, like *Bosworth*, *Scotish* contains a single citation of a large number of individuals who were present at the events the texts describe. The poet briefly mentions them in similar traditionally flattering terms although, unlike *Bosworth*, he has not chosen to remark them all in one comprehensive list. In *Bosworth* this catalogue directs attention to the men,

---

53. Précis of 'The Articles of the bataill', item 2246 in *Letters and Papers*, p. 1005. See also Holinshed, *England*, p. 597; *Rotta*, pp. 118 & 121; *Trewe Encountre*, pp. 67, 73-74. It is however noted that a summary of a letter, dated 22nd October, 1513, from Dacres himself to Henry VIII (*ibid.*, item 2836, p. 1055), says: 'at the battle, his men not being strong enough to be a wing to my Lord Treasurer [Surrey], he assigned him Bamboroughshire and Tynemouth [in Northumberland], but they fled at the first shot of the Scottish guns'.

Also Dacres says to the king on the 13th November, 1513: 'I well perceyve yo<sup>r</sup> Highnes regardeth not the sinistre reoport or rumor surmised ayenst me' (*Original Letters*, p. 93). In an undated letter to the Bishop of Durham he hears that he is slandered by lords and gentlemen who were on the field, because the Lord Treasurer and my Lord Howard took him into council in preference to others: (*Letters and Papers*, item 2387, p. 1056). Unfortunately the nature of the slander is not spelt out, but it may be that in contradiction of the apparent facts, there was a rumour that he had fled. However since this is only speculation it does not affect my argument that Item 6 is not valid in respect to PF 25.

who, as I have shown, might reasonably be expected to compose the poet's prospective audience. The 'scattered' effect of the *Scottish* poet's 'namings' dissipates attention from the minor characters and allows the narrative itself, and the poet's logical progression towards the exculpation of the Shire-men, to come into prominence.

Compared to the texts previously discussed in this study, *Scottish* has very little dialogue, and, what is perhaps remarkable, with the exception of the delivery of the news of the victory and Henry VIII's reception of it at the end of the poem, *all* the passages of dialogue are given to the enemy. Thus the villain is given a human character which is denied the composite 'hero': his standing and virtue are depicted solely through the narrator's report which is essential to the poet's carefully thought-out and ingenious refutation of the Shire-men's cowardice. The Stanleys are not given individual personalities, and while it can be deduced that the poem is intended to be pleasing to the Stanleys and their followers, the text does not strike the reader as written solely for such a narrow audience: it gives the impression of having been composed to edify and instruct the wider world of the marcher Shires.

*Scottish Feilde* is a late product of the alliterative tradition: in the following analysis the poem's motifemic structure is examined to determine whether this aspect of the text also follows convention.

**TABLE 4.** *Stylistic Structure of ‘Scottish Feilde’*

Motifeme	Allomotif	Scene	Theme (Episode)	
1. <i>Exhortation</i>	a. Prayer: May I please God b. Synopsis c. Moral	Threat		
2. <i>Scene setting</i>	a. Naming of hero: Stanleys, Lancashire & Cheshire b. Events leading to invasion of France			
3. <i>Departure</i>	a. Appoints Lord Lieutenant b. Summons Helpers c. Leaves from Dover			
4. <i>Arrival</i> (Embedded: <i>Council</i> )	a. Arrives Calais b. Advised to besiege ‘Turwine’ c. Arrives ‘Turwine’			
5. <i>Misdeed</i> (Villain’s) (Embedded: <i>Council</i> )	a. Villain named: French king b. Ruse devised: Persuade Scots to invade England c. Messenger sent d. Villain named: Scottish king e. Ruse accepted			
6. <i>Bidding to battle</i> (Villain’s)	a. Forces gather b. Directed to Millfield			
7. <i>Combat</i> (Embedded: <i>Battle Preparation Dawn</i> )	a. Scots (Maxwell) attack b. 1st result: English flee c. Assemble forces d. Move to Scots e. Day breaks f. English (Bulmer) attack g. 2nd result: Scots flee h. English give chase			Battle
8. <i>Enumeration of casualties</i>	a. Scots dead			
9. <i>Victory</i>	a. Scots beaten			
10. <i>Scene setting</i> (Embedded: <i>Villain’s Boast</i> )	a. Scots (Maxwell) returns to villain b. Announces defeat c. Villain: I’ll avenge you			Warfare (invasion- resistance- ejection)
11. <i>Bidding to battle</i> (Villain’s)	a. Villain summons forces			
12. <i>Departure</i> (Villain’s)	a. Travel to Norham			
13. <i>Arrival</i>	a. Sits before Norham	Battle		
14. <i>Bidding to battle</i> (Hero’s)	a. Shires summoned b. Knights summoned			
15. <i>Battle preparation</i> (Hero’s) (Embedded: <i>Dawn</i> )	a. Strategic position chosen b. Commanders appointed c. Camp set up d. Day breaks			
16. <i>Combat</i>	a. 1st blow: Villain’s Helpers attack b. Result: Hero flees c. 2nd blow: Villain attacks d. Result: Villain killed e. Scots flee f. Hero gives chase			
17. <i>Victory</i> (Embedded: <i>Enumeration of Casualties; Carnage; Gloat</i> )	a. 15,000 Scots killed b. Many stark corpses c. Victory announced to Henry d. Henry rings a ‘sowle knell’ with guns			
18. <i>Status-quo</i>	a. Heroes walk home b. Their horses have been stolen	Triumph		
19. <i>Valediction</i>	a. Explicit b. Source c. Prayer			

### III. Form and Tradition: *Scottish Feilde*

#### A. *The Motifemes*

##### a. *Exhortation*

This motifeme is present in an impaired form in that it lacks the nuclear compulsory component, the *exhortation* itself. However it does have the peripheral components *prayer*, *synopsis* and *moral* — though it omits the optional *source*.

The *prayer* is wholly conventional. It addresses God, His Mother and ‘the seemlie Saints’ (ll. 1-4) and requests that the tale the narrator is about to tell might be pleasing to them. The *moral* is embedded in the *synopsis* and is vestigial:

I will carpe of kings : that conquered full wide,  
that dwelled in this land : that was alyes Noble.

PF 25: ll.5-6

The lesson is ambiguous.<sup>54</sup> The lesson appears to be either that victorious kings of England are noble — which compares with the later presentation of the kings of Scotland and France as ‘ignoble’ or that England itself, and by inference its people, are ‘alyes Noble’. Since the purpose of the text is to refute the suggestion that the Shire-men behaved in a way which was *not* noble and to present the Stanleys as being the epitome of English nobility, I think that the latter interpretation of the lesson is consistent with that which the poet is setting out to do.

The *synopsis* is a lengthy and complicated variant of the traditional motifemic component: it names the members of the composite ‘Hero’ and in a précis of events which took place before the current adventure, establishes their qualities. For ease of reference the Table of Stylistic Structure has been greatly simplified, and does not show the complexity of *exhortation*’s motifemic component, *synopsis*, in PF 25. As it has a double function it is I think, an example of *assimilation*. Although as *synopsis* it makes it plain that the Villain will not overcome, it also serves as the motifeme *scene-setting* in that it explains the state of affairs current at the commencement of the action proper. As *synopsis/scene-setting* it has an unusually high ‘embedded’ content: *departure*, *arrival*, *misdeed* and *bidding-to-battle*. It is not until line 149 that the allomotific component that signifies that the adventure will end well appears:

---

54. The manuscripts of *Scottish* all abbreviate ‘king’ to ‘K’ and omit the indefinite article. Furnivall and Hales have interpreted this as ‘kings’. Baird has emended his edition (taken mainly from *The Lyme Manuscript*), to ‘carpe of a king that conquered . . .’, on the grounds that the ‘nobility’ applies to the ‘king’ in the previous line and therefore the verb should be in the singular, and also because the poet ‘talks about only one king for many lines’. (Baird, pp. 1 and 36). I disagree with Baird’s emendation because in the first fitt which follows, the narrator speaks of the English kings ‘Brute’, Henry VII, Richard III and Henry VIII. The occasional occurrence in Middle English verse of a verb which does not agree in number with its subject is too well known to need exemplifying here, and is not generally sufficient reason for amendment unless there are other grounds for making a change. In this case first, as I have remarked, the narrator speaks of many kings, and secondly there is no reason why the ‘nobility’ should not refer to the noun which precedes it, the ‘land’.



for killed they were like Caytiues : as you shall heere after.

b. *Valediction*

This motifeme contains the obligatory component *prayer* and the optional components *explicit* and *source*. There is no *moral*.

*Prayer* follows the convention of the Romance:

Jesus bring vs to blisse : that brought vs forth of bale,  
that hath hearkened me heere : or heard my tale.  
PF 25: ll. 421-22

The *explicit* is also straightforward and does not deviate from tradition:

Now is this ferle feild : foughten to an ende  
PF 25: l. 413

The component *source* is however unusual in that the poet purports to present a few autobiographic details:

he was a gentleman by Iesu : that this iest made,  
which say but as he sayd : forsooth & noe other:  
Att Bagily that bearne : his bidding place had  
& his Ancetors of old time : haue yearded their longe,  
Before william the Conquerour : this cuntry did inhabitt  
PF 25: ll. 416-20

Attempts to name the ‘gentleman’ have resulted in a tentative identification of him as a ‘Legh’.<sup>55</sup> However I am not here concerned with the poet’s historical identity but rather with the fact that in this text we have an unusual example of the *source* component of *valédiction* although its allomotifs are not without the authority of at least one Romance. The nearest parallel is *William of Palerne* (c.1350) — which, interestingly, is also an unrhymed alliterative text — where the poet (who, confusingly, has the same name as the hero of his narrative), refers to himself, almost in passing: ‘In þise wis haþ william : al his work ended. . . .’ (l. 5521), and after the conventional modest disclaimer, goes on to identify his patron and his

---

55. See Lawton, *SF*, p. 44; Baird, pp. iv-viii. However it is interesting to note that *PF 27: As it Befell*, (with only one text intervening between *PF 27* and *PF 25*), has:

as I went vp Scotland gate  
I herd one to another say,  
“Tohn a Bagilie hath lost his Mate.”

PF 27: st. 1

This text belongs to the ‘ballad medley’ genre, popular with the Elizabethans. (See J.H. Long, ‘The Ballad Medley and the Fool’, *Studies in Philology*, 67 (1970), 504-16). These amusing songs were a hotch-potch of lines from popular ballads strung together. The point I wish to make is that because the *essence* of these works was that they were composed of lines from, or references to, other works, it is reasonable to suppose that at some time the salient line above, was well known in a now regrettably lost work. The coincidence of names and the fact that the two items are all but adjacent in *The Folio* suggests that the scribe probably collected the two items from the same source: as Chapter I notes, *The Folio* originated from an area which includes Baguley. Baird (p.vii) points out that it has been thought that the ‘Legh’ who perhaps wrote *Scotish* was the author of a body of poems. It is possible that the poem from which *PF 27*’s line is taken may have been written by him. If, as is likely, Legh’s poems were locally popular then the juxtaposition in the *Folio* of the only two poems which mention Baguley may be a small but significant factor lending weight to the supposition that the colophon to *PF 25* is genuine and written by a Legh of Baguley.

lineage:

þe hende erl of hereford : humfray de boune -  
 þe god king edwardes dou3ter : was his dere moder -  
 ll. 5530-31

Thus the singularity of the *source* in *PF 25* lies in the fact that the allomotif *lineage* refers to the poet himself - as will be discussed shortly — his ancestry has been developed slightly because as a ‘gentleman’ only, he wished it to be known that his house has a pedigree as venerable as any of more exalted status. Similarly he seems to have felt that the naming of his ‘bidding place’ and estate would be recognition enough for his audience and there was no need for the direct identification as seen in, for instance, the brusque ‘Thomas Chestre made þys tale’ of the *Launfal* poet (l. 1039).

I have previously remarked that there has been some scholarly argument as to whether or not the *valediction* properly belongs to the original text of *PF 25*.<sup>56</sup> I am inclined to believe that it does on the grounds that part of the purpose of the poem is to exculpate the Shire-men and that the poet’s excuse for their behaviour has an enhanced chance of being held credible if he can support his narrative with an *auctoritas* whose word might be depended upon. It is for this reason that the poet attempts to vouch for the truth of his work by presenting himself as a man of standing, ‘a gentleman, by Iesu!’. He is not a *parvenu* but of old respectability, whose word might be expect to carry some weight.<sup>57</sup> I have previously said that I believe this text probably to be written for a wider audience than the Stanley families. For such an audience the addition of the poet’s name is likely to have detracted from his position as a reliable ‘authority’: the location of his dwelling place is sufficient to identify him to a local audience to whom his reputation would be known, but in a wider field, as a simple ‘gentleman’ his name would probably have been of little note, hence the weight of his authority would have been diminished and with it the credibility of his text. Thus the manipulation of this motifeme is wholly in line with the poet’s presumed general purpose.

---

56. The solitary occurrence in *PF 25* of the periphrastic conjugation in ‘this cuntry did inhabitt’ (l. 420), seems to point to a later addition: *The Lyme Manuscript* has ‘this Countrey inhabited’ and therefore it is probable that ‘did’ was not part of the original.

57. Compare the lines:

he was a gentleman by Ieus : that this iest made  
 which say but as he sayd : forsooth . . .

*PF 25*: ll. 416-17

He was a gentilman by Jesu : that this Jest made  
 which said but as ye see : for soth . . .

*Lyme*, ll. 418-19

Baird (p. 419), concludes that the latter text ‘may be faulty’ here. He notes the *Lyme Manuscript’s* ‘see’ with some surprise as contradicting what he believes to be the poem’s oral nature. There is of course no evidence but comparing the two versions I believe that the original, in an effort to add further verisimilitude may have read:

which said but as he saw : for soth . . .

Since in both texts, the poet refers to himself as ‘that’ in ‘that this iest made’ the following ‘which’ (where we might expect ‘who’), is consistent.

c. *Terminal Status-quo*

The compulsory nuclear component *hero*, here being composite, includes the optional components *associates* and *populace*. However convention requires that the allomotif should relate to some form of positive reward for the characters after the close of the ‘adventure’. This *PF 25* does not do:

Now is this ferle field : foughten to an ende:  
many a wye wanted his horsse : & wandred home a Foote -  
all was long of the Marx men : a Mischeefe them happen!  
*PF 25: ll. 413-15*<sup>58</sup>

Beyond the notion that the composite *hero* is still in a condition whereby he is able to go ‘home’, the immediate status-quo does not show the ‘adventure’ to have benefitted anyone whatever. Instead it reminds the audience of the ever-present difficult conditions prevailing north of the Trent, and that the heavy responsibility for the peace of the border areas lies with the lords and men of the northern counties.<sup>59</sup> They are not shown as enjoying a ‘reward’ (which in the Romances requires peace and leisure to enjoy), because it is in line with the poem’s purpose that they be shown as valorous fighters constantly engaged in a struggle to keep the king’s peace. Thus the *terminal status-quo*, by implication, upholds the status of the men in whose defence the poem is written.

d. *Boast*

i. *T-brag*

This brag, conventionally made by the villain, is present in *Scottish*:

“Ile [wynde] you to [wreke] : [wees] I you [heete],  
alonge within that Land : the length of 3 weekes  
& destroy all arright : that standeth me before.”  
thus he promised to the prince : that paradise weldeth.  
*PF 25: ll. 200-03*<sup>60</sup>

The *T-brag* component *assessment of strength* is not present in *Scottish*, despite the appearance of:

There is no leeds in that land : saue Millers & Masse preists,  
all were faren into france : that fayre were in armes  
*PF 25: ll. 109-10*

and:

there is no Lord in that Land : to look him against,  
all were faren into france : that fierce were in armes

---

58. This incident is mentioned in several of the sources: apparently the Borderers took advantage of the opportunity and raided the English tents and stole their horses. Letter from the Bishop of Durham to Wolsey, item 2283, *Letters and Papers*, p. 1021; Hall, *Chronicle*, p. 564; HF I, 233n.

59. Border raids were so endemic to the area that Northumberland, Cumberland, Westmorland, Durham, Lancashire, Yorkshire and Cheshire were all, as a general rule, excused from providing troops for the successive kings’ wars in order that they might be able to keep the peace north of the Trent. Mackie, ‘English Army’, *Miscellany Scottish Historical Society*, 8 (1951), 53-55; for a full discussion see: H. Pease, *The Lord Wardens of the Marches of England and Scotland* (London, 1913).

60. The words in parentheses are from *Lyme*. The *Folio* here has ‘wend’, ‘worke’, ‘wayes’ and ‘sett’ and seems to be the result of a scribal attempt to make sense of a line that was not understood.

Despite the fact that a like passage in *Durham* — the similarity of which has already been mentioned — is part of this motifemic component in that work, here it is not. This is because *assessment of strength* as a component of *boast* is a function of dialogue spoken by the bragger — usually the villain. The first of the two passages cited above is dialogue, but it is spoken by the French King’s council who are advising him of inducements to persuade the King of Scots to invade. The second of the two passages is the narrator repeating the French messenger’s errand to the Scottish king. The essence of the passages is “Because they are so few *you* will mangle them” — the *T-brag* component requires the sentiment to be in the first person.

ii. *I-brag*

The *I-brag* component of *boast*: “I-will-fight-till-I-die”, is present in *Scotish* but it is spoken by Henry VIII in France before ‘Turwine’ (it is paired with the *T-brag* by the repetition of the final line):

then our King full of Courage : carped these words,  
sayes: “I will seege it about : within this 7 dayes,  
or win it or I hence win : with the leaue of our Lord,  
or leaue here my liffe : Lord I you [hett]”  
thus he promised to the prince : [that paradice weldeth].

PF 25: ll. 83-86: *Lyme*: 1.87-88

This passage is present to hearten others (the English have been told that the city is impregnable: ll. 80-82). The poet has given this brag to the king in order to establish the valour of the English as personified by their monarch. It is noticeable that with the exception of the English king, no member of the ‘heroic body’ speaks at all — the Stanleys and the Shiremen are mute. The poet’s purpose does not permit him to single out any one individual from his composite hero in England — the King of England is the ‘hero’s’ representative.

iii. *Gloat*

1. *Right and Enumeration of casualties*

These two components of the *gloat* component of the motifeme *boast* occur together:

there were killed of the Scotts: that told were by tale  
that were found in the field: 15teene thousand:  
loe what it is to be false : & the Feende serve!  
they haue broken a bookothe : . . .  
& the truce that was taken :

PF 25: ll. 392-96

This example of *gloat* is wholly conventional.

2. *Humiliation of Dead Villain*

The following is, I think, probably a new allomotif of the above component of *gloat*: it is a ‘vaunting of achievement’ and is spoken by the King of England when, in France, he has been

informed of the death of the King of Scots:

“I will sing him a sowle knell: with the sound of my gunnes.”

PF 25: 1.409

As in the *I-brag*, here the English king is the composite hero's representative spokesman.

## B. Conclusions

I. This study of selected motifemes supports the conclusion which I previously derived from my study of the paradigm: the poet's primary purpose is the exculpation of the Shire-men — the praise of the Stanleys being an integral part of that exculpation and not a primary goal. It also shows that the poet has utilised public respect for tradition to strengthen acceptance of his text and its lesson.

The poet is familiar with the motifemic structure of the Romance and he uses it without distortion wherever he can: the *prayer* components of the motifemes of *discours*, (*exhortation* and *valediction*), conform in every way to the traditional allomotif usage, as does the *explicit* component of the latter, the *right* and *enumeration of casualties* components of *gloat* and the *brags*. This scattering of conventional motifemes (and others such as *bidding to battle* which I do not discuss in this study), together with the unrhymed alliterative style of the overall text, gives the poem the authority of accepted tradition. This is important to the poet since his work is written with a specific end in view which requires the text to be composed in a manner which will contribute to public acceptance.

The presentation of ancestry as a factor adding to the honour and worth of an individual is seen at the beginning and ending of the text. In the *source* component of the *valediction* motifeme the poet has manipulated the traditional allomotifs to include something of his own lineage. That public belief in the message of his text means a great deal to the *Scottish* poet is seen in this manipulation which goes far beyond the traditional protestations of veracity seen in the Romance. Here the poet stands behind what he has written by going some way towards identifying himself: he is shown as being from a specific geographic location, he is of a specific social standing, and he is shown to be descended from an ancient English line. The emphasis given to these items is designed to point to his integrity and reassure his audience that indeed he has told what he knows 'forsooth & noe other': his word may be relied upon.

The other example of ancestry implying virtue relates to Henry VIII. Both *Durham* and *Bosworth* have a composite hero, but that circumstance has not prevented their respective authors from including the motifemes (such as the *I-brag*), which traditionally are presented through the medium of dialogue spoken by a member of the direct heroic body. However it is noticeable that in *Scottish*, apart from the villain and his helpers, the only voice heard throughout the conduct of Flodden itself is that of the narrator: the direct 'hero' is mute. This 'silence' has necessitated the introduction of an adaptation of convention which is not present in any of the texts previously examined. The poet has designated the King of England, who throughout the duration of the action is in France, as the 'hero's' spokesman. This device is both appropriate and effective: the 'hero' is a section of the English public - the Shire-men and the Stanleys — therefore who better to represent them than their anointed king? That their king is himself heroic is established at some length in the *synopsis* component of *exhortation* and, to some extent, accounts

for the complexity of this motifemic component where, besides drawing a picture of the king's martial valour, the poet also sets out his ancestry.

In the matter of the *Scottish* poet's use of dialogue, it is seen that the poet has included the conventional motifemic *I-brag* and a new allomotif to illustrate the *humiliation of dead villain* subcomponent of the *gloat* component of *boast* — which are given to the heroic body by association. The lack of direct dialogue from individual members of the composite hero in England, means that the poet has no opportunity to develop his heroic characters *per se* through motifemes (such as the *pre-battle address*), which are a function of direct speech. This results in the character of the villain receiving conventional attention through the *T-brag* (and other motifemes, such as *surveillance of opposition* which are not discussed here), while the hero is left (despite the poet's eulogy to the memory of the Bishop of Ely), as, on the whole, an amorphous body whose virtues are put before the audience through the narrative or through comments by the extrinsic voice. The reason for the absence of heroic dialogue and close focus on any but the villain and the English king, is first, that the 'hero' is the Shire-men — *en masse* they fled and *en masse* they must be redeemed. Secondly that any characterisation of an individual hero above his fellows — and this includes the Stanleys — would introduce an imbalance which would distract from the poet's message and perhaps negate his purpose.

This purpose is why the poet has inverted the *status-quo* component so that it has a negative allomotif: the hero is not shown as enjoying a 'reward'. The presence of the perpetually troublesome Borderers is brought forward with what can only be the intention of reminding the poet's audience that the 'hero' has traditionally been, and will *continue* to be, an essential bulwark in the northern defences. This reminder of their traditional rôle may be seen as an unspoken implication that their valour ought not therefore to be impugned.

To sum up: the study of the poet's manipulation of the conventional motifeme shows that he leans heavily on tradition to ensure acceptance of his 'message'; where necessary he has manipulated custom better to make his point and in so doing has introduced three novelties: a 'spokesman' who while not himself a direct participant in the 'adventure', utters the conventionally expected heroic sentiments which the composite hero cannot produce, a motifemic component which has a negative allomotif, and a new allomotif to fill a 'slot' in a component of an old motifeme. All of these interesting changes have been brought about as a function of the poem's purpose.

**II.** A key-word relevant to any description of *Scottish Feilde* is 'tradition'. The lexis is deliberately archaic: where conventional motifemic structure cannot be neatly included the poet has made appropriate modifications, and some of the matter itself looks towards the past for authority. This authority is required to establish that the matter of the text is credible and thus the poet's 'message' can be believed. Where motifemes have been altered because they could not otherwise be included they have been changed to assist the purpose of the poem. Similarly the four items which do not agree with the *Durham* paradigm have, in three cases, been modified towards inducing history to support the poet's 'message' and, in one instance an altered item concerns the 'message' itself.

In the Introduction to this chapter, I remark the close similarity between *Durham* and *Scottish* in the actual lexemes used to describe the expected English defenders. The two most notable non-lexical similarities are whole scenes which occur in both texts — 'the defeated helper flying to the villain and obtaining his promise of revenge' and 'the villain's despatch of a herald to view the hero's banners in a valley and the herald's subsequent report'. These scenes are only similar in substance in these two poems, not in

vocabulary. However, taken in conjunction with the lexically similar passages relating to the expected English defence, it seems to me that there are grounds for believing that the *Scotish* poet was certainly familiar with *Durham*. Both of these poems were written as propaganda; the purpose of both concerns their 'composite hero'; in both the 'message' is presented with a similar subtlety; both poems originated in a similar geographic location and both are sufficiently contemporaneous to have originated within the span of one man's life-time. Taken in conjunction with the audience-orientated *Bosworth* and other regional historical texts present in the *Folio* but not discussed in this study (such as *PF* 154: *Ladye Bessiye*), it would seem that *Scotish* adds to the picture of the existence of an integrated but parochial marcher society with little national vision but an intense pride and interest in the events which affected the reputation of the families which made up their own limited world.

#### IV. Utilisation of Primary Material: *PF* 39: *Flodden*] *Feilde*

##### a. Introduction

Despite its title, *PF* 39 relates to the battle of Flodden only inasmuch as the poem is concerned with the manner in which various members of the English force in France received the news of the victory sent by the Earl of Surrey.<sup>61</sup> Nevertheless it has been chosen for inclusion in this study because, like *Scotish*, its primary purpose is to exculpate the Shire-men's flight. It will be shown that the *Flodden* poet utilises the *Scotish* poet's excuse but also invents another: the report of the flight was false — Cheshire and Lancashire have been maligned by Surrey. As in *Scotish*, this new vindication also centres around the Stanleys, but here it principally relates to Thomas Stanley (the Earl of Derby), and his association with Surrey.

*PF* 39 is not wholly unique to *The Percy Folio* as lines 1-422 and 508-13 are present in two other manuscripts: Harleian MS. 293 (fols. 55<sup>v</sup>-61<sup>v</sup>), and Harleian MS. 367 (fols. 120<sup>f</sup> -125<sup>f</sup>), which scholars designate as MSS. 'A' and 'B' respectively. Lines 433-507 of *PF* 39, are unique to *The Folio*. There is a high probability that they are a later and less competent insertion as they are concerned with the ancestral fortunes of the Egerton family.<sup>62</sup>

The text of *PF* 39 is written into *The Folio* in 513 lines (including the interpolation), without stanzaic division. Therefore citations are, in this study, identified by their line numbers even though the two manuscripts are both divided into fifty-four 8-line stanzas and end with a quatrain.<sup>63</sup> Furnivall and Hales divide their text into 123 stanzas — mainly quatrains but with some irregular divisions according to the apparent

---

61. BL Add. MS. 27,879, fols. 57<sup>f</sup>-61<sup>v</sup>: HF I, 313-340.

62. The interpolation muddles the original grant of the manor of Ridley to the Egertons (which occurred after the taking of Tournai in 1513), with an English invasion of France which took place in 1544. Lexical and stylistic reasoning aside, that this passage is an interpolation is extremely likely because the manor of Ridley had been a *Stanley* property until William forfeited it to the crown on his attainder (which I have previously discussed). That the poet would care to remind his audience of this blot on the Stanley escutcheon in a text where his purpose requires this family to be the epitome of loyalty, is, I think, highly improbable. *Calendar of Letters & Papers: Henry VIII*, ed. J.S. Brewer, rev. R.H. Brodie (London, 1920; rpt. Vaduz, 1965), I, 1, item 94.g.14, 47; G.F. Beltz, 'Original record of . . . Entry of King Henry VIII into Tournay . . . in 1513', *Archaeologia*, 27 (1838), 257-61; HF I, 338-39n; Baird, *Scotish Feilde*, pp. iii, xxiv-xxv; Lawton, 'Scottish Field, 42-57.

requirements of the rhyming scheme and the sense of the matter as they understand it. *The Folio* text is divided into two Parts, 238 lines to the first and 275 to the second.

The prosody of *PF 39* is complex and since Baird and Lawton have provided a thorough and comprehensive analysis I do not propose to dwell on it at length. However it is necessary to present a general survey of the composition of *PF 39* so that it can take its place in the context of the works I have hitherto discussed.

The geographic origin of *Flodden* is generally agreed to be the border area of Lancashire and Cheshire.<sup>64</sup> It is not possible to be dogmatic about the poem's original date of composition, but Baird and Lawton believe that *Flodden* is 'approximately contemporary with *Scotish*' (and therefore with *Durham* and *Bosworth*).<sup>65</sup> Baird also considers, and I have found no reason to disagree with his opinion, that *PF 39* was originally intended for oral recitation.<sup>66</sup>

The text's current form suggests that it was originally composed in 4-line stanzas the majority of which rhymed a b c b. A high proportion of the rymes are on 'ee' and in a few instances the rhyme now fails due to scribal emendment.<sup>67</sup>

The language is English with approximately 71% of the total population of nouns, verbs and adjectives (excluding the probable interpolation — ll. 423-507), derived from Old English. The figure for the 'interpolation' falls to 66%. In the first one-hundred lines *PF 39* also has twenty lexemes which are currently obsolete in form or meaning.<sup>68</sup> These figures are almost identical with *Durham* (70% and eighteen respectively), and probably reflect the similar 'ballad' style seen in the two texts. The 'interpolation' has five obsolete words in its eighty-five lines.<sup>69</sup> It is noted that one of these, 'plainsht' is the sole occurrence of the later fashion for the 'unvoicing' of the final '-d' of the weak past participle.

---

63. Baird (p. xi), is in error when he states that the manuscripts are divided after every fourth line.

64. Baird, p. viii.

65. Baird, p. iv; Lawton, p. 50.

66. Baird, p. ix.

67. For instance 'before' now rhyming with 'borne' (ll. 74, 76), was probably 'before/borne', similarly 'hand/founde' (ll. 42, 44), from 'hond/fond'.

68. These are:

Forsooth (l. 2); tydings (l. 3); Leed (l. 10); Laine (l. 14); sith (l. 15); nume (l. 15); lowlye (l.20); speed (l. 22); minge (l. 23); fare (l. 25); comelye (l. 32); bespake (l. 33); Longd (l. 39); study (l. 41); vnfaine (l. 58); arraye (l. 62); deerlye (l. 66); rowned (l. 77); quoth (l. 79); teenouslye (l. 88).

69. bespake (l. 451); Milner (l. 460); avow (l. 463); meethinkes (l. 472); plainsht (l. 506).



**Figure 6. Stanzaic Patterning in *Flodden*.**

<i>Flodden (1-422 : 508-13)</i>			
Stanzaic Line	Traditional Formula	Alliteration	'Weak' Lines
1	35% *	7%	-
2	27%	14% *	29%
3	20%	13%	5%
4	19%	6%	39% *
<i>Interpolation (423-507)</i>			
1	33%	-	-
2	27%	-	61%
3	-	-	-
4	17%	11%	44%

The interpolated passage is seen to be less complex than the remainder of the text: the 'weak' lines follow the traditional placement and are the stanzaic second and fourth lines. The high figure in the 'weak' fourth line reflects the fact that the only alliterative figures in this passage (all of which alliterate on 'kneel' and 'knee'), also occur in that line. It also shows that the 'weak' line or cheville is sometimes traditional. 'Tradition' in connection with this passage refers to expressions which occur in both Romance and ballad but are seen most frequently in the latter: for instance the line 'these were the words said hee' (which occur in five second-line slots), is generally a ballad convention as is the phrase 'come thou hither unto me'. The poet has preferred to commence new stanzas where possible with a conventional opening syntagm such as 'and then [verb-(adjective)-noun]' — such as: 'and then [bespake] (Noble) [King Harry]', 'and then forth [is gone] [Alexander Ratcliffe, Knight]'. The *Figure* shows that the linear lexical structure of this passage is basically simple and differs quite markedly from that of the first three-quarters of *Flodden*.

The remainder of *PF* 39 is seen to follow the conventional pattern in that the highest proportion of 'weak' lines are found in the second and fourth line. In the second line this is a function of the use of traditional alliterative phrase which the poet has utilised as a mnemonic handle. (Alliteration in this text is ornamental and comes about solely through the use of alliterative tags, some of which — for instance 'Christ christen king that on the crosse dyed' - belong to the Romance rather than the ballad). The high proportion of 'weak' fourth lines is, in this section, the result of the poet having completed the sense of the quatrain in its first three lines finishing with a rhyming repetand (only 'formulaic' to this particular text) such as, to give but one example, the reiterated 'thou wold neuer shun beside the plaine' (ll. 168, 176, 184, 192). The 'weak' fourth line is frequently followed (as the *Figure* shows), with a new stanza where the opening line (as in the interpolation), is conventionally formulaic in its syntagmeme and relates to the ballad though the poet's choice of an individual syntagm:

- When [noun] came before [noun] . . .  
(e.g. 'When the Herald came before our King').  
ll. 19, 293, 355
- The first [noun] that [noun] did [verb] . . .  
(e.g. 'The first word that the prince did minge').  
l. 23
- Then [verb][pronoun/adjective/noun] . . .

(e.g. ‘Then bespake our comely King’).

ll. 33, 45, 53, 69, 365, 373

The conventional ‘lament’ which necessitates the commencement of fifteen stanzas with ‘Farwell . . .’ contributes quite strongly to the Romance component which helps to make up the 35% of traditional formulae in stanzaic 1st lines — but again this component is also found in the ballad.

Thus it appears that while the greater part of *Flodden* retains a proportion of archaic vocabulary and Romance formulae, and is a little less artless in style than the interpolation, it is nevertheless directed towards a ‘folk’ audience and is written for the most part, as a traditional ballad.

Child saw it as a traditional ballad and printed it as an Appendix to Ballad 168.<sup>70</sup> As I have remarked, the text contains Romance phrases which are sometimes seen in the traditional ballad, such as ‘kneeled . . . knee’, ‘by him that dyed on the roode’, ‘woe be the time that . . .’, but there is a greater predominance of expressions peculiar to the ballad alone: ‘in a study stood . . .’: ‘the first word that . . . did speake’, ‘then bespake . . .’<sup>71</sup> These two last tags are also examples of repetition in that they frequently occur as the first line of a new stanza: other expressions such as ‘Christ christen king that on the cross/tree/rood dyed.’ also regularly occur — often as a second-line cheville, while variants of ‘well I wott that thou art slaine’ are repeated fourth-line tags. Besides single lines, the poet also uses multiple line repetition:

“Who did fight & who did flee  
& who bore him best . . .  
& who was false & who was true to me?”

ll. 34-6; 365-67

This incremental question with its internal repetition, is a ballad tradition and sometimes does not require an answer but is present almost as a ‘filler’: for instance “‘How fares my Leeds, how fares my Lords/my knights, my Esquires in their degree?’” (ll. 25-6).

Besides the influence of the traditional ballad as seen in the lexis and the repetitive style, the *Flodden* poet uses an end-filler when at a loss for a rhyme — his preference is for ‘trulye’, which he uses in six instances. He links his stanzas with the conjunctive ‘and’ (eight instances — with another four in the interpolated passage) or ‘then’ (seven instances — plus four), while seventy-nine of the one hundred and eight 4-line stanzas (omitting the interpolation), are linked to their fellows through dialogue. In this respect *Flodden* is the antithesis of *Scotish* (where, as has been pointed out, there is very little dialogue), but conforms with the general custom of the traditional ballad which frequently uses conversation to tell the tale. The traditional ballad does not generally utilise the extrinsic voice. It is noticeable that in the *histoire* of *PF* 39, beyond the conventional use of the domestic ‘our’, and the formulaic ‘filler’ ‘as I weene’ (l. 352), the narrator does not appear directly and makes only a single subjective comment on the action (l. 18). In the units of *discours*, his presence is only inferred by the use of ‘us’ and ‘our’ (ll. 1,2 & 4; 511 & 512). The personal pronoun appears only once in this text — including the interpolation.

---

70. F.J. Child, *EPSB*, III (New York, ‘Dover’ edn. 1965), 351-62.

71. It is noted that the use of enallage, i.e. ‘saies’ where ‘said’ might be expected, occurs in the interpolated passage in seven instances: it does not occur elsewhere in the text at all.

Despite the lack of a personal immediacy given to a text through the presence of a vociferous narrator (as seen in *Bosworth* for instance), the narrative flow is carefully maintained and the poet demonstrates a degree of personal skill which is not entirely dependent on an ability to remember, select and fit traditional phrases together to make his story. This is particularly noticeable in the episode with which the Second Part begins, which might be termed 'The Yeoman's Story'. At this point there is a marked falling away in the inclusion of traditional phrases and a diminution in 'weak' lines and chevilles — although of course when characters arrive before the king they naturally 'kneel' upon their 'knees' (l. 294), and the small roll of knights with Derby are described in similar chivalric terms to those present in the Battle Roll in *Bosworth*. However because the matter of this section of the text does not easily lend itself to convention — there is no traditional paradigm for the poet to follow as the episode is unique — the *Flodden* poet has had to rely on his own skill, and has told the tale in a straightforward way with little ornamentation or repetition, and very few 'weak' lines. The result is that the style becomes more taut and the poet's pace is quickened. It is here that the poet begins the careful build up that terminates in the climactic lines 'it was a wronge wryting . . . /that came from the Erle of Surrey' (ll. 399-400).<sup>72</sup> The consequence of the slight change of style, is that the effectiveness of the poet's 'message' is enhanced while the audience is unaware that it is being subject to deliberate propaganda because the story's fluency is uninterrupted.

In short the text of *Flodden* in its lexical structure and style exhibits a greater affinity with the traditional ballad than it does with the Romance. The remainder of this chapter will show that it is probable that the original *Flodden* text was written by a single author and that the ballad format was deliberately chosen as being the most suitable for his audience and his purpose.

---

72. This climax is ruined in the *Folio* text by the interpolation of the 'Egerton' episode.

b. Synopsis of Tale

For the purpose of this analysis the text has been divided into 4-line stanzas. The system used follows that utilised for *Durham*.

<b>Plot Unit</b>	<b>Complementary Unit</b>
	<i>cu 1a (i)</i> (Narrator's exhortation: st. 1)
	<i>1a (ii)</i> (Narrator's synopsis: st. 1)
<i>pu 1</i> The Earle of Surrey writes a letter to our king in France: st. 2	<i>cu 1b (i)</i> He seals it himself: st. 2
<i>pu 2</i> Herald leaves from Newcastle: st. 2	
<i>pu 3</i> He arrives at Calais: st. 3	<i>cu 3a</i> Like a nobleman: st. 3
<i>pu 4</i> He goes to 'Turwin': st. 3	<i>cu 4a</i> He hopes to find King Harry: st. 3
	<i>4b</i> The town has been razed: st. 4
	<i>4c</i> It is garrisoned with English: st. 4
<i>pu 5</i> He goes to 'Turnay': st. 4	<i>cu 5a</i> The Emperor of Almaine is there: st. 4
	<i>5b</i> Also the English king: st. 4
	<i>5c</i> (Blessed be his name: st. 4)
<i>pu 6</i> Herald meets the king: st. 5	<i>cu 6a</i> He falls on his knees: st. 5
	<i>6b</i> He greets the king: st. 5
<i>pu 7</i> The king asks after his people: st. 6	
<i>pu 8</i> The Herald replies that the king should try his luck in France as the Scots' king Jamie is dead: st. 7	<i>cu 8a</i> The corpse is in London: st. 7
<i>pu 9</i> The king asks who fought and who fled: st. 8	<i>cu 9a</i> He asks who did best at Flodden: st. 8
	<i>9b</i> Who was false? st. 8
	<i>9c</i> Who was true? st. 8
<i>pu 10</i> "Cheshire and Lancashire fled" st. 9	<i>cu 10a</i> "None of Derby's men dared look at the enemy" st. 9
<i>pu 11</i> In a study the king stands thinking: st. 10	<i>cu 11a</i> He takes the letter: st. 10
	<i>11b</i> Breaks the seal: st. 10
	<i>11c</i> Confirms the news: st. 10
<i>pu 12</i> The king asks for Derby to be brought: st. 11	<i>cu 12a (i)</i> He says that Derby has called these Shires the flower of chivalry: st. 12
	<i>12a (ii)</i> But they fled: st. 12
	<i>12a (iii)</i> No one was loyal: st. 12
	<i>cu 12b (i)</i> Egerton kneels: st. 13
	<i>12b (ii)</i> He asks for pardon: st. 13
	<i>12b (iii)</i> He says he would wager that if the two

- Shires fled it was for want of their  
Captain: st. 14
- 12b (iv)* If Derby had been Captain they would  
not have fled: st. 15
- cu 12c (i)* The king replies that so it would seem  
as they were false in his hour of need:  
st. 16
- cu 12d (i)* Brereton kneels: st. 17  
*12d (ii)* If the king will put Derby and his men  
in the fore of the next battle he will  
see if they are true or not: st. 18
- cu 12e (i)* Compton whispers to the king that  
they should leave the cowards: st. 19  
*12e (ii)* Egerton challenges: st. 19  
*12e (iii)* "Take my glove and fight man to man:  
st. 20  
*12e (iv)* If the king were not here one of us  
would die: st. 20  
*12e (v)* Neither would move a foot until one  
was dead" st. 21
- cu 12f (i)* Angry, the king quells him: st. 21
- pu 13* Derby arrives: st. 22
- cu 13a* He kneels: st. 22  
*12b* He greets the king: st. 23  
*12c* The king greets him: st. 23
- pu 14* The king asks him how he  
likes Cheshire and  
Lancashire: st. 24
- cu 14a* They were counted the chief in  
chivalry: st. 24  
*14b* But falsely they fled: st. 24  
*14c* None were true! st. 24
- pu 15* Derby replies that he  
should not be rebuked  
as he wasn't there: st. 25
- cu 15a (i)* "I would wager life and land if I had  
been Captain they would not have  
fled" st. 26
- cu 15b (i)* He asks for the two Shires; they are  
all he needs to fight the Scots:  
sts. 27-28  
*15b (ii)* "Hang me if I fail: st. 28  
*15b (iii)* I'll conquer all the way to Paris: st. 28  
*15c (iv)* I'll raze strong castles" sts. 28-29
- cu 15d (i)* "You'll never have the Shires at your  
sole command: st. 30  
*15d (ii)* Cowards will fight fiercely for victory"  
st. 31
- cu 15e (i)* Derby says, "We were never cowards:  
st. 31  
*15e (ii)* Who helped your father at Milford  
Haven? st. 31  
*15e (iii)* Got him to Shrewsbury? st. 32  
*15e (iv)* We crowned him: st. 32  
*15e (v)* We judged Richard to death that day."  
st. 32
- pu 16* The king turns away: st. 33

- pu 17* Buckingham arrives: st. 33
- pu 18* “The letter is a false libel of Surrey’s” st. 34
- cu 17a* “Buck up Stanley” st. 34  
*17b* “Don’t grieve” st. 34
- cu 18a (i)* He would wager his life on it: st. 34  
*18a (ii)* “Surrey hasn’t liked you since Bosworth: st. 35  
*18a (iii)* Your Uncle killed his Father: st. 35  
*18a (iv)* Sir Christopher Savage took his Standard away” st. 35<sup>73</sup>
- cu 18b (i)* Derby deplores the time he was made knight: st. 36  
*18b (ii)* Became ruler of land: st. 36  
*18b (iii)* Had manhood to fight: st. 36
- cu 18c [i-xviii]* Derby ‘Farewells’ 18 knights from Cheshire and Lancashire whom he feels must have died rather than run away: sts. 36-47
- cu 18d (i)* Talbot and Shrewsbury come to comfort him: st. 48<sup>74</sup>  
*18d (ii)* “Buck up and be merry: st. 49  
*18d (iii)* Don’t grieve: st. 49  
*18d (iv)* I’m the king’s Godfather” st. 49
- cu 18e (i)* Derby takes Buckingham’s arm: st. 50  
*18e (ii)* So does Shrewsbury: st. 50  
*18f (i)* “I am sorry to part with you: farewell” st. 50
- cu 18f [ii-xiii]* Derby ‘Farewells’ 11 towns or manors: sts. 50-58

## Part II

- pu 19* Jamie Garsed flees to Derby: st. 60
- cu 19a (i)* He is a Yeoman of the Guard: st. 60  
*19a (ii)* Brought up with Derby: st. 60  
*cu 19a (iii)* He has slain 2 of his fellows and wounded 3 more: st. 60
- cu 19b (i)* Derby is not pleased: st. 61  
*19b (ii)* Once he could have helped: st. 62  
*19b (iii)* But if he intercedes now Jamie will die: st. 62
- cu 19b (iv)* He will ask his friends to help: st. 63  
*19b (v)* Buckingham: st. 63  
*19b (vi)* Shrewsbury: st. 63  
*19b (vii)* Fitzwater: st. 64  
*19b (viii)* Willoughby: st. 64  
*19b (ix)* Sir Rice ap Thomas: st. 64
- pu 20* A message from the king arrives ordering Garsed to be hanged: sts. 65-66
- cu 20a (i)* Derby hopes the king will change his mind: st. 67

73. The text has ‘always’ for ‘awaye’ (l. 144); see *Bosworth* (ll. 619-624) where Sir William Brandon is praised as Henry’s Standard Bearer. The Savages were closely related to the Stanleys.

74. Historically these two individuals are one and the same person - Talbot was the family name of the Earls of Shrewsbury.

- pu 21* Garsed and the knights  
come to the king: st. 73
- cu 20b (i)* The poet recites a list of 13 men with  
Garsed: sts. 68-72
- cu 21a (i)* They all kneel: st. 73  
*21a (ii)* They are welcomed: st. 73-4
- cu 21b (i)* Garsed is a traitor: st. 74  
*21b (ii)* "How dare you come to me? st. 74  
*21b (iii)* Slay your companions?" st. 75
- pu 22* Garsed asks pardon: his  
companions had called him  
a coward: sts. 75-76
- cu 22a (i)* "I was at supper: st. 76  
*22a (ii)* They wouldn't stop talking: st. 76  
*22a (iii)* I became angry: st. 76  
*cu 22a (iv)* They bade me flee to the coward  
Derby: st. 77  
*22a (v)* Derby helped me when I was little:  
st. 77  
*22a (vi)* He kept me until I was able to  
shoot and pitch a stone: st. 78
- cu 22b (i)* Then at Greenwich a Scottish minstrel  
brought you a bow none of your Guard  
could draw: st. 79  
*22b (ii)* The bow was given to Derby who  
gave it to me: st. 80  
*cu 22b (iii)* I shot 7 shots before you and then  
the bow broke: st. 80  
*22b (iv)* I told the minstrel to give the bow  
back to the King of Scots: st. 81  
*cu 22b (v)* You enrolled me in your Guards:  
st. 81  
*22c (i)* Since then I have had a good life:  
st. 82  
*22c (ii)* I thank you and Derby: st. 82  
*22c (iii)* But I had rather suffer death than be  
false to my 'bringer-up', so true to  
me" sts. 82-83
- pu 23* The King forgives him:  
st. 83
- cu 23a (i)* He gives him a Charter: st. 83  
*23a (ii)* "Let me have no more fights while  
we're in France" st. 84
- cu 23b (i)* "Then order death for any who  
rebuke the Shires: sts. 84-5  
*23b (ii)* Taunting will cause strife among your  
men" st. 86
- pu 24* For the sake of peace in his  
army the king orders death  
for any who rebuke the  
Shires: st. 86
- pu 25* A night passes: st. 87
- pu 26* A messenger comes from the  
Queen: st. 87
- cu 26a (i)* He kneels: st. 88  
*26a (ii)* He greets the king: st. 88  
*cu 26a (iii)* The Queen tells the King to be glad:  
st. 89

- 26a (iv) The Scots' king is dead: st. 89  
26a (v) His body is in London: st. 89
- pu* 27 The King asks who fought  
and who fled? st. 90
- cu* 27a "Who did best at Flodden? st. 90  
27b Who was false and who was true?"  
st. 90
- pu* 28 The messenger says that  
Lancashire and Cheshire  
were the heroes: st. 91
- cu* 28a (i) If Derby had not been true then  
England would have been in peril:  
st. 91
- cu* 28b (i) The king rewards Egerton: st. 92  
28b (ii) Sir Edward Stanley: st. 92  
28b (iii) Young John Stanley: st. 93
- cu* 28c (i) Buckingham tells Derby the news:  
st. 93  
28c (ii) "Be merry! Yesterday your men were  
cowards: today they are heroes!"  
st. 94
- pu* 29 Derby goes to the king:  
st. 95
- cu* 29a (i) He is welcomed: st. 95  
29a (ii) His power is restored: st. 96  
29a (iii) The situation has grieved him: st. 97
- pu* 30 The king declares that Surrey  
will be punished for his  
'wrong writing': st. 98
- cu* 30a (i) Derby asks to be his Judge: st. 99  
30a (ii) The king makes him the Lord  
Marshall: st. 100
- cu* 30a (iii) Derby says he will save Surrey's life:  
st. 101  
30a (iv) Surrey was only avenging his  
Father's death: st. 101
- cu* 30b (i) The king replies that Derby is very  
patient: st. 102  
30b (ii) He has the Holy Ghost: st. 102
- cu* 30c (i) He is to siege south Tournai: st. 102  
30c (ii) With Shrewsbury: st. 102
- pu* 31 Derby and Shrewsbury go  
to Tournai: st. 103
- cu* 31a They set about the walls: st. 103  
31b In 3 days they win the town: st. 103
- [The section unique to PF 39 begins here.]**
- pu* 32 Ratcliffe is ordered to  
southern Tournai: st. 104
- cu* 32a He has 1003 men: st. 104
- pu* 33 He goes forth: st.105
- pu* 34 Tournai falls in 3 days:  
st. 105
- cu* 34a 300 English garrison it: st. 106  
34b The king wishes Ratcliffe to be  
Governor: st. 106  
34c Ratcliffe wants to go home: st. 106
- pu* 35 The king orders Egerton  
to come to him: st. 107
- cu* 35a He is to be rewarded: st. 108



- pu* 36 Egerton comes: st. 108
- cu* 36a (i) He kneels: st. 109  
36a (ii) He asks for a reward at home in Cheshire: st. 109
- cu* 36b (i) The king says he has nothing there: st. 110  
36b (ii) He can have 5 mills on the Dee at Chester: st. 110
- cu* 36c (i) Egerton says he doesn't wish to be a miller: st. 111
- cu* 36d (i) The king vows that while there is a King of England there will be a Miller of Dee: st. 112  
36d (ii) He will give Egerton the Forest of Snowdon: st. 113  
36d (iii) The rents should please him: st. 113
- cu* 36e (i) Egerton says he doesn't wish to be a ranger: st. 114
- cu* 36f (i) The king is vexed: st. 115  
36f (ii) He says nothing pleases Egerton: st. 115
- cu* 36g (i) Egerton asks for a small grange in the lordship of Ridley: st. 116  
36g (ii) It was a tanner's house: st. 117  
36g (iii) It is very small: st. 117  
36g (iv) It would please him: st. 117
- pu* 37 The King grants him the grange and lordship of Ridley: st. 118
- cu* 37a For Egerton's good service: st. 119  
37b For him and his heirs: st. 119  
37c (Thus Egerton came to be Lord of Ridley: st. 119)
- pu* 38 King Harry won many French victories: st. 120
- cu* 38a Hans, Guisnes and other walled towns: st. 121  
38b 'Turwine' & 'Tournay': st. 121  
38c Bologne & Base Bologne: st. 122  
38d Montreuil: st. 122  
38e (Chronicles do not lie: st. 122)  
38f He kept Calais garrisoned to his dying day: st. 122
- [The unique section ends here]**
- pu* 39 Thus were the two Shires rebuked through Surrey's cunning trick: st. 123
- cu* 39a (God save the king: st. 123  
39b Have mercy on Derby's soul: st. 123)

This synopsis shows that *Flodden* does not mirror the structural patterns of any of the texts previously examined in this study. It also shows that the 'Egerton' section, unique to *The Folio*, has a structure which can be interpreted as confirming the premise that it is an interpolation.

The section of *PF* 39 which is not unique (the *Flodden* passage), has a little symmetry but this would appear to be a function of the 4-line stanza. None of the units

within the interpolated passage has a structure which reflects its 4-line stanza. The basic simplicity of the plot-units within the *Flodden* section of the text, is embroidered to a considerable degree with a high proportion of incremental complementary-units necessitating sub-divisions within the unit. However this is apparently done at random in accordance with the demands of the tale. The interpolation is more purposeful. The essence of the added passage is set out in a plot-unit containing a lengthy complementary infrastructure which is linked to the main narrative by two simple plot-units (*pu 32 & 33*), and introduced by two further plot-units expanded by minimal complementary-units. The point of the poet's interpolation having been made, the poet then attempts to rejoin the main narrative prior to its termination, by means of a final pair of double units. That the 'Egerton' poet has been more concerned with the 'message' in his addition than in the manner in which he connects it to the original text, is seen in his unnecessary repetition (*cu 31b, pu 34*) and the fact that he has ignored the scenic structure of the poem he has used which has been oriented towards its quite different 'message' — partly, as Baird remarks, through 'the technique of playing a scene twice, with slight differences the second time': this systemic pattern in the hands of the *Flodden* poet uses irony to emphasize the 'message' — the events of the first scene will be reversed in its later repetition.<sup>75</sup> The incremental repetitions which the 'Egerton' poet makes within his dialogue have no such irony and are a function of the structure of the traditional ballad. This poet's indifference to the composition of the original poem has meant that the climax of the original work has been virtually negated by the presence of his addition which, having nothing whatever to do with the original text's topic and having been placed, at length, immediately before the *Flodden* poet's succinct summary (*pu 39*) of what his verses have been about, ruins the effect and confirms that there has been an interpolation.

#### A. *The 'Flodden' Poet's Account and the Historical Sources*

The sources consulted for *Flodden* are for the most part, those used for *Scotish*. No part of *PF 39* appears to be indebted to any one source now extant, but because the historical setting of the siege of Tournai is present only as a background to the action of the poem and is therefore highly condensed, the text does not contain sufficient detail to enable evidence to be produced which might suggest that the poet was or was not present at the action he describes.<sup>76</sup>

### V. **The 'Durham' Paradigm and *Flodden Feilde***

#### a. Examination

The first part of the following discussion examines the thirteen areas in which *PF*

---

75. Baird, p. 64.

76. On the whole I am inclined to think that he was not, on the grounds that first, the few facts which he does give are such as were probably general knowledge, and secondly that he utilises every method he can to emphasise Derby's sterling character and loyalty *except* his martial valour in France: intimation of this is quite missing with regard to the reduction of 'Turwine' and with regard to Tournai is confined to the bleak statement that he 'wan the towne in dayes 3' (l. 422).

39 agrees with the paradigm derived from *Durham*. This is perhaps a surprisingly high number in view of the fact that *Flodden* differs from the texts previously discussed, in several ways. First, the poem does not primarily describe a battle: Tournai, as I have noted, is present only because historically that was where Henry VIII was when he received news of Flodden<sup>77</sup> Secondly, the composite 'hero' (the Shire-men), is physically absent but is in effect present through the representatives Derby (for the commanders) and Garsed (for the men). Thirdly, the hero of the interpolation is Sir Ralph Egerton, but the actual deeds that qualify him for the position are not mentioned except as a generality, and fourthly, almost the whole of *Flodden* is couched in dialogue.

It will be shown that these differences have affected the poet's presentation of some of the topics covered by the paradigm and are the cause of all but one of the items which disagree being at variance with it.

The 'message' of the text relating to the innocence of the Shire-men at Flodden is framed within the context of Henry VIII's siege of Tournai. The broad circumstances of the siege are reduced to hints: for instance the presence of the 'Emperour of Almaine' (l. 16) is left unexplained and no mention is made of the conditions which led to various alliances and ultimately Henry's invasion of France.<sup>78</sup> (Item 1: *Simplification*). With regard to Flodden the poet speaks only of Henry's reception of the announcement of victory in Surrey's letter, the news of the Shire-men's flight and the Queen's later message. Both the *Flodden* and 'Egerton' poets omit or summarise specific smaller historical details likely to distract from the poem's 'message', (Item 2: *Details*).<sup>79</sup> Both authors concentrate on their principal character (Item 3: *Character focus*). This is more noticeable in the 'Egerton' passage which has only two main characters — Egerton of first importance and the King second. In *Flodden* attention is fixed first on Derby; positions of secondary magnitude are filled by the King and by Garsed. However, unlike the 'Egerton' passage where, after the introduction, the action takes place in isolation, in *Flodden* mention is made of numerous subsidiary characters so that the overall impression is that of an event taking place in the midst of an encampment which is milling with activity even though that activity is not described.

As in the other texts so far studied, *PF* 39 is sprinkled with inaccurate names which in most cases, are probably due to scribal error, for instance 'Sir Bode' (l. 177) for 'Bold', 'Sir Downe' (l. 185) for 'Done' (Item 4: *Nomenclature*).<sup>80</sup> The intrusion of an ampersand between lines 195-96 changes the presentation of a single person to two:

---

77. The 'Egerton' passage has been interpolated into *PF* 39 probably because the *Flodden* poet had already included Sir Ralph Egerton into his text (ll. 53-64, 374).

There is a possibility however, that in the second passage where Sir Ralph is mentioned, the 'Egerton' poet has deleted another character's name and inserted Egerton's. The reason for so thinking is that this passage (ll. 373-78), occurs where Henry VIII, having just had the victory at Flodden confirmed and been told that it was the Shire-men who gained the upper hand, is busily noting how he will reward the Shire-men's commanders, Edward and John Stanley. It seems rather odd that he should also reward Egerton — for no particular reason — at this particular time, when Egerton had no connection with Flodden. On the other hand there is a *caveat* which may negate this suggestion: Sir Ralph is present in these lines in both the variant manuscripts — which do *not* contain the 'Egerton' interpolation, although it is possible that having recognised the addition, they omitted it.

The geographic and military background of the poem is only relevant to Sir Ralph inasmuch as he was historically present at Tournai: as will be shown however, Tournai is the wrong location for the event covered in the interpolation's topic.

78. For which see the succinct summary made by Baird, pp. xvff.

79. In the following I shall refer to the interpolation as the 'Egerton' passage and its author as the 'Egerton' poet. The remainder of the text is the *Flodden* poem and its author is therefore the *Flodden* poet.

came For to comfort him the trew Talbott  
& the noble Erle of Shrewsburye

Similarly there is error in place names: 'Beeston' (l. 224) for 'Bidston', 'fortune' (l. 129) for 'Forton'. However I have observed that few of the inaccuracies are common to all three manuscripts and conclude that therefore most of these errors in *PF* 39 are probably scribal, and that the poet shows sound personal knowledge of the men and places associated with the Stanleys. As might be expected from the paradigm, minor characters are not named unless by naming them the poet can create an effect.<sup>81</sup> This is seen in Derby's 'Farewell' speech, where the piling up of names is necessary to the passage's essential *commoratio* — 'these men must have fought until they were killed: they would never have been part of a cowardly flight'.

The 'Egerton' poet does not seem to have a sound knowledge of his topic. The hero is not the *Flodden* poet's historically accurate 'Raphe' (l. 53). but the inaccurate 'Rowland' (l. 440 and *passim*).<sup>82</sup> This may conceivably be a scribal error if the scribe was copying from a manuscript which abbreviated well known names — the *Folio* for instance, has the abbreviation 'Row', but the reference to the taking of 'Hans', 'Gynye', 'High-' and 'Base-Bullen' and 'Muttrell' (Guines, Boulogne and Montreuil) is anachronistic and belongs to the French campaign of 1544 (Item 7: *Chronology*).<sup>83</sup>

The topic of both sections of *PF* 39 describes a single 'episode' organised in a single chronological linear sequence (Item 13: *Episode: linear sequence*), although there are slight lapses from temporal accuracy (Item 7: *Chronology*). The Queen's messenger who confirmed the first news of the victory at Flodden, historically arrived on the 21st September — the same day that Tournai submitted, and the report (in both the *Flodden* and 'Egerton' passages), that it yielded after only three days is false: Henry VIII himself, in a letter to Pope Leo X, states that the siege lasted 8 days.<sup>84</sup> Egerton did not receive the honour of Ridley at Tournai in September but, as I show presently, in England five months later.

Because there are few changes of physical location the *Flodden* poet's concatenation of scenes is simple (Item 11: *Links*). A change of scene is frequently heralded by the advent of a new character and the opening of a new conversation with characters appearing as the result of a journey or a summons, or sometimes they just

---

80. From my study of MSS. A and B, I conclude that the nomenclature of *PF* 39 is, by and large, more accurate than that of the variant texts. For identification and details relating to the historical characters named see Baird, pp. 63-78.

However, strictly speaking, the allocation of knighthood to many of the poem's characters is inaccurate since Brereton, Egerton, Willoughby, and Compton were not knighted until the 25th September, and Lealand and Ratcliff until the 14th October. (*CLP, Hen. 8, I, 2, item 2301, p. 1027; App. 26, p. 1556*). These gentlemen were honoured as a result of their efforts at Tournai and elsewhere in France, and since the anachronism is only a matter of a few weeks, I feel that it is of no real significance and only note it for completeness.

81. For instance Maximilian I (1459-1519), is only the 'Emperour of Almaine'.

82. Egerton in the *Flodden* passage in the manuscripts. is: MS. A: 'Ralphe'; MS. B: 'Rauphe'.

83. Baird, p. iii.

84. *CLP, Hen. 8, I, 2, item 2268, p. 1016; item 2355, p. 1047; Original Letters, 3 vols., ed. H. Ellis, (1824; London, 3rd series, 1836), I, 88.*

Baird, p. xiv, does not give his sources but states that Tournai 'eventually capitulated on 26th September'. This is incorrect — the treaty of capitulation, signed by Henry VIII, is dated the 23rd of September: *CLP, item 2294 (xvii), p. 1026.*

arrive. As in the paradigm the majority of the links are fictitious — the arrival of messengers from England being the only scenic links with any likely veracity. The ‘Egerton’ poet’s *histoire* consists of two scenes: the siege of Tournai (ll. 423-38), and the donation of Ridley. They are not linked other than by the conjunctive phrase ‘& then’ (l. 440) when, with no connection with what has gone before, the king sends for Egerton.

Both the *Flodden* and ‘Egerton’ passages in *PF* 39 have a grand climax (ll. 399-422, 492-495): the *Flodden* poet builds up his poem to the final vindication of the Shire-men and the proposed punishment of the villain — which then allows the hero to display magnanimity and martial prowess (Item 14: *Climax*). The ‘Egerton’ passage climaxes with the donation of Ridley to the hero and his heirs.

Both the *Flodden* and ‘Egerton’ poets present a terminal summary of their topic (Item 15: *Post-climactic moral*):

& thus came Row[land] Egertton  
to the Lordshippe of Rydley faire & free.

ll. 494-95

thus was lancashire and Cheshire rebuked  
thorow the pollicye of the Erle of Surrey

ll. 508-09

These are not ‘morals’ in the sense that they encapsulate some universal maxim regulating conduct which has been exemplified in the preceding text. However they *are* ‘morals’ in that they encapsulate the information which has been set out in the tale and incorporate a suggestion of right or wrong. In *Flodden* the use of ‘rebuked’ (in the meaning ‘blamed’) and ‘pollicye’ (in the meaning ‘cunning trick’), focuses on the theme of *Wrongful Accusation*. On the other hand the ‘Egerton’ poet’s ‘faire & free’ focuses on the theme *Rightful Reward*.

The idea that the Egerton’s gained their family seat ‘faire & free’ is repeated in the same words at lines 490-91; that it was freely given because the king desired to please and reward Egerton, is repeated at lines 443-4, 448, 468, 492, 486-7 (Item 16: *Moral: repetition*). The notion that the Shire-men were unfairly ‘rebuked’ is present throughout the *Flodden* text while the information that the accusation of cowardice stemmed from a false report from Surrey is repeated at lines 137-44.

The dialogue in the whole of *PF* 39 is unsourced (Item 8: *Dialogue & source*), and thus agrees with the paradigm. Agreement is also seen in the dialogue’s expansion of character and emphasis on the text’s ‘message’ (Item 9: *Dialogue: character & moral*).

The greater part of the ‘Egerton’ passage is in the form of a conversation between the hero and the King and is designed to show the hero as a worthy Egerton ancestor. Similarly a considerable proportion of the spoken passages in the *Flodden* poem are intended to show Derby as a man of moral worth, loved and trusted by his followers — represented by Garsed — who, by a kind of osmosis take their qualities from their leader and would therefore be incapable of cowardice when led by such as he. This is especially emphasised in the ‘Farewell’ passages. In the first of these (ll. 145-92), Derby speaks of the knights, his friends, at Flodden and describes them in terms which leave no doubt that they are all steadfast and honourable men.<sup>85</sup> The ‘message’ of this passage is repeated (with slight lexical variation), ten times:

---

85. ‘manly’ (l. 166), ‘noble’ (l. 162), ‘bold’ (l. 149), ‘good’ (l. 158), ‘true’ (l. 161), &c.

“surelye whiles thy liffe wold last  
thou woldest neuer shrinke beside the plaine . . .  
well I wott that thou art slaine!”

ll. 153-156

In the second ‘Farewell’ (ll. 201-38), the ‘message’ relates to Derby himself as he says goodbye to all the places and properties he will not see again. The implication is that in true heroic fashion, he cannot continue to live after his companions have died:

“farewell now for euer & aye:  
many pore men may pray for my soule  
when they lie weeping in the lane”

ll. 207-08<sup>86</sup>

The excellence of Derby’s character is summed up by the king at the end of the *Flodden* passage:

“the holy ghost remaines, I thinke, in thee”

l. 416

The conversations which Derby has with Buckingham, Shrewsbury and other knights, show these gentlemen attempting to alleviate Derby’s loyal grief — Derby is too honourable to suspect Surrey’s duplicity — and in one passage, expressing disbelief that the Shire-men could have fled and postulating that the news is false (ll. 135-44). This of course is also the conventional use of dramatic irony which lets the audience know a fact in advance of the characters. Here they are given foreknowledge of the essential message of the whole text.

That the Shire-men have ‘right’ on their side is shown by implication throughout the *Flodden* text (Item 18: *Right*). Their leader Derby, is shown to be ‘honourable’ (ll. 28, 48, 90), and ‘noble’ (ll. 246, 280, 403). Surrey’s letter, and therefore Surrey, is ‘false’ (l. 140) and ‘wronge’ (l. 399).

Because the ‘Egerton’ section does not properly have a villain, the poet cannot contrast right and wrong: the hero, Egerton, is ‘right’ only in that he has done ‘good service’ (l. 443-44) for his king and merits a substantial reward.

The following discussion shows how the poet’s treatment of his topic has influenced his text away from agreement with the paradigm.

The ‘Egerton’ poet’s purpose is to demonstrate the validity of the foundation of the Egerton family as lords of Ridley. The presentation of the honour is set out at length but the king’s reason for making it is simply for ‘the good service that thou hast done’ (ll. 443 & 492), and nothing further (Item 5: *Motivation*). Here the poet conforms to the paradigm.

---

86. HF I, 327 prints ‘lane’ for ‘laue’; MSS. A and B have ‘Laue’ and ‘lawue’ respectively although Baird, while agreeing that there is corruption (p. 72), prints ‘Lane’ and ‘lawne’. I have carefully examined all three manuscripts and through comparison with other examples of the disputed letters, conclude that the ‘u’ reading is more accurate than the ‘n’ even though such a reading forms an unfamiliar word. There are three possible meanings to ‘laue’ — any of which make better sense than ‘lane’:  
*OED*, Law, *sb*<sup>3</sup>, *Sc.* and *north*. 1, 2: a ‘hill’ or a ‘grave-mound’.  
*OED*, Lee, *sb*<sup>1</sup>, 3: ‘peace’, ‘calmness’, ‘tranquillity’.  
Because, in all three texts, the word is to rhyme with ‘aye’ (pronounced ‘ee’); because ‘lee’ would not necessitate the emendment of ‘in’ to ‘on’; because ‘lee’ is often found as part of a formulaic phrase and with various forms of the alliterating verb ‘to lie’ — as it is here — I suggest that this may be marginally the more favourable emendation.

Since the *Flodden* poet's purpose is to exculpate the Shire-men from the charge of cowardice, he must provide some acceptable reason for their flight if they fled or prove it a lie if they did not. Therefore, because the poet has carefully detailed all his principal characters' motivations insofar as they relate to the Shire-men's flight, this section of *PF* 39 does not conform to the paradigm. The *Flodden* poet presents several motivations as reasons for flight: Egerton (the same man as the hero of the interpolation), tells the king that if the Shires fled 'it was for want of their Captaine' the Earl of Derby (ll. 57-64).<sup>87</sup> This theme is reiterated by Derby himself (ll. 101-108), and later expanded by an indirect suggestion that if the ranks fled it was because their subordinate commanders had been killed (ll. 149-192). In a long preamble to the news that the tale of the flight was a lie, Garsed appears and reminds the king of his motivation in making him, Garsed, a member of the King's Yeomen. He explains the division of loyalties which motivate the troops to fight among themselves — some uphold Derby and the Shires and some decry their valour (ll. 305-48).<sup>88</sup> In order to maintain a united army, the king decrees death for any who vilify the Shire-men. His action is justified when the charge of cowardice is proved to be untrue with the arrival of the Queen's Messenger who bears the news that the Shiremen did not flee and that Surrey's letter was a 'wronge wryting' (l. 399). The audience realises that Surrey's motivation for writing it (which has been given earlier in the poem at lines 141-44: he hated Derby whose uncle killed his father) must have been true, and the poet underlines this with a direct statement: 'thus was Lancashire & Cheshire rebuked/thorowe the pollicye of the Erle of Surrey' (ll. 508-09).

In the texts so far studied, dialogue serves to note character movement but does not greatly forward the principal event (Item 10: *Dialogue: movement and event*). The dialogue of *PF* 39 notes movement but in the whole of the text the 'event' — which here is not the flight at Flodden but its repudiation — is almost entirely described through characters' speech.

In the 'Egerton' section of this text the 'event' is the gaining of the Lordship and manor of Ridley. Since it was not seized in war but was a gift, the transaction requires a donor and a recipient: to add authenticity to his account of the original acquisition of the Egerton family seat, the poet reports the dialogue accompanying the gift.

With regard to item 5: *Motivation*, it was shown that paradigmatic non-conformity is only present in the *Flodden* section: in the following discussion of item 17: *Partisan*, it is shown that here it is the 'Egerton' passage which is aberrant. Because the whole of *PF* 39 is for the most part, presented through the speech of the characters themselves, the narrator's voice is seldom heard. However the *Flodden* poet shows that he is partisan: he is English — he refers to 'our English soldiers' (l. 14), in referring to the king he frequently uses the domestic 'our' and, in almost the only aside in the entire text, he demonstrates a fervent patriotism:

---

87. This is the same reason as that given in *Scotish*.

88. With the kind permission of Messenger Sergeant-Major Tom Taylor, I have personally inspected the archives of the King's Yeomen held at St. James's Palace, London. Owing to an eighteenth century fire, the existing records are somewhat scanty and make no reference to James Garsed. However there are three mentions of a 'James Gartside yeoman of the Guard' among extant State Documents: he was granted 6<sup>d</sup> per day on 20th June, 1512; the offices of 'troner and keeper of the beam in the town of Newcastle upon Tyne' on 18th July, 1512 and, on 8th February, 1514 a warrant was issued to the 'Great Wardrobe for "watching cloth" to James Gartsyde . . . of the Guard'. Thus it would appear that the poem's 'Long Jamie Garsed' is not an imaginary figure, but there is no historical reference to his feat with the bow — reminiscent of the traditional exploits of folk-heroes such as Robin Hood or Clim of the Clough — which is probably fiction. *CLP, Hen. 8*, I, 1, 1266(21), p. 581; I, 2, 1462(18), p. 668; 2638, p. 1152.

there he found the King of England —  
blessed Iesus, preserue that name!

ll. 17-18

That he is partisan with regard to the Stanleys is seen in the terminal prayer, 'haue mercy on the Erles soule of Derby' (l. 513). That he himself is probably a Stanley dependent is suggested in his detailed knowledge of the Earl of Derby's properties, relatives and friends as shown in the 'Farewell' passages and the 'Garsed' episode.<sup>89</sup>

That the 'Egerton' poet had partisan opinions as seen in the previous works studied, is not certain: the use of the domestic 'our' and the adjective 'noble' as applied to the King may be simply ballad convention, and there is nothing to show any personal connection with the House of Egerton other than the topic itself. Since he has misrepresented several of the basic facts for no ulterior purpose, if he is an Egerton then the connection is probably distant in either time or kinship.

Because the actual battle of Flodden is not described, and the siege of Tournai is only the background to the poets' narratives, there is no indication of the numbers opposing the English and thus this paradigmatic disagreement is plainly a function of the structure of the texts (Item 19: *Outnumbering*), as is the fact that the *Flodden* poet omits figures for the English forces — present in the 'Egerton' passage (Item 20: *Figures*). The 'Egerton' poet notes that Alexander Ratcliffe had 1003 troops with which to besiege the southern side of Tournai and that when overcome the city was garrisoned with 300 Englishmen (ll. 428, 430, 433). These figures are inaccurate. Alexander Ratcliffe, (kin to Lord Fitzwalter — see line 277 — who married Lady Margaret Stanley, daughter of Derby, about 1533, and who is thus a Stanley connection), is known to have been historically present as he was knighted at Tournai on 14th October, 1514.<sup>90</sup> He accompanied his relative, Fitzwalter, who was in the foreward with Shrewsbury, Derby, Hasting and Cobham.<sup>91</sup> Fitzwalter's retinue consisted of 'captain and petty captains, foot soldiers, 108'.<sup>92</sup> It is therefore improbable that Ratcliffe, not yet knighted, commanded 1003 men — it is certain that he did not besiege southern Tournai alone.<sup>93</sup> The garrison consisted of:<sup>94</sup>

Sir Edward Powninges . . . to be his [the king's] lieutenaunt  
with iiij.C archers, with capitaynes, horsemen and artilerie  
conuenient . . . and of his [the king's] garde he left there  
iiij.C archers.

In both the *Flodden* and 'Egerton' sections fiction is present which has a direct bearing on the event (Item 6: *Fiction and action*). The *Flodden* poet suggests (ll. 137-44), that Surrey sent a 'false writing' (l. 140), because he has 'neuer loued' Derby since Derby's uncle killed Surrey's father (the Duke of Norfolk), at Bosworth. Historically this is not

---

89. Baird, pp. 67-76.

It is probable that, as in *Bosworth*, the poet hoped to read his work to the men whom he carefully names in flattering terms.

90. *CLP, Hen.* 8, I, 2, App. 26; *DNB*, XVI, 578 ff.

91. *CLP, Hen.* 8, I, 2, item 2051, p. 923

92. *CLP, Hen.* 8, I, 2, item 2052, p. 924; item 1662(50), p.758.

93. Hall, *Union of the Two Noble Families of Lancaster and York*, (1550 facsim; London, 1970) 'The v yere of Kyng Henry the viij', fol. xxxvj<sup>v</sup> (xx).

94. Hall, *ibid.*, fol. xlv<sup>f</sup> (xxx).



so: it is thought that the Duke was killed by Oxford.<sup>95</sup> In reality Derby was not penalised for the Shire-men's flight and therefore the king could not restore Derby's 'Maurydden' (l. 391 — 'manred'), which he had not lost. Surrey was never in a position whereby Derby was to sit in judgement upon him (ll. 399-416), and, insofar as I have been able to discover, Derby was never Lord Marshall.<sup>96</sup> There is no record of strife within the English army in France over the Shire-men's flight and therefore there was no 'cry' that disputes were to cease on pain of death (l. 343) that had this matter as its cause.<sup>97</sup> Finally the message that 'lancashire & Cheshire haue done the deed' (ll. 369-70), that is, won the battle of Flodden, is only partially true in that the the Shire-men under Sir Edward Stanley did not retreat and they fought well. The *Flodden* poet's argument is that *none* of the Shire-men fled whereas (as noted in my examination of *Scottish*) this is certainly not true of the wing of Shire-men under Sir Edmund Howard.

As I have previously stated, the purpose of the 'Egerton' poet is to establish the foundation of the Egerton family at Ridley. The picture he paints of the founder is of a man who refuses all gifts proffered to him by the king, in favour of a 'cote with one eye' (l. 485) — a small cottage with one window — as the sum total of his humble ambition: the king grants it to him and throws in the Lordship of Ridley *gratis*. This picture is for the most part false. The historical facts which follow, depict an opportunist with larger aspirations than a humble cottage. They show how the poet has distorted reality to present the acquisition of Ridley as a straightforward chivalric reward, and Egerton as a man whose noble self-esteem shies at the thought of plebeian commerce:

1. May 1509: Ralph Egerton, 'gentleman usher of the Chamber', was made 'keeper of the manor and lordship of Ridley, Cheshire, with a mill and certain lands. . . . also steward and receiver of the lordship of Tatnall and all lands lately belonging to Sir William Stanley in the counties of Chester and Flint, with the nomination of the Bailiff of Nantwiche. . . .'
2. Nov. 1509: Receiver of lands 'lately belonging to the Lords Audeley and Lovell, attainted . . . with the fee-farm of the lordships of Newehaule and Tonstall. . . .' (Backdated to Michaelmas 1508).
3. May 1510: Twenty year lease of three manors. (Backdated to previous November).
4. Dec. 1510: Annuity of 2*l.* 13*s.* 4*d.* (Backdated to 1509).
5. May 1511: 'Keepership of the park of Wigmore in the marches of

---

95. HF I, 324n; Jean Molinet, *Chroniques de Jean Molinet*, 3 vols, ed. G. Doutrepoint & O.J. Jordogne (Brussels, 1935-37), I, 434; Sir George Buck, *The History of King Richard the Third (1619)*, ed. A.N. Kincaid (Gloucester, 1979), p. 107.

96. Thomas Howard, Earl of Surrey (created Duke of Norfolk as a reward for his service at Flodden, 1.2.1514) died in 1524. (See *DNB*). Thomas Stanley, 2nd Earl of Derby, died in 1521. However the second Duke of Norfolk (also a Thomas Howard), the Earl of Surrey until the death of his father, was tried for treason in 1546/7. The death of the king intervening, he appears eventually to have been pardoned. The third Earl of Derby, Edward Stanley (1508-1572), may have been among his judges. If, as has been stated by R.H. Robbins and J.L. Cutler, *Index of Middle English Verse: Supplement* (Lexington, 1965), p. 118, *PF* 39 was written post 1544 despite Baird's unsubstantiated assertion to the contrary (Baird, p. iii), then this may be simply another example of authorial confusion which, in view of the custom of perpetuating a forename in the eldest sons of given families, — to the perplexity of subsequent historians — is wholly understandable.

H.A.L. Fisher, *The History of England from the Accession of Henry VII to the Death of Henry VIII (1485-1547)*, Vol. V of *The Political History of England*, in 12 volumes (London, 1906), 478-80.

97. It is possible that the poet obtained the idea from the friction that certainly existed between the English and the German troops of the 'Emperour of Almaine'. *CLP, Hen.* 8, I, 2, item 2391, 'Diary of John Taylor, Clerk of the Parliaments', pp. 1057-62.

- Wales, with usual fees. . . .’
6. Oct. 1511: Lease for 41 years of the right to levy custom fees (‘prisage’), on wine &c. entering Chester.
  7. Aug. 1512: ‘Reversion of the manor and park and town of Shotewike, Cheshire, with herbage and pannage of the park and fishery in the Dee; for 41 years. . . .’
  8. Oct. 1512: ‘To have, for life, the keeping of all towers, chambers, stables, &c., in the castle of Chester. . . .’
  9. Dec. 1512: ‘Next presentation to the rectory of Billington Magna’.
  10. Sep. 1513: Knighted at Tournai.
  11. Jan. 1514: Appointed ‘to be the King’s standard bearer with 100*l* a year’.
  12. Jan. 1514: For life: ‘Steward of the manor of Londondale, Chester. . . .’
  13. Feb. 1514: ‘Grant in tail male of the manor of Rydley, a windmill in Farneton. . . . lands &c. (specified) in Bekerton, Chorley, Northwich, Frodesham, Waverton, Upton-near-Bache, Rowton and Lawton. . . . [lands] in the city of Chester, and in Huredyke, Flynt, N. Wales; forfeited by Sir William Stanley, attained.’<sup>98</sup>

From this it is seen that Egerton became the King’s standard bearer — not his marshall (l. 373); that he was knighted after Tournai but he was not given the lordship of Ridley until the following year when the king had left France (Item 7: *Chronology*); and that his refusal to become a miller on the Dee (l. 460) or a ranger in Wales (l. 475) as offending his dignity, is not in character in view of the positions he already held.<sup>99</sup> In short it would appear that the historical Egerton had no scruples about accepting whatever was offered; the modesty of the poetic Egerton who wants only the humble ‘cote’ — ‘a tanner there in it did dwell’ (l. 484), is an affectation appropriate to the depiction of the founder of the Egerton fortunes as a ‘simple soldier’.

The final item in this discussion concerns the paradigm’s statement, valid for the *Flodden* passage, that ‘minor fictions will be present to entertain the audience’ (Item 12: *Light relief*). In the *Flodden* section this is Garsed’s tale of how the Scottish bow could not withstand his strength and broke (ll. 317-28), which finishes:

“Then I bad the Scott bow down his face  
& gather vp the bow & bring it to his king”

ll. 325-26

This is in line with the examples of humour seen in the texts previously examined, in which the amusement is derived from the discomfiture — either real or imagined — of the enemy.

That Item 12 is also valid for the ‘Egerton’ passage is uncertain: the interpolation has two items which may once have had a humorous context given the contemporary audience’s extra-textual field of reference, but which are now obscure. First is Egerton’s aside that the ‘cote’ used to be inhabited by a tanner (l. 484).<sup>100</sup> Secondly, the king’s vow that as long as there is a King of England there shall be a ‘Miller of the Mills of Dee’ (ll. 463-66), occupies a whole stanza of the text and, as it stands, seems rather pointless unless it is a reference to something known to the audience but which is now lost.<sup>101</sup>

---

98. *CLP, Hen. 8, I, 1*, items 257(65), 485(9), 651(24), 784(8), 924(28), 1365(25), 1462((12), 1524(13); *I, 2*, items 2617(1), 2617(20), and 2684(45). After these grants Egerton appears to have received nothing further: later references simply call upon him to perform various duties.

99. *CLP, Hen. 8, I, 2*, item 2436, p. 1077-78.

100. That the reference to a tanner is a play on words alluding to the previous historical owner — Sir William Stanley — is possible though I have been unable to find any source evidence to support the suggestion.

## A. Conclusions

I. In the context of the texts previously examined in this study, the *Flodden* passage of *PF* 39 is unusual. The principal ‘event’ is not a concrete action taking place at the time of the poem which can be described by an ‘eye-witness’ narrator, but consists of the poet’s attempt to negate an abstract belief (the idea of the Shire-men’s flight), relating to an action which took place before the tale opens: in short, the *Flodden* poet deals mainly with his characters’ thoughts and opinions, not their actions. For this reason this poem is not a straight narrative recounting an historical tale, but rather is it an accumulation of arguments presented in the form of a narrative. The poet has had first, to present his rationale almost entirely through dialogue and has taken an oblique approach using *consummatio* — a number of different arguments tending towards the establishment of the same point. Secondly, because the causative action takes place before the narrative begins, the poet need not repeat the story of Flodden: a statement covering the actual action he is to exculpate or disprove is sufficient.<sup>102</sup> Likewise the background to the poem is basically irrelevant and may therefore be simplified to hardly more than a passing mention. Thirdly, because the Shire-men (who perform the ‘real’ heroic function), are not present, the poet sets up a dichotomic ‘representative hero’ in the persons of Derby (to stand for the heroic Commanders) and Garsed (to represent the rank and file). Fourthly, it has previously been shown that the texts so far studied which have not conformed to the paradigm with regards to character motivation, have not done so because the poet needed to explain a hero’s unheroic deed within the narrative ‘present time’. The *Flodden* poet’s characters’ motivations cannot relate to the unheroic deed while it is occurring or immediately after it has happened because the deed which in this poem needs explanation, took place in narrative ‘past’ time and at another location. Therefore the motivations provided by the poet are of two kinds: those which relate to the narrative present *actions* of various characters, and those which relate to the causative unheroic deed in the narrative past and which are put forward as *opinions* delivered by the present characters — never by the narrator.

In summary, although three-quarters of the paradigmatic items are valid in the *Flodden* passage, the complications which have arisen as a result of the causative action having been performed at another time and another place, have initiated paradigmatic disagreement in three items which have conformed in the previous texts studied (10, 19 and 20: *Dialogue: movement and event; Outnumbering; Figures*), as well as in two items which have disagreed elsewhere (Items 5 and 6: *Motivation and Fiction and action*).

II. The historical event which is covered in the ‘Egerton’ passage has a minimal relationship to the background of the siege of Tournai in that although the presentation of the honour of Ridley did not take place either then or there, it was the scene of Egerton’s

---

101. It is possible for instance that there once was a variant of the very popular ballad *The King and the Miller* (*PF* 75) concerning a Miller of Dee rather than the Miller of Mansfield. Similarly it is possible that Isaac Bickerstaffe’s ‘The Miller of Dee-side’ found in his play *Love in a Village* (Act I, sc. ii), printed in 1773 but acted a decade earlier, was adapted from a traditional song. There are a very large number of songs, ballads and stories about millers — some of them of a ribald nature — dating from Chaucer’s *The Miller’s Tale* onwards. It is not possible to prove that the ‘Egerton’ poet is making a covert jocular reference to any of these but the likelihood that he is cannot be ruled out.

102. It is probable that the poet believed the story and the calumny to be well known. Since he utilises the exculpation found in *Scotish* (that the Shire-men fled for want of their Captain, Derby), it is possible that that work was in general circulation in his area.

acquisition of knighthood and therefore there is a probability that his reward was the result of valour displayed at that time and place. However although Egerton is the 'hero' and the passage relates an historical incident, it is unusual in that the poet has not chosen to relate the details of the heroic deeds for which Egerton is rewarded.<sup>103</sup> Because the 'event' therefore does not cover the details of a military matter concerning the hero, the 'Egerton' passage shares the non paradigmatic Item 19: *Outnumbering* with the *Flodden* passage. However it also displays paradigmatic nonconformity in an item not seen to disagree elsewhere: the poet displays no specific partiality for or connection with the Egertons (Item 17: *Partisan*), although the use of the conventional domestic 'our' makes it clear that he is an Englishman. The remaining two items that fail to agree with the paradigm as in the *Flodden* passage and for the same reason, are Items 6 and 10: *Fiction and action* and *Dialogue: movement and event*. Both disagreements are a function of the presentation of the poem mainly in dialogue — which must therefore be connected with the direct action of the historic event. The 'Egerton' poet having omitted other matters, the conversation leading to the presentation of Ridley must be embroidered partly to make a poem of a respectable length, partly to demonstrate Egerton's character, and partly to authenticate the foundation of the Egerton family seat. This embroidery necessitates the incorporation of fiction.<sup>104</sup>

Thus it is seen that variation of form (in this case, presentation of a work almost entirely in dialogue) and variation of stylistic approach (here a presentation of events through opinion and argument rather than straightforward narrative), affects the structure of an historical text.

---

103. It is of course possible that if the insertion was written some time after the event — and I believe it was — the poet may not have known them and, unlikely though it may seem, have been reluctant to invent them. However there is a brief mention of the reduction of Tournai but it is achieved through the valour of one, Alexander Ratcliffe — a quite extraneous character who appears, performs the deeds it might reasonably be expected the hero should have done, and then vanishes. It is possible, since 'Ratcliffe' is not a rhyme word, that it is a later substitution for 'Egerton', because, as it stands, this incident is an oddity. It is also perhaps possible that 'Ratcliffe' is the result of a later and abandoned alteration made by yet another poet who intended to change this text in order to paint a sycophantic portrait of the Ratcliffes.

104. This follows convention as even the most reputable of serious historians (such as Polydore Vergil), felt that it was quite in order to include accounts of lengthy conversations or speeches that they felt their characters might have said in a given situation, but which are in fact the products of their own imaginations.

**TABLE 5.** *Stylistic Structure of 'Flodden Feilde'*

Motifeme	Allomotif	Scene	Theme (Episode)
1. <i>Exhortation</i>	a. Now let us talk . . .	<i>Initiation of villainy</i>	
	b. Synopsis		
2. <i>Misdeed</i>	a. Naming of villain		
	b. Villain writes false letter		
3. <i>Departure</i>	a. Messenger leaves England.		
4. <i>Journey</i>	a. To Calais:		
	b. To 'Turwin':		
	c. To Tournai.		
5. <i>Message delivered</i>	a. King of Scots is dead		
	b. Shiremen fled from Flodden		
6. <i>Summoning</i>	a. King sends for Hero		
7. <i>Accusation</i>	a. Hero lied		
	b. His men are false		
8. <i>Defence</i> (of Hero by Helpers) (Embedded: <i>Challenge</i> )	a. Egerton: "It was for want of Derby"		
	b. Brereton: "Tell us to fight & see if we fly"		
	c. Compton accuses Hero: "Coward!"		
	d. Egerton: "Fight me!"		
9. <i>Arrival</i>	a. Hero greets King		
10. <i>Accusation</i>	a. Hero lied		
	b. His men are false		
11. <i>Defence</i> (by Hero) (Embedded: <i>Punishment</i> )	a. "I was not there"		
	b. "When we fight we overcome"		
	c. King confiscates Hero's power		
	d. Hero: "We were never cowards:		
	e. We made your father king"		
12. <i>Arrival</i> (Helper)	a. Buckingham comes		
13. <i>Defence</i> (of Hero)	a. "The letter is untrue:		
	b. Surrey hates you"		
14. <i>Lament</i>	a. Hero laments death of knights		
15. <i>Arrival</i> (Helper)	a. Shrewsbury		
16. <i>Defence</i> (of Hero)	a. "I am the king's Godfather"		
	b. Implied: "He will listen to me"		
17. <i>Lament</i>	a. Hero cites places he won't see again		
18. <i>Arrival</i> (2nd Hero)	a. Garsed comes to Derby		
19. <i>Help</i>	a. Asks for help.		
	b. Garsed accused		
	c. He fought his fellows		
	d. Appeal considered.		
	e. Hero no longer able to help		
	f. Names 5 knights to intercede		
20. <i>Summoning</i>	a. King asks for Garsed		
21. <i>Judgement</i>	a. Garsed is to hang		
22. <i>Defence</i> (of 2nd Hero)	a. Thirteen knights intercede		
23. <i>Defence</i> (by 2nd Hero)	a. "My fellows called Derby coward.		
	b. He brought me up		
	c. I will not be disloyal to Derby.		
	d. I would rather die"		
24. <i>Forgiveness</i>	a. Garsted reinstated		
	b. King: "No more fighting:		
	c. I cannot have strife among my troops.		
	d. Who taunts the Shires will be hanged"		

*Wrongful Accusation*

(‘Flodden’ continued)

Motifeme	Allomotif	Scene	Theme (Episode)
25. Arrival	a. Queen’s messenger comes	Failure of villainy	Wrongful Accusation (continued)
26. Message delivered	a. King of Scots is dead b. Shire-men won Flodden		
27. Reward	a. Flodden commanders rewarded b. Also Egerton		
28. News passed on	a. Buckingham tells Hero		
29. Arrival	a. Hero comes to the king		
30. Reward (Embedded: Justification Judgement)	a. Hero’s power restored b. King: “Surrey lied” c. Hero made Lord Marshall d. He is to judge Surrey e. Hero forgives him		
31. Disposition of Forces (Siege)	a. Hero to siege Tournai b. With Shrewsbury		
32. Victory	a. Town taken in 3 days		
33. Valediction	a. Synopsis b. Prayer: Bless King and Hero		

**TABLE 6.** Stylistic Structure of ‘Egerton’ Passage: PF 39

Motifeme	Allomotif	Scene	Theme (Episode)
1. Scene setting	a. Ratcliffe preparing to siege Tournai b. Taking 1003 men	Earning of reward	Valour Rewarded
2. Battle	a. Town invested		
3. Victory	a. Town taken in 3 days b. Garrisoned with 300 men c. Ratcliffe offered Governorship d. Ratcliffe refuses		
4. Summoning (Hero)	a. King summons Egerton b. “You have done good service: c. I shall reward you”		
5. Reward	a. Hero asks for reward at home in Cheshire b. King offers 3 mills on the Dee c. Hero refuses: He will not be a Miller d. King offers Forest of Snowdon e. Hero refuses: he will not be a Ranger f. King turns away g. Hero asks for small ‘cote’ at Ridley h. King grants it i. Also bestows Lordship of Ridley	Bestowal of Reward	
6. Terminal Status-quo	a. Synopsis b. Enumeration of Victories c. Source		

**VI. Form and tradition: Flodden ffeilde**

As a means to simplification the ‘Egerton’ passage embedded within the *Flodden* text, is set out (above) in a separate table. The following examines the continuity of the motifemic composition of PF 39.

## A. Motifemes

### a. *Exhortation*

This opening motifeme cannot of course, properly be a part of the ‘Egerton’ passage embedded within the *Flodden* text, but it does commence the *Flodden* passage. It contains the nuclear compulsory component, the *exhortation* itself, and the optional peripheral component *synopsis*. It is not at all remarkable: the poet suggests that the time is appropriate for ‘vss’ to ‘talke of [the] Mount off flodden’ (l. 1), and in a very brief *précis* states that the topic of his poem will concern the news that Surrey sent to Henry VIII in France.

### b. *Valediction*

This motifeme terminates the *Flodden* text and contains the compulsory *prayer* together with the optional *explicit* and *moral*. The *prayer* is conventional in its address:

Now god that was in Bethlem borne  
& for vs dyed vpon a tree

ll. 510-11

It continues with the allomotif *god-save-the-king* and ends with a request for mercy on Derby’s soul.

The *explicit* is interesting as by *assimilation* it also performs the function of the *synopsis* and hints at the *moral*:

Thus was lancashire & Cheshire rebuked  
thorow the pollicye of the Erle of Surrey

ll. 508-09

That this is an *explicit* component, is signalled by the use of ‘thus was’ followed by a summary of what the tale has been about. This gives an indication that the end of the story has been reached. As a *synopsis*, with its identification of Surrey, as villain, this summary echoes the synoptic component of the initial *exhortation*. In my discussion of paradigmatic Item 15: *Post-climactic moral*, where the significance of ‘rebuked’ and ‘pollicye’ was considered, it was shown that these lines also contain a judgematic presence sufficient to mark them as performing the function of a vestigial *moral*.

The ‘Egerton’ passage cannot have a formal *valédiction* as the poet cannot take conventional leave of his audience as his work does not close the poem. However he utilises the *Flodden* poet’s structure by placing his insertion so that it terminates immediately before the *valédiction* and adds a motifemic component which the *Flodden* poet has not included — the *source*. This is wholly conventional in its reference to ‘Cronicles’ which ‘will not lye’ l. 505), and, although embedded in the ‘Egerton’ poet’s *terminal status-quo*, because it is only separated from the *Flodden* poet’s *valédiction* by two lines it therefore becomes a natural part of it.

### c. *Terminal Status-quo*

In the *Flodden* passage, this motifeme is complicated by the fact that Derby is a ‘representative hero’ standing in for the real ‘hero’, the collective Shiremen (who can also be seen as the ‘populace’), and their Commanders (some of whom are Stanleys, Derby’s close kin, and are therefore ‘associates’). With the

exception of the allomotif *family*, all the components of *terminal status-quo* are present — *hero*, *associates* and *populace*. However the *Flodden* poet has been meticulous and noted not only the terminal status of the characters traditionally found in this motifeme, but has added a new component: *villain*.<sup>105</sup> The representative hero is rewarded in the conventional manner — he becomes Lord Marshall (ll. 407-408) and the ‘Maurydden’ (‘manred’) of Lancashire and Cheshire is restored to him: ‘att thy bidding euer to bee/For those men beene true . . . indeed’ (ll. 388-93). This by implication also rewards the populace over whom he will exercise a doubtless benevolent power. (Garsed, the second ‘representative hero’, has been rewarded at the end of the scene in which he appears — ll. 335-36). The true composite hero, in the persons of the *Flodden* commanders, is rewarded with the traditional increase in rank (ll. 375-78) and the poet completes his recital of the status-quo of his list of characters by noting that the villain’s punishment is averted through the clemency of the representative hero (ll. 407-16).

The ‘Egerton’ passage contains a truncated version of this motifeme which consists solely of the compulsory component *hero* which is extended by implication to *hero + family* in that the manor and lordship of Ridley is given to the hero and his ‘heyres’ ‘faire & free’ (ll. 490-95).

d. *Boast*

i. *Brag*

Neither the ‘Egerton’ nor the *Flodden* passage contains either the *I-brag* or the *T-brag*. In the latter passage, Derby’s speech to the king is a component of the motifeme *response to calumny*:

“Lett me haue Lancashire and Cheshire both . . .  
if I Fayle to burne vp all Scotland  
take me & hang me vpon a tree.  
I, i shall conquer to Paris gate,  
both comlye castles and towers hye;  
whereas the walls beene soe stronge,  
Lancashire and Cheshire shall beate them downe!”

ll. 111-18

The essence of the *I-brag* is that the idea that “I shall be victorious or die” should be spoken by the hero: its purpose is to demonstrate the valour of him and his party and also to encourage others prior to a battle. Here it is spoken by the hero to demonstrate the valour of both the ‘representative’ and the ‘true’ hero, but it departs from the *I-brag* in that it is *not* spoken to encourage others with a statement of heroic intention before an actual and imminent fight. It is a rhetorical invitation to test the hero’s worth in relation to a retrospective engagement. The prospect of a further battle is conditional and the protasis is not followed by an apodosis concerning the hero’s death at the hands of a villain. The same arguments apply to the apparent *T-brag* in the lines cited, but with the additional observation that

---

105. That *villain* is a component of *terminal status-quo* is seen in that the action which affects him is prospective: when Derby sits in judgement upon him he *will* forgive him: ‘Thou shalt be Iudge . . . & as thou saiest, soe shall it bee’ (ll. 409-10). Had this act of judgement taken place within the present time of the narrative or before the essential ‘adventure’ had ended, then it would have fulfilled the function of a negative *punishment* and perhaps, by assimilation, *humiliation of villain*.



this component traditionally generally belongs to the villain.

ii. *Gloat*

1. *Right*

This sub-component is not valid in the *Flodden* passage although at first sight it appears to be present by implication — Surrey's letter is 'false' and 'wronge' (ll. 140, 399), therefore the 'hero' is 'right'. Similarly Garsed, the second representative hero, states that he would 'rather suffer death' than be 'false' (ll. 333-34). However 'right' is not put forward as a reason for a victory over a 'wrong' enemy and is therefore not a traditional *gloat* component.

In his presentation of Henry VIII's French campaign, the 'Egerton' passage does include a true *right* component of *gloat*:

this Noble King Harry wan great victories in france  
thorrow the Might that Christ jesus did him send.

ll. 496-97

God never supports a 'wrong' cause.

2. *Enumeration of victories*

This motifemic component is not present in the *Flodden* passage, but in the context of the fighting in France, the 'Egerton' poet names eight victories and says there were others 'many a one' (ll. 498-508).

## VII. Conclusions

I. Because the *Flodden* poet's topic deals with a battle which is over before the poem opens, the motifemic structure of the text has been affected. Those narrative motifemes which relate to a combat described in an *histoire* — such as the *brag* and *gloat* components of *boast* — cannot be present in the *Flodden* poem because the battle which is central to the narrative took place before the story opens.<sup>106</sup> Similarly pre- and immediately post-battle motifemes — *assessment of strength*, *enumeration of casualties* and so on — cannot be present either. Lack of these motifemes with relation to the French campaign as the setting for the *Flodden* text (where they might reasonably have been expected), emphasises first, the poet's indifference to this setting and the fact that it is fortuitous, and secondly, his disinterest in promoting Henry VIII's martial valour points up the importance he gives to his central topic in which the king is only a catalyst present to facilitate the presentation of the poem's 'message'. Nevertheless it is apparent in the poet's treatment of the motifemes of *discours*, that he is aware of the traditional forms. His use of *assimilation* whereby three motifemic components are neatly combined suggests an inclination to avoid the verbosity of the Romance but a desire to nod towards traditional audience anticipation. This desire and knowledge of form (and perhaps respect for convention), is borne out by the fact that the poet has manipulated the heroic boast so that both his representative heroes utter an approximation of the *I-brag* and

---

106. One of the reasons for the presence of these motifemes, is to encourage audience participation in an event which although being narrated to them is also, paradoxically, taking place as they listen. It is therefore not surprising that I have found no example of these motifemes relating to an event which in 'audience time' has taken place in the past.

declare their preference for death before a dishonourable alternative. Similarly, though not making the statement — irrelevant to his matter — that the victors of Flodden won because they were ‘right’, he is at pains to show that the villain is associated with ‘falsehood’ and therefore, by implication, suggest that his hero is ‘right’: conventionally heroes are of course, always ‘right’ but here the continuity of tradition still requires the poet to tell his audience so. This continuity is also seen in that as in the Romance, the *prayer* component of *valediction* relates to the ultimate heavenly reward and not worldly prosperity.

The structure of the ‘Egerton’ passage is affected by two factors: first that it is an insertion into another man’s work and secondly, its chosen topic. It is remarkable because it has no villain and basically, the entire text deals with the theme *reward* — usually a component of the motifeme *terminal status-quo*. The ‘adventure’, in this case the valiant deeds which Egerton has performed to merit his guerdon, is glossed over in one line in the anonymous ‘good service’. This compaction of the ‘adventure’ has meant that just as the poet cannot include the motifemes of *discours* (*exhortation* and *valediction*), because his poem is embedded in a text which already contains them, so he cannot include *any* of the standard motifemes relating to chivalric adventure unless he expands the poem’s frame — the French campaign. This he does with the inclusion of the traditional *right* to support Henry’s victories and an *enumeration* of them, but unless he expands the frame to include a specific battle and thus introduce a new story into his matter, this is virtually all that he can do. That he is aware of the traditional structure is seen in his inclusion of the one valedictory motifemic component, *source*, which the *Flodden* poet omitted.

In summary, both the *Flodden* and ‘Egerton’ poets have tried where possible, to conform to traditional motifemic structure but have been constrained by the nature of their topic, the importance of which in both cases, has taken priority over structural convention. In short *PF* 39 shows that even where a text is manifestly not a Romance the poet will include as many of the traditional motifemic structures as he conveniently may.

**II.** The examination of the paradigmatic items and the motifemic structure of the ‘Egerton’ passage, confirms the simplicity of this section first seen in the lexical analysis. This simplicity is partly a result of the poet’s lack of poetic ability, but with regard to the historical situation and stylistic structure it is to some extent forced upon him: his text is embedded within another man’s work and is therefore framed by the situation and structure as already set out by the first author, and with which the ‘Egerton’ poet must conform as best he can. However the primary cause of the poem’s lack of extensive embroidery lies in the ‘Egerton’ poet’s basic purpose. It is apparent that his intention is to insert his account of the Egerton’s initial acquisition of the honour of Ridley into an older text in order that subsequent readers, assuming it to be part of the original, will imagine that it is an authentic record. Therefore the ‘Egerton’ poet, engaged in producing a spurious document, is not overly concerned with historical veracity or the recording of any details extraneous to the matter in hand. He confines the limits of his topic because first, his topic is all that concerns him and secondly, it seems reasonable to suppose that he believed the self-evident truth that the shorter the insertion the greater is the likelihood of it being readily accepted as part of the original work.<sup>107</sup> Thus the ‘Egerton’ passage is another example of a poet’s purpose taking precedence and modifying traditional

---

107. The lack of stanzaic regularity, faults in nomenclature and chronology and so on, suggest that it is unlikely that the extant text has been transcribed without alteration. If however, despite appearances it remains much as it was composed, it can only be concluded that the poet’s ambition outran his ability.

narrative requirements.

The previous discussions have shown that where the paradigmatic and motifemic structures of the *Flodden* passage differ from the other historical verses examined in this study, they do so principally because either the narrative time nor place are in immediate agreement with the essential topic — the original historical action the poet is attempting to refute is retrospective to the poem. However the structure of the *Flodden* passage is not ruled by the poet's purpose, the exculpation of the Shire-men, *per se* — which (as is evidenced by the *Scottish* poet's text), could be achieved without departing from tradition — but by his choosing to present his argument through concentration on his characters' thoughts, opinions and personalities, not their actions. In choosing to fulfil his purpose in this way the *Flodden* poet is the precursor of a level of sophistication which does not flower among popular narrative poets until considerably later and his work, by being an exception to the rule, underlines the predomination of straightforward narrative action in popular rhymed entertainment constructed more wholly along traditional lines.

**III.** Looking at the entire sample of poems discussed in this study, my conclusions are, first, that each poem has been composed for a definite purpose, secondly, that the incidence of deliberate manipulation of historical fact is remarkably low, and thirdly, that the level of mediaeval continuity is high.

It is reasonable to believe that the early rhymed popular narratives such as the Middle English Romance or the folk-ballad, were intended principally for an audience who occasionally had the leisure to appreciate a pleasant means of passing an idle hour. They were composed by a poet exercising his talent — probably in the hope of remuneration — who chose a topic likely to entertain. In the field of fiction the topic was usually a romance, chivalric deeds or a quest for justice — or any combination. In the area of fact the poet might commemorate some notable local or historical event which ideally incorporated romance, chivalry, or justice, or which stirred patriotic feelings which would make a jingoistic appeal to a generous audience. It is then, surprising to find that the primary conclusion reached with regard to the poems I have been discussing, is that with the exception of *Agincourt*, none of these texts appear to have been written solely in the hope of financial gain; as the result of an historiographic impulse; for the pleasure of exercising a poetic gift; or to provide unadulterated entertainment.<sup>108</sup> In each poem the manipulation of lexical, paradigmatic and motifemic structure appears to have been ruled by the poet's purpose in composing his text, the selection of his topic — which is never a disinterested choice — and his own personal involvement.

With perhaps the exception of *Agincourt*, which in language and style conforms without real deviation to the character of the broad-side ballad, the language and prosody of each text does not in itself suggest the nature of the poet's underlying purpose: it does reveal the likelihood that he may have had one. Each poem has a 'battle' topic and originates from roughly the same geographical location at roughly the same time, yet each is significantly different in its lexical choice and stylistic patterning. This suggests that each author has assessed the tastes of a different set of people and written his work accordingly. If each poet addresses a different group of people then it is probable that he does so because he wishes to bring his work to their particular attention. It follows that

---

108. Although *Agincourt* differs from other texts here discussed in that the poet's attitude towards his work is coldly businesslike — he takes no personal interest in his tale and writes solely for money — it was the results of the methodology used in this study which produced the evidence leading to this conclusion.

there is a strong likelihood that he does so for a specific purpose. The prosody and vocabulary of each poem does not supply an explanation of this purpose. But with regard to each poet's use of historical facts, the results of the application of the methodology used in this study has pointed towards what each poet's purpose is likely to have been.

At the beginning of this study I said that it was my intention to show if and how authors of popular rhymed historical narratives manipulated their facts to make a pleasing tale. At this stage of my examination I conclude that by and large the poets have only manipulated facts in two areas. First, in the cases of the texts so far studied, the paradigmatic item 'Fictitious material will not usually be concerned with the direct action of the historical event itself' (Item 6: *Fiction and action*), appears to be erroneous.<sup>109</sup> It does not appear that where fiction is present it is included because the original poet did not know the truth — or what was currently held to be the truth — or knowing the truth wished to add fiction to make his tale longer or more exciting. In each case the introduction of fictitious matter relating to the *essential* historical event has been shown to be associated with the direct action of the hero. The poet has never associated fiction with the essential historical actions of the villain (for instance to make him more villainous), or an associate or helper (for instance to bring into better focus a person who in reality played a minor part). In every case fiction is associated with the hero to excuse some action of the principal character which he performed in reality, but which the poet sees as being 'unheroic' and at odds with the purpose of his poem. Because this is so, it follows that the paradigmatic suggestion that 'Motivation will not be detailed' (Item 5: *Motivation*) is also incorrect in these texts. This is because rather than omitting an unheroic but historical action of the hero, the fictional element is always present to explain it — sometimes briefly (as in *Agincourt*) and sometimes as the *raison d'être* of the entire poem (as in *Scotish* and *Flodden*). What is unexpected is that a fiction is *never* presented as a plot-unit and in no case has an unpalatable fact been suppressed. This, as is pointed out in the relevant discussions, is almost certainly related to the poet's source of information and may be a function of audience composition. With the exception of paradigmatic items five and six, it is noted that there is a remarkable level of paradigmatic consistency throughout the texts, which deviate only where the poet is influenced by external factors such as the *Agincourt* poet's source and the evident Stanley patronage of the *Bosworth* and *Scotish* poets. It is therefore concluded that if items five and six of the paradigm are modified in accordance with textual presence or absence of a flawed hero, the paradigm may be a useful tool in the analysis of authorial systematisation of the popular rhymed historical narrative.

Because the motifs examined in this study were derived from the Middle English Romance which, as a genre, appear to have little surface similarity with the texts I have discussed, it is quite surprising to find a relatively high level of motifemic agreement and consistency existing in these historical poems. The motifs of *discours* are not present in *Agincourt* but their absence is not a function of its relatively late date compared to the other texts discussed, except insofar as it is related to the confines of the printed sheet. It is notable that in this work the allomotif component of the *terminal status-quo* is unadulterated and conforms so exactly to the Romance pattern that it is almost *plus royaliste que le Roi*. It is interesting that with the exception of *Durham*, mediaeval continuity is maintained in the *prayer* components in that they all concentrate on the ultimate other-worldly reward and do not request prosperity in this.

The poems so far studied have not however, always incorporated the Romance

---

109. It is presently shown however, that this is not so for the remainder of the *Folio* texts yet to be analysed.

motifemes without modification: the poets have not simply included those they could and omitted the remainder. While continuity *has* been stoutly maintained there are nevertheless progressive variations. There is a rise in *assimilation* which reaches a higher level of complexity than is found in the Romance: due to the dictates of historical fact, with the exception of *Agincourt*, the hero is no longer a simple individual but where necessary, is 'composite' or 'representative'. Nevertheless where possible within this innovation, there is a continuing conformity with heroic allomotifs. There is also the introduction of what appear to be new motifemes and new allomotifs within existing patterns. It is therefore concluded that the motifemic structure of these popular rhymed narratives written for specific audiences, reflects a tradition which the audience still wants and expects, but which is sufficiently flexible to admit of variation without protest — provided it is presented within a conventional framework.

My general conclusions are that the methodology used in this study is effective and has produced evidence to show that each text was written for a definite purpose and has shown the nature of that purpose. It has also produced evidence to show that the historical accuracy of the texts as set out in the fundamental plot-units is high and that there is a solid strata of mediaeval continuity at both the lexical and structural level. These however stem from a close inter-relationship between the poet's purpose, his audience and the overall composition of his text: the evidence has shown that none of these elements can be set apart from any other — they are mutually dependent to an extent which is not seen in other rhymed popular narratives.

NARRATIVE FORM AND MEDIAEVAL CONTINUITY IN  
THE PERCY FOLIO MANUSCRIPT:  
A STUDY OF SELECTED POEMS

by

S. G. St. Clair-Kendall

VOLUME II

A thesis submitted in fulfilment of  
the requirements for the degree of  
Doctor of Philosophy

DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH

UNIVERSITY OF SYDNEY

May, 1988.

# CHAPTER FIVE

## THE HISTORICAL ITEMS — DOMESTIC EVENTS

### POEMS WHICH COMMEMORATE AN INDIVIDUAL

#### I. Utilisation of Primary Material in Five Texts

##### A. Introduction

This chapter discusses five works which commemorate a single person either as a hero or as a villain.<sup>1</sup>

*The Percy Folio* contains fifty-four texts (approximately a quarter of the manuscript), based on an historical incident: nine of these relate to national battles; ten cover events which are recorded but where there is little or no historical evidence of the 'hero's' part in it.<sup>2</sup> There are eight texts where the existence of the 'hero' is known but where the event in which he took part is not recorded.<sup>3</sup> Furthermore, of these and the remaining texts some are incomplete.<sup>4</sup> Others discuss incidents which took place at a too late date for the present study.<sup>5</sup> Finally, fourteen are almost certainly by one author: Thomas Deloney.<sup>6</sup> The discussion that follows requires works which appear to be complete; which are within the temporal scope of this discussion; for which there exist some reasonably detailed historical documentation; which were not all composed by the same author, and which celebrate a given individual. I have therefore chosen the following poems:

<i>PF 22</i>	<i>Sir Aldingar</i>	—event occurred c.1036
<i>PF 87</i>	<i>Buckingam betrayd by Banister</i>	—October, 1483
<i>PF 122</i>	<i>William the Conquerour</i>	—Event c.1067-68
<i>PF 168</i>	<i>Sir Andrew Bartton</i>	—Summer, 1511
<i>PF 183</i>	<i>Kinge Edgar</i>	—fl. c. 964

These texts are an eclectic cross-section of historical works commemorating an

- 
1. For the purpose of this study, whether the character celebrated actually existed or not is irrelevant provided only that he was believed to have lived, and that the tale present in the *Folio* text has been at least partially recorded in the extant historical chronicles.
  2. For instance, *PF 10: Captain Carr*; *PF 154: Ladye Bessiye*.
  3. For instance: *PF 129: Sir John Butler*; *PF 92: Hugh Spencer*.
  4. For instance: *PF 16: Thomas, Lord Cromwell*; *PF 194: Siege of Roune*.
  5. For instance: *PF 56: Newarke*; *PF 59: The Tribe of Banburye*.
  6. See R.A. Schwegler, 'Sources of the Ballads in Bishop Percy's Folio Manuscript', Diss. Chicago, 1978, Ch. V, pp. 354ff.

individual, found as can be seen from their numbers, at fairly regular intervals throughout the *Folio* manuscript. Their topics range from an event of the tenth to an event of the sixteenth century. In the following, individual introductions to each poem are presented *seriatim* before a general discussion of their historical and stylistic structure.

1. *PF* 168: *Sir Andrew Bartton* — Child No. 167<sup>7</sup>

This text is introduced first because it is a transitional piece: it commemorates Sir Andrew through the medium of a battle. This engagement was not between national armies but was a sea-fight between Henry VIII's men, Thomas and Edward Howard, and the Scottish 'pirate' Andrew Barton.<sup>8</sup> Because the Scots and the English were not at war the Howards' expedition was ostensibly a private venture — albeit with the sanction of the king.<sup>9</sup> The battle took place in late June or early July, 1511, off the Goodwin Sands in the English Channel.

Although the *Folio* scribe presents the text in two 'Parts' without stanzaic divisions, Hales and Furnivall print it in forty-one 8-line stanzas.<sup>10</sup> It is written in anapaestic tetrameter quatrains — Hendren's 'long meter' found in about a quarter of all ballad stanzas. It rhymes a b c b — the most common scheme in long meter.<sup>11</sup> *PF* 168 also has the occasional internal rhyme occurring in either stanzaic lines one or four.<sup>12</sup>

This story appears to have been extraordinarily popular as there are a considerable number of variants which, examined as a body, demonstrate the progressive stages of a continuing oral tradition.<sup>13</sup> These variants appear to be divided into two principal groups

- 
7. F.J. Child, *The English and Scottish Popular ballads*, II (1885, rpt. New York, 1965), 334-48.
8. Within this study the spelling 'Bartton' refers to the title of the *Folio* text or the anonymous 'Bartton poet'; the spelling 'Barton' is used to refer to the man himself.
9. J. Campbell & J. Kent, *Biographia Nautica* (Dublin, 1785), II, 4-5.  
It has been noted in my discussion of *Durham*, that the result of this sea-battle was one of the reasons for the Scottish aggression which led to Flodden.
10. The *Folio* has marginal dashes at each eighth line but comparing these with similar divisions in other *Folio* texts, I am of the opinion that these are later insertions — probably by Percy.  
HF III, 399-418; BL. Add. Ms. 27,879, fol. 243<sup>r</sup>-245<sup>v</sup>.
11. J.W. Hendren, *A Study of Ballad Rhythm* (Princeton, 1936), pp. 78-87.
12. For instance:
- |   |                       |
|---|-----------------------|
| "Horsley," says hee, "I must sayle to the sea. . . ." | <i>PF</i> 167: l. 57  |
| Simon was old, but his hart itt was bold. . . .       | <i>PF</i> 167: l. 169 |
| Simon had a sonne, with shott of a gunne . . .        | <i>PF</i> 167: l. 189 |
13. See B.H. Bronson, *The Traditional Tunes of the Child Ballads*, IV (Princeton, N.J., 1972), 24-25, for a discussion of the oral aspects of the variants of *PF* 168.  
That the ballad was still well known in the early part of this century (at least in Scotland — it may be significant that the lexis of the oldest existing variant shows a marked tendency towards Scottish forms), can be deduced from the fact that in his Rectorial Address delivered at St. Andrew's University in 1922, J.M. Barrie quotes lines 257-60 of the text (identical to *PF* 168) in the obvious expectation that they would be recognised by his audience: (J.M. Barrie, *Courage* (London, 1922), p. 41. These lines have migrated to the broadside *Johnny Armstrong's last Goodnight* (Child, No. 169; *ESPB*, III, 362- 372) which celebrates an event of 1530. The earliest English copy is that in the Wood Collection (401, fol. 93<sup>v</sup>, Bodleian), by 'T.R.' and printed by Francis Grove (fl. 1623-1640). Unfortunately this is no help in dating *Bartton*. Later copies are also found in Rox. III, 513; Bagford I. 64; Pepys II, 133; Euing 151. There is a Scottish variant (see Child) which does not have these lines and which appears to be earlier than the English version.



in which the story of the event is relatively undisturbed but which contain two sets of differing minor features. For convenience I shall call these two groups **A** and **B**, one later group which retains only a part of the story, **C**, and one modern group in which the plot is so vestigial that there is scholarly argument concerning its descent, **D**.<sup>14</sup>

Group **A** begins with a variant of the line 'As it befell in Midsummer time' and consists of only two texts.<sup>15</sup> Since the two members of Group **A** have some significant variations, I shall call the York MS. **A1** and *PF* 168 **A2**. Group **B** is quite large: the poems in this group begin with a variant of the line 'When Flora with her fragrant flowers . . .'.<sup>16</sup> The ballad of *Andrew Barton* was taken to America, probably with the early settlers. There it was sung and subject to oral variation: the result is Group **C**.<sup>17</sup> Group **D**, the largest set, demonstrates the continuity of oral tradition in England. The story-line as set out in Groups **A** and **B**, has been very much corrupted and is now almost vestigial. The title has undergone a change and has become *Henry Martin* (as such it is Child. No. 250).<sup>18</sup>

Groups **A** and **B** probably stem from a single source (**X**) — perhaps a 'folk' ballad. That **A1** is probably the earliest version extant is seen when it is noted that amongst other alterations, its 'with a woefull hart and a sorrowefull minde', has become **A2**'s 'with a pure hart & a penitent mind'. Likewise 'Marye, thats ill hartinge!' has been replaced by 'this is cold comfort!'.<sup>19</sup> The language of **A1** is more archaic, more artless and more northern than that of **A2**. Its dating (which is correct where that of the other

- 
14. A.B. Friedman, *The Viking Book of Folk Ballads* (1956, rpt. Harmondsworth, 1982), p. 348, admits to the possibility of some doubt; P. Barry *et al.* *British Ballads from Maine* (New Haven, Conn., 1929; New York, 1982), pp. 253-58 and *The Maine Woods Songster* (Camb. Mass., 1939), p. 100, argues for the authenticity of the descent as does Bronson, *Tunes*, III, 133 and IV, 24-25. I agree with Barry and Bronson.
  15. Group **A**:  
*The Percy Folio* Item number 168 and a sixteenth century manuscript from York Minster library (cited in Child *ESPB*, III, 503ff.).
  16. Group **B** consists of the following copies:  
Roxburghe I. 23; Bagford 643, m.9.(61); Bagford 643, m.10(77); Douce I. 18b; Pepys I. 484 (249); Wood 401 (55); Wood 402 (37); Glenriddell MSS., XI, 20 (cited by Child, *ESPB*, III, 348ff.). This latter is a Scottish 'oral' version learned from the printed text: homophonic errors (amongst which are 'A nobler day' for 'a noble a day', 'My ludge' for 'my Liege' and 'I quitted all' for 'no whit at all'), are strongly in evidence; stanzas have been omitted and interchanged and stanza 51 has been muddled with a stanza from an entirely different poem — see *PF* 115: *Adam Bell, Clime of the Cloughe &c.* st. 27. There are also variant copies in *A Collection of Old Ballads*, 3 vols. (London, 1723), I. 159-69; *Ancient Songs and Ballads* (1790), coll. J. Ritson, rev. W.C. Hazlitt, 3rd edn. (London, 1877) p. 323-31; *The Early Naval Ballads*, coll. J.O. Halliwell (London, 1841), pp. 4-13.  
It is probable that there are other surviving copies which I have not found, but this list (and those which follow for other groups) is sufficient to demonstrate the popularity of the text.  
The older anthologies such as those compiled by (?)Philips, Ritson and Halliwell, cite a text from group **B**, while modern collections such as C.H. Firth's *Naval Songs and Ballads*, Navy Records Society (n.p., 1908), pp. 6-15, and F.B. Gummere's, *Old English Ballads* (Boston, 1899), use the *Folio* text (**A2**).
  17. Bronson, *Tunes*, III, 133-39, prints ten versions, variously named, of *Andrew/Andy/Bardee/Bardeen/Briton/Bardan/Battan/Battam* which have been sung and recorded (one as recently as 1959) for the Archives of American Folk-Song and other sound systems. There is another variant — also from America — *Andrew Martin*, as a late addition to Child (*ESPB*, V, 423), and a further three in Barry's *British Ballads*, pp. 248-53. He also gives a further title: *Bolender* — a corruption of 'Bold Andrew'.
  18. Child, *ESPB*, IV, 393-96 prints six versions of this variant and Bronson, *Tunes*, IV, 24-46, prints a further fifty! Of these fifty-six texts, sixteen came from America. Since English emigration has been a continuing process, it can I think, be assumed that sundry emigrants took the ballad with them after it had achieved its degenerate form as *Henry Martin*.

groups is not) is made in the old style — by reference to religious feasts, ‘St. Maudlen even’, or the season of the year, ‘midsomer moneth’.<sup>20</sup> It also contains naval expressions which have been changed in **A2**, where for instance ‘cables’ are ‘ropes’, and it retains stanzas, lines and examples of internal rhyme which are not present in the latter.

The internal rhyme has disappeared from the later groups (**B**, **C** and **D**), as have many of the technical expressions. The lack of detail present in **C** and **D** permits only a tentative suggestion that they are more likely to derive from **X** than **A** or **B** on the grounds that they do not lexically echo either of these groups in any way.

The earliest entry for *Sir Andrew Barton* in the *Stationers’ Register*, is June 1629 when sundry copyrights held by the widow [Margaret] Trundle passed to John Wright and his partners.<sup>21</sup> Margaret’s husband, John, published from 1603 to 1626, his wife continued the business until 1629, and the rights to their *Barton* — probably the broadside Group **B** — may have been acquired at any time during this period.

As it stands in the *Folio*, *Sir Andrew Bartton* is a hybrid. This is seen in its structure where it displays many of the features of the folk-ballad such as one-to-one dialogues, the general presentation of a new idea in each 4-line stanza, much repetition, symmetry both in repetition and in the scenes at the opening and closing of the tale, and the minimal presence of a narrator. On the other hand, unlike the ballad, the poet uses the mnemonic cheville infrequently, the second and fourth stanzaic lines are not generally ‘weak’, and the poet does not utilise the ‘cinematic’ technique of ‘leaping and lingering’.<sup>22</sup>

The lexical structure is varied. Approximately 70% of the nouns, verbs and adjectives is derived from Old English and in the first 100 lines there are twelve archaic traditional lexemes.<sup>23</sup> Similarly the poem has a large number of traditional Romance and ballad phrases.<sup>24</sup> However there are also words and phrases which would not be out of place in the broadside ballad and which are not seen in the earlier genres of ‘popular’ narrative verse.<sup>25</sup>

It is not possible to date the original composition of *PF* 168 with pinpoint accuracy, but from the fact that in both poems of the **A** Group, the poet has substituted Sir Charles

---

19. *OED*, **Penitent**, *A. adj.* 1.b. *transf.*: first mention, 1723. For a discussion of the visible degeneration of **A2** when compared to **A1** see D.C. Fowler, *A Literary History of the Popular Ballad* (Durham, N.C., 1968), pp. 114-19. Note also that **A1** has eight occurrences of the auxiliary ‘did’ to form a preterite whereas **A2** has only four: a minor deviation but perhaps significant.

20. This matter is discussed in detail presently under *Item 7: Chronology*.

21. *A Transcript of the Registers of the Stationers’ Company*, ed. E. Arber (London, 1875; repr. N.Y., 1950), IV, 179.

22. C. Day Lewis, *The Lyric Impulse* (London, 1965), p. 55.

23. These are: ‘befell’ (l. 1), ‘rood’ (l. 11), ‘Fare’ [to go] (l. 14), ‘False’ [wicked] (l. 15), ‘mickle’ (l. 18, ‘vnright’ (l. 20), ‘alas’ (l. 21), ‘bread’ [breadth] (l. 52), ‘speede’ [one who promotes success; a helper] (l. 58), ‘pikes’ (l. 65), ‘stout’ [fierce] (83), ‘wight’ (l. 86), ‘archebord’ (l. 91).

24. Such as: ‘mickle of might’ (l. 18), ‘euer syghed and said “alas!”’ (ll. 21, 86), ‘[noun] looked ouer his left shoulder’ (l. 25, ‘if . . . , then . . . ’ (ll. 55ff, 61ff), ‘god be my speede’ (l. 58), ‘they had not (sailed) dayes three . . . ’ (l. 69) ‘both stay & stand’ (l. 72), ‘might & maine’ (ll. 210, 222, 270), ‘deerly dight’ (l. 109), ‘worthy wight’ (l. 144), ‘the first (sight) that . . . ’ (l. 175), ‘Lord in his hart that hee was faine’ (l. 183), ‘[noun] come hither to me . . . ’ (ll. 205, 217), ‘for his good service that hee hath done . . . ’ (ll. 308, 316).

Howard (Lord High Admiral from the 8th of July, 1585 until 1619; died in 1624) for the historical hero, Sir Edward Howard, it seems that this part of the text was written post 1585.<sup>26</sup> The text notes that after he has been victorious, Howard is made ‘the Erle of Nottingham’, ‘& soe was neuer Howard before’ (ll. 311-12). This points to a date after the historical creation on the twenty-second of October, 1597. The fact that this is mentioned in the text — and indeed the Howards had not been the Earls of Nottingham before — negates any suggestion that ‘Charles’ is merely a scribal error made in mistake for ‘Edward’ at some stage in the text’s transmission. However this does not contradict the almost certain likelihood that this date only applies to these two lines — rewritten to suit a new hero — and the replacement of ‘Edward’ with ‘Charles’. The evidence for this suggestion is lexical. The story of Andrew Barton as we have it has two features which suggests that **X** was composed not long after the event: the latter half of 1511 or perhaps early 1512. The first concerns the minor personnel: the Master of the merchant ship, Harry Hunt; the seventy year old gunner, Peter Simon and his son, and the expert bowman William Horsley from Yorkshire. Harry Hunt and William Horsley existed. Hunt appears several times in the *Calendar of Letters and Papers*: in 1512 he is shown with Charles Clifford as receiving wages for 59 soldiers and 40 marines together with payment for victualling their ship *The Baptist of Calais* (120 tons). Clifford, as Captain and Hunt as Master of *The Baptist* are still together in the following year.<sup>27</sup> In the poem the king promises that ‘Harry Hunt shall haue his whistle & chaine’ (*PF* 168: l. 305). This reward appears to have eventuated — in contemporary records a whistle and chain often appears as a symbol of rank.<sup>28</sup>

Horsley is also promised a reward:

“Horsley right Ile make the a knight,  
In Yorkshiere shall thy dwellinge be.”

**A1:** st. 80

“Horslay right thoust be a knight,  
Lands & liuings thou shalt haue store”.

**A2:** ll. 308-09.

I have found no evidence that Horsley was knighted, but the remainder of the promise seems to have been fulfilled: he was made a Yeoman of the King’s Guard and bailiff of two properties in Yorkshire for life.<sup>29</sup> The text specifically notes that Horsley was born in

- 
25. Such as:  
‘to take the ayre’ (l. 6), ‘merchants ware’ (l. 16), ‘your grace’ [as a title] (l. 31), ‘with a pure heart & a penitent mind’ (l. 78), “‘this is cold comfort” says . . .’ (l. 117), ‘I will giue you a glasse (l. 128), ‘your honour’ [as a title] (l. 140), ‘I am bound towards . . .’ (l. 95), ‘the pinnace itt shott of’ (ll. 161), ‘besids other great shott lesse and more’ (l. 172), ‘sounde out amaine’ (l. 184), ‘he swarmed the maine-mast’ (ll. 209, 221), ‘Henerye shifted his roome’ (l. 317).
26. Details relating to the Howard Family have been taken from *The Complete Peerage*, ed. V. Gibbs *et al.*, 12 vols. (rev. edn., London, 1910-59), IX, *sv.* NORFOLK; VI, *sv.* EFFINGHAM.
27. *Letters & Papers, Hen.* 8, I, 1, items 1424, 1661(4), 3457.
28. *Letters and Papers Relating to the War with France; 1512-1513*, ed. A. Spont, Navy Records Society (1897), pp. xxxix-xl, 134, 139, 148; D.W. Waters, *The Art of navigation in England in Elizabethan and Early Stuart Times*, 2nd edn. (Greenwich, 1978), I, 3; III, 502.  
It is noted that the dying Barton sounds his whistle as long as he can, to encourage his men to continue to fight.
29. *Letters & Papers*, item 3226(19). It is interesting to compare this with the episode in *Flodden Feilde* where Jamie Garsed is made a yeoman for his outstanding archery.

Yorkshire (st. 14). The ballad, as do many of *The Folio* items, seems to have a generally northern component — Harry Hunt is bound for Newcastle on Tyne (st. 20), the Howards had great estates in the north and as I have remarked the older **A1** variant has a northerly or border lexis.

I have not been able to find any mention of Peter Simon but, as the poem tells us, he was old: perhaps he did not survive for very much longer. His son's forename is not given and therefore he is not traceable.<sup>30</sup> Nevertheless the naming of these obscure participants is almost certainly accurate, since some can be shown to have existed and to have had the skills attributed to them in the story. Thus it follows that there is a high probability that the original text was composed close to the event. Furthermore, since nomenclature within the popular rhymed historical narrative is vulnerable and liable to change, it seems likely that *Bartton* is close to the original.

The second point which suggests that the original composition was made shortly after the event, and that the 'modern reference' to a later Howard is an insertion into it, relates to the poem's accurate description of naval tactics in use at the time and its casual presentation of technical terms which imply familiarity with naval terminology.<sup>31</sup> The writer is also familiar with naval customs: I have already mentioned his knowledge of a whistle and chain as a symbol of command but there is also reference to the dipping of the topsails as a courtesy from one ship to another (as this is relevant to the plot it is explained in more detail presently under the heading *Synopses*). There are two further matters which although now obscure, seem to me through their very obscurity to speak of specialist knowledge on the part of the composer. First the method used when Howard wishes to disguise his ship as a merchantman (I cite several variants in what I believe to be their chronological order):

“All our greatt ordienance weell take in;  
fetch downe my streamers,” then said hee,  
“and hange me forth a white willowe wande  
as a marchante man that sailles by the sea.”

Group **A1**: st. 39

“Take in your ancycents & your standards,  
yea that no man shall them see,  
& put me Forth a white willow wand  
as Merchants vse to sayle the sea.”

---

30. He *may* be the 'Symond' who is mentioned as a gunmaker, but this is conjecture. *Letters & Papers*, I, 2, item 2812. I have not been able to discover the Scottish minor characters, James Hamilton and 'Gordon'.

31. Within a few decades of the action of *Bartton*, the well known surge of global discovery made by the sixteenth century maritime explorers, and the necessities of the largely naval English war with Spain, would be responsible for a considerable advance in maritime technology, tactics and terms, and bring about many changes. Once initiated this advance never faltered. For details see Waters, *Navigations*, *passim*.

For a discussion of the accuracy of the strategy reported in *Bartton* see pages 29-31 of C.H. Firth's, 'The Ballad History of the Reigns of Henry VII and Henry VIII', *Transactions Royal Historical Society*, 3rd series, 2 (1908), 21-50.

The naval terms are such as: 'lerboard' ('larboard': the port side of the ship as opposed to the 'starboard'); 'topcastle': 'pennis' ('pinnacle'); 'streamers' ('streamers': very long tapered flags); 'missone mast' ('mizzen-mast'), 'mayn mast'; 'cables'; 'ouer deck' ('upper deck'; 'hatches' ('decking'); 'archborde' (a specific board at the stern of the ship); 'fore mast'.

See R. de Kerchove, *International Maritime Dictionary*, 2nd edn. (London, 1961); W.G. Perrin, *British Flags* (Cambridge, 1922); *MED*, ed. H. Kurath, S.M. Kuhn & J. Reidy (Ann Arbor, 1952-) and the *OED*.

Group A2: st. 37

“Fetch me my lyon out of hand,”  
Saith the Lord, “with rose and streamer high.  
Set up withal a Willow wand  
That Merchant-like I may pass by.”

Group B: st. 17 (8-line sts.)

From the first version it is apparent that Howard is removing his usual flags and substituting a merchant’s identification. It seems probable that ‘white willow wand’ is a corruption: a white pole, especially among the masts, spars and rigging of a sailing ship, would not be a very visible symbol at any distance, which surely must be the whole point of the exercise. (Neither is a wand as likely to be ‘hung’ as is a flag). I therefore conclude that this is a landsman’s approximation of a term with which he is unfamiliar: that such corruption is possible is evident from the last of the above quotations where the whole point of the ruse has been lost.<sup>33</sup>

The second technical term which presents some difficulty is as follows — (the merchant, Harry Hunt, in his ship sometime before dusk, is preparing to lead Howard’s ship to Barton):

“Toe morrowe by seven a clock and souner  
In the morne yowe shall Sir Andrew see,  
Fore I will set yowe a glasse, my lord,  
That yowe shall saille forth all this night.”

Group A1: sts. 55-56

Lett no man to his topcastle goe  
and I will giue you a glasse, my lord,  
and then you need to Feare no Scott  
whether you sayle by day or by night.  
And tomorrow by seuen of the clocke  
you shall meete with Sir Andrew Bartton, knight.”

Group A2: sts. 32-33

A glass Ill set as may be seen  
whether you sail by day or night,  
And tomorrow be sure before seuen  
you shall see Sir Andrew barton, knight.”  
The Merchant set my Lord a glass  
as well apparent in his sight  
that on the morrow . . .

Group B: st. 16 (8-line sts.)

The significance of ‘glass’ is obscure: the least likely explanation is that it is a ‘perspective glass’, that is, an early telescope. These were in existence in the sixteenth century but they were primitive and expensive and not commercially marketed until 1608.<sup>34</sup> The second explanation may be that if it was intended to set up a light that could be followed, it was ‘a large lantern with four lamps set in it’ or something similar such as

32. Rox. I, 1, 2.

33. The normal merchant flag seems to have been ‘a striped ensign (which appears to have been displayed only when attacking or resisting attack from pirates or other foreign ships, or when signalling to consorts)’. Perrin, *Flags*, p. 129. I note in this connection that the *OED* has **Wale**, *sb* 1, **3b**: a stripe of colour, and that an ‘aune’ was a measure of cloth. If ‘white’ has crept in through association with ‘willow’ there is a possibility that the original phrase may have meant ‘a striped flag’. It is also known that a ‘willow wand’ was a symbol of peace — perhaps the flag may have been familiarly known as ‘the willow wand’?

34. Waters, *Navigation*, II, 298ff.

was used later in the century.<sup>35</sup> This explanation seems unlikely because such a beacon would advertise their presence not only to Barton but to any other pirate that may be in the offing. Ship masters were careful about showing lights at night for that reason.<sup>36</sup> The most likely explanation in view of the collocation of 'glass' and 'seven o'clock', is that Hunt was offering to prepare a sand-glass or a set of running-glasses which, used in co-ordination with the normal regular reading of the log-line, told the mariner how far the ship had travelled and for how long. Thus if Howard and Hunt sailed in such and such a direction (known to Hunt but not to the reader) for the time it took for a given number of glasses to run out, then if Hunt had reckoned correctly it would be shortly before seven a.m. and they would be in the vicinity of Barton — who, as we are told later in the poem, was anchored.<sup>37</sup>

This discussion of the accuracy of minor character's names, and the naval terminology of this text, when considered together with details of the actual fighting (such as the type of arrows used — 'bearing arrows', 'broad headed arrows' — ammunition used — 9 yard chain-shot — and the mysterious 'beames' which, relevant to the plot, are examined presently under the heading *Synopses*) suggests that although there has been some corruption *PF* 168 is a fairly close descendant of a work composed by an eye-witness or someone who had spoken with a participant.<sup>38</sup> The accuracy of the names and those of the technical naval terms which I have been able to confirm — neither names nor terms being present in any of the extant historical accounts — suggests that, allowing for poetic exaggeration, the details of the battle may be fundamentally true and thus *Bartton* like *Bosworth* has something to contribute to recorded history.

In view of the foregoing, I suggest that despite minor corruptions and a late interpolation, the greater part of the text of *PF* 168 owes much to the original composition of about 1511-1512.<sup>39</sup>

---

35. W. Graham, *The Spanish Armada* (London, 1972), p. 236.

36. Waters, *Navigation*, II, 344.

37. It seems that the movement of the ship in rough seas and the tendency of the sea air to cause rust precluded general use of mechanical timepieces. Waters has a great deal to say about the necessity and the difficulty of finding the correct time at sea: he quotes many contemporary works on how to tell the time by celestial observation — which of course only worked if the sky was clear. Waters, *Navigation*, I, 58, 97; II, 140, 193, 203, 310, 365, 461; III, 424, 280 and *passim*. The first reliable marine chronometer was made by John Harrison (1693-1776). It did not have a pendulum, all the wheels (except the escape wheels) were made of wood and it was mounted in gimbals in a case suspended by springs. E.G. Forbes, *The Birth of Scientific Navigation*, Maritime Monographs and Reports, No. 10 (London, 1974) p. v, and Plates 14-18.

38. Fowler, *Literary History*, p. 115-16 notes that the poem has the 'vivid, pictorial representation usually associated with an eye-witness account'.

39. The historical sources for *PF* 168: *Sir Andrew Bartton* are:

*The Great Chronicle of London*, ed. A.H. Thomas & I.D. Thornley (facsim. Gloucester, 1938), pp. 376-78.

*Letters & Papers, Hen. 8*, 2nd. edn., rev. R.H. Brodie, (1920: Vaduz, 1965), I, 289, 452, 516, 704, 960.

*Letters of James the Fourth: 1505-1513*, coll. R.K. Hannay, ed. R.L. Mackie & A. Spilman (Edinburgh, 1953), pp. 311-13.

Edward Hall, *Hall's Chronicle* (1548: London, 1809), pp. 525, 558.

Raphael Holinshed, *Chronicles of England, Scotland and Ireland*, (1587: London, 1808), III, 565-66.

John Leslie, *The Historie of Scotland*, trans. J. Dalrymple, 2 vols., ed. E.G. Cody and W. Murison (Edinburgh, 1888, 1890), pp. 122, 130-32, 135.

John Speed, *The Historie of Great Britaine* (London, 1632), p. 58.

John Stow, *The Annales or Generall Chronicle of England* (London, 1615), p. 490

2. PF 122: *William the Conquerour*<sup>40</sup>

This text was written by Thomas Deloney (?1543-1600). It was published in his *Strange Histories*, the earliest extant edition of which, was printed in London in 1602.<sup>41</sup> The date of the first edition is not known. Mann believes that ‘probably . . . none of the ballads’ [in *Strange Histories*] ‘had been circulated before’ [the first publication].<sup>42</sup> This would appear to be borne out by the fact that I have been unable to find any early broadside copies of the ballad. Deloney commenced writing about 1583 or 1584 and continued till his death in 1600: *William* therefore was originally composed within this seventeen year span but it is not possible to date it more nearly.<sup>43</sup>

PF 122 is written in twenty-four 4-line stanzas in common metre rhyming a b c b. If the 1602 edition of *Strange Histories* is identical to the first edition, then *William* was originally printed in 8-line stanzas. *The Folio* has it with no stanzaic divisions.<sup>44</sup>

The language of *William* is as might be expected, late Elizabethan and conforms to Dahl’s analysis of Deloney’s usage.<sup>45</sup> Only approximately half the total population of nouns, verbs and adjectives are words originating from Old English. The nine archaic lexemes found in the first one hundred lines are generally appropriate to the late sixteenth/early seventeenth centuries although they may also be a reflection of the scribe’s (or his source’s) regional preference as five of these words differ from the 1602 copy.<sup>46</sup> There are only three ‘traditional’ phrases: ‘many a . . .’ (l. 8), ‘brave & bold’ (l. 27) and ‘speare & shield’ (l. 2). Generally the second and fourth stanzaic lines are not ‘weak’ and Deloney nowhere uses the formulaic cheville. There is no use of the domestic ‘our’ and the narrator is not present.

In short this text is a professional ballad and a product of the broadside market: it is in no way lexically remarkable.<sup>47</sup>

40. The manuscript has lost this title since Furnivall’s day: HF III, 151-55; BL Add. MS. 27,879, fol. 206<sup>r</sup>-206<sup>v</sup>.

41. In the Table of Contents of *Strange Histories*, the title of this text is ‘The Kentishmen with long tayles’: this is expanded above the ballad itself to a synopsis: ‘The valiant courage and policie of the Kentishmen with long tayles, whereby they kept their ancient Lawes and Customes, which *William* the Conquerer sought to take from them.’ For the various legends of the ‘long tayles’ see: M. Houck, *Sources of the Roman de Brut of Wace* (Folcroft, Pennsylvania, 1974), pp. 264-277; Robert Manning of Brunne, *The Story of England (A.D. 1388)*, ed. F.J. Furnivall, I (London, 1887), 527-28; *The Brut*, ed. F.W.D. Brie (1906; rpt. New York, 1960), I, 97; *Brut Y Brenhinedd*, ed. J.J. Parry (Camb. Mass., 1937), p. 199.

42. *The Works of Thomas Deloney*, ed. F.O. Mann (Oxford, 1912), p. 585. R.G. Howarth, *Two Elizabethan Writers of Fiction: Thomas Nashe and Thomas Deloney* (Cape Town, 1956), p. 40.

43. *William* is undoubtedly a *contrafactum* as it is directed to be sung to the tune ‘Roger’ which was certainly in existence in the mid-1500s. W. Chappell, *Popular Music of the Olden Time*, 2 vols. (London, n.d.), I, 93-95.

44. There is a strong possibility that the manuscript scribe wrote this text (as he did many others in *The Folio*), from an oral source, or perhaps from someone else’s copy taken down from speech. I do not propose to cite details of my reason for this conclusion, other than to state that the errors in *William*, being mainly homophonic, are not those commonly found in texts transcribed from the written page.

45. T. Dahl, *An Inquiry into Aspects of the Language of Thomas Deloney*, Acta Jutlandica, Aarskrift for Aarhus Universitet, 23, 2, Humanistisk Serie 36, Linguistic Studies in Some Elizabethan Writings, I (Copenhagen, 1951).

46. They are: ‘told’ (‘counted’) l. 4 [‘foiled’: 1602]; ‘sort’ (‘manner’) ll. 5, 45; ‘eke’ l. 23; ‘one’ (for ‘a’) l. 30 [‘a’: 1602]; ‘bondmen’ l. 33; ‘espyed’ l. 55 [‘spyed’: 1602]; ‘sore’ (‘very’) l. 70; ‘arriht’ l. 80 [for ‘our right’: 1602]; and ‘manlike’ l. 95 [‘manly’: 1602].

3. *PF 87: Buckingham betrayd by Banister*<sup>48</sup>

This event took place in the autumn of 1483. There are two broadside ballads on this topic but neither are allied to *PF 87*.<sup>49</sup> There is however a manuscript variant text in BL Add. MS. 15,225 (fol. 13<sup>r</sup>-15<sup>r</sup>) written in a late Elizabethan Secretary hand. This copy lacks five stanzas present in *PF 87*: however it occasionally provides a better reading where the wrenched metre suggests that *PF 87* is faulty.<sup>50</sup> Although *PF 87* is the better text it is not possible to state categorically which of the two transcriptions preceded the other but the evidence shows that they both stem from a common original.

*PF 87* is written in thirty-three 4-line stanzas in common metre rhyming a b c b and with seven occasional instances of internal rhyme in stanzaic first lines similar to the example shown in the previous footnote.<sup>51</sup>

The language is late Elizabethan ‘broadside’: only approximately 40% of its vocabulary stems from Old English and there are only four traditional phrases — ‘low degree’ (l. 9), ‘chests curse . . . if euer . . .’ (ll. 59/60), ‘gold & silver bright’ (l. 82) and ‘beauty bright’ (l.121). Of the nine archaic lexemes found in the first one-hundred lines, only ‘fee’ belongs to the vocabulary of the traditional folk ballad or Middle English Romance.<sup>52</sup> The narrator is nowhere present in the first person nor in an aside and there is only one use of the domestic ‘our’ (present in the terminal *prayer*). On the other hand

47. The principal historical sources for *PF 122: William the Conquerour*:

William Camden, *Britannia, 1695*, intro. S. Piggott, with G. Walters (facsim. Newton Abbott, Devon, 1971), p. 187.

Thomas of Elmham, ‘Chronologia Augustinensis’, *Historia Monasterii S. Augustini Cantuariensis*, ed. C. Hardwick (London, 1858), p. 27.

John Foxe, *Actes and Monuments* (London, 1563), ed. G. Townsend II (London, 1843), 89.

Richard Grafton, *Abridgement of the Chronicles of Englande* (London, 1570), p. 29<sup>r</sup>-29<sup>v</sup>.

Sir John Heyward, *The Lives of the III Normans, Kings of England* (London, 1613), p. 97.

Raphael Holinshed, *Chronicles*, pp. 2-3.

William Lambarde, *A Perambulation of Kent* (London, 1570), intro. R. Church (Bath, 1970), pp. 20-21.

Guillaume de Poitiers, ‘Vie de Guillaume le Conquerant’, *Collection des Mémoires relatifs a L’Histoire de France*, ed. M. Guizot (Paris, 1826), pp. 413-14.

John Speed, *Historie*, p. 420.

Thomas Sprott, *Chronica*, ed. T. Hearne (Oxford, 1719).

John Stow, *Annales*, pp. 102-03.

William Thorne, *Chronicle of St. Augustine’s Abbey, Canterbury*, trans. A.H. Davis, intro. A.H. Thompson (Oxford, 1924), pp. 47-48.

48. HF II, 253-59: BL Add. MS. 27,879, fols. 133<sup>r</sup>-134<sup>r</sup>.

Within this study the spelling ‘Buckingham’ is used in the title of the *Folio* poem and to refer to the anonymous ‘Buckingham poet’: the spelling ‘Buckingham’ refers to the hero of the text, the historical person or the title of other poems.

49. Pepys I. 64, *A most Sorrowful Song, setting forth the miserable end of Banister, who betrayd the Duke of Buckingham, his Lord and Master*, registered with the Stationers’ Company on the 18th of January, 1600 (III, 154).

*The Life and Death of the Great Duke of Buckingham, who came to an untimely End*, published by Richard Johnson, *The Crown Garland of Golden Roses* (1612), Percy Society, 4 (1842), 25-27.

50. For instance:

For one of his sones for greeffe Starke madd did fall. . . .

*PF 87*: l. 117

His eldest sonne starke mad did runne. . . .

MS: st. 25

51. The *Folio* text is written without stanzaic division.

52. These are: ‘endite’ (l. 4), ‘tract’ [of time] (l. 17), ‘swaying’ (‘s. the sword’ l. 39), ‘murthered’ (l. 31), ‘leathern’ (l. 65), ‘marks’ [money] (l. 81), ‘lucre’ [profit] (l. 88), ‘fee’ (l. 88), ‘attach’ [arrest] (l. 91).



there are eight examples of periphrastic conjugation using 'did' to form a preterite. In short, this text does not demonstrate a descent from an original which preceded it by many years: the author tells us twice in the first stanza that he is *writing* the text (this is discussed more fully presently when I consider the motif *exhortation*), and there is no evidence to detract from the suggestion that this ballad was intended to be a broadside and that it was probably written in the latter quarter of the 16th century.<sup>53</sup>

#### 4. PF 183: *Kinge Edgar*<sup>54</sup>

*Edgar* covers an event which the Chroniclers cite as having happened round about the year 958 AD. This ballad is also by Thomas Deloney (d.1600) and has been chosen for discussion because it is written in a different style from its companion texts in this section and is probably earlier than *William*.

It consists of 90 couplets written in predominantly 10 syllable lines generally with four stresses per line. The variants (with the exception of the (?)Philips text) have a refrain which *The Folio* scribe as is his custom, omits: 'Adowne, adowne, downe, down, down' after each couplet-line one, and 'call him downe a' after each couplet-line two.<sup>55</sup> The ballad was printed in Deloney's *Garden of Good Will*, which according to Mann was first published in 1593.<sup>56</sup> However unlike *Strange Histories*, *The Garland* is a gathering of texts, many of which had been previously published as individual broadsides.<sup>57</sup> Because no such broadside variants now exist it is not possible to date *Edgar* exactly. (It will be shown presently that none of the available variants was the exemplar for PF 183.) However there are two pointers which suggest — though they do not prove — that *Edgar* stems from early in Deloney's career, which all commentators agree commenced about 1586 when his first certain publication appeared.<sup>58</sup> First, a *contrafactum*, that is to say a

---

53. The historical sources for PF 87: *Buckingham* are:

*Chronicles of London*, ed. C.L. Kingsford (Gloucester, 1977), p. 191-92.

*The Crowland Chronicle Continuations: 1459-1486*, ed. N. Pronay & J. Cox (Gloucester: 1986), p. 165.

*The Great Chronicle of London*, p. 234

Robert Fabyan, *The Chronicle of Fabian whiche he nameth the Concordaunce of Histories* (London, 1559), p. 517.

Edward Hall, *Chronicle*, pp. 394-95.

John Hardyng, *The Chronicle from the firste begynnyng of Englande*, (London, 1543: facsim. Amsterdam, 1976), fols. lxxxix<sup>v</sup>-xCi<sup>r</sup>.

William Martyn, *The Historie of the Lives of the Kings of England from William the Conquerour to the end of the reigne of King Henry the VIII*, (London, 1638), p. 251.

John Speed, *Historie*, pp. 926-27.

John Stow, *Annales*, p. 466.

Polydore Vergil, *Three Books of Polydore Vergil's English History*, ed. H. Ellis, Camden Society OS 36 (1844), 199-201.

54. HF III, 485-93; BL Add. MS. 27,879, fol. 253<sup>r</sup>-54<sup>f</sup>.

55. The variants are found in: T. Deloney, *Works*, ed. F.O. Mann (Oxford, 1912), pp. 305-309; R.H. Evans, *Old Ballads . . . collected from rare copies and manuscripts* (London, 1810), pp. 22-28; [(?)Ambrose Philips,] *A Collection of Old Ballads* (London, 1723), II, 25-33.

56. Mann bases his assumption on an entry in the *Stationers' Register* which in March 1593, refers to the *Garden of Good Will*. Mann believes 'Garden' to be an error for 'Garland'. *Works*, ed. F.O. Mann, p. 562-63. The next datable reference to *The Garland* (1596), was made by Thomas Nashe in his *Haue With You To Saffron-Walden: The Works of Thomas Nashe*, 5 vols. ed. R.B. McKerrow (London, 1904), III, 84.

57. *Works*, ed. Mann, p. 563. Schwegler, in Chapter V of his Dissertation (p. 354ff), argues that the 'Deloney' texts in *The Folio* stem from an earlier edition of *The Garland* than any now extant and published no later than 1600.

work written to a pre-existing tune, cannot have been composed prior to the publication of that tune. *Edgar* was sung to the tune known variously as *Labandalashot* (*Garland*) or *Labandulishot* (Philips). This is Simpson's *Labandala Shot*, the earliest dateable reference for which is 1576.<sup>59</sup> However *Lanbandulashot* is an *alternative* option: the directions to *Edgar* are that it is 'To be sung in the old ancient sort, or else to the Tune of Labandalashot'. Simpson points out that the use of the latter tune requires the omission of the burdens.<sup>60</sup> Therefore it is likely that *Edgar* was originally written before *Labandulashot* became so popular that a writer could safely assume that his public would know it.

Secondly, as Fowler points out, the use of a refrain is an early practice, and as Friedman notes, the couplet-ballad preceded the quatrain-ballad.<sup>61</sup> Both of these scholars are speaking of earlier works than *Edgar*, but it seems to me to be possible that the first ballads from an inexperienced writer might well echo those with which he was most familiar. Deloney started life as an artisan — a weaver — and may therefore be supposed in his early years to have been more likely to have heard or read traditional folk ballads than belletristic literature. It is I think, credible that *Edgar* is an early work styled upon probably oral exemplars known to the poet.

The language of *PF* 183 is similar to that of *William* and as in *William*, approximately half the text's vocabulary stems from words originating in Old English and, also as in *William*, there are only three traditional phrases: 'Lady gay' (ll. 12, 84), 'Lady bright' (ll. 13, 51) and 'False knight' (l. 86), — although the phrase 'Phebus beames' (l. 15) is a later cliché. The traditional cheville and 'weak' line are inappropriate to the couplet, but if the interlinear burden is included then this ballad has a full complement of these aspects of the traditional ballad. In ten cases 'did' is used to form a preterite; the domestic 'our' does not appear, and the narrator is not seen to be present through the use of the first person or the 'aside' but, as in *William* his presence is suggested by the use of 'your' as a direct address to the audience in the terminal moral. In short, the lexis and structure of *PF* 183 is that of a broadside ballad: I have found no other 'song' of Deloney's which incorporates an interlinear refrain and in this regard *Edgar*, though not *PF* 183, is unique.<sup>62</sup>

##### 5. *PF* 22: *Sir Aldingar*: Child No. 59<sup>63</sup>

This text has been chosen for discussion because it is a traditional ballad and because it deals with a more nebulous historical topic than the other texts studied here. The ballad's theme is the popular 'Queen Falsely Accused' (seen for instance in *The Erle of Toulouse* and *Sir Triamour*), and the text falls into a class half-way between the 'Historical' topic of the present section of this study, and the 'Romance' topic of the next: as such it is an interesting transitional piece.

The event described in this text is legendary and has been associated with several historical queens of several countries and at several periods.<sup>64</sup> With regard to this study

---

58. This is not to say that there were no earlier works or *juvenilia* which have failed to survive.

59. C. Simpson, *The British Broadside Ballad and its Music* (New Brunswick, N.J., 1966), pp. 418-20. The tune originally came from 'continental dance music of the 1550s and 60s'. *ibid.*, p. 420n.

60. *Idem.*

61. D.C. Fowler, *Literary History*, p. 11-12; A.B. Friedman, 'The Formulaic Improvisation Theory of Ballad Tradition — A Counterstatement', *Journal of American Folklore*, 74 (1961), 113-15.

63. HF I, 165-173; BL Add. MS. 27,879, fol. 33<sup>r</sup>-35<sup>v</sup>; Child, *ESPB*, II, 33-48.

the authenticity of *Aldingar*'s historical background is of little importance: *PF 22* is in English, the *dramatis personae* are English and several early English chroniclers have recorded the story — albeit in Latin. They have allotted the events celebrated in the ballad to the early eleventh century and their accounts are therefore presently compared with *The Folio* text.

The 206 lines of *PF 22* are divided into 4-line stanzas, although there is now some irregularity. It is written in common metre and the rhyme is a b c b.<sup>65</sup> The vocabulary is traditional: approximately 80% of the total population of nouns, verbs and adjectives stem from Old English — this is a higher proportion than has been seen in any text so far discussed. In the first 100 lines there are seventeen archaic lexemes — the most modern of which (assuming it not to be a piece of armour), is the queen's 'gorgett' (ll. 75 and

---

62. Of the 39 texts printed by Mann, five *appear* to be in couplets. However *A joyful song . . .* (*Works*, p. 460), taken from a 1586 broadside, conflates two short lines into one long line — presumably for reasons of space, and was therefore not written in couplets. The 'death of King John' is celebrated in 4-line stanzas, a 'ballad on Edward II' is written in 10-line stanzas, the story of 'Matreuers and Gurney' is written to incorporate intermittent but deliberate formal alliteration in 8-line stanzas, and only the account of Wat Tyler's rebellion is written without stanzaic divisions. For the above see *Works*, p. 460 ('Joyful'), Canto V, p. 399 ('John'), Canto VI, p. 402 ('Edward'), Canto VIII, p. 408 ('Matreuers'), and Canto X, p. 413 ('Tyler').

Each of these latter four are considerably more sophisticated than *Edgar* and all four are found at the end of *Strange Histories*. It may be that towards the close of his career a more skilled Deloney returned to a form with which he had previously experimented and subsequently discarded, or — and since these texts appear at the end of his publication this possibility seems the most likely — running out of ballads suitable for inclusion in his book, he resurrected and polished some of his earlier and perhaps unpublished attempts.

The historical sources for *PF 183: Kinge Edgar* are:

*Brut*, ed. Brie, I, 113-14.

*Chronica de Mailros* (Edinburgh, 1835), p. 32.

*Eulogium (Historiarum sive Temporis)*, ed. F.S. Haydon, III (London, 1863), 18-19.

*Liber Monasterii de Hyda*, ed. E. Edwards (London, 1866), pp. 189-90.

*Le Livere de Reis de Brittainne et . . . de Engleterre*, ed. J. Glover, (London, 1865), pp. 25, 73.

*Chronicle of England, Westmynstere 1480* (Caxton's edn., facsim. Amsterdam, 1973), n.p.

Richard of Cirencester, *Speculum*, 2, 123-24.

Robert Fabyan, *Chronicle*, pp. 250-51.

John Foxe, *Acts*, II, 60-61.

Geffrei Gaimar, *Lestorie des Engles*, ed. T. Duffus Hardy, I (London, 1888), 151-66.

Ralph Higden, *Polychronicon*, ed. J.R. Lumby, VII (London, 1879), 22-26. This publication also includes John Trevisa's English translation and that of an unknown 15th century writer.

Raphael Holinshed, *Chronicles*, pp. 695-96.

Henry of Huntingdon, *Chronicle*, trans. & ed. T. Forester (London, 1853), p. 176.

William of Malmesbury, *De Gestis*, I, 178-80.

John Speed, *Historie*, pp. 350-351.

John Stow, *Annales*, p. 84.

64. For a review of the possible historical backgrounds to *Aldingar*, see: P. Christophersen, *The Ballad of Sir Aldingar: Its Origin and Analogues*, Oxford, 1952.

This work has a comprehensive bibliography of relevant books and articles and in particular is especially useful for foreign-language references. However Christophersen's conclusions to the effect that the early English historical chroniclers took their facts from the ballad, are based on a false reading of William of Malmesbury's Latin which he construes as referring to the existence of this ballad at that time. His assumption is groundless. It is also present in W.J. Entwistle's *European Balladry* (Oxford, 1939), pp. 66-67, 195, 233-234, where he asserts that *Aldingar* stems from the mid-twelfth century and is the oldest English ballad now extant. It *may* be so, but as D.S. Taylor points out in 'The Lineage and Birth of Sir Aldingar', *JAF*, 65 (1952), 139-147, Malmesbury does *not* mention it. A useful discussion of *Aldingar* and its lineage is found in E.E. Metzner's 'Lower Germany, England, Denmark and the Problem of Ballad Origins', *The European Medieval Ballad* (Odense, 1978), pp. 26-39.

65. In six instances the rhyme is imperfect: 'betrained'/'nay' (ll. 4/6); 'lame'/'lay' (ll. 12/14); 'away'/'geere' (ll. 74/76); 'geere'/'nest' (ll. 124/26); and 'Fooder'/'auger' (ll. 160/62).

123) a term for an article of female apparell from the 1500s.<sup>66</sup>

The text conforms to several of the conventions of the folk-ballad. There is repetition of phrase, line and stanza; transference of scene is wholly achieved through the technique of 'leaping and lingering'; just under half of the second and fourth stanzaic lines are 'weak' and in almost all cases the first stanzaic line introduces a new idea which is developed in the remainder, and there are six instances where the tense changes from past to present ('saies') to heighten the immediacy of a character's speech. There are five instances of the periphrastic 'did' but at least two of these are probably later interpolations as they distort the metre to a degree which is unacceptable even in a genre which is not known for strict prosody.

However despite its folk ballad affinity, the ballad has some remnants of possible minstrel influence: the narrator is present although he is a dim figure making only two 'asides' (at lines 105 and 168) but consistently using the domestic 'our' (eighteen examples). The text's complement of traditional phrases and formulae is not confined solely to those found in the folk-ballad, the minstrel ballad or the romance but consists of items found in all three.<sup>67</sup>

In short the lexical and stylistic structure of *PF 22* indicates that there is nothing to suggest that it did not have the very early origins some critics have postulated, and it is possible that in its descent to the seventeenth century it has retained something of each of the retellings it has undergone.<sup>68</sup>

## B. Synopses

Since my method of constructing a synopsis of a poem has been comprehensively set out in the previous examples, and since the discussions which later follow are in parallel and readers will not require a detailed knowledge of each text, I propose to give only a very brief précis of each *Folio* item using for the most part only the plot-units.

---

66. See the *OED*, **gorget**, *sb*, 2, 3.

67. For instance: 'false steward' (l. 1); 'false traitor' (l. 87); 'there came a [noun] to [noun] . . .' (e.g. There came a lame lazar to the Kings gates: l. 10); 'god you saue & see' (l. 22); 'say on, say on [noun — e.g. Sir Aldingar]/say thou on & vnto me . . .' (ll. 25/26); 'that euer Christen King did see' (l. 28); 'if this be true, thou [noun — e.g. Aldingar]/that thou dost tell to me/then will I [apodosis]/But if it be false [noun — e.g. Sir Aldingar]/that thou dost tell to me/then . . . [apodosis]' (ll. 35-40); 'both of gold & fee' (l. 38); 'euer alas & woe is mee' (ll. 68); 'an [adjective — e.g. gladed/glad/loulie] [noun — e.g. man/woman/child] then was [pronoun — e.g. hee/shee] . . .' (ll. 136,138, 148). There are many others but these are sufficient to illustrate some of the ballad syntagms found in this text.

68. For a full discussion of the ballad's origins see Christophersen, *Aldingar*, *passim*.

The historical sources consulted for *PF 22*: *Sir Aldingar* are:

'La Estoire de Seint Ædward le Rei', *Lives of Edward the Confessor*, ed. H.R. Luard (London, 1858), pp. 39-40.

John Brompton, 'History', ed. R. Twysden, *Historiae Anglicanae Scriptores X*, I (London, 1652), col. 933, cited in P. Christophersen, *The Ballad of Sir Aldingar* (Oxford, 1952), p. 28.

Richard of Cirencester, *Speculum Historiale*, ed. J.E.B. Mayor, II (London, 1869), 191-92.

Ralph de Diceto, 'Abbreviationes Chronicorum', *The Historical Works of Master Ralph de Diceto*, I, ed. W. Stubbs, (London, 1876), 174.

William of Malmesbury, *De Gestis Regum Anglorum*, ed. W. Stubbs, I (London, 1887), 229-30.

Matthew Paris, *Chronica Majora*, ed. H.R. Luard, I (London, 1872), 515.

*Flores Historiarum*, ed. H. R Luard, (1601: London, 1890), I, 562. (This work used to be thought to be by Matthew of Westminster, but this is now felt to be erroneous: the matter is discussed in Luard's preface).

Conclusions drawn from the full synopses (not set out here) will be given at the end of these summaries.

1. *PF 168: Bartton*<sup>69</sup>

(*pu 1: sts. 1-2*) Henry VIII, is petitioned by 80 London merchants. (*pu 2: st. 4*) They wish him to rid the sea of a Scottish pirate [Barton] who is hindering commerce. (*pu 3: st. 7*) Henry asks if none of his Barons will bring the pirate to him. (*pu 4: st. 8*) Lord Charles Howard declares that he will capture Barton. (*pu 5: st. 9*) He is given 600 men. (*pu 6: st. 11*) He co-opts Peter Simon, an old gunner and (*pu 7: st. 14*) William Horsley, an expert Bowman. (*pu 8: st. 17*) They go to sea and (*pu 9: st. 18*) meet a ship which they halt. (*pu 10: st. 20*) It is a merchant, Harry Hunt. (*pu 11: st. 22*) He tells them that he has only just been robbed by Barton (*pu 12: st. 26*) who is very strongly equipped and armed. (*pu 13: sts. 31-32*) He gives Howard advice on the strategy he should use. (*pu 14: sts. 33-35*) He says he will break the oath he gave Barton and help Howard. (*pu 15: st. 37*) Howard disguises his ship as a merchantman. (*pu 16: st. 38*) They sail on and pass Barton who is angry because they do not pay him the customary naval compliments.<sup>70</sup> (*pu 17: st. 41*) He sends his pinnace after them, shoots away Howard's foremast and kills 14 of his men. (*pu 18: st. 42*) Howard orders Simon to fire and (*pu 19: st. 44*) he sinks the pinnace. (*pu 20: st. 45*) Barton says he'll fetch the 'pedlars' himself. (*pu 21: st. 48*) Simon's son fires and kills 60 of Barton's men. (*pu 22: st. 49*) Hunt's ship fires and kills another 80. (*pu 23: sts. 52-53*) Barton orders Gordon to climb the mainmast to let down his 'beames'.<sup>71</sup> (*pu 24: st. 53*) Horsley shoots him and kills him. (*pu 25: st. 55*) Barton orders Hamilton to climb and (*pu 26: st. 65*) he too is shot dead. (*pu 27: st. 58*) Barton dons his armour and determines to climb the mast himself. (*pu 28: sts. 63-64*) Horsley shoots and hits Barton but he does not fall. (*pu 29: sts. 65-66*) He exhorts his men to fight on as long as they can hear his whistle — he will rejoin the fight presently. (*pu 30: st. 67*) After a while Hunt notices that he can no longer hear Barton's whistle and concludes that he is dead. (*pu 31: st. 68*) They board the pirate vessel. (*pu 32: st. 69*) Howard beheads Barton and (*pu 33: st. 70*) throws the torso overboard. (*pu 34: st. 71*) They all return to the king and (*pu 35: st. 74*) give him the pirate ship. (*pu 36: sts. 77-79*) Henry rewards all concerned and (*cu 36a (i): st. 80*) the Queen and her ladies come to see the head. (*cu 36a (ii): st. 81*) Henry regrets Barton's death. (*cu 36b (ii): st. 82*) Henry says that because Barton has fought manfully he will pay for his crew to be returned to the King of Scotland.

2. *PF 122: William*

(*pu 1: sts. 1-3*) After William had subdued England and been crowned he

---

69. This text has been analysed in 4-line stanzas, *not* as it is printed in HF III.

70. It was apparently required that merchant ships passing a King's ship should salute by lowering their top-sail. This requirement was first drawn up by King John in 1201 and continued until 1806. W.G. Perrin, *British Flags: Their Early History and Their Development at Sea* (Cambridge, 1922), pp. 189-192. Perrin cites Twiss, *Black Book of the Admiralty*, I, 129 in support of the Ordinance of King John. This source is not available to me so I have been unable to check it.

Howard, disguised as a merchantman, would have been required to salute Barton as a representative of the Scottish King. Although Barton was reviled as a pirate by the English, he was one of James IV's Scottish Captains and was plundering under Letters of Marque granted by his sovereign — his death was one of the reasons given for the Scottish invasion which led to Flodden. *Letters & Papers, Hen. 8*, I, item 2443; W. Croft Dickinson, *Scotland from the Earliest Times to 1603*, 3rd edn. rev. A.A.M. Duncan (Oxford, 1977), p. 260-61.

changed the laws of England. (*pu 2: st. 4*) This does not suit the men of Kent. (*pu 3: sts. 4-5*) The Archbishop of Canterbury discovers William is intending to journey to Dover so (*pu 4: st. 7*) with the Kentish commons he prepares to capture him. (*pu 5: st. 12*) They set an ambush in a wood. (*pu 6: st. 15*) They attempt to surround William. (*pu 7: st. 16*) They do so and (*pu 8: st. 20*) request that they be allowed to retain the old laws. (*pu 9: sts. 21-22*) William agrees to this if they will acknowledge him as their king. (*pu 10: st. 23*) They agree. (*cu 10a (i): st. 24*) This is why Kent has different customs from the rest of England.

3. *PF 87: Buckingham*

(*cu 1: st. 1*) Read this strange but true story. (*pu 1: sts. 2-3*) The Duke of Buckingham has a low-born servant, Banister, whom he has advanced to riches. (*pu 2: sts. 8-9*) Buckingham forms an army to avenge the Princes in the Tower who have been murdered by Richard III. (*pu 3: sts. 10-11*) But his men flee from Richard's army. (*pu 4: st. 12*) In search for a refuge Buckingham hastens to Banister. (*pu 5: st. 15*) who promises to hide him or incur Christ's curse on himself and his family. (*pu 6: st. 16*) The Duke disguises himself as a labourer. (*pu 7: st. 20*) Richard puts a price on Buckingham's head. (*pu 8: st. 22*) Banister, hoping for the reward that has been offered, betrays the Duke, (*pu 9: st. 23*) who is captured. (*pu 10: st. 26*) He is beheaded. (*pu 11: st. 27*) Banister goes to court to collect the reward but is thrown into prison. (*pu 12: st. 28*) His friends desert him. (*pu 13: st. 29*) Christ's curse descends upon him and his children all come to a miserable end. (*cu 13a (ii): st. 33*) God send those in need a better friend than Banister.

4. *PF 183: Edgar*<sup>72</sup>

(*pu 1: ll. 1-6*) King Edgar has heard of the beauty of the Earl of Devonshire's daughter [Estrild]. (*pu 2: ll. 7-10*) A widower, Edgar falls in love with her. (*pu 3: ll. 11-38*) He decides to honour her and (*pu 4: ll. 39-48*) sends a knight to tell her father he wishes her to be his queen. (*pu 5: ll. 49-54*) The knight

---

71. *Folio MS: 'beanes', '?beaues'.*

I have been unable to discover any evidence of the nature of these 'beames'. We are told that they are in his top-castle — a small railed platform almost at the top of the mast (l. 106), — and certainly the English seem very much afraid of them: they fear that if they are permitted 'to fall' Barton could overcome twenty ships with ease (ll. 113-16). Child suggests that they may have been heavy ingots of lead or iron suspended from beams attached to the mast and which were let fall onto the enemy ships (Child, *ESPB*, III, 337n.). Francis Gummere agrees with this (*Old English Ballads* (Boston, 1899), p. 330, n.27.2). However Firth, editor of *Naval Songs and Ballads*, Navy Records Society, 33 (1908), 341, suggests that they may have been 'primitive rams' but he thinks it more likely that they were 'apparatus for grappling the enemy's ship'. Unfortunately this suggestion relies on Hales' and Furnivall's definition of 'archborde' as the 'side of a ship'. It is not: 'ARCH BOARD. A decorated frame across a ship's stern outside of the planking. It is sunk at the lower part of the taffrail and frames the stern windows'. (R. de Kerchove, *International Maritime Dictionary*, 2nd edn. (Princeton, N.J., 1961), p. 22). On the other hand A.B. Friedman (*The Viking Book of Folk Ballads* (Harmondsworth, 1956 edn.), p. 348) proposes that they were 'butts of wood impregnated with inflammable substance. These were set afire and hurled at the enemy ships'. In view of the apprehension shown by the English and the fact that they thought Barton's 'beames' could demolish twenty ships from any direction ('either in charke bord or in hall' (l. 114) is a scribal error for 'either in archborde or in hull' meaning either stern on or abeam), it seems to me that this latter explanation is perhaps the most likely and that 'beames' may have been primitive 'bombs'. The earliest mention of an explosive device such as we may have here, appears to be 1588, 'bome' (*OED*, **Bomb**. See also *MED*, 'Beme', 'Bem'). It is not impossible that the poem's 'beame' may perhaps be a hitherto unrecognised early etymological variant of 'bomb'.

72. This text has no stanzaic divisions and due to its euphuistic style, the actual plot-lines are so interwoven into the complementary-units that it is not possible to give a single line reference for each plot-unit.

falls in love with her, (*pu 6: ll. 55-60*) courts her, and wins her for himself. (*pu 7: ll. 61-70*) Returned to the king he tells him that the story of her beauty is false. (*pu 8: ll. 71-78*) He asks leave to marry her himself for her lands. (*pu 9: ll. 79-88*) Permission is granted and they marry. (*pu 10: ll. 89-94*) However the stories of her beauty grow and the king realises he has been deceived. (*pu 11: ll. 95-104*) Thinking of a ruse he invites himself to the knight, Ethelwold's house. (*pu 12: ll. 105-12*) Ethelwold pretends to be glad and returns to his house to prepare for the royal visit. (*pu 13: ll. 113-46*) He reveals his original mission to his wife and beseeches her to present herself to the king as an undesirable woman lest his treachery be discovered. (*pu 14: ll. 147-58*) Angry at his deceit, Estrild does the opposite. (*pu 15: ll. 159-66*) The king falls in love with her. (*pu 16: ll. 167-70*) He takes Ethelwold hunting and (*pu 17: ll. 171-72*) the knight is 'accidentally' slain. (*pu 18: ll. 173-76*) Edgar marries Estrild. (*cu 18a (i): ll. 177-80*) You should be true and faithful to your friend.

5. *PF 22: Aldingar*

(*pu 1: sts. 1-2*) The King's steward, Aldingar, desires the Queen who refuses him. (*pu 2: st. 3*) Aldingar determines on revenge and (*pu 3: st. 4*) lays a leper in her bed. (*pu 4: st. 8*) He invites the King to take note of the Queen's lover. (*pu 5: st. 14*) The king condemns the Queen to death. (*pu 6: st. 18*) The Queen sees this as confirming the message of a warning dream she has had. (*pu 7: st. 23*) She asks for a champion to fight for her and (*pu 8: st. 24*) the King gives her 40 days to find one. (*pu 9: st. 26*) The Queen's messenger is unable to do so but (*pu 10: st. 28*) he meets a small child who (*pu 11: sts. 30-31*) [supernaturally] knows the Queen's dream and bids the messenger tell her all will be well. (*pu 12: st. 37*) The Queen is about to be burnt when the child arrives. (*pu 13: st. 39*) He calls for Aldingar, (*pu 14: st. 44*) they fight and Aldingar is mortally wounded. (*pu 15: st. 47*) He confesses. (*pu 16: st. 52*) He tells the King to take back his faithful wife. (*cu 16a (i): st. 53*) The leper is made steward in Aldingar's place.

### C. Conclusions

In none of the texts summarised above, is there the same degree of symmetry of units as that seen in *Durham*, although *Bartton* comes close to its style. Most of the stanzas open with a plot-unit and follow it with a complementary-unit which is sometimes tripled — but here this happens as a function of the four-line stanza. There is also a certain symmetry in the poem's occasional use of repetition. The text's complementary-units mainly concern the characters' direct and natural words and actions rather than the narrator's reported description. This, heightened by the poem's previously noted use of enallage and the word 'sayes' where 'said' could perhaps be expected, has the effect of bringing the events and the characters of the tale into the audience's present time: it gives an illusion of actuality of scene and character and permits the audience to participate in an on-going event with the poet who appears to be close to his characters and to *care* about his topic.<sup>73</sup> Thus despite the fact that *Barton* is the longest of the five texts studied and that the complementary-units are often leisurely and often the subject of repetition, the pace of the tale does not falter and audience interest is maintained.

---

73. I notice that C.H. Firth also praises this poem's 'graphic representation': ('Ballad History', *Royal Historical Society*, 3rd series, 2 (1908), 29).

*Aldingar* presents its units in a similar manner to *Bartton*: the complementary units also reflect speech and direct action; the plot units occur with a regularity that ensures the text's continual movement but with pauses for the repetition of lengthy complementary-units. This is seen to a slightly greater extent than in *Bartton* and in this poem involves looking back to events which have already taken place. In *Bartton* the repetition of units always concerns prospective events and therefore the poem's forward movement is never disturbed. However unlike that text, *Aldingar* is not about known historical people of the relatively recent past, but about distant semi-legendary royalty and a 'supernatural' hero. Therefore it is likely that despite the narrator's use of 'sayes' to give immediacy, the poet and audience may not so readily identify with the characters or the story and there is time to stop and look back. It is the repetition of The Queen's Dream (*pu 6*, and introduced by a sudden change of tense ('said' where 'sayes' is currently being used), as the complementary unit to *pu 11*, which causes the audience to realise that the Child is no ordinary being and this is not just an everyday story of an historical event. Both *Bartton* and *Aldingar* sustain audience attention through feeding the audience's curiosity, but unlike the former where the repeated complementary-units direct tension towards human achievement and the arousal of audience suspense lest the minor (but sympathetic) characters fail (they stake their lives on their prowess), the introduction of the supernatural in the latter, assures the audience of a happy outcome and directs its attention towards the *deus ex machina* and the manner of the plot's resolution. Both *Aldingar* and *Bartton* have a degree of symmetry in their overall shapes. However this is most evident in the former where the tale is noticeably circular: the initial plot-units (*pu 1-3*) with their complementary-units are repeated in the closing stanzas and the ballad opens and closes with the steward. Despite minor differences with regards to the structure of their plot- and complementary units *Aldingar* and *Bartton* are basically similar.

They contrast quite markedly with both *Edgar* and *William* which have the same author, Deloney, and neither of which need or expect close audience involvement: in both the audience is required to sit still and learn from a reported *histoire*. The lesson is explicitly set out in the complementary unit of the terminal *discours*. Without stanzaic division *Edgar's* plot- and complementary-units are interwoven: the plot-units when abstracted are seen to be brief and deal with actions made as a result of the characters' thoughts and feelings. These thoughts and feelings are set out at length in the complementary-units. *Edgar* is an ostentatious piece. Quite early in the story there is a twenty-six line complementary unit (ll. 12-38) which is a classical soliloquy and sets the tone of Deloney's euphuistic mode for the rest of the text.<sup>74</sup> The entangled plot- and complementary-units are written in a flowery 'high style' which has the effect of dispersing any individual personality the characters may have had — they make speeches *at* each other (with one eye on the audience), and unlike *Bartton* it is difficult to imagine that their words may ever have been actually spoken by anyone. They are not mimetic. The result is that it becomes all too obvious that the complementary-units are for the most part 'padding' designed to lengthen a tale which basically has only a few short plot-units, impress the reader with Deloney's poetic ability, and perhaps provide a contrast with the more basic reportage of the text's fellow broadsides. Unfortunately, regarded solely as a tale, the efflorescent verbiage slows the pace — the tale becomes tedious, reads like a poetic exercise and the impression is given that the poet has no real interest in his actual topic.

---

74. For a discussion of Deloney's euphuism see H.E. Rollins, 'Thomas Deloney's Euphuistic Learning in *The Forest*', *PMLA*, 50, 3 (1935), 679-86.



*William* is written in the 4-line stanza of the ballad, but there the resemblance to the ballad ends. Like *Edgar* the style is artificial and contrived — it is not redeemed by the burden present in some variants as its simplicity contrasts too strongly with the poet's studied style. The basic matter of the plot- and complementary units is generally brief but its presentation is often lengthy. The poet's language is literary with a high incidence of adjectives. This is especially noticeable in the complementary units where the verbiage of latinate phrases such as 'ancient liberties', 'servile yoke', 'fruitful Kent', 'sober pace' et cetera, slows the pace of the tale and hinders audience participation and interest by leaving nothing to the imagination. Like *Edgar* the fundamental tale is short and simple but the poet's expansion of his complementary units is maladroit and reveals that, again like *Edgar*, they are for the most part heavily 'padded' to fill out an uninspired factual presentation of a reported event made by a poet who appears uninterested in his topic *per se*.

As in *Edgar* and *William*, the *Buckingham* poet appears to have a motive for telling his tale which is ulterior to that of simple audience-entertainment achieved through the arousal and satisfaction of curiosity. The poet sets out the essence of the principal plot-units relating to each main scene of his tale, *prior* to its telling so that the reader is made aware of what is to come and the element of surprise is removed.<sup>75</sup> This has two effects: first it inhibits audience involvement in the story as a gradual revelation, and instead, directs attention to the lesson which should be looked for in each scene (the overall moral is spelt out at the end and in this regard the text is similar to the Deloney texts). Secondly when, after the initial synopsis, each scene is recounted, its complementary units appear longer than they are, because the plot-units are restated. *Buckingham* falls somewhere between the naturalism of *Barton* and *Aldingar* and the artificiality of *Edgar* and *William*. It lacks *William's* colourful adjectives and in general, unlike *Edgar*, the plot-units follow each other rapidly and move the story along quite quickly. The longest pause is the complementary-unit (sts. 17-18) which describes the Duke's humble disguise in domestic terms which reflect *Barton's* naturalistic and unsophisticated style as does the first of the two passages of direct speech — also using 'sayes' rather than 'said' — where the Duke asks Banister for refuge (*pu 4, pu 5*). However the unstudied effect falters (despite a further use of 'sayes') in the second speech: an impassioned complementary-unit where the Duke reviles his servant for his treachery (sts. 24-25) and which is important to the 'moral'. Thenceforward in the terminal complementary-unit describing the fate of the traitor's children, the tale dissolves into plain 'journalese'. The *Buckingham* poet is in the main a reporter, but the audience is not set entirely apart from the poem: the poet is not wholly distanced from his topic and the function of his longer complementary-units is not simply to lengthen his tale.

In short, my analyses of the plot- and complementary units of these five texts reveals a progressive sophistication: the oldest texts are concerned solely to tell a story to a participating audience. These are followed by a text where the story element is equal to the didactic component and the audience is expected to note both. Finally we have two texts where the story is subordinate to the poetic style and the moral lesson: the presence of an audience is felt only in the abstract. I suggest that these differences are caused by the fact that the early texts were almost certainly originally composed for recitation (perhaps from memory) to a present audience and that the later texts were composed for the printer and for sale to an unknown audience.

---

75. In my system of analysis a plot-unit is noted only on its first appearance with its complementary unit (if any). Synopses of events to come, narrative 'forewarnings' or subsequent restatements of plot-units without a *new* complementary-unit, are usually counted as being complementary.

## II. The Historical Sources, the Five Texts and the ‘Durham’ Paradigm.

The results of my examination of the five *Folio* items presently being studied, and the available historical sources when compared with the *Durham* paradigm, showed that (with the exception of *Item 20: Figures*, which is irrelevant in all cases but *PF 168*) the paradigm is valid for rhymed texts commemorating a single individual.

However before discussing paradigmatic agreement, it is necessary to note that comparison between the five texts and their sources shows that *Edgar* is taken from the account in Fabian’s *Concordaunce* (pp. 250-51) and *William* from either Stow’s *Englyshe chronicles* (first published in 1565) or *Holinshed’s Chronicles* (published in 1577) which repeats Stow.<sup>76</sup> It is probable that Holinshed was also the source used for *Buckingham*: there is no lexical evidence for this but I present the suggestion on the grounds that Holinshed covers a larger number of the ‘facts’ incorporated in *PF 87* than any other source account and is the only historian given to inserting moral synopses relating to an event which he is about to cover.<sup>77</sup> As I have previously noted, the *Buckingham* poet also does this.<sup>78</sup>

The following shows that all five texts agree with the paradigm in eleven of its items. *Aldingar* disagrees in one instance only (95% agreement); *Bartton* in two (90% agreement); *Buckingham* in four items (80% agreement); *Edgar* in six (70% agreement), and *William* in eight (60% agreement). My final conclusion will be that the ultimate cause of these differences is related to the age of the text analysed, but that there are four contributory factors: errors in transmission; the poet’s source; his adjustment of ‘fact’ to dramatic structure; and finally, his emphasis on a ‘moral’.

The discussion immediately following considers the texts which agree with the paradigm. It shows that the probable effects of transmission do not change the main outlines of the narrative though they are likely to alter such small details as the original poet (or subsequent transmitters) have seen fit to include — notably figures relating to dates and troop numbers. However despite alteration due to a poem’s physical progress from one minstrel/scribe/ collector/editor to another, the fundamental drama of the historical action remains and is neither changed by the addition of fictional ‘events’ nor occluded by the retention of lengthy detail. Omission or simplification of points basically irrelevant to the main plot, including matters concerning minor characters, sharpens the poem’s focus and, if the text was composed to a purpose, tends to its clarification. It is shown that regardless of the importance of moral doctrine to each poem, each text nevertheless has a lesson (if only minimal), which is always presented following the climax to a sequence of events, which have themselves included repetition (often via the spoken word) of the matter from which the ultimate lesson will be drawn.

The chronological sequences of each of the five texts discussed here, occur in their

---

77. For instance after the Duke flies to Banister Holinshed states: ‘But alas he fell unfortunatlie into the hands of the foaming bore. . . .’ (The Boar was Richard’s heraldic symbol). Raphael Holinshed, *The third volume of chronicles beginning at Duke William the Norman . . . and continued to the yeare 1586* (London, 1587), p. 743.

78. The *PF 87* equivalent of the above citation is:

For then it came to passe, more woe alas,  
for sorrowes then began. . . .

*PF 87*: st. 7

proper order (*Item 7: Chronology*), and *Bartton* also agrees with the paradigm in that it

76. Despite careful attention it is not possible to suggest the source of the information found in either *Aldingar* or *Bartton*.

*Edgar:*

The details of the names given in Fabian's story are identical with those used by Deloney — **Earl Orgarus** has a daughter **Estrild**, whose husband is killed in **Horswood** with a **Shaft**. *None* of the other sixteen accounts studied agree with *PF* 183 in each of these details. Some of the variants found are (in alphabetical order under the headings as above):

Earl	Orgarus	Estrild	Horswood	Shaft
Baron	Edgarus	Aelfthryth	Harewood	Dart
Comitis	Erdegar	Alfdriþa	Warewell	Jaculum
Duke	Ergarus	Alfred	Warlewood	'did sle hym'
Dux	Horgerius	Alfrida	Welwerley	'ran him through'
Ealdorman	Ordgar	Elfþriþa	Wherewell	no mention
Earl	Orgar	Ethelfriþ	Werewylle	no mention
Sire	Osgar	Wylþriþa	Wewelle	no mention

Further, there are lexical and semantic similarities between Fabian and *PF* 183 which are not found elsewhere. For example:

Fabian	PF 183
This knight having sight of this mayden was so wounded that . . .	The knight . . . was so ravisht att her sight that . . . (l. 49-52)
His trouth and allegyaunce that he should owe . . .	The duty tho/which hee unto the kinge did owe (l. 59-60)
Beautie that she was reported of . . .	Beauty of such great report . . . (l. 67)
As other women were. . . .	No better than the common sort. . . (l. 68)
Considering she was her fathers heyre. . . .	Sith she is her Fathers heyre. . . (l. 72)
Yet kept good countenance as though he . . .	But kept his countenance good and kind as though hee . . . (l. 97-98)
As it were in a game . . .	In sport, he said. . . (l. 101)
He . . . was so wounded . . .	Thy beauty gave me such a wound . . . (l. 134)
She . . . cast in her mynde. . . .	Casting many things in mind . . . (l. 149)
To make that foule which [God] had made. . . .	To make that Foule which god did Frame. . . (l. 152)
Moost costly aparayle . . .	Most costly robes . . . (l. 153)
So that he set reason aparte. . . .	That reason quite From him did passe. . . (l. 160)

*William:*

The incidents in this text (including the terminal moral) occur in the same order in both *Holinshed* and *PF* 122. This is not the case in other sources available to Deloney who has paraphrased *Holinshed/Stow*:

Holinshed/Stow	PF 122
He was crowned king vpon Christmas daie by Aldred Archbishop of Yorke.	Vpon Christmas day . . . then was hee crowned by Albert, Archbischopp of yorke: st. 2
He took his iourney towards the castell of Douer to subdue that . . .	To douer then he tooke the way the castle downe for to flinge. st. 5
When the archbishop Stigand and and Egelsin the abbat of S. Augustines . . . did percieve . . .	When the Archbischopp bold of Canterbury knew, the Abbott of S <sup>x</sup> . Austines eke . . . st. 6
All the people of the countie of Kent to assemble at Canterburie. . . .	All the yeomen . . . that were in . . . Kent, att Canterbury they did meet: sts. 7-8
The pride and insolencie of the Normans . . . bondage & seruile estate yoke of seruitude & bondage.	like bondmen . . . to Frenchmen in their pryde: st. 9
rather to die in battell	seruile yoke . . . st.10
Everyone . . . should beare boughs in their hands.	Rather lett vs dye in bloody Feild. st. 10
As soone as the captains of the Kentishmen sawe that duke William was inclosed in the midst of their armie, they caused their trumpets to be sounded, their banners to be displayed and threw down their boughes . . . their swords drawne . . . and . . . stretched foorth. . . . William was sore astonied and amazed.	Eche man took a bow in his hande: st. 13
ancient liberties . . . lawes . . . customes	But when the Kentishmen had thus enclosed the Conquerour round, then suddenly they drew their swords & threw their bouges to ground; their banners they displayed in sight, their trumpetts sounded . . . their troops stretch Forth. . . . Whereatt this . . . Conquerour theratt was sore agazed: sts. 16-18
	libertyes . . . ancient customes: st. 22

has a specific temporal location which is inaccurate.

*Bartton* begins ‘As itt befell in Midsummer time’, and Howard goes to sea ‘the day before Midsummer even’ (st. 17) (June 22nd), but after the adventure is over we have:

the day before Newyeeres even  
& into Thames mouth againe they came.

*PF* 168: st. 72

This reference to the New Year is not an error as there are two further mentions:

“such a newyeeres giff I haue brought to your grace.”

st. 72

Sir Andrews shipp was the Kings Newyeeres guiff.<sup>79</sup>

st. 74

Those of the sources which mention dates agree that the King heard of Barton’s activities in June. Given that the Howards had to have time to mount the expedition (see my earlier footnote on their ships), that they did not put to sea until Group **A1**’s July the 1st or so, seems likely. Hall (the source for later historians such as Holinshed) avers that Howard returned to court on the 2nd August. This return (having first seen to their vessels, crews and prisoners), also seems reasonable.<sup>80</sup> It is probable that Group **A1**’s 1st of July for Howard’s setting out to sea is correct, and that *PF* 168 is incorrect: it is quite certain that *Bartton*’s date for Howard’s return, New Year’s Eve, is also wrong. These errors are likely to be the result of faulty textual transmission.

Errors derived from the process of circulation may also be relevant in the case of *Item 20* which states that figures will generally be inaccurate. *Bartton* is the only text of the five discussed here which gives any actual numbers. Howard appears to have had 100 gunners and 100 bowmen on his ship(s) (sts. 12, 13, 15 & 16). If it is accepted that these figures are probably rounded-off in accordance with the dictates of balladry, it is somewhat surprising to discover that they may well be correct — insofar as can be ascertained through comparison with known figures given for other ships of a similar tonnage. One of Howard’s ships, the *Barbara*, was a vessel of about 140 tons: there are no extant figures for her but comparable ships carried about 50 guns.<sup>81</sup> However these guns were the heavy artillery: it was also customary to carry a large number of smaller

---

79. These references are *only* found in Group **A2**: in Group **A1** Howard sets sail on ‘the morowe after midsomer moneth’ (st. 17) (July 1st) and returns to *land* (not the court) the night before ‘St. Maudlen even’ (st. 74) (July 21st). Group **B** has no reference to a terminal date but the matter of the poem begins in May. It is probable that the text is following the old calendar and the New Year here is in March, but even if it should refer to January, the text is still temporally vague.

80. Practical documentary evidence relating to their return to land (although I have been unable to sight the paper myself) appears in the Records Office document, Exchange Accounts, 55 (30), which has been summarised by Brodie (who believes that the record relates to the Barton battle) in *Letters & Papers, Hen. 8, I, 1, item 855*. The entry refers to the expenses of one, Richard Dyves ‘upon a Scot taken in the Downes’. Dyves is paid for the ‘cost of his horse, riding in haste, 6 July, betwixt Rochester and Canterbury, 12<sup>d</sup>. Hire of a horse to the Downes, 8<sup>d</sup>, guide 4<sup>d</sup>, boat to go on board ship, 8<sup>d</sup>. Subsequently he hires 3 horses for himself, his guide and a prisoner and goes to Greenwich, from whence on the 9th of July he goes to ‘Mr. Pechi’s place’. He is paid board wages for ‘self and man and the Scot’ from the 7th to the 31st July. For six days in August he rode ‘after the King’ ‘conducting a Scot’ — presumably the dead Andrew Barton’s next-in-command. These fiscal accounts seem to show that Howard was back in port by at least the morning of the 5th of July — time would have been needed to send a message of the victory and because of the reference to ‘haste’ it can be reasonably assumed that Dyves set out immediately he received his instructions.

pieces.<sup>82</sup> If such are included in the ballad's figures then its estimate of the gunners needed is probably reasonable. We are told (A1) that the king gave Howard '500 men/beside all other merriners and boys' (st. 10) (A2: 600 men). Even if this company were divided amongst the Howards' two ships this is undoubtedly an exaggerated figure, since other ships of 140 tons carried only from 120 to 160 men. Here the text agrees with *Item 20*. However with regards to bowmen, since the *Henry Grace à Dieu* (rebuilt 1540) of 1000 tons carried as many as '500 bows of yew' and '700 men', it seems at least possible that Howard in his smaller ship could at need muster 100 bowmen — given also that archery was a vital part of the training of Tudor youth.<sup>83</sup>

The following figure shows the variant numbers given in the principal ballad groups:<sup>84</sup>

**Figure 7. Weapons, Crew & Casualties cited in *Bartton*.**

Men	A1	Stanza	A2	Stanza	B Glen.	Stanza	B Rox.	Stanza
English crew	500+	st.10	600	st.9	100	st.9	100	st.9
Bartton's guns	120	st.28	-	-	36	st.25	36	st.25
Pinnace guns	26	st.29	30	st.28	-	-	-	-
Pinnace crew	180+	st.29	190+	st.28	-	-	-	-
Scots captured:	360	st.71	360	st.68	360	st.55	360	st.55
English killed	15	st.44	14	st.41	15	st.37	14	st.37
Scots drowned	180+	st.48	190+	st.44	-	-	-	-
Scots shot: (1)	50	st.50	60	st.48	50	st.39	15	st.39
Scots shot: (2)	40	st.52	80	st.48	50	st.41	50	st.41
Total Scots dead	270		330		103		68	

The figure does not show the additional deaths of the named Scots (Gordon, Hamilton and Barton himself), but it demonstrates that the figures in the *Folio* variant are generally inflated above those given in both the earlier and later versions. I suggest that this may be

81. W.L. Clowes, *The Royal Navy: A History from the Earliest Times to the Present*, 5 vols. (London, 1897), I, 422-23.

82. Among these small-arms were:

Fowlers, short, light weapons, with or without a separate breech which could be unshipped and reloaded while another was being discharged; post-pieces, small fowlers with the same peculiarities; curtalds, short heavy guns, apparently employed for high angle fire; slings, demi-slings, bassils or small basilisks, and top-pieces, all of diminutive calibre and relatively large powder charge, working on swivels or pivots; hail-shot pieces, carrying a charge of cubical dice; and hand-guns or calivers, which although fired from the shoulder, required to be supported on a pivot or staff.

Clowes, *Navy*, I, 412. See also a list of ordinance taken from *The Complaynt of Scotland* and cited pp. 415-419.

I note that Howard carried a weapon that would fire 'chaine yeards 9': st. 43.

83. Clowes, *Navy*, I, 420.

84. The figures in the various texts are sometimes given in 'scores': for convenience I have translated these into whole numbers. For reasons of space the Glenriddell MS. cited by Child, has been abbreviated to 'Glen.' and ballad I, 2, 3, from the Roxburghe Collection to 'Rox.'

because *Bartton* has been transmitted from a source which underwent many repetitions before it arrived at the *Folio* scribe, whereas Group **B** is perhaps derived from a source which had fewer repetitions in its transmission process.<sup>85</sup> At any event it is clearly seen that no reliance may be placed on figures found in rhymed historical verse: even if the figures have not been altered by the poet to influence the perceived glory (or disgrace) of the outcome of a combat, then they may well have undergone distortion through transmission.

Those texts (*PF* 122 and 183) where the plot is derived from detailed source accounts, do not have extra fictitious material relating to the direct action of the historical event (*Item 6: Fiction & action*): the essential drama is retained without addition.

The two texts, *Bartton* and *Aldingar* which expand a plot only generally sketched in the historical documents, may perhaps include fictional matter covering the action of the event but I argue that this is unlikely. In the case of *Bartton*, I have found no discrepancy in all matters which can be checked and which relate to the main action. It is true that the text has fictional ornament such as the report that Andrew Barton's ship was bejewelled: 'besett with pearles and precyous stones' (st. 75) (which, without evidence, I feel is most unlikely) but this kind of fictional embellishment in no way concerns the action of the poem. Similarly, when Barton's ship is presented to Henry, the poet says gleefully:

Now hath England 2 shipps of warr,  
2 shipps of war, before but one!

*PF* 168: st. 75

This is not true: (Henry VII left at least four warships he had had built besides others bought or captured), but again the fiction does not concern the action.<sup>86</sup> In short there is no evidence that the *Bartton* poet has incorporated fiction into the action of his plot.

Similarly the action of the story of *Aldingar* fails to contradict the source accounts, most of which cover the essential points of the poem: the queen is accused of adultery; finds herself a small champion; he fights a huge man; he hamstringing him and overcomes him. The fact that in *PF* 22 the 'Child' appears to be a supernatural character does not concern the action as he does not use the paranormal to overcome his enemy. There is no evidence that fiction relating to the fundamental action of the plot has been introduced: the essential drama is untouched.

The clarity of each of these five poems commemorating an individual has not been shadowed by the inclusion of lengthy or unimportant minutiae: (*Item 2: Details*). Deloney's historical sources for *William* and *Edgar* have very few details, but even so he has omitted peripheral information relating to the Conqueror's actions concerning the government of England. Holinshed, his source, has that '[the Conqueror] tooke order how to keepe the realme in good and quiet gouernement' and he goes on to speak at some length of the measures initiated.<sup>87</sup> Deloney sums them up in a broad statement: 'he

---

85. It would appear from the homophonic error in the Roxburghe text's '15' Scotsmen shot in the first sally (st. 39) where the Glenriddell MS. has '50', that there have been errors in transmission (of which this is only one example) which imply that not all the Group **B** texts came from the same source.

86. The four warships were the *Regent*, the *Sovereign*, the *Sweepstake* (probably renamed the *Katherine Pomegranate* under Henry VIII), and the *Mary Fortune*. These four alone were still sound at Henry VIII's accession. W.L. Clowes, *Royal Navy*, I, 404-5, 419-21; *Letters & Papers, Hen. 8*, I, 1, item 1698; *Naval Accounts and Inventories of the Reign of Henry VII*, ed. M. Oppenheim, Navy Records Society (1896), pp. 161-338.

changed quite/the customes of England' (PF 87: st. 2). This generalisation of the source facts, which facts actually imply that the new measures were not all oppressive (for instance the appointment of 'officers and councellers . . . such as he thought to be wise and discreet men'), has the effect of presenting William as the poem's Villain early in the text.

In *Edgar*, Deloney has followed his source very closely except with regards to Aethelwold's death. Fabian has:

He [King Edgar] awaytynge his Season and tyme stroke the earle throwe  
the bodye with his shaft, so y<sup>t</sup> he dyed sonne after.<sup>88</sup>

This regal murder does not accord with Deloney's presentation of the king as Hero. The poet is in something of a quandary as Aethelwold *must* die before Estrild can re-marry, therefore somewhat embarrassed and casting all responsibility on his source, he skips over the incident in a single couplet:

[hunting in the wood] the story telleth plaine  
that with a shaft the Earle was slaine.

PF 183: ll. 171-72

The existing historical accounts of *Aldingar* are all brief and it may be that the poet's source material did not include any facts which are not present in the extant texts. However it is noticeable that the popular scene *attempted seduction* found in other works with the *Accused Queen* theme, such as *Toulouse* or *Triamour*, is generalised in PF 183.<sup>89</sup> It becomes a single stanza of *scene-setting*:

Our king he kept a False steward,  
Men called him Sir Aldingar:  
he wold haue layen by our comely queene  
her deere worshipp to have betraide.  
our queene shee was a good woman  
& euer more said him nay.

PF 22: ll. 1-6

The effect of this is to précis the first part of a story (which in a Romance would have been leisurely set out), quicken the tale, immediately establish the Villain and the initial *Misdeed*, and enable the poet to plunge into the more dramatic aspects of his story straightaway: a description of the attempted seduction would have distracted from the 'real' action of the narrative.

The omission of details likely to distract from the narrative is also seen in *Buckingham* where the cause of the flight of Buckingham's army who 'left him one by one' (st. 11), has been simplified to 'Feare' of King Richard's 'ost' (st. 10), with no mention of the fact that the Duke's army was mainly Welsh and by reason of great floods and continual rain was stranded without food or wages, unable to cross the river Severn, for ten days.<sup>90</sup>

---

87. Holinshed, *Third Volume*, p. 2.

88. Fabian, *Chronicles*, p. 251

89. *The Erl of Tolous and The Emperes of Almayn*, ed. G. Lüdtké (Berlin, 1881), sts. 45-55, pp. 243-49; *Syr Tryamowre*, ed. A.J.E. Schmidt (Utrecht, 1937), ll. 67-120, pp. 49-50.

With regard to *Bartton*, in light of the esoteric interest that *is* present in the text, it is probable that other information which would distract from the principal ‘adventure’ has been deliberately excluded. For instance, historically Barton had two ships, the *Lion* and the *Jenny Purwyn*.<sup>91</sup> The Howard brothers (also in two ships)<sup>92</sup> separately chased and separately captured Barton’s two vessels. Both were presented to Henry VIII and became part of his fleet. The *PF* 168 poet deals only with the capture of Andrew Barton and the *Lion* (though the ship is not named). Even when the prize is presented to the king (st. 75), the poet retains his single focus and no mention is made of the *Jenny Purwyn*. The effect of this example of omission (and others not detailed here), is to concentrate the narrative on the physical actions that take place in the tale and to keep a constant tension with attention directed towards the drama in a single area of combat.

Thus the effect of the omission of specific historical details in both the Deloney texts and *Buckingham* relates to the rôle of the titular character: in *William* he is made more villainous, in *Edgar* he is made more heroic, and in *Buckingham* his condition is made to appear more pitiful. However this last text also joins *Aldingar* and *Bartton* in that by omitting detail the poet sharpens the poem’s focus: in *PF* 87 the audience is led to concentrate on the Duke’s desperate need — which underlines the perfidy of the ultimate betrayal; in *PF* 22, by omitting preliminary details of the initial wrongdoing the poet can concentrate upon the dramatic deeds to which it led, and in *PF* 168 the poet’s omissions result in a clear-cut and linear story which can be easily followed without the necessity of audience attention alternating between two simultaneous battles.

All five texts focus specifically on only two or three persons besides each poem’s titular character (*Item 3: Character focus*), and conform to the paradigm with regard to the inaccuracy or absence of some names (*Item 4: Nomenclature*).

Although, as I have previously shown, *Bartton* is surprising in the authenticity of some of its minor characters, the duality of the historical Hero (the two Howard brothers) is suppressed in favour of a single Hero — who is wrongly named.<sup>93</sup> Nomenclature in *Buckingham* is absent in one instance where instead, the character is singled out by his office — which is historically inaccurate: the sources agree that the Duke’s captor was not an anonymous ‘herald of armes’ (st. 23) but John Mitton, the Sheriff of Shropshire.<sup>94</sup>

---

90. Holinshed, *Third Volume*, p. 743; Fabian, *Chronicles*, pp. 517-18.

91. The barque, *The Jennet of Purwyn* (70 tons) had been given by James of Scotland to the King of Denmark: she had been taken from Copenhagen by Barton without the king’s permission. When John of Denmark heard that Henry VIII had the ship he wrote (11th February, 1512) asking for it back — he didn’t get it. *Letters & Papers, Hen. 8*, ed. R.H. Brodie, (1920: rpt. Vaduz, 1965), I, 1, Item no. 1056, 513; A. Spont, *Letters and Papers Relating to the War with France, 1512-1513*, Navy Records Society, 10 (1897), viii; Clowes, *Navy*, I, 419.

In 1512 her victualling accounts are for 65 men: ‘souldiours 20, maryners 40, gonners, 3 and servitours 2’. She also asked for ‘22 deddeshares’. Spont, *ibid.*, p. 10. This ship is unlikely to have been the ballad’s ‘pinnacle’ which, in the ballad, is sunk. The *Jenny*’s companion vessel *The Lion* (120 tons) was a war-ship with 130 men (‘souldiours 80, maryners 40, gonners 5, servitours 5’ and ‘22 deddeshares’): Spont, *ibid.* p. 8.

92. Thought to be the *Barbara* and the *Mary Barking* — both hired and fitted out expressly for this expedition. Spont, *Letters*, pp. ix-x citing *The Records Office Chapter House Book*, pp. 34, 35, 122, 126, 129, 151.

93. This error has been discussed earlier in this chapter: here it is only briefly mentioned as an example of *PF* 168’s conformity to the paradigm. I have already noted that I believe the substitution of a later Howard for the earlier man, to be an example of the sycophantic alteration of an older text in order to direct adulation towards a person for whom the original work was not intended: cf. the ‘Egerton’ interpolation in *PF* 39.



*William* errs where the historical Aldred, Archbishop of York, is named Albert.<sup>95</sup> Egelsine, the Abbot of St. Augustine's, is nowhere named, nor is Stigand, the Archbishop of Canterbury, although both clerics lead the Kentishmen in their resistance.<sup>96</sup> The names of the characters in *Edgar* agree with Fabian, but Deloney does not name Edgar's first wife, Egelfleda (Aethelflæd) or his son by Estrild, Egelred (Aethelred).<sup>97</sup> The name of the wood in which Ethelwold met his death, according to Fabian, is 'Hoorewood'.<sup>98</sup> Deloney has written this as 'Horswood'.<sup>99</sup> Because, as the previously listed variant names for the wood shows, no source document has 'Horswood', I suggest that Deloney has altered the morpheme 'Hoore' of his source to 'Hors' in order to avoid the associations connected with 'hoore' which in his day was the spelling for 'whore'. I have already remarked that Deloney in his management of Ethelwold's murder was aware that the behaviour of his Hero could not stand up to close moral scrutiny. The lines that follow the death of Estrild's husband imply that not only had there been a murder but that the hero and heroine were adulterous:

& when that hee [Ethelwold] had lost his liffe  
he [Edgar] took the Lady to his wiffe —  
he married her all shame to shunn  
by whom he had begot a sonne.

PF 183: ll. 173-76

Under the circumstances the alteration of 'Hoore' to 'Hors' is understandable.<sup>100</sup> It would hardly have been prudent to include any material to remind his audience that historically neither of the protagonists matched his heroic presentation.

In the historical accounts the 'Hero' of *Aldingar* (the Child), is called 'Mimecan' or 'Mimekin'.<sup>101</sup> In *PF 22* he is nowhere named. However the originality of the names given to the poem's other characters is interesting.<sup>102</sup> The name 'Aldingar' for the villain is peculiar to *PF 22*. In one source account he is named 'Rodingar': 'Aldingar' is likely to

---

94. Holinshed, *Third Volume*, p. 744.

95. This may be a scribal error (he is only named once) but if so it originates with Deloney not the *Folio* scribe as the variant texts also have 'Albert'.

96. Egelsine was Abbot from 1059-1070 when he fled to Scotland with the Abbey's sacred vessels: 'vasis vero aureis et argenteis' 'pretiosum sapphirice lapide adornatum' (Thomas of Elmham, *Historia*, pp. 27-28, 89, 101). Stigand was Archbishop from 1053 until his deposition in 1070. (F. Stenton, *Anglo-Saxon England*, 3rd edn. (Oxford, 1971), pp. 465, 659-60.).

97. Fabian, *Chronicles*, pp. 250-251. In fact Aethelred was their second son. Stenton, *AS. England*, p. 372

98. Fabian, *idem*.

99. The presence of a name for the wood is found *only* in *PF 183*: none of the variants of this text give a name at all. It is partly for this reason that I believe that the *Folio* text was derived from a different source than any of the variants now extant.

100. It is also understandable that he does not name Estrild's son nor Edgar's son by his first wife. A certain reticence would have been indicated as it was then believed (and there is no certain evidence to the contrary even today) that in 978 at Corfe Castle in Dorset, Estrild murdered her stepson Edward (who had become king on Edgar's death in 975), to favour the succession of her younger son Aethelred (the elder died when he was about six or seven years old). Stenton, *AS. England*, pp. 372-73.

101. *La Estoire*, l. 526, p. 40; Westminster, *Flores*, p. 562; Cirencester, *Speculum*, p. 191; Paris, *Chronica*, p. 515; Diceto, *Abbreviationes*, p. 174. For a thorough discussion of the nomenclature in *PF 22* and all its variants see Christophersen, *Aldingar*, pp. 57-80.

102. Since I am comparing the text of *PF 22* with the historical sources, I have no concern here with either the Scandinavian versions or the Scottish ballad variant, *Sir Hugh Le Blond*.

be the result of oral error in transmission.<sup>103</sup> The name 'Henry' for the king is correct: the only error being that according to the historical sources, he was the Emperor Henry III and not an English king.<sup>104</sup> In the poem his queen is named 'Elinor' (st. 12). In the sources she is 'Gunnild' or 'Gunhild'. It is possible that in moving the scene from Germany to England the poet felt it was desirable for the queen to have a different name (there has never been an English queen called Gunhild), and therefore by association he renamed the wife of the Emperor Henry III according to the name of the wife of King Henry III (1216-1272).<sup>105</sup>

The conclusions derived here are that the errors and omissions of nomenclature are related to each poem's character focus. In *Bartton* their purpose is to place the emphasis on the hero; in *Buckingham* the odium of the principal villain is not diminished through giving details which might bring forward the lesser. In *William* we have a composite Hero — the Kentishmen: their glory is not diluted by attention to named leaders. Changes and omissions of nomenclature in *Edgar* are to protect the poet's presentation of his protagonists as good-people-who-have-been-deceived and in *Aldingar* changes have been made to concur with the heroine's apparent nationality and thus add to the poem's geographical credibility.

I now move on to those *Items* which are connected with the form of the text as it relates to the moral doctrine. The topic of each of the five texts covers a single episode: that is to say, a collection of scenes organised in chronological order (*Item 13: Episode: linear sequence*) and in each the plot builds up to a grand climax (*Item 14: Climax*). These are *Restitution* (in *William*), *Marriage* (in *Edgar*), *Retribution* (in *Buckingham*), *Victory* (in *Bartton*), and *Vindication* (in *Aldingar*). The Climax is followed by the Moral and the substance of the matter from which it will be drawn is repeated at intervals throughout each text (*Item 15: Post-climactic moral; Item 16: Moral: repetition*). However the broadside ballads, *Edgar*, *William* and *Buckingham* are *exempla*. Their lesson is specifically stated in the terminal unit of *discours* by the poet, but because each topic has been chosen as the basis of an *exemplum*, the story itself is present only to illustrate a given lesson and is subordinate to the moral.<sup>106</sup> On the other hand in *Bartton* and *Aldingar* the moral is subordinate to the story: it is there but it does not receive heavy emphasis.

The terminal lesson in *Edgar* is:

---

103. Diceto, *Abbreviationes*, p. 174; Christophersen, *Aldingar*, pp. 57-64.

104. I am aware that historically the attachment of this tale to the German Emperor is likely to be as erroneous as assigning it to an English setting. However we are not at this point much concerned with historical veracity, only with what the Chroniclers believed and reported. *PF 22* does not specifically state that the event took place in England but since the messenger rides south to Portsmouth (st. 25) this can be inferred.

105. There is one small piece of information, not previously noted, which may perhaps lend weight to the suggestion that the queen is renamed through association of ideas. The poem *La Estoire de Seint Aedward le Rei* (Camb. Univ. MS. Ee. iii. 59, dated 1245) which contains the story, has a dedication to 'Alianore, riche Reine d'Engleterre' and is thought to be a presentation text: (*Estoire*, pp. x-xi). It is possible that if this or a copy of it, is the source text for the English translation and composition of *Aldingar*, then the dedication may have reminded the poet of Henry's queen and provided a name. An additional mild speculation may be that if *Aldingar* was composed sufficiently early — and as I have previously noted many scholars have believed it to be our oldest extant ballad — there is a remote possibility that the originator of the English text was among the queen's court and the change was made deliberately to please her. This would account for the omission of the information that after the episode the historical queen refused to cohabit with her husband and took the veil. This omission is discussed presently in my examination of the poems which do not agree with the paradigm.

thus hee which did the King deceiue,  
did by desart this death receiue.  
then to conclude & make an ende,  
be true & Faithffull to your Freind.<sup>107</sup>

PF 183: ll. 177-80

This lesson is foreshadowed within the tale when the poet, having established that Ethelwold was the king's most trusted knight (l. 40), remarks that Ethelwold forgot his duty (ll. 59-60) and when he himself speaks of his own 'desart & trecherye' (l. 126).

The moral lesson of *Buckingham* is identical to that of *Edgar*, but although post-climactically present it is only partially spelt out. That it is inherent in the story is seen by the use of the comparative 'better' in the final lines:

[God] send euery distressed man  
a better Freind att need [than Banister was].

PF 87: st. 33

The state of friendship and trust is contrasted with betrayal within the text. Banister is

---

106. It is interesting to note that in *Buckingham*, God's punishment for breach of faith, includes imprisonment and poverty for Banister but is also visited upon his children who respectively (1) go mad, (2) drown in a puddle and (3) die of an unpleasant disease (sts. 29-32). Vergil (*Three Books*, p. 201) notes a moral but associates Buckingham's beheading with Richard III's fate. The first of the source writers to associate Banister's deed with a worldly lesson is Hall (*Chronicle* (1542) p. 395) where the children respectively (1) go mad (2) die of leprosy (3) become deformed and (4) die in a puddle — both strangled and drowned. Banister himself is in his old age, found guilty of a murder. It seems probable that historically Banister in fact did rather well from his betrayal:

[August 15th, 1484] Grant to the king's servant Ralph Banastre . . . for his good service against the rebels, of the manor of Ealding . . . of the yearly value of 50*l.*, to hold with knights' fees, wards, marriages, reliefs, escheats, advowsons, stews, fisheries, waters, stanks [weirs], mills, parks, woods, underwoods, liberties and commodities by knight-service and a rent of 4*l.* yearly.

*Patent Rolls. Ric. III*, Pt. 1 (London, 1901; rpt. 1971), 482. See also p. 484 of the same reference [the italics are mine]:

Grant for life to . . . Thomas Jebbe, for . . . subjection of the great rebel Henry, late duke of Buckingham, of an annuity of 4*l.* from the . . . lordship and manor of Ealding . . . lately pertaining to the said rebel, at the hands of Ralph Banastre . . . occupiers of the lordship and manor.

The Banister family seems to have prospered from their treachery. The only *caveat* is that this Banister is 'Ralph' but *all* the sources refer to the traitor as 'Humphrey'. However the *DNB* believes Buckingham to have been betrayed by Ralph as does Ramsay (*Lancaster and York*, 2 vols. (Oxford, 1892; facsim. Ann Arbor, 1978), I, 506-7), who notes that beside 'Yalding' Banister also received the Keepership of Everley Park: (MS. Harl. 433, ff. 37<sup>v</sup>-38.). Ramsay and *DNB* both believe the traitor to have been the Ralph Banister of Lacon Hall, near Wem in Shropshire and a few miles north of Shrewsbury (which is on the Severn — the river at which Buckingham was halted). This accords with Banister's geographical location in the historical sources.

It seems probable that insofar as Banister's inability to collect the reward is concerned, the 'moral' is untrue and while it is possible that a subsequent tragedy in Banister's or his descendents' family may have been seen as divine retribution, there is no evidence. I suspect that the entire Moral is probably a fabrication invented by Hall, copied by later historians and consequently used by the *PF* 87 poet.

107. As an *exemplum* this tale appears to be a poor choice: Deloney does not seem to have noticed that Estrild's disloyalty to her husband in enticing the lust of the king without penalty — she is rewarded with marriage — is in flat contradiction to the text's homiletic content. It seems unlikely that the moral of *Edgar* was not intended to include relationships within the marital state, even though, judging by the number of texts printed on the faithlessness of women and the best way to manage domestic relations, the spirit of the times was pessimistic about women's behaviour, L.B. Wright, *Middle-class Culture in Elizabethan England* (Ithaca, New York, 1958), pp. 201-227.

first set up as a friend:

[who] wold not be desirous still  
to be his [Banister's] daylye freind?

PF 87: st. 6

Trust is then covered in stanzas 14 and 15, betrayal in stanzas 24 and 25, and finally in stanza 28 the poet comes full circle:

small Freinds he [Banister] found in his distresse . . .  
but euery man reuiled him  
[for] this his trecherous deede.

*William's* moral, 'Do not tamely submit to adversity', is implicit within the poet's caudal synopsis of the text's plot.<sup>108</sup>

by this meanes King Edwards lawes  
doe still in Kent abyde,  
& in no place in England else  
such customes doe remaine  
as they by their manlike policye  
did of duke william gaine.

PF 122: sts. 23-24

The substance of the lesson within the poem is seen in lines such as 'Kent did still withstand his power' (st. 4), "'lett vs dye in bloody Feild . . . [rather] than endure the seruile yoke'" (st. 10).

*Aldingar's* moral is within the *histoire* itself and is spoken by the villain after he has been defeated:

"euer alacke!" sayes Sir Aldingar,  
"Falsing neuer doth well."

PF 22: ll. 193-94

Within the story *Aldingar* is described as 'false' five times at regular intervals (sts. 1, 11, 17, 22, and 45); he is a 'traitor' thrice (sts. 22, 23, and 45), and his name is twice associated with 'betray' (sts. 20 and 47). The idea that 'falsing' does not pay is implicit very early in the text when the king tells *Aldingar* that if he is true he will be rewarded, if he is false he will die (sts. 10-11). Since from the first line of the ballad, the audience knows that *Aldingar* is false they also know that he will meet with retribution and that his lying will avail him nothing. The moral is also implicit in the fate of the queen: while she is thought to have deceived the king she is condemned — 'falsing never does well', but since she is in fact true, the hero comes to her aid and she does 'well'.

The lesson of *Bartton* is present after the climax, but unlike the previous texts examined here, it is not specifically stated. It is suggested early in the story:

---

108. The moral might also be rather neatly expressed in the popular tag *Illegitimus non carborundum*. Robert the Devil, William's father, was never married to William's mother. E. Partridge, *Dictionary of Catch-phrases*, 2nd edn. (London, 1985), p. 162; Stenton, *AS. England*, p. 555.

King Henery was stout & he turned him about  
& swore by the Lord that is mickle of might,  
“I thought he had not beene in the world throughout,  
that durst haue wrought England such vnright!”

PF 168: st. 5

“chuse them [the pirates] out of my realme soe Free.”

PF 168: st. 9

The lesson is completed in the two terminal stanzas which begin with the court looking at the horrid spectacle of Barton's severed and eyeless head, and continue with an example of Henry's goodness and magnanimity. Read with the earlier statements in mind, these stanzas imply that Barton would not have been killed had he not menaced the subjects of Good King Harry and thus England: he brought his fate upon himself:

but when they see his deadly Face  
his eyes were hollow in his head.  
“I wold give a 100<sup>li</sup>,” sayes King Henerye,  
“the man were alive as hee is dead.<sup>109</sup>  
yett For the manfull part that hee hath playd  
both heere & beyond the sea,  
his men shall haue half a crowne a day  
to bring them to my brother King Iamye.”

PF 168: sts. 81-82

The lesson is I think twofold: ‘Henry VIII is a good man’ — he admires bravery, he is not vindictive but generous, he feels sorry when men go astray but for all that ‘Justice will be done in England’. The message is plain — *nemo me impune lacessit* — which, ironically, is the motto of Scotland.

Only five of the thirty-three stanzas of *Buckingham* reproduce the spoken word (sts. 13-15, 24, 25). These five expand character but only in relation to the Moral: (*Item 9: Dialogue: character and moral*). The first three spoken stanzas occur together and consist of the Duke's request for sanctuary, Banister's agreement, The Duke's exhortation to be ‘true’ and Bannister's double oath that he will. In this short exchange the Duke's state of mind — desperation — is clearly shown as is his reliance upon and opinion of his servant whom he refers to as ‘sweete Banister’ three times. This passage establishes the situation prior to the ultimate betrayal. The apparent trustworthiness of the villain's character is emphasised by his double oath without which the ‘lesson’ would lose much of its force — it will rebound upon Banister when he betrays the Duke. Thus it is seen that this first conversation tells us only what it is essential for us to know about character insofar as it relates to the Moral. The second passage (sts. 24 - 25) is spoken by the Duke. It is addressed to the villain after the betrayal and is written in a highly rhetorical style which makes much use of *exclamatio*. The villain's true character is revealed; he is

---

109. There is some doubt as to whether these two lines have not drifted from an earlier stanza. The possibility exists because in both Group **A1** and Group **B** they are spoken by Howard when he boards the pirate vessel, sees Barton's body and beheads it. The sentiment makes better sense in the earlier stanza when Howard has just defeated a brave enemy whose courage demands admiration: mortally wounded, Barton exhorts his men to continue to fight (sts. 65-66):

“I am hurt but I am not slaine;  
Ile lay mee downe & bleed a while,  
& then Ile rise & Fight againe. . . .  
Fight on For Scotland & S<sup>t</sup> Andrew  
[while] you heare my whistle blowe!”

When the sound of the whistle dies Howard knows Barton is no longer alive.

now 'False Banister':

“Ah, False Banister! a, wretched man!  
Ah, Caitiffe!” then sayes hee.  
“haue I maintained thy poore estate  
to deale thus Iudaslye?”.

*PF 87: st. 24*

The Duke continues in a lament that regrets his own trusting nature: ‘ “Alas that euer I believed . . . !”, “woe worth the time that . . . !” ’ (st. 25). The effect is to arouse pity for the deceived man and abhorrence for the villain’s betrayal of friendship and thus inculcate a sentiment in the audience which can be put into words for them in the terminal Moral.

Only four stanzas from the total of twenty-four in *William* are ‘spoken’ (sts. 9-10, and 21-22). As in the previous text, character is only demonstrated inasmuch as it relates to the ultimate lesson. The first passage emphasises the composite hero’s resolution not to submit to adversity:

“lett vs not liue like bondmen pore  
to Frenchmen in their pryde,  
but lett vs keepe our ancyent libertyes  
what chance soeuer tyde!”.

*PF 122: st. 9*

The second passage details the successful result of their determination, ‘ “ you shall haue what you will. . . . ” ’ (st. 21).

*Edgar* has three lengthy passages of speech (ll. 18-38, 65-78 and 116-46). The first is the king’s soliloquy on his love for Estrild and is intended to tell the audience that the hero’s love for the unseen heroine is deep enough to resist the inequality of rank and riches — she is ‘base & lowe’ (l. 19) and cannot ‘a worthy dowry bringe’ (l. 24) — but he is an honourable man who will only be satisfied with marriage. (l. 38). The other two passages are composed of speech addressed to a specific person. Because both passages are crucial to the eventual lesson, the essential information is delivered via the medium of the spoken word, but because the replies are peripheral to it their purport is conveyed by the narrator. The first of these two passages concerns the return of the king’s trusted proxy from his wooing and his deception; the second consists of the villain’s recapitulation of events for his wife’s benefit and his plea that by disfiguring her beauty she might save him from the king’s retribution. Both of these passages only relate to character insofar as it concerns the Moral. In the latter passage Ethelwold is now placed in the same position with regards to his wife as he himself lately had with regards to the king: as the king trusted him to act for the king’s benefit so Ethelwold now trusts his wife to act for her husband’s benefit, but because neither keeps faith the villain meets his ‘desart’ and the poet can point the Moral.<sup>110</sup>

In these three exemplary texts where the story is subordinate to the lesson, the

---

110. Because as I have previously mentioned, Estrild’s betrayal is not punished, the moral Deloney draws is not firmly grounded. His source material notes that Estrild refused to make herself ugly because it was wrong to deface what God had made fair. This is repeated in Deloney’s poem but since he makes no other justification or attempt to excuse her deliberate seduction of the king, I conclude that he had not seen the flaw in his argument. This oversight is probably a function of the mechanics of commercial ballad production and may perhaps lend weight to my earlier suggestion that this text is perhaps a re-hashed version of one of Deloney’s more juvenile texts.

dialogue has little verisimilitude: *what* the characters say is more important than how they say it. Dialogue is necessarily brief in relation to the total length of the poems, because it concerns the actual plot only inasmuch as it touches upon a course of action which the hero desires to make ('resist' *William*, 'marry' *Edgar*, 'hide' *Buckingham*), and without which there would be no final lesson. Speech must always by its nature reveal something of the speaker, but here what is said and done is confined solely to matters which affect the eventual Moral. Therefore the characters acquire a flat artificiality and taken out of their historical contexts they are presented as lacking personality: they thus become one-dimensional personifications of vice or virtue.

The spoken passages of *Bartton* and *Aldingar*, as might be expected, contrast with the exemplary texts in several ways. First, there is a higher proportion of dialogue than narrative; secondly, speech is presented as conversation in situations of one-to-one dialogue and in the 'familiar' tenor, and thirdly, whereas in the exemplary texts speech mainly concerns *future* actions (which in *PF* 87 and 183 are not performed), here it relates to *present* actions. Fourthly, in the broadside texts the lesson is delivered by the narrator, here it is delivered through the speech of the characters themselves. Fifthly, because speech is primarily directed towards the on-going action of the plot which in these ballads is more important than the Moral, a character's words, as in *Bartton*, either round out his rôle as a person or, as in *Aldingar*, present him as a character 'type' so familiar to the audience that the cue is all that is needed for full identification. In neither text is the conversation confined to matters solely relevant to the eventual moral — the characters, for instance, politely greet or address each other — an indulgence which is quite absent from the didactic texts (*PF* 168: sts. 3, 20, 52, 55; *PF* 22: sts. 6, 15, 30). Finally, even *Aldingar* who as the 'False steward' is instantly recognisable as the Villain, has a personality in his own right. As his dying speech shows, he is not simply a flat and monochromatic representation of a particular vice:

"A preist! a preist!" sayes Aldingar,  
"me for to houzle & shrive!"  
st. 46

"forgiue, forgiue me Queene, Madam,  
for Christs loue forgiue me!"  
st. 51

"Now take thy wife thou King Harry,  
& loue her as thou shold."  
st. 52

My discussion now turns to those paradigmatic *Items* with which one or more of the five texts being examined in this chapter, do not agree. Where appropriate they are contrasted with the texts which match the paradigm, and I show that the reasons for disagreement are connected with the importance of the Moral, authorial use of source material or dramatic technique needed at the dictates of a difficult plot.

*Item 1: Simplification* states that 'Complicated historical events occurring over a broad spectrum have been simplified.'

The *Bartton* poet introduces his topic by relating the merchants' complaint against the pirate made to Henry VIII, and closes with the restoration of the captured Scotsmen to their king. There is no mention of the events which led to Barton's 'piratical' career or the repercussions which followed its abrupt termination and which led to Flodden.<sup>111</sup> Likewise in *Buckingham* nothing is said of the political situation leading to Buckingham's rebellion and there is no mention of his co-conspirators nor his own voluntary betrayal of them after his capture.<sup>112</sup> The source accounts of *Aldingar*, originating as they do with

the early chronicles, are, as are the chronicles themselves, confined to only a few principal 'facts'. Even so the *PF 22* poet has omitted a description of the wedding festivities prior to the event he covers in his poem, and is silent about the interesting aftermath when the Queen, refusing to co-habit with her husband, took the veil.<sup>113</sup>

The two texts in which complicated historical events do not appear to have been simplified, are the Deloney poems *William* and *Edgar*. In both cases all the facts present in the historical sources are also in the ballad. The author has copied the matter of his sources carefully, with the result that since his archetypes have not spoken of the events surrounding the action of the poems, neither has the poet. Complexities may have been smoothed by the source historians but they have not been simplified by Deloney. Thus the paradigmatic disagreement here is a function of authorial technique relating to the use of a given source to produce a commercial broadside. This is also the case concerning the presence of sourced dialogue in these texts (*Item 8: Dialogue and source*). As was seen when earlier I cited my reasons for believing that Deloney used specific sources for these two texts, much of the dialogue, although lightly paraphrased in *William* and *Edgar*, is present in Holinshed or Fabian. Similarly in all three of the broadside ballads none of the links between scenes is fictitious: either they are not present because, as in *Bartton* and *Aldingar*, the poet leaps from one scene to the next with no intervening connection, or they are present in the historical accounts (*Item 11: Links*).

*Item 19*, 'The party favoured will be outnumbered by the foe or otherwise handicapped', is true for all the texts except *William*. In *PF 168*, Barton is not going to be an easy conquest because

"hee is brasse within and steele without,  
& beames hee beares in his Topcastle stronge;  
his shipp hath ordinance cleare round about —  
besides, my Lord, hee is verry well mand."

*PF 168: st. 27*

The heroine of *Aldingar* is handicapped because she cannot fight in her own right but must seek a champion and *he* is penalised because of his size:

he seemed noe more in a mans likenesse  
then [sic] a child of 4 yeeres old.

*PF 22: st. 28*

Buckingham is alone against Richard's army (*PF 87*) and because he is a king, Edgar cannot leave his throne to do his wooing himself (*PF 183*). However in *William* we have a complete reversal of *Item 19*: it is the *villain* who is outnumbered by the hero — there is no fight and he is surrounded with ease. This abrogation of custom is solely due to the

- 
111. The Portuguese, within the territorial waters of Flanders, had killed Barton's father after plundering his ship. Barton took the matter to the Flemings who gave judgement in his favour. However in defiance of Scottish representations, the Portuguese refused to pay compensation and so the Scottish king gave Barton letters of authority to prosecute a private revenge against Portuguese shipping until he had made up his losses. Unfortunately Barton was none too careful about establishing the nationality of his victims: G. Buchanan, *The History of Scotland* (Edinburgh, 1582), trans. J. Aikman, 4 vols (Glasgow, 1827), II, 247-48.
112. The details of Buckingham's rebellion are not sufficiently straightforward to be effectively reduced to a brief statement: for a good source account see Polydore Vergil, *Three Books*, pp. 198-200.
113. This last must have been of great interest to the monkish chroniclers as even those who do not mention the charge of adultery tell of the Queen's chaste life. For the best source account see William of Malmesbury, *op. cit.*.



fact that Deloney is paraphrasing his source: since Holinshed says that William was surrounded without a fight and only mentions his few companions at the very end of his narrative, Deloney has left them out.<sup>114</sup>

*Item 10* postulates that ‘Dialogue may serve to remark the movement of the characters but it will not greatly forward the principal event’. Although in all five texts dialogue does ‘move’ the characters, in *Bartton*, *Aldingar*, and to a lesser extent, *William*, it also forwards the action. Because, as I have previously noted, a large part of the two former texts have a high percentage of dialogue this is perhaps not surprising. In *Bartton*, after the initial *scene-setting*, the action begins with the merchants’ complaint to the king and his challenge to any ‘“Lord in all my realme” ’ (st. 7) to capture Barton, and Howard’s acceptance: ‘“Yes, that dare I!” ’ (st. 8). This technique of scene-setting followed by a dialogue which puts the ballad’s train of events in motion, is also seen in *Aldingar* where the king is told of the queen’s adultery, himself speaks of her punishment and gives her ‘40 dayes’ (st. 24) to find a champion.

The actions present early in *Bartton* and *Aldingar* are set out through the spoken word rather than through narrative representation because both poems are concerned with the results of a *negative* action performed by the villain before the tale begins.<sup>115</sup> After the opening circumstances have been briefly set out the poet must move on to the *positive* reaction of the characters themselves since both causal situations (Barton’s piracy and Aldingar’s attempted seduction) require a reciprocal action dictated by emotion — in both cases, anger. Both dramatically and practically words and actions performed under the stress of deep feeling are most convincingly described through the characters’ own speech. This also permits the nature of the character and his actions (hero or villain) to be firmly established out of his own mouth or the words of his contemporaries. That *Item 10* in these texts does not agree with the paradigm is the result of the poets’ manipulation of a difficult opening situation and his inauguration of an acceptable dramatic structure.

In *Bartton* and *Aldingar* the action is begun with dialogue but the climax is described by the narrator. In *William* the situation is reversed: the action prior to the terminal event is detailed by the narrator but its culmination (the Kentishmen’s request and William’s concession) is achieved through dialogue (sts. 20-22). This is partly a function of the poet as copyist. The request is presented as dialogue in Holinshed and Deloney carefully follows him. However Deloney also phrases the reply in a like manner. He does so in order to further the text’s dramatic structure and preserve the consistency of his Climax; to avoid Holinshed’s abrupt transfer to narration with its rather prolix explanation of the Conqueror’s reasons for granting the request, and to accentuate the culmination of all that has gone before.

As might be expected, the older and more traditional ballads, *Bartton* and *Aldingar*, agree with the paradigm in that their characters’ actions are simply motivated (*Item 5: Motivation*). This is not the case in the later broadsides. In *Buckingham*, *William* and *Edgar* the characters’ reasons for acting as they do are specifically spelt out in order to emphasise the ballads’ Moral.

In *Buckingham* the causes of the hero’s mistaken reliance on the villain’s

---

114. Holinshed, *Third Volume*, p. 3.

115. It might be argued that the topic of *PF 39: Flodden Feilde* also concerns an action which took place before the story opens. Despite its title this is in fact not so as that text is involved with the truth or otherwise, of the news within the Earl of Surrey’s letter, and the poem opens (sts. 1-2) with its writing and its despatch.

trustworthiness are given in four detailed stanzas (sts. 3-6) which explain at length that the villain owes his present prosperity to the hero's goodness and generosity. The villain's reason (greed) for his betrayal of his benefactor is set out in another four stanzas (sts. 19-22). These motivations stress the two characters' respective heroic and villainous qualities and accentuate the iniquity of the action from which the moral is drawn. Likewise in *PF* 183, the characters are all shown in some detail as having cause to act the way they do. Edgar, because first, he is enamoured of Estrild (ll. 10-38) and later because he is naturally angry at having been deceived (ll. 92-98); Ethelwold because first, he is so 'ravisht' at the sight of Estrild that he forgets his knightly duty (ll. 51-60), and then later because he is motivated by guilt (ll. 116-47), and Estrild disobeys her husband from piety (ll. 148-52). Thus here too the good and bad qualities of each character are stressed in order that the moral may be plainly seen. This is also the case in *William* where the reasons for the Kentishmen's steadfast refusal to submit to the impositions of the Normans, is set out in six stanzas (sts. 6-11). This motivation is the kernel of the entire ballad as their resolution and their consequent behaviour is the historical example which illustrates the lesson that adversity can be overcome by courage.

*Item 12* suggests that 'Minor fictions will be present to entertain the audience'. *Bartton* has a brisk interchange between the king and the aggrieved merchants:

"O yee are welcome, rich merchants  
[the best saylers in Christentie!]"<sup>116</sup>  
They swore by the rood, the[y] were saylers good,  
but rich merchants they cold not bee. . . .  
". . . all For a False robber that lyes on the seas  
& robb vs of our merchants ware!"

*PF* 168: sts. 3-4

In *Aldingar*, prior to the combat, with a homely simile the hero taunts the villain on his large size and adds a hope that this situation may be changed:

"thou seemust as big as a Fooder!  
I trust to god, ere I have done with thee  
god will send to vs [other]!"<sup>117</sup>

*PF* 22: st. 41

The amusement is in the fact that the villain is quite literally 'cut down to size' when the Child removes his legs at the knee: he drives the joke home in a jeering taunt:

sayes, "stand vp! stand vp thou false traitor,  
& fight vpon thy fete!  
for & thou thriue as thou begins  
of a height wee shalbe meete!"

*PF* 22: st. 45

The purpose of this passage is to amuse the audience by inviting them to visualise the disparate sizes of the combatants and laugh with the Child at the villain's

---

116. This line which occurs at the bottom of the folio has been lost: rather than use Furnivall's guessed emendment I have replaced it here with the equivalent line from group **A1**.

117. I have emended the third line in this quotation: 'Fooder' in the first line is 'fother', that is, Aldingar's size is being compared to a 'cart load', meaning that he is big and ungainly: anyone who has seen a loaded hay-wain for instance, will understand the strength of this simile. Therefore since 'auger' in this context is meaningless, I suggest it is a corruption of 'other' in the sense of 'that which is different to that which has gone before'.

Note also the insulting use of the second person singular.

predicament.<sup>118</sup> This is not so in any of the three exemplary texts where there is nothing to leaven the earnestness of the respective stories. The nearest approach to light relief is in *Buckingham* where the poet pictures the great Duke disguised in a labourer's garments:

an old felt hat vppon his head  
with 20 holes therein:  
& soe in labor he spent the time  
as tho some drudge he had beene.

PF 87: st. 18

But this portrait is pathetic rather than amusing: it stresses the Duke's fall and his consequent dependence upon Banister who is responsible for the disguise. In each of the three broadsides the poet never loses sight of the fact that the moral lesson is of more importance than the story.

The *Aldingar* and *Barton* poets are of course on the side of Right and the Hero (*Item 18: Right; Item 17: Partisan*). In both texts this is conveyed by the frequent use of the domestic 'our' and complimentary adjectives such as 'good' or 'comely' when referring to the protagonists, and both texts use the narrator's 'aside' to comment on the action. The *Aldingar* poet prefers the former technique and uses the latter but once: 'Blessed be god made sunn & moone!' (st.27) he exclaims when the queen succeeds in finding a champion. The *Bartton* poet, although using 'our' and laudatory adjectives prefers to use the extrinsic voice to indicate the narrator's views. The best example is seen where, commenting on the death of one of the Scots, he adds complacently:

itt is verry true, as the Welchman sayd,  
couetousnesse getts noe gaine.<sup>119</sup>

PF 168: st. 57

The narrators of the three exemplary texts do not have an immediate presence in the body of their respective tales. In *Buckingham* he is present in the opening and closing units of *discours* but we are led to assume that he is partisan only because he uses direct address, the present tense and himself points out the moral. In *Edgar* and *William* there is no opening *discours* and that the narrator is present at all is only suggested in the terminal stanza where he sums up the lesson using the present tense. In all three texts the general style is that of didactic factual presentation: the narrator as *hortator* is not allowed to intrude; nothing is permitted to be present which might lessen the ballads' serious moral doctrine.

---

118. *Aldingar* also has a probable *double entendre* when the king surveying the leper in the queen's bed says:

"there is a lodly lome" says Harry King,  
"for our dame, Queene Elinor!"

PF 22: st. 12

The word 'lome' has the alternative meanings of either 'a person maimed by illness — a cripple', or 'a penis'.

119. This proverb is not present in any of the variant texts, only **A2**. I have been unable to satisfy my curiosity as to the identity of this Welshman. The proverb appears to have been quite well known as it, or a variant, is entered in most of the standard references but with no attribution.

## A. Conclusions

The above discussions show that the older texts agree more nearly with the *Durham* paradigm than the later texts. However agreement or disagreement is found to be due to one or more of four fundamental reasons: (1) Adjustment of historical fact to dramatic structure; (2) The importance given to the Moral; (3) Close adherence to the source material; (4) Transmission error.

The first reason (1) is seen to be responsible for agreement in all five texts in eight *Items*.<sup>120</sup> The requirements of structure demand that the poet should omit historical detail in order to present an essentially simple story capable of being easily followed by an audience but which apparently should nevertheless retain the core of the historical tale without fictional addition relating to the action.<sup>121</sup> Because the structure is simple, chronology is always found to be linear and sequential and the narrative progresses through a series of minor crises towards a grand climax. While a few minor characters are sometimes named, the principal focus is never allowed to deviate from the major characters whose functions (as Champion of Right or Malefactor) are stressed — often through the medium of dialogue.

Disagreement with the paradigm for reasons connected with dramatic structure is seen only once.<sup>122</sup> This occurs in the two older texts where the plots require explanation of the events which, happening before the story begins, nevertheless precipitate the characters' actions from which the tale itself depends.

The presence of a moral or lesson (2) caused agreement in all five texts in two *Items*.<sup>123</sup> It is concluded that there is a difference between the reason for the repetition of the 'moral matter' within the two oldest texts and within the three broadsides. In the former the lesson is subordinate to the story but the story concerns actions performed as a result of human emotion (here, in both cases, anger): actions made as a result of characters' human sensibility are always open to moral interpretation — if the poet or the audience cares to do so. Without such actions in these two ballads there would have been no story — hence the apparent repetition of the 'moral matter'. On the other hand, in the three exemplary ballads the story is subordinate to the lesson and therefore the repetition of the 'moral matter' within the tale is *not* necessarily an integral part of the story after its first appearance, but is an example of the poets' technique to ensure that the interest of the unfolding tale does not swamp its point. In these texts the moral is not an optional alternative but their *raison d'être* and their justification. It is because of this that in two cases the three broadsides disagree with the paradigm.<sup>124</sup> As *exempla* their characters' motivation *has* to be detailed and comic or light relief can not be permitted to impair the texts' serious register.

Adherence to source material (3) is seen to cause paradigmatic disagreement in five *Items*.<sup>125</sup> Matters not present in a source text obviously cannot be included, deliberately

---

120. (*Items* 2, 4, 6, 7, 13, 14 and 18).

121. Because, as I have shown, the historical stories found in all the ballads examined in this study are accurate in their *fundamental* narratives, it seems that basic truths were respected.

122. In *Item 10: Dialogue: movement & action*.

123. *Items*: 15 and 16.

124. *Items*: 5 and 11.

excluded or simplified in a derived ballad. Because the texts with a known source are the exemplary poems there is no need for the author to invent since his sources are self-evidently chosen because they contain sufficient material as they stand to illustrate a given lesson. For this reason (and perhaps also through lack of poetic inspiration), the content of each source text is closely followed: thus for instance, where dialogue (either reported or actual) appears in the account the poet is using, then dialogue appears in the resulting ballad. The linking of scenes has a similar origin. However it was shown that in one case close attention to source material resulted in a reversal of traditional custom and the poet's *villain* was shown to be outnumbered by the protagonists. A further point to be noted is that because the historical sources are comparatively objective, texts following a particular account are unlikely to have an overtly present narrator except perhaps in the final stanzas where the poet, relying on his own ability to close his poem, may reveal himself and a partisan viewpoint.

Finally (4), it is seen that in all cases the texts agree with the paradigm with regard to (*Chronology* and *Figures*).<sup>126</sup> It has been shown that where there is a combat, troop numbers are likely to be erroneous due to the poet's desire to magnify the glory of the eventual victory. However it is here concluded that any figures, including dates, are likely to be more susceptible to corruption in transmission than any other matters, though personal and place names would seem to be the next most vulnerable items.

Thus the overall conclusions drawn from the examination of these five texts are that the older texts focus inward: their tone is subjective and the narrator, his story and his audience are together: they become a unit. The older texts are formal in their structure in that they adhere where possible to the precepts of the paradigm, but their language, with a high percentage of dialogue, is informal and paradoxically represents a structured realism. On the other hand the later exemplary texts focus outwards: their tone is objective and the narrator and his audience are disparate. Their language is formal in that it is mannered and, with a minimal use of dialogue (present only to enable a speaker to be a vehicle for the lesson), has little mimetic reality. In comparison with the older works and their compatibility with the paradigm, the textual structure of the broadsides is less formal. However even these later texts do conform to the paradigm in not less than 60% of the *Items* — paradigmatic agreement is thus seen to be fairly constant with only relatively few items subject to variation. It is finally concluded that the essential underlying factor relating to the extent that paradigmatic mediaeval continuity is present in rhymed historical 'popular' verse lies in the text's date of origin.

My final comments regarding the validity of the *Durham* paradigm and its relationship to 'popular' rhymed historical entertainment, are set out in Chapter Seven where I present my conclusions relating to all the texts discussed in this study. The following examination turns to the five texts considered in this present chapter and looks at their motifemic content in the light of the structural themes surveyed in the previous sections.

---

125. *Items*: 1, 8, 11, 17 and 19.

126. *Items* 7 and 20.

**TABLE 7.** *Stylistic Structure of PF 168: 'Bartton'*

Motifeme	Allomotif	Scene	Theme (Episode)	
1. <i>Scene-setting</i>	a. <i>Tempus amœnum.</i> b. <i>Locus amœnus.</i> c. Naming of king.	Villainy	Justice (violation- punishment)	
2. <i>Arrival</i>	a. Complainants.			
3. <i>Misdeed known</i>	a. Hurt recited. b. Reprisal demanded. c. Naming of Hero.			
4. <i>Boast</i> (Hero's)	a. "I alone will capture him."	Battle		
5. <i>Bidding to Battle</i> (Embedded: <i>Battle Preparation;</i> <i>Boast:</i> (Hero's; Helpers')	a. Enumeration of troops. b. Naming of Villain. c. Hero's <i>I-brag.</i> d. Simon called. e. Simon's <i>I-brag.</i> f. Horseley called. g. Horseley's <i>I-brag.</i> h. Weaponry noted.			
6. <i>Departure</i>	a. Hero sets sail.			
7. <i>Arrival of Helper</i> (Hero's)	a. Hero meets Hunt. b. News given. c. Help offered. d. Help accepted.			
8. <i>Pre-battle Preparation</i>	a. Ship disguised.			
9. <i>Boast</i> (Villain's)	a. <i>T-brag</i>			
10. <i>Combat</i>	a. 1st shot: (villain) — Foremast down; 14 dead. b. 2nd shot: (hero) — Pinnacle sunk; (Crew drowned). c. Disguise discarded. d. 1st shot: (hero) — 60 dead. e. 2nd shot: (hero) — 80 dead. f. 3rd shot: (hero) — Gordon dead. g. 4th shot: (hero) — Hamilton dead. h. 5th shot: (hero) — Barton dead. i. Villain's ship boarded.			
11. <i>Victory</i> (Embedded: <i>Enumeration of Casualties;</i> <i>Humiliation of Dead Villain;</i> <i>Gloat</i> )	a. Dead counted. b. Captives counted. c. Barton's corpse beheaded. d. Helpless, Scots lament. e. Barton's torso overboard. f. Hero returns to court. g. Presents ship to king.			Triumph
12. <i>Terminal Status-quo</i> (Embedded: <i>Gloat</i> )	a. Helpers rewarded. b. Hero rewarded. c. Head displayed. d. Villain's helpers sent home.			

**TABLE 8.** *Stylistic Structure of PF 87: 'Buckingham'*

Motifeme	Allomotif	Scene	Theme (Episode)
1. <i>Exhortation</i>	a. Come Barons bold. b. See what I will write. c. Synopsis.	Rescue	Treachery
2. <i>Scene-setting</i>	a. Naming of hero b. Naming of villain c. Hero is a 'wanted' man.		
3. <i>Journey</i>	a. He flies to villain.		
4. <i>Appeal for help</i>	a. Hero asks for shelter. b. Villain agrees.	Betrayal	
5. <i>Disguise</i>	a. Dresses hero as labourer.		
6. <i>Misdeed</i>	a. Reward offered for hero. b. Villain betrays him. c. Hero captured. d. Hero beheaded.	Penalty	
7. <i>Punishment</i>	a. Villain imprisoned. b. Misfortunes overcome his children.		
8. <i>Terminal Status-quo</i>	a. Villain lived to be old. b. His life was lived in shame.		
9. <i>Valediction</i>	a. Moral. b. Prayer. c. Moral.		

**TABLE 9.** *Stylistic Structure of PF 122: 'William'*

Motifeme	Allomotif	Scene	Theme (Episode)
1. <i>Scene-setting</i>	a. Naming of villain. b. He has conquered. c. He has been crowned.	Villainy	Warfare (deprivation- restitution)
2. <i>Misdeed</i>	a. Villain changed laws. b. Punished rebels. c. Subdued cities. d. Naming of Hero		
3. <i>Departure</i>	a. Villain leaves London.		
4. <i>Pre-battle Preparation</i> (Embedded: <i>Boast</i> )	a. Forces gather. b. Arm themselves. c. Assert <i>Right</i> d. <i>I-brag</i> e. Prepare ambush.	Battle	
5. <i>Combat</i>	a. Surround villain. b. Make demand.	Triumph	
6. <i>Victory</i>	a. Demand granted.		
7. <i>Terminal Status-quo</i>	a. Old laws restored.		
8. <i>Valediction</i>	a. Moral.		

**TABLE 10.** *Stylistic Structure of PF 183: 'Edgar'*

Motifeme	Allomotif	Scene	Theme (Episode)
1. <i>Scene-setting</i>	a. Naming of hero. b. Naming of heroine. c. Status of both.	Love	Love-Marriage (love- betrayal- marriage)
2. <i>Enamouring</i>	a. Hero falls in love. b. Resolves to marry. c. To woo by proxy. d. Instructs proxy. e. Naming of villain.		
3. <i>Departure</i>	a. Villain (proxy) leaves.	Villainy	
4. <i>Enamouring</i>	a. Villain loves heroine. b. Courts her. c. Wins her.		
5. <i>Journey</i>	a. Returns to hero.		
6. <i>Misdeed</i>	a. Tells hero lady unsuitable. b. Asks leave to marry her himself. c. Leave given. d. Villain marries heroine.		
7. <i>Revelation</i>	a. Hero discovers villain's lie.	Conflict	
8. <i>Combat (Ruse)</i> (Embedded: <i>Journey; Right</i> )	a. Hero announces visit to villain's home. b. Villain conceives counter-ruse. c. Journeys home. d. Admits treachery. e. Instructs heroine.		
9. <i>Journey</i>	a. Hero travels to villain's home.		
9. <i>Victory</i>	a. Heroine disobeys instructions. b. Enamours hero. c. Hero takes villain hunting. d. Villain killed.	Triumph	
10. <i>Terminal Status-quo</i>	a. Marriage.		
11. <i>Valediction</i>	a. Explicit. b. Moral.		



**TABLE 11.** *Stylistic Structure of PF 22: ‘Aldingar’*

Motifeme	Allomotif	Scene	Theme (Episode)	
1. <i>Scene-setting</i>	a. Villain’s office. b. Naming of villain. c. He has tried to seduce heroine. d. She refused.	Villainy	Justice (false- accusation: trial-by- combat)	
2. <i>Misdeed</i> (False-accusation)	a. Villain meets a leper. b. Carries him to the heroine’s bed. c. Tells him to stay there. d. Says he will cure him. e. Tells the king his wife has a lover. f. Invites him to come and see.			
3. <i>Deception</i>	a. King sees leper in bed. b. He is deceived.			
4. <i>Punishment</i> (Embedded: <i>Prophetic dream</i> )	a. King orders heroine to be burnt. b. Heroine recalls dream. c. Asks for a Champion. d. King grants her 40 days to find one.			Threat
5. <i>Journey</i>	a. Heroine’s messenger goes south. b. Fails to find champion. c. He goes east. d. Meets hero.			Search
6. <i>Help</i> (Embedded: <i>Prophetic dream</i> )	a. Hero greets messenger. b. Tells him help is at hand. c. Recalls heroine’s dream. d. Repeats that help is at hand.			
7. <i>Journey</i>	a. Messenger returns to heroine.			
8. <i>Help</i>	a. He tells her help is at hand. b. She rewards him.			
9. <i>Punishment</i>	a. Heroine about to be burnt.	Combat		
10. <i>Arrival</i>	a. Hero arrives.			
11. <i>Combat</i> (Embedded: <i>Challenge</i> )	a. Hero orders fire to be removed. b. Orders villain to be brought. c. Taunts him about his size. d. Says he will cut him down. e. He will give the first blow — then the villain need not spare him. f. 1st stroke (hero): cuts off villain’s legs. g. Challenges him to stand up and fight.			
12. <i>Victory</i> (Embedded: <i>Moral</i> )	a. Villain asks to be shriven. b. Confesses misdeed. c. “Falsing never doth well”. d. Asks forgiveness. e. Tells king to love heroine. f. She is ‘true’.			Triumph
13. <i>Terminal Status-quo</i>	a. Leper rewarded with villain’s office.			

### III. Form and Tradition — The Five Texts

The items cited in each second column (headed **Allomotif**) within the motifemic tables immediately preceding this page, more frequently present a general allomotif component than in previous tables. This column of allomotififs ought to show exactly how a poet has filled the available ‘slots’ of a given motifeme: many entries in these preceding

tables have not been set out to conform with this. For instance in *Buckingham* the poet has chosen to discharge the motifeme *punishment* by detailing the fate of each of the villain's progeny: in the table these details have been subsumed under the broad statement 'Misfortunes overcome his children'. This kind of reduction is sufficient to indicate the poets' general intention, and has been done because my purpose does not require a comparison to be made of all motifemic minutiae — where comparisons *are* made the relevant allomotifs are set out within the appropriate discussion.

### A. *The Motifemes*

The structural composition of each text insofar as it relates to the motifemes studied in earlier chapters, is now discussed. The following presents the evidence that leads to my conclusions that motifemic structure is affected by a poem's literary genre; by its age; by its maker's use of source material; by its use of fictional narrative; by its purpose; and by whether or not it was intended or prepared for print.

#### a. *Exhortation and Valediction*

The motifeme of *discours, exhortation* is only present in *Buckingham*. The nuclear compulsory component found in the Romance, the *exhortation* itself, is present: the poet addresses 'You Barons bold . . . ' (st.1). The exhortation conforms to tradition in respect to the flattery of the address: 'You Barons bold' is of equal status with the earlier 'Lordings' *et cetera*. Unlike the Romances where as I have previously shown the *exhortation* most commonly refers to a work which is about to be heard ('come', 'listen') by a present audience, the *Buckingham* poet discloses his expectation that his audience will read his text:

. . . marke and behold  
the thing/ that I will rite . . .  
I purpose to Endite.<sup>127</sup>

The peripheral and optional components *prayer* and *source* are absent and *synopsis* has degenerated to the single line: 'a story strange & yett most true'. This is so vestigial that it can only be seen as a *synopsis* because it conforms to the component's requirement that within the motifeme the poet must speak of the contents of the narration he is about to make. Here it is so indefinite that that it may also be seen as a doubled or *assimilated* component in that while 'strange' is a function of *synopsis*, 'most true' relates to the optional *moral* component of this motifeme.

The motifeme of *discours, valediction* is also present in its traditional form in *Buckingham* and is vestigially present in *William* and *Edgar* — it is not seen in the older texts *Aldingar* and *Bartton*. In *Buckingham* the compulsory component *prayer*, as in several of the Romances, is divided into two parts, the first being a request for the good of a specific group and the second to the address of a more general group (*PF* 87: st.33):

now god blesse our king & counsell graue,  
in goodness still to proceed;

---

127. As A.C. Baugh shows in his 'The Middle English Romance: Some Questions of Creation, Presentation and Preservation', *Speculum*, 42, 1 (1967), 1-31, although there are frequent references in the Romance to its having been 'written', the *exhortation* almost always refers to prospective verbal transmission.

& send euery distressed man  
a better Freind att need.

The second half of *prayer* has a doubled function as it is also the optional component *moral*. The allomotific components *source* and *explicit* are not present.

Neither *William* nor *Edgar* conforms very greatly to the traditional *valediction* — neither for instance, contains the nuclear component *prayer* although *Edgar* does have an *explicit*: ‘then to conclude & make an ende’ (l. 179), and a definite *moral* signalled by the use of the imperative in ‘be true & Faithfull to your Freind’ (l. 180). The *valediction* in *William* as a unit of *discours* is intimated by a change from the preterite to the present tense. Its sole nod to tradition is in its *moral* which here is indirect and attached to a new component of *valediction* — *explication*. This would appear to be an allomotif which I have not found in the Romance but which certainly appears in other texts within *The Percy Folio* — for instance *PF 173: Kinge Humber* in which the poet explains how the River Severn got its name.

b. *Terminal Status-quo*

Despite its Romance topic *Aldingar* does not conform as nearly to the traditional *terminal status-quo* as does *Bartton*. In the latter text the nuclear component *hero* is present: Howard is rewarded with *rank*, *associates* is covered with the ‘helpers’ reward of *riches*. *Populace* is not specifically present.<sup>128</sup> The presentation of *Aldingar*’s motifeme is interesting because the compulsory nuclear component *hero* is not wholly present. The ‘Child’ disappears from the story after the villain is defeated and the allomotific component is filled only through the implication that the *heroine* will be re-united with her husband:

“now take thy wife, thou King Harry  
& loue her as thou shold.”

*PF 22: st. 53*<sup>129</sup>

*Associates* is covered through the lazar’s reward — he becomes the king’s Steward — but *populace* is absent.

Of the three broadsides *Edgar* and *William* have only one allomotific component of *status-quo: hero*. In *Edgar* the hero is rewarded with *marriage* but in *William* this component has a trebled function due to the fact that the hero is composite and therefore *hero* is also *populace* and *associates*. Here *hero* is not fulfilled through any of the traditional ‘reward’ allomotifs which pertain to it (*marriage*, *riches*, *rank*, *long-life* or *heavenly reward*), but through a traditional allomotif belonging to *populace: justice* — an improvement in laws.

The *status-quo* in *Buckingham* is unusual among the texts examined in this study in that its sole component is the rare negative *hero* and negative *hero+family*.<sup>130</sup> In this component the poet dwells on the terminal status of the villain and his family. Here instead of the conventional *riches* we have *poverty*;

---

128. Since by the end of the poem the pirates have been abated, presumably this is to the betterment of the merchants with whose complaint the story commenced. Thus *populace* can be inferred but it is not specifically present in any of the groups.

129. This is not a component of *hero+family* as the King is not the hero and the Queen and the Child are not related.

instead of *happy life* we have *miserable life* — though in both allomotifs the life is long — and instead of *prosperity of children* we have *misfortunes of children*.

c. *Boast*

i. *T-brag*

The *T-brag*, which relates to the braggart's future actions and their prospective effect on the opposition, traditionally a function of the villain, is not present in any of the five texts except *Bartton* where it is given in a mild form:

“they shall all hang att my maine mast tree!”  
st. 40<sup>131</sup>

The component *assessment of strength* is not present as a component of *T-brag* in any of the texts discussed here.

ii. *I-brag*

This component of *boast* (usually an heroic function), is also present only in *Bartton* and is uttered by the hero and his associates: however it has been modified. The hero's *I-brag* is non-traditional in that it is not ‘victory or death’ but ‘victory or exile’ (st.10), it is not spoken to encourage others nor to demonstrate the valour of the hero's ‘side’ but to accent the speaker's worth. Nevertheless because it is an intransitive ‘vaunting of intention’ in the first person it is a variant *I-brag* component of *boast*. The hero's associates declare that if they fail to perform well in the forthcoming combat then the hero may hang them (sts. 13, 16). These boasts are also modified *I-brag* components: they are again a ‘vaunting of intention’ in the first person, they are uttered immediately prior to the battle and they underline the quality of the speakers and the hero's party. The modification lies in that they are not spoken to encourage others and the future death is not expected at the hands of the villain: they are not proposing to fight until they either win or are overcome.

The traditional *I-brag* is present in *William*. The ‘commons’ (a composite hero), assert their preference for death rather than defeat: ‘rather lett vs dye in bloody Feilde . . . than to endure . . .’ thus did the Kentish Commons crye/vnto their leaders.’ (sts. 10-11). Although in context, this speech is uttered at a ‘protest meeting’ prior to the journey to the site of the proposed combat, I think that it is both the resolution put before the meeting as a ‘statement of desire’ born of desperation, and also a ‘vaunting of intention’ designed to encourage each other and demonstrate the worth of their cause, and thus it is an *I-brag*.

iii. *Gloat*

---

130. The only other example of this negative aspect of *hero* which I have been able to find in the Romance is present in *Athelston* (st. 75).

131. A *T-brag* considerably more traditional in the extent of its gruesomeness is present in Group **A1** where Barton boasts of having met some ‘Portingails’ and having ‘salted thirtie of ther heades/and sent them home to eate with breade’ (st. 42): he implies that he will do the same to Howard.

1. *Right*

*Right* is a tied component and must be expressed as the reason for the result of the combat. The implication that the hero won, or would win, because he is on the side of 'Right' is seen in its traditional form in *Aldingar* where, as in some of the Romance examples previously cited, it is presented indirectly when the villain declares the cause of his own downfall: 'falsing neuer doth well'.<sup>132</sup> Although the fact that the hero is 'right' is made abundantly clear in the remaining four texts — often by stressing the 'false' qualities of the villain — it is only in *Aldingar* that 'right' is a component of *boast*. However in *Aldingar* *right* is a doubled component: it is also *moral*. It is embedded within *victory* as it is spoken by a character and therefore cannot properly be an allomotif component of *valediction* which is a unit of *discours*.

2. *Enumeration of Casualties*

This tied motifemic component, which must if it is present, appear at the termination of combat, is only seen in *Bartton* (st. 68):

. . . 18 score Scotts alive  
besids the rest were maimed & slaine.

3. *Enumeration of Victories*

This allomotif component is not present in any of the five texts.

4. *Enumeration of Spoils*

In the meaning of 'enumeration of goods taken from a defeated enemy' and cited as a 'vaunting of achievement' this is an allomotif of *gloat* which has not previously appeared in this study and which does not appear in the Romance. It is present in *Bartton*:

Now hath our King Sir Andrews shipp  
besett with pearles and precyous stones!  
now hath England 2 shipps of warr,  
2 shipps of warr! before but one!

PF 168: st. 75

5. *Humiliation of Dead Villain*

This is only present in *Bartton*. The head is cut from the villain's corpse and the torso is cast overboard (st. 70):

. . . about his middle 300 crownes.  
"Wheresoeuer thou lands, itt will bury thee!"

The humiliation lies in the gloating tone of the spoken jibe — the direct address to the villain's corpse. The spoken taunt of **A2** is not present in group **A1** which consequently lacks the jeering mockery:

. . . tiede five hundreth angels about his midle

---

132. Compare the 'false quarrel comes to euell end' of *Toulouse* (l. 125) or 'Falsnesse can neuere to good endyng' of *Beves* (Caius, l. 4511).

that was to cause him buried to be.

A1: st. 73

## IV. Conclusions

The discovery of the ‘new’ allomotif *Enumeration of Spoils* within the *gloat* component of *boast* suggests that the following ‘set’ should be modified. As it stands it is:

*Boast* → *Gloat* → *Enumeration of spoils*.

I now think that *enumeration* is probably a complete sub-set with its own allomotific components, thus:

*Boast* → *Gloat* → *Enumeration* → *Casualties/Victories/Spoils*

The following conclusions are drawn mainly from my study of the five texts examined in this chapter. However, although the conclusions concerning all the rhymed historical poems studied in this work are presented in my final chapter, they do not contradict the findings that:

1. The historical texts derived from a received source reflect that fact in the presence or absence of given motifemic structure within the *histoire*.
2. The historical texts show mediaeval motifemic continuity — albeit sometimes modified — within those narrative areas where the material is drawn from the poet’s own imagination.

It is seen that of the motifemes of *histoire* which I have examined in this study, several are present in *Aldingar* and *Bartton* but *none* are represented in the broadside sample except in the *terminal status-quo*. Because the motifemes of *discours*, (*valediction* and *exhortation*) which the poet has had to invent, are well represented in these texts I conclude that *status-quo* is present because it enjoys a special position with regard to its immediate narrative situation between the end of the ‘adventure’ and the poet’s ‘farewell’. Although nominally *status-quo* is a unit of *histoire*, in fact the historical poet has freedom to manipulate it as he sees fit because it is not ‘tied’ to his source of information. Historical accounts by and large, see an individual historical occurrence as part of an ever-flowing stream of events and therefore seldom assess the status of the actors after each incident has been described unless that status will affect the actions of a subsequent event. Even then this is normally placed at the beginning of the new occurrence which sometimes, with other matter intervening, may not immediately follow the previous appearance of its characters. Consequently the poet who follows an historical source is generally required to consolidate his own text in the *terminal status-quo* himself: hence the broadside poet turns to the familiar and utilizes traditional motifemic structure for this section of his narrative.

3. The historical texts written as *exempla* modify traditional motifemic structure to accord with the purpose of the poem.

Mediaeval continuity is present in each of the five texts but where necessary has been modified to meet the above criteria whether literary or practical. Hence the *Buckingham* poet presents the rare but nevertheless authentic negative *hero+family* as being the best form to suit his text's exemplary nature. However the poet does not abandon the positive form of the motif entirely but merely reverses the traditional allomotifs to negate the customary rewards expected in the formulaic motif.

Similarly the *William* poet triples the function of *hero* to include *associates* and *populace* because his poem's purpose requires a composite hero. Multiple functions are seen elsewhere but here the poet shows a logical originality in declining to use the allomotif rewards traditionally pertaining to the hero and instead, substituting an allomotif from the traditional rewards of *populace*. This in the context of a hero who *is* an entire populace, is sensible: it is also the legitimate resolution of the poet's narrative and accentuates his *moral*.

4. Texts which were written or re-organised for a printed broadsheet omit or modify traditional units of structure in accordance with spatial limitations.

The multiplication of function seen in *William* and *Buckingham*, helps to keep the narrative to the point and quickens its pace. It is noticeable that doubling of function and minimisation of allomotifs is found specifically in those sections of the text, the beginning and the end, where the poet is not tied to his source and where the texts are most amenable to adjustment in length without losing narrative depth. Thus the *exhortation* has been omitted from *William* and *Edgar*, and *Buckingham* has doubled and minimised the components *synopsis* and *moral*. That the *exhortation* is not absent from these broadsides because it was felt to be inappropriate to 'modern' works, can be seen from a glance at the ballads which proliferate within any of the Collections and which begin 'Come all ye [adjective] [noun]'. All three texts compress the *valediction* to a minimum and *Buckingham* has doubled the allomotif functions of *prayer* and *moral*. *Edgar* has only *explicit* and *moral* and *William* retains only *moral*.

That the older texts *Aldingar* and *Bartton* have no *exhortation* or *valediction* may be because they have been lost in transmission or, particularly in the case of *Bartton*, because they have been deliberately deleted in order to facilitate printing. However perhaps the most credible reason reflects their origin as folk ballads in which, as scrutiny of Child's collection confirms, these motifs which require the presence of a narrator, are the exception rather than the rule. This observation leads to my next point.

5. The text's literary genre influences motifemic presentation.

As previously mentioned, some scholars believe that *Aldingar* is an old, if not the oldest, English folk ballad. Because of their different audiences and their comparative brevity the folk ballad, as compared to the minstrel ballad, does not have the traditional motifemic structure of the Romance but, as is evidenced in any of the standard works on the topic, evolved a motifemic structure of its own. However certain universal themes such as Right and Wrong, Reward and Punishment, are common to all romantic

narratives composed for popular consumption. Thus although *Aldingar* is the only text of the five to have a wholly traditional presentation of the *right* allomotif of the *gloat* component of *boast*, it is also the *moral* which traditionally belongs to one of the units of *discours* spoken by the narrator in person. Because, as I have said, the folk-ballad (unlike the minstrel ballad) does not generally have an immediate narrative presence, the placement of this motifemic component has to be elsewhere.

*Bartton* falls into the 'Heroic' genre involving combat between opposing bodies of men. It follows tradition in having the *I-brag* and *T-brag* components of *boast* although the poet has modified the latter from 'Victory or Death' to 'Victory or Exile'. This is a reflection of the fact that as a 'battle poem' the protagonists are expected to conform to the heroic formulae, but since this battle is not one where the fate of a country is at stake, that the hero should be prepared to die is not apparently mandatory.

6. Later texts modify traditional motifemes to accommodate 'progress'.

This is seen in *Buckingham's exhortation* where the audience is invited to read, not to listen. It may also be the reason for the 'new' motifemic component *explication* seen in *William*. This allomotif component of the valedictory *moral* is perhaps the result of the stimulation of public curiosity through the growth of literacy and mass communication with more and more cheap printed works on an ever increasing variety of topics and written for the 'comminalty' becoming available. Similarly, proliferation of *exempla* with heavy stress given to *moral* components, probably reflects the religious ethic brought about by the reforms of Henry VIII. This was later followed by the need for all printed texts to receive the official *imprimatur* without which no work could be legally printed. Issued at first by the Archbishop of Canterbury or the Bishop of London and later by their Chaplain, it is not surprising that a large numbers of ballads with unexceptional moral doctrines seem to have been passed for printing.

The broad conclusion is that the percentage of unmodified traditional motifemes within a given rhymed historical narrative designed for a popular audience, is in proportion to its age of origin. However, even though the actual text studied may be a copy made considerably later than its original date of composition, or may itself be written at a relatively late date, with regard at least to the texts discussed here, there is a continuity of mediaeval motifemic structure: I have found no historical text that fails clearly to echo tradition.



# CHAPTER SIX

## THE ROMANCE ITEMS

### I. 'The grene knight' and 'The Squier'

#### A. Introduction

These two texts are discussed *seriatim*. They have been chosen for study because they are amenable to analysis through the methods used in the foregoing chapters since there are variant texts of the same tale. The literary qualities of the antecedent versions of these two poems are for the most part, ignored: they are viewed solely as source material pertaining to the *Folio* texts in exactly the same fashion as the historical chronicles, which were considered only in the light of their relationship to a given historical ballad.

### II. PF 71: 'The grene knight'

*The grene knight* as it stands, is unique to the *Folio*.<sup>1</sup> Its narrative is a free adaptation of the story found in the alliterative poem *Sir Gawain and the Green Knight* which was composed towards the end of the fourteenth century.<sup>2</sup> PF 71 is thought to have been composed about a century later.<sup>3</sup> I agree with J.R. Hulbert's opinion that there is a strong probability that *GK* was derived from *SGGK* 'but with the addition of elements from oral versions of the story which the redactor knew'.<sup>4</sup> The following study also shows that there is evidence to suggest that the *GK* poet incorporates new material to fit the circumstances in which he is writing and a tentative suggestion is made concerning the date of composition of his work.

*GK* is written in two fitts. It originally appears to have had 88 stanzas — 44 in each fitt. The stanzaic form of *GK* does not reflect that of *SGGK*. It is not a ballad but a Romance. The units of verse maintain much of the original tail-rhyme scheme with stress and rhyme  $a^4 a^4 b^3 c^4 c^4 b^3$ . However the *Folio* text is corrupt: the scribe has omitted the terminal three lines of stanzas 9, 11, 76 and 80 and has conflated two short lines into one long line in stanza 55. Thus the poem now comprises 515 lines.<sup>5</sup> Textual corruption is also seen in the presence of false rhyme where the original word has been

- 
1. HF II, 56-77; *The Percy Folio MS.*, fols. 101<sup>v</sup>-105<sup>r</sup>. Henceforward *The grene knight* is abbreviated to *GK*.
  2. *Sir Gawain and the Green Knight*, ed. J.R.R. Tolkien & E.V. Gordon, 2nd edn., rev. N. Davis (Oxford, 1972) [p. xi], p. xxv. All references and quotations are taken from this edition and the title is abbreviated to *SGGK*. It will be noted that I cite few modern references to textual criticism of PF 71. This is because by and large, with a few notable exceptions, later writers who mention *GK* at all, tend only to acknowledge its existence before passing on to *SGGK*.
  3. *Medieval English Romances*, ed. D. Speed (Sydney, 1987), I, 234.
  4. J.R. Hulbert, 'Syr Gawayn and the Grene Knyzt', *Modern Philology*, 13, (1915-16), 703.

misread, misheard, or not understood.<sup>6</sup> The following demonstrates that the vocabulary of *GK* suggests an antecedent text. The first one hundred lines (omitting pronouns and verbal tense signifiers), contain 42 words which are currently archaic either in form or meaning but a large number of these are from the traditional tags which are patterned as a cheville in approximately 53% of all stanzaic lines three and/or six. The poet's use of well-worn minstrel phrases diminishes towards the end of the second fitt, where his matter is his own, and it seems reasonable to assume that elsewhere the text's lexical preference for Old English and traditional syntagmemic lines is a function of the poem's origin. This lexical preference is found in an analysis of the total population of verbs, nouns and adjectives which shows approximately 79% of these lexemes are immediately derived from Old English. This is a high figure which may reflect the poem's predecessor. However the immediate antecedent source was probably not *SGGK*: there are no expressions which have been bodily transported from that text, and while the poem's traditional tags provide a fortuitous alliteration it does not echo *SGGK*'s formal scheme. There are a few lines which have a parallel sense but they are, as Kittredge remarks of his list of resemblances, 'not impressive'.<sup>7</sup> It is I think, almost inevitable in two works with the same basic plot that there should be occasional similarities, but even though it is unlikely that either text was derived immediately from the other there is nevertheless a sufficiently close connection to permit me to use *SGGK* as a protosource for *PF 71*.

Ackerman believes, and I have found no reason to disagree, that *PF 71* was probably composed at the beginning of the sixteenth century.<sup>8</sup> It is therefore approximately contemporary with *Durham* and the following narrative synopsis utilises the method employed for my précis of that text.

### A. Synopsis of Tale

Comparing the narrative of *GK* and the antecedent text objectively, the following shows that in at least one respect, the author of *PF 71* has achieved a high standard: *all* the essential plot-units of the tale as told in *SGGK*, are present. It is shown that the poet

---

5. In regard to stanzaic interpretation (though in no other way) Madden's presentation of the *Folio* text is superior to that of Furnivall: *Syr Gawain*, intro. F. Madden (London, 1839; facsim. N.Y., 1971), pp. [224]-242. Although in this thesis I am working mainly from the *Folio* manuscript itself which does not include definite stanzaic division, for convenience in facilitating identification of quotations, I refer to stanzas. I have counted the three lines preceding each of the four *lacunae* as a whole stanza, thus dividing Furnivall's nine-line stanzas into two. I have not used Furnivall's line numbering as it is erroneous, and Madden has incorporated into his enumeration the line numbers he has allotted to the *lacunae*.

6. For instance, to cite only a few of many errors: 'fell and fryth' (st. 10) is now paired with 'Lim & lightt' where the original tag was certainly 'lim and lyth'; 'as I haue said' (st. 29) ought to be 'as I have heele' to rhyme with 'kneelee'; 'plight their truthes to beleuee' (st. 61) should be 'to be leele' to rhyme with 'deale'; 'londe' rhyming with 'bond' (st. 81) has degenerated into 'land' and 'bound'; 'honnere' to rhyme with 'cleere' has become 'honor'. There is dittographic error in 'for sooth he rode the sooth to say' (st. 16): as is shown presently, the first 'sooth' cannot properly be a misspelled 'south' as, in geographic context, it ought to be 'north': however it is in fact, almost certainly the line which is repeated at stanza 49, 'forth he rode the sooth to tell'. This stanza also contains an example of lipography: 'we 2 [sworn] both wilbe'. Likewise 'I am come hither a venterous [knight]' (st. 21).

7. G.L. Kittredge, *A Study of Gawain and the Green Knight* (Gloucester, Mass; 1960), p. 282-89.

8. R.W. Ackerman, 'English Rimed and Prose Romances', *Arthurian Literature in the Middle Ages*, ed. R.S. Loomis (Oxford, 1959) p. 497.

has reduced the length of his poem by omitting the repeated 'hunting' and 'seduction' scenes (which in *SGGK* are arguably complementary-units because the fundamental tale remains undisturbed if they are removed), and has avoided complementary-units involving lengthy scenic description or detailed explication of the poem's emblematic content. It is noted that although there is a slight preference for tripartite unit division, *PF 71* does not achieve the symmetry of *Durham*, but there is no imbalance between reciprocal units such as is seen in *SGGK* where the ratio of complementary-units to plot-units is extremely high. It is also seen that certain significant or climactic incidents within the tale are given emphasis through the use of a 'free-standing' plot-unit, that is a plot-unit with no attached complementary-unit: thus the arrival of the Green Knight (pu 9), the falling of the severed head (pu 18). On looking at the synopses of other texts studied in this work it is seen that this occurrence in *GK* is an unusual technique because, as is also done in *GK*, it is normally used for routine plot units — such as pu 44 where everyone retires for the night.

<b>Plot Unit</b>	<b>Complementary Unit</b>
	<i>cu 1a (i)</i> (Listen! st.1)
	<i>1a (ii)</i> When Arthur was king, Britain was united: st. 1
	<i>1a (iii)</i> Aliens were banished: st. 2
	<i>1a (iv)</i> Arthur lived in peace: st. 2
	<i>cu 1b (i)</i> His knights competed as to whom should be highest: st. 2
	<i>1b (ii)</i> Arthur was not pleased: st. 2
	<i>1b (iii)</i> He made the Round Table so that they sat without precedence with the king and queen: st. 3
<i>pu 1</i> All the knights come to Arthur at Christmas: st. 4	<i>cu 1c (i)</i> None stay at home: st. 4
	<i>1c (ii)</i> They are so great that no castle or manor can house them: st. 5
	<i>1c (iii)</i> They pitch tents for their night's lodging: st. 5
<i>pu 2</i> They go to table: st. 5	<i>cu 2a (i)</i> Messengers bring much food: st. 6
	<i>2a (ii)</i> Wine and wild fowl: st. 6
	<i>2a (iii)</i> No cost is spared: st. 6
	<i>cu 2b (i)</i> (I won't tell you more of Arthur: st. 7
	<i>2b (ii)</i> I shall speak of a knight from the west country: st. 7)
<i>pu 3</i> There is a knight called Sir Bredbeddle: st. 7	<i>cu 3a</i> He is a mighty man: st. 7
<i>pu 4</i> He has a wife: st. 8	<i>cu 4a</i> He loves her dearly: st. 8
	<i>4b</i> She secretly loves Sir Gawain: st. 8
	<i>4c</i> She loves him for his prowess: st. 8
	<i>4d</i> She has never seen him: st. 8
<i>pu 5</i> Her mother, Agostes, is a witch: st. 9	<i>cu 5a</i> She can transform men: st. 10
	<i>5b</i> She can make them seem wounded to death: st. 10
	<i>5c</i> She taught the skill to Bredbeddle: st. 10
<i>pu 6</i> Agostes tells Bredbeddle to visit Arthur in a transformed state: st. 11	<i>cu 6a</i> "You will have great adventures": st. 11
	<i>6b</i> She says this for her daughter's sake: st. 12
	<i>6c</i> She wishes to get Gawain to her daughter: st. 12
<i>pu 7</i> Bredbeddle agrees to go: st. 12	<i>cu 7a (i)</i> He wishes to 'prove' Gawain: st. 13
	<i>cu 7b (i)</i> At dawn he prepares himself: st. 14
	<i>7b (ii)</i> He has a good steed: st. 14
	<i>7b (iii)</i> He puts on his armour: st. 14
	<i>cu 7c (i)</i> (It was a jolly sight to see: st. 15
	<i>7c (ii)</i> Horse, armour and weapon were all green! st. 15
	<i>7c (iii)</i> But when he was all ready he looked

			well: st. 15
		7c (iv)	I can safely swear that: st.15)
<i>pu 8</i>	The king is at Carlisle: st. 15	<i>cu 8a</i>	Bredbeddle lives at the Castle of Flatting in Delamere Forest: st. 16
<i>pu 9</i>	The Green Knight arrives at Carlisle on Christmas day: st. 16		
<i>pu 10</i>	He meets the Porter: st. 16	<i>cu 10a</i>	The porter asks his business: st. 17
		<i>10b</i>	GK says that he wishes to meet the king and court: st. 17
		<i>10c</i>	Silent, the Porter leaves the GK at the gate: st. 18
<i>pu 11</i>	The Porter goes to Arthur: st. 18	<i>cu 11a</i>	He tells the king he has never seen anything like it in all his life! st. 18
		<i>11b</i>	“At your gates is a knight entirely in green!”: st. 19
		<i>11c</i>	The king asks for the GK to be brought to him: st. 19
<i>pu 12</i>	The GK comes to Arthur: st. 20	<i>cu 12a (i)</i>	He stretches in his stirrups: st. 20
		<i>12a (ii)</i>	He greets the king: st. 20
		<i>12a (iii)</i>	Says he is a venterous knight: st. 21
		<i>12a (iv)</i>	He has come a long way: st. 21
		<i>12a (v)</i>	He has come to try the knights’ manhood: st. 21
		<i>cu 12b (i)</i>	Arthur is silent while he speaks: st. 22
		<i>12b (ii)</i>	The king grants his request: st. 22
		<i>12b (iii)</i>	“You may try on foot or on horseback: st. 23
		<i>12b (iv)</i>	If your armour is poor I’ll give you some of mine.” st. 23
		<i>12c (i)</i>	The GK thanks him: st. 23
<i>pu 13</i>	The GK issues a general challenge: st. 24	<i>cu 13a (i)</i>	He will bend his head and let any knight try to behead him — but the knight that does so is to allow the GK a blow at his head in a year: st. 25
		<i>13a (ii)</i>	He is to come freely in a year: st. 26
		<i>13a (iii)</i>	The GK will direct him to the Green Chapel where he will be: st. 26
		<i>cu 13b (i)</i>	The court listens in silence: st. 27
		<i>13b (ii)</i>	Sir Kay boasts loudly that he will behead the knight: sts. 27-8
		<i>13b (iii)</i>	The court tells him to be silent as he is doing no good: st. 28
		<i>13b (iv)</i>	Everyone wants to do the deed: st. 28
<i>pu 14</i>	Sir Gawain rises: st. 29	<i>cu 14a</i>	He kneels to Arthur: st. 29
		<i>14b</i>	He says it would be wrong if the task is not given to him: st. 29
		<i>14c</i>	He is the king’s nephew: st. 30
<i>pu 15</i>	Arthur permits him to accept the challenge: st. 30	<i>cu 15a (i)</i>	He suggests that mirth is best at a meal: st. 30

- 15a (ii)* The guest should be cared for: st. 30  
*15a (iii)* "Give him wine: st. 30  
*15a (iv)* The blow shall be given after dinner"  
st. 30
- cu 15b (i)* The GK is brought to the meal: st. 31  
*15b (ii)* Served at the Round Table: st. 31  
*15b (iii)* He wants for nothing and eats: st. 31
- cu 15c (i)* After dinner Arthur wishes Gawain  
good luck: st. 32  
*15c (ii)* "This knight is steadfast." st. 32
- pu 16* The GK bows his head: st. 33  
*cu 16a* Gawain seizes an axe: st. 33
- pu 17* Gawain cleaves the  
neck-bone: st. 33  
*cu 17a* There is much blood: st. 33
- pu 18* The head falls from the body:  
st. 33
- pu 19* The GK picks up his head:  
st. 34  
*cu 19a (i)* He leaps into his saddle: st.34
- pu 20* Gawain is to meet him  
in a year's time at the  
Green Chapel: st. 34  
*cu 20a* Everyone is marvelling: st. 35
- pu 21* The GK puts his head on  
again: st. 36  
*cu 21a* He shakes hands with Arthur: st. 36  
*21b* Promises a good blow at the return  
bout: st. 36
- pu 22* He departs: st. 37  
*cu 22a (i)* (All this was done by the old witch's  
enchantment: st. 37)  
*cu 22b (i)* The King is upset: st. 37  
*22b (ii)* The Queen weeps: st. 38  
*22b (iii)* Lancelot is sorry: st. 38  
*22b (iv)* So are the others: st. 38  
*22b (v)* Gawain's manhood will not help:  
st. 38  
*cu 22c (i)* Gawain comforts the King, Queen  
and court: st. 39  
*22c (ii)* He swears he is not afraid: st. 39  
*22c (iii)* He will keep his word when the time  
comes: st. 40  
*22c (iv)* He will search for the Chapel as he  
doesn't know where it is: st. 40  
*cu 22d (i)* All approve Gawain's intent: st. 41  
*22d (ii)* They all go forth: st. 41  
*22d (iii)* Some joust: st. 42  
*22d (iv)* Some revel, dance and sing: st. 42  
*22d (v)* They swear to burn the west if  
Gawain is overcome: st. 42  
*cu 22e (i)* (Now we leave the king: st. 43)
- pu 23* Sir Bredbeddle returns to  
his own castle: st. 43  
*cu 23a (i)* Folk ask what he has done: st. 43  
*23a (ii)* He tells them nothing: st. 43  
*23a (iii)* He knows his wife loves Gawain:  
st. 44

*cu 23b (i)* (Listen Lords; if you will sit, I'll tell you what happened to Sir Gawain: st. 44)

**The second fitt begins**

*pu 24* The day comes for Gawain to leave: st. 45

*cu 24a (i)* The court is downcast: st. 45  
*24a (ii)* The King falls ill: st. 45  
*24a (iii)* The Queen almost faints: st. 45

*cu 24b (i)* In his armour Gawain is one of the best knights in Britain: st. 46  
*24b (ii)* A horse is brought: st. 46  
*24b (iii)* It is a good dapple-grey steed: st. 46  
*24b (iv)* His bridle is ornamented with pearls and gold: st. 47  
*24b (v)* His stirrups are of Indian silk: st. 47  
*24c (i)* (I tell you this is true! st. 47)

*pu 25* Gawain departs: st. 48

*cu 25a (i)* As he rides his gear glistens: : st. 48  
*25a (ii)* On the way are many wonders: st. 48  
*25a (iii)* Birds scatter over waters: st. 48  
*25a (iv)* He sees many extraordinary wolves and wild beasts: st. 49  
*25a (v)* He is heedful of hunting: st. 49

*cu 25b (i)* He seeks the Green Chapel: st. 49  
*25b (ii)* He doesn't know where it is: st. 49

*pu 26* Gawain arrives at a castle: st. 50

*cu 26a* It is evening: st. 50  
*26b* It seems to be a fine castle: st. 50  
*26c* He approaches to seek lodging: st. 50

*pu 27* In the twilight he meets a knight: st. 51

*cu 27a* He is the lord of the castle: st. 51  
*27b* Politely Gawain speaks: st. 51  
*27c* "I have laboured to travel far: st. 52  
*27d* Can you lodge me tonight?" st. 52

*pu 28* The knight leads Gawain into the castle: st. 52

*cu 28a (i)* He calls a page: st. 52  
*28a (ii)* He orders Gawain's horse to be well stabled: st. 52  
*cu 28b (i)* They go quickly to a chamber: st. 53  
*28b (ii)* Everything is prepared: st. 53  
*28b (iii)* (I can safely swear to this: st. 53)  
*28b (iv)* There is a bright fire: st. 53  
*28b (v)* There are burning candles: st. 53

*pu 29* They go to supper: st. 53

*cu 29a (i)* The knight orders his Lady to come to table: st. 54  
*29a (ii)* She arrives with her maids: st. 54  
*cu 29b (i)* As she eats the lady gazes at Sir Gawain: st. 55  
*29b (ii)* After supper she and all her maids leave: st. 55  
*cu 29c (i)* The knight gives Gawain wine: st. 56  
*29c (ii)* He makes him welcome: st. 56

- pu 30* The knight asks Gawain politely why he has come so far this way: st. 56
- cu 30a (i)* Says Gawain may tell him the truth as they are both knights: sts. 56-7
- 30a (ii)* He can keep a secret: st. 57
- pu 31* He offers to help if there is anything worrying Gawain: st. 57
- cu 31a (i)* (Smooth words, but if Gawain had known the truth he would not have told all! st. 58
- 31a (ii)* Gawain is with the Green Knight! st. 58)
- cu 31b (i)* The GK tells Gawain he knows the Green Chapel: st. 59
- 31b (ii)* It is three furlongs away: st. 59
- 31b (iii)* Its master is a 'venerous' knight: st. 59
- 31b (iv)* Day and night he does many wonders by witchcraft! st. 59
- 31b (v)* He is courteous when he sees cause: st. 60
- pu 32* The knight tells Gawain to stay and rest: st. 60
- cu 32a* He is going to the forest: st. 60
- pu 33* They agree to divide anything god sends between them: st. 61
- cu 33a* They will divide everything whether it be silver or gold: st. 61
- 33b* They swear to be true: st. 61
- pu 34* The Green Knight goes hunting: st. 62
- pu 35* Sir Gawain stays sleeping: st. 62
- pu 36* The old witch goes to her daughter: st. 62
- cu 36a* She tells her that the man she has wanted for so long is available: st. 63
- 36b* "He is lodged in this hall" st. 63
- pu 37* She brings her to Gawain's bed: st. 63
- cu 37a* The witch asks Gawain to wake up st. 64
- 37b* "Take her, who has loved you so long, into your arms: st. 64
- 37c* Its quite safe." st. 64
- pu 38* The lady kisses Gawain three times: st. 65
- cu 38a (i)* "Unless I have your love I shall die!" st. 65
- 38a (ii)* "Your husband is a gentle knight" says Gawain, blushing: st. 65
- 38a (iii)* "It would shame me to dishonour him — he has been kind to me! st. 66
- 38a (iv)* I have a deed to do and I won't be at rest until it is done." st. 66
- cu 38b (i)* The Lady asks what his task is: st. 67
- 38b (ii)* "If it is to do with fighting, if you will be governed by me, no man can harm you: st. 67



- 38b (iii) I have a silken lace: st. 68  
38b (iv) It is white as milk: st. 68  
38b (v) It is of great value because no man can hurt you while you have it on you” st. 68
- pu 39 Gawain accepts a lace from the Lady: st. 69
- cu 39a He promises to return: st. 69
- pu 40 The Knight in the forest takes many deer: st. 69
- cu 40a He finds wild boars: st. 69  
40b He finds plenty of does and wild pig: st. 70  
40c Also foxes and other beasts of prey: st. 70  
40d (I heard truthful men say this: st. 70)
- pu 41 Gawain welcomes the knight on his return from hunting: st. 70
- cu 41a The GK lays down his venison: st. 71  
41b He asks what Gawain has gained: st. 71
- pu 42 The GK shows Gawain his venison: st. 71
- cu 42a Gawain swears the knight shall have his share of his gains: st. 72
- pu 43 Gawain gives the GK three kisses: st. 72
- cu 43a “This is what god sent me” st. 72  
43b He keeps the lace hidden: st. 73  
43c (This is his only wrong: st. 73)
- pu 44 Everyone retires until morning: st. 73
- pu 45 Gawain departs: st. 74
- cu 45a He thanks the Lady: st. 74  
45b He takes the lace: st. 74  
45c He goes towards the Chapel though he doesn’t know the way: st. 74  
45d He wonders whether he should do as the Lady asked: st. 75
- pu 46 The GK departs in a different direction: st. 75
- cu 46a He transforms himself into his green array: st. 75
- pu 47 Riding over a plain, Gawain hears a horn on a hill and arrives at the Chapel: sts. 76-77
- cu 47a (i) It is covered in greenery: st. 77  
47b (i) Gawain looks about for the Green Knight: st. 77  
47b (ii) He hears him loudly sharpening a blade: st. 77
- pu 48 The GK welcomes Gawain: st. 78
- pu 49 The GK tells Gawain he must bow his head: st. 78
- pu 50 He strikes: st. 78
- cu 50a He barely cuts the skin: st. 78
- pu 51 The GK accuses Gawain of flinching: st. 79
- cu 51a (i) Gawain becomes angry: st. 79  
51a (ii) Stands straight: st. 79

- 51a (iii)* Draws his sword: st. 79  
*51a (iv)* Threatens to kill the GK if he speaks like that: st. 79  
*51a (v)* “We have both had a stroke: st. 80  
*51a (vi)* You found no falsehood in me!” st. 80
- cu 51b (i)* The GK says that he thought he had killed Gawain: st. 81  
*51b (ii)* The best knight in the land: st. 81  
*51b (iii)* “You might have won the crown of ‘curtesie’ over anyone in the land, bound, free or gentry” sts. 81-2
- pu 52* Gawain has lost the chance of being the best knight because he did not keep his word: st. 82
- cu 52a* “You hid the lace my wife gave you!” st. 82  
*52b* You knew the arrangement and you had half the spoils of my hunting: st. 83  
*52c* You would have been in no danger from me were it not for the matter of the lace: st. 83  
*52d* I swear it! st. 83  
*52e* I knew my wife loved you but you would not dishonour me: st. 84  
*52f* You would refuse her.” st. 84
- pu 53* The GK asks Gawain to take him to Arthur’s court: st. 84
- cu 53a* Then he will be satisfied: st. 84  
*53b* They are agreed: st. 85  
*53c* They go to the Castle of Hutton for the night: st. 85  
*53d* Happy, in the morning they leave for the Court: st. 85
- pu 54* The Court is pleased to see them: st. 86
- cu 54a (i)* They thank god Gawain lives: st. 86  
*cu 54b (i)* (This is why Knights of the Bath wear a lace until they have won their spurs: st. 86  
*54b (ii)* Or until a noble Lady removes it because they have done deeds of prowess: st. 87  
*cu 54c (i)* It was at Gawain’s request that Arthur granted the Knights of the Bath this privilege: st. 87)  
*cu 54d (i)* (This is the end of the story: st. 88  
*54d (ii)* May God bless those who have listened to this tale about what happened in the west country and the days of King Arthur: st. 88)

### III. The 'Durham' Paradigm and *The grene knight*

The following discussion demonstrates that *PF 71* supports the paradigm in all but one item. The date of origin of both the *GK* text and the text from which the paradigm was derived is similar. Therefore the paradigmatic agreement presently shown, upholds my earlier conclusion that such concurrence may be a function of age.

The paradigmatic analysis of *PF 71* underlines the obvious fact that in comparison with *SGGK* it has been heavily condensed and has become a simple, fast-moving and conventionally styled 'adventure'.<sup>9</sup> However the analysis also serves to bring forward extra-textual information about the poet's audience. The discussion shows that the poem's probably regional audience is conservative; it does not occupy its leisure hours with intellectual or abstract concepts but prefers entertainment which emphasises narrative *action* rather than interpretative *sens*; it is familiar with the 'popular' tales of its area but has only a slight knowledge of 'classical' Arthurian matters and finally, it is fully aware of the polite social behaviour pertaining to a knight's household. It is a logical conclusion that the poem was written to entertain the dependants and followers of such a family and there is a small amount of evidence which may point, very tentatively, in the direction of the Stanleys.

#### A. Examination

Many of the paradigmatic items support more than one of the points made above and therefore this discussion opens with those items which sustain the basic proposition that the *PF 71* poet has rewritten the tale of the Green Knight to conform to the conventions of the popular rhymed adventure story created primarily for entertainment.

First: the *GK* poet concentrates only on the leading characters involved in the 'adventure' and omits the subordinate players (Item 3: *Character focus*). *SGGK* names nineteen Arthurian characters: *GK* names only six.<sup>10</sup> Thus the tale's circumference is drawn inwards towards a concentration on the central issues: this helps the story towards simplicity, brevity and rapid narrative pace.

Secondly, the stylistic 'shape' of the poem is conventional. The topic relates to a single episode covering the ramifications of one adventure (Item 13: *Episode*). The narrative progresses towards Gawain's submission to Bredbeddle's blow which is followed by an explanation or moral (Item 14: *Climax*).

Thirdly, Gawain is a conventional principal character provided with recognisable and stock heroic attributes and who illustrates a simple lesson.<sup>11</sup> The lesson is derived from the poet's *explication* (Item 15: *Post-climactic moral*).<sup>12</sup> The general application of the 'lesson' (which is in effect that 'Honour must be earned and maintained'), is seen in the Green Knight's explanation that because Gawain was deceitful his honour was

---

9. That it has been greatly condensed is obvious because the antecedent *SGGK* has 2530 lines while the later *GK* has only 515.

10. The principals, Sir Bredbeddle and Sir Gawain, followed in rôle importance by King Arthur and Agostes, Sir Kay and Queen Guinevere.

11. Gawain's actual status as the functional 'hero' will be discussed presently: for now it is sufficient to note that he is initially presented with the full traditional heroic panoply.

diminished and he was therefore wounded (sts. 81-84). The lesson hinges on Gawain's position among the knights of the Round Table, as the epitome of righteous and chivalric behaviour: 'to Arthurs court I will mee hye/to proue Gawains poynts 3' (st. 13); 'I am come hither to proue poynts . . . that longeth to manhood' (st. 21), says Bredbeddle and 'Maintaine thine honour!' (st. 20) he says to Arthur who is the 'proudest in all' (st. 19). (Item 16: *Moral: repetition*).<sup>13</sup> Gawain's virtues are repeated both indirectly, 'of my deede I was neuer feard/nor yett I am nothing a dread' (st. 39), and directly: 'he was one of the goodlyest Knights/that euer in brittaine was borne' (st. 46), he speaks 'meekly' (st. 51) and 'mildly' (st. 69), he abhors a deed that will bring him 'shame' (st. 66), he is 'curteous and free' (st. 74) and 'the gentlest knight in this land' (st. 81). Finally the narrator specifically repeats the matter from which the lesson will be drawn:

euere priuily he held the lace —  
that was all the villanye that euer was  
proued by Sir Gawain. . . .

GK: st. 73

The price of merited position is eternal vigilance — even Gawain could fall.

Although Gawain is not outnumbered by the foe (inasmuch as the poem does not relate to martial conflict), like the historical heroes, he is conventionally otherwise handicapped — in this case through his adversaries' knowledge of witchcraft (Item 19: *Outnumbering*). However witchcraft is 'wrong', and 'right' should prevail (Item 18: *Right*). Here Gawain is, as convention and the lesson demands, the embodiment of 'right'. The fact that when tested his personal virtue is found to be imperfect is irrelevant in the context of the paradigm, which requires only that the hero does not support a wrongful cause. That Gawain is right to accept the challenge is plainly stated: 'that were great villanye/without you put this deede to me' (st. 29). As with the historical heroes 'righteousness' is a protection:

"If the lace had neuer been wrought  
to haue slaine thee was neuer my thought."

GK: st. 83

The fact that Gawain is slightly wounded in proportion to the diminution of his virtue has the double function of illustrating the 'lesson' and also the conventional precept that the hero with 'right' on his side will conquer.

The fourth aspect of *GK* which relates to entertainment and tradition, concerns the poet, his manipulation of his source and his narrative style rather than his characters. The poet writes as an onlooker but through his use of the domestic 'our' with reference to King Arthur and Queen Guinevere, and his condemnatory tone as he terms Agostes' magic 'witchcraft' (sts. 9-10), the audience is left in no doubt as to where his sympathies lie (Item 17: *Partisan*): he is not quite as distant as his counterpart in *SGGK*.<sup>14</sup>

The links between scenes are fictitious (Item 11: *Links*). The poet uses either a journey (sts. 16, 48, 74 and 85) or narrative formulae: 'now of . . . noe more shall I mell,

---

12. The poem's terminal *explication* is a modification of that found in the source narrative where it is noted that the Lady's girdle was adopted by members of the Round Table as a sign of their 'broperhede' (l. 2516). In *PF* 71 the emblem of the girdle becomes a 'lace' and is applied to the Knights of the Bath (sts. 86-87). Since the narrative itself concerns the story of the lace, the *explication* relates to the tale.

13. L.D. Benson, *Art & Tradition in Sir Gawain and the Green Knight* (New Brunswick, N.J., 1965), p. 36

but of . . . ’ (st. 7); ‘now leave wee . . . ’ (st. 43). Of these six scene changes only two are present in *SGGK*: Gawain’s journey to the Green Knight’s castle and his journey to the Chapel. This is a function of the fact that first, in order to present his poem as a short, fast-moving ‘adventure’ the *GK* poet has interpolated a ‘new’ explanatory scene near the beginning of his tale. This is further discussed presently: the point I am making here is that the ‘new’ scene necessitates character movement which is not in the antecedent text and which therefore gives *GK* the appearance of more action. Secondly, and to the same effect, the poet has omitted the repetition of the Hunting and Temptation scenes found in *SGGK* and has condensed them to one.

He has also condensed matters relating to numbers (Item 20: *Figures*).<sup>15</sup> There are few numbers in *GK* but those which are present differ from the source narrative. The exception is the three kisses Gawain receives from the Lady, but this *has* been altered as in *GK* the giving of kisses is shown in a single scene. As the poet has omitted Gawain’s pentangle, he need have only three ‘poynts’ not five (st. 13). These abridgements speed up the narrative: it is probable that other minor numerical differences have no significance and are the result of poetic choice or transmission error.<sup>16</sup>

The following shows that while *GK* shares the basic matter of the earlier work, with regard to the topics of the conversations it has also been freely adapted. The dialogue is either a précis of the matter found in the antecedent text in either dialogue or narrative, or it is a ‘fiction’ (Item 8: *Dialogue & source*).

These are the main conversations:

	<b>Participants</b>	<b>Topic</b>	<b>Source</b>
1.	Bredbeddle/Agostes (sts. 11-13)	Despatch	Un sourced as dialogue: taken from source narrative.
2.	Porter/Bredbeddle — Porter/Arthur (sts. 17-19)	Arrival	Un sourced fiction.
3.	Bredbeddle/Arthur (sts. 20-26)	Challenge	Un sourced: it is a précis of <i>some</i> of the matters in the parallel dialogue in <i>SGGK</i> with additions and omissions. The language is the poet’s own.
4.	Kay/Court (st. 28)	Boast	Un sourced fiction.
5.	Gawain/Arthur (sts. 29-30)	Acceptance	Précis of source material.
6.	Bredbeddle/Arthur (st. 30)	Farewell	Un sourced fiction.
7.	Gawain/Bredbeddle (st. 52)	Arrival	Un sourced fiction
8.	Gawain/Bredbeddle (st. 56)	Welcome	Précis of source narrative.
9.	Gawain/Bredbeddle (sts. 57-61)	Information: promises	Précis of source dialogue — plus fiction

14. Although some of his traditional exclamations such as ‘I will you tell’ (st. 7), ‘as I hard true men tell’ (st. 70) have their equal in the antecedent narrative: ‘I am in tent yow to telle’ (l. 624), ‘as I haf herde telle’ (l. 26).

15. The paradigm states that ‘Figures relating to the forces involved are inaccurate’ (Item 20). Strictly speaking this statement is not relevant to *GK* as there are no opposing armies. However if the item is modified to ‘Figures present in the source narrative are likely to differ in a derived text’, there is agreement.

16. For instance: the return bout is set at ‘this day 12 month’ (sts. 25 and 26) not ‘a twelmonyth and a day’ (*SGGK*, l. 298) and the distance of the Chapel from Bredbeddle’s castle is ‘furlongs 3’ (st. 59) not ‘not two myle henne’ (*SGGK*, l. 1078).

10. Agostes/Lady (sts. 62-64)	Plan	Un sourced fiction.
11. Lady/Gawain (sts. 65-68)	Seduction: kisses: lace	Précis of source dialogue — plus fiction.
12. Bredbeddle/Gawain (sts. 70-72)	Exchange	Précis of source dialogue.
13. Bredbeddle/Gawain (sts. 78-83)	Test	Précis of source dialogue.
14. Bredbeddle/Gawain (st. 84)	Resolution	Un sourced fiction.

Although shorter, there are more conversations in *GK* than there are in *SGGK*. The effect is to enhance the poem's entertainment value by bringing the characters closer to the audience as in the manner of a play.

The discussion so far has covered paradigmatic items which concern only some aspect of the poem as traditional entertainment. I now turn to items which support more than one argument and which while still relevant to the above, also illustrate aspects of *PF 71* not yet explored.

The three items following show how the poet has quickened the narrative pace of *GK* and how by concentrating on action and omitting the antecedent text's preoccupation with abstracts, he has gone some way towards making his poem more 'realistic' in terms of a short adventure with which members of his audience might identify.

The poet's technique of condensation and omission is evident from a comparison of the respective opening lines of each text (Item 1: *Simplification*). The *GK* poet has omitted much of *SGGK*'s leisurely narrative preamble which begins with the history of Britain *ab initio*:

Siþen þe sege and þe assaut watz sesed at Troye . . .

*SGGK*: 1. 1

The *GK* poet signifies the narrative's Arthurian topic more quickly by going straight to England and Arthur's reign:

List! wen Arthur he was King . . .

*GK*: st. 1

This pattern of simplification through abridgement is seen throughout *PF 71*, but the most striking contraction is the compression of *SGGK*'s three 'Hunting' and three 'Temptation' scenes into one. Thus the parallel structural patterning and interwoven significance of these episodes in *SGGK* is lost in *GK* and the poem becomes a straightforward narrative devoid of symbolic importance and interpretative levels of meaning. This is also seen in *PF 71*'s failure to specify Gawain's shield blazoned with a pentangle — the emblematic significance of which, in *SGGK*, is carefully explained. The *GK* poet omits or condenses all matters which distract from the physical action of his tale (Item 2: *Details*). Thus the 'fyue poyntez' of the pentangle and their import with relation to Gawain and chivalry, are present only in a vestigial form in *GK* and their nature is never directly explained. Their first mention occurs when the Green Knight tells his mother-in-law that he is going to Arthur's court 'to proue Gawains points 3' (st. 13), and their second mention is when the Knight arrives at court and introduces himself:

“I am come hither a venterous [Knight]  
& kayred thorrow countrye farr,  
to proue poynts in thy pallace

that longeth to manhood in euery case  
among thy Lords deere.”

*GK*: st. 21<sup>17</sup>

The matter is raised once more after Gawain has received the Knight’s blow and has flinched. He is told:

“Of curtesie thou might haue woon the crowne . . .  
& now 3 points be put fro thee. . . .  
Sir Gawain, thou wast not Leele  
when thou didst the lace conceal.”

*GK*: sts. 81-82

The notion that these ‘points’ are somehow related to chivalric reputation is present but the poet’s omission of the detail given in the source narrative obscures any thorough understanding of their precise significance, although from their context, they appear to be ‘valour’, ‘courtesy’ and ‘truth’.<sup>18</sup> His concern lies solely with the ‘adventure’ itself — which suggests a prospective lack of audience interest in the matters he has omitted: natural realism is preferred to artificial abstracts.

This ‘realism’ is also illustrated by Item 7: *Chronology*. The broad chronological sequences in *GK* occur in their proper linear order but, as the paradigm states ‘Specific temporal locations are inaccurate’ — that is to say they are inaccurate inasmuch as they do not reflect *SGGK*. However, paradoxically, they are *more* accurate than *SGGK* when considered in terms of ‘real time’, *ordo naturalis*. For instance the *GK* poet shows the Green Knight being sent to Arthur’s court by his mother-in-law at the point in the narrative where his despatch and journey would properly occur if the sequence of events were taking place in ‘real time’. In *SGGK* this scene is not present at this stage and that he was so sent is only given as part of a general explanation at the end of the poem (*SGGK*: ll. 2445-66). This scene in *GK* (sts. 10-12), notes the antagonist’s magic powers *before* he arrives at Court and also more than hints that Gawain will somehow be brought to his castle. There is a certain logic in the poet’s revelation at this point but initially it seems as though the later poet has sacrificed ‘surprise’ in favour of realism. This isn’t entirely so: as Benson notes:

The simpler narrative organisation of *The Grene Knight* allows the audience to share the narrator’s omniscience and to enjoy from the standpoint of their superior knowledge the predicament in which the hero finds himself.<sup>19</sup>

The surprise now lies in the solutions to the practical questions of how the magical

---

17. In view of the nature of the Green Knight’s challenge I do not think that this means that he simply wishes to try the quality of their weapon-play in joust.

18. *Medieval Romances*, ed. Speed, II, 315; Kittredge, *Study*, p. 125.  
The poet’s omission of the lengthy description of Gawain’s shield, the pictured Virgin and the pentangle and its significance may be not only because he thought his audience might find such matters tedious, but also because although the pentangle had become a Christian symbol associated with Mary, it had stronger overtones of magic, both good and bad. He may therefore have felt a) that to associate Gawain with the protection of the Christian pentagram and Mary and then to have that protection fail, mocked the Christian ethic, or b) to associate Mary and the good Gawain with a magic pentacle — which despite the explanation in *SGGK* — everybody knew was sometimes used in ‘real life’ to raise demons, was also injudicious. Hulbert, ‘Syr Gawayn’, pp. 721-730; R.H. Green, ‘Gawain’s Shield and the Quest for Perfection’, *Middle English Survey: Critical Essays*, 2nd edn., ed. E. Vasta (London; 1968), p. 83 & p. 83 fn. 10.

powers will be manifested; how Gawain will be lured to the castle; what will happen to him there. Thus the audience is subject to the excitement of long-term expectation very early in the narrative. Audience anticipation however, has to do with *action*: *PF 71* does not evince or require a passive audience happy to listen to lengthy scenic descriptions, ponder over the significance of religious emblems and appreciate the elegance of parallel scenes. In short *PF 71* does not require a sophisticated audience, but an audience whose greatest satisfaction comes from an exciting tale with plenty of action and some relationship, however indirect, to their own lives.

The following Items show that *PF 71* is primarily an entertainment along traditional lines such as might be expected by a conservative audience familiar and comfortable with 'popular' narrative conventions.

Unlike *SGGK* where the principal actors have some individual personality *GK*'s characters have been rewritten and now comply to the stock 'types' of the Romance. This is reflected in the dialogue where Arthur is always noble, Kay is funny, the witch schemes, the porter is nothing more than a porter, Gawain and Bredbeddle are the 'good' knightly opponents of the Romance and Bredbeddle's wife is simply an embodiment of the stock-character 'The Enamoured Lady'. All these characters are simple and are presented without complication and, in that important point of courtesy the use of the second personal pronoun, the characters speak as is appropriate to their rank or the situation. Thus conversations with the Porter are conducted on both sides in the formal second person plural (yee) as is Arthur's address to Gawain and Gawain's conversation with his host — whom he does not yet know to be the Green Knight. The Lady's first speech is in the intimate mode, the singular (thee), but she receives no encouragement from Gawain who replies formally and sets the tone for the rest of the conversation. The Knight at the Chapel welcomes Gawain formally but the remainder of the exchange after the blow has been given is conducted in the singular (thee, thou, thy). The result is traditional and in this respect similar to *SGGK* except that in *GK* the Green Knight is nowhere shown to be churlish or to 'embody the qualities antithetical to the perfect courtesy of the hero'.<sup>20</sup>

The poem is seen to be emphatically conservative when we take into account the omission of any of the stock plot variations or themes which could legitimately have been derived from the protosource, such as the ramifications of the Lady as 'the fairy wife/mistress'; the witch as the 'loathly hag'; or the 'spiritual' aspects of Gawain's knighthood. Gawain of course is chivalric, and in this regard much of the dialogue he has with the Lady or Bredbeddle underlines the poem's lesson that Honour must be earned and constantly maintained, (Item 9: *Dialogue & moral*). First Gawain's respect for his honour is shown: 'to me it were great shame/if I should do . . . any grame' (st. 66), then his belief that it is sufficient that he should honour his promise to arrive at the Chapel and submit to Bredbeddle's blow: 'noe falsehood in me thou found!' (st. 80), and finally the discovery that he had been judged and found wanting in respect to other actions: 'thou wast not Leele/when thou didst the lace conceal' (st. 82) and he has lost his 'poynts' and the 'crowne of curtesie'. The connection between the moral and the dialogue is certainly present, but it is pushed further into the background of the poem than it is in *SGGK*.

The sole paradigmatic statement which is not valid for *GK* notes that 'Dialogue will serve to remark the movement of characters but will not greatly forward the principal

---

19. Benson, *Art and Tradition*, p. 171.

20. Benson, *Art & Tradition*, p. 36



event' (Item 10). The challenge, its acceptance, the promise to share, the Lady's attempt at seduction, her gift and the final climax are *all* presented through the medium of dialogue. This is a function of poetic mimesis: the previous texts examined in this study have stemmed from received history set down as a factual record; it is well known that dialogue is the exception in such documents and therefore dialogue in historical poems is most often a later addition to the event as described in the source.<sup>21</sup> In fictional adventure the entire tale is an invention and therefore, copying life (where actions and conversations are not mutually exclusive), the author is free to adapt his tale to a certain degree of immediate realism and give his characters' lives a similitude of normality. This is what the *GK* poet has done.

The following items continue to demonstrate the poet's conformity to tradition: the discussion of them also shows that he expects the audience to be familiar with the 'popular' Arthurian rhymed texts of the Midlands and unfamiliar with the 'classical' *Arthuriad*.

In line with adapting his story towards entertainment and audience expectation, the poet has included a 'comic' interlude which is *not* in *SGGK* (Item 12: *Light relief*). As with the examples of this Item relating to other texts set out in my previous chapters, so in *PF* 71 its presence contrasts with the tension of the matter which precedes it (in this case the Green Knight's appearance and challenge):

vpp stood Sir Kay, that crabbed knight —  
spake mightye words that were of height:  
that were both Loud and shrill.

“I shall strike his necke in tooe!  
the head away the body froe!”  
— they bade him all be still.

*GK*: sts. 27-28

This may not strike the modern audience as being very comic, but it seems that in many of the popular rhymed Arthurian narratives of the midlands Kay has the status of recognised comedian: he is associated with laughter and to those who follow the 'popular Arthurian serial', his name is familiar and keyed to amusement.<sup>22</sup>

Sir Kay is not mentioned in *SGGK* and of the six leading characters present in *PF* 71, two are renamed (Item 4: *Nomenclature*): Sir Bredbeddle replaces Bertilak de Hautdesert and Agostes replaces Morgan La Faye.<sup>23</sup> Because Sir Bredbeddle also occurs in *PF* 8: *King Arthur and the King of Cornwall*, it is possible that his name is used because it is familiar and perhaps because the name 'Sir Bertilak de Hautdesert' for a character who is 'on stage' a good deal, is likely to present a difficulty in a not overly long poem with lines of three or four stresses. Therefore because in *Cornwall* there is an alternative 'Green Knight' known to the poet and probably his audience, 'Bertilak' is dropped and 'Bredbeddle' introduced. (The reasons for believing that *PF* 8 was written

---

21. There are of course, historical records which incorporate conversations or speeches, but all too often these were not in the original account but have been 'written in' by later copyists or redactors eager to improve the shining hour and point a moral.

22. Kay as 'the crabbed knight' also appears in *PF* 21: *Sir Lambewell* (l. 37) and *PF* 12: *The Turke & Gowin* (l. 19). In the latter he is a comic figure in that he speaks boastfully with no chance of fulfilling his brag: he also does this in *PF* 139: *Carle off Carlile* (ll. 92-94, 103-112). In *PF* 94: *Boy and Mantle* (l. 61-68) he is a figure of fun when he is publicly shown to be a cuckold, and in *PF* 13: *The Marriage of Sir Gawain* (ll. 128-43) his is the coarse assessment of the charms of the 'loathly lady'.

before *PF* 71, are discussed presently). Thus *PF* 71 is made to seem part of the (possibly local) Arthurian corpus with which the audience is already familiar.

The motivations given in *GK* are not detailed and are occasionally omitted entirely or replaced by an abbreviation of a reason which occurs at a different point in the narrative in *SGGK* (Item 5: *Motivation*). For instance the first motivation given in the latter relates to Arthur's custom not to feast before he has heard of 'sum auenturus þyng an vncouþe tale' (l. 93), or some 'iustying' has been arranged. This custom ushers in the subsequent 'adventure'. This introduction is not present in *GK*, perhaps because since Arthur's practice stems mainly from the French Romances, the poet (and probably his audience) may not be familiar with it.<sup>24</sup> It has been replaced with a scene shift to Bredbeddle. He is being despatched to Court by his mother-in-law to fetch Gawain. She does this for 'her daughters sake' (st. 12) because her daughter loves Gawain 'paramour' (st. 8). This is a plain and simple reason. It is the only one provided.

The corresponding initial reason for the Green Knight's appearance at Court in *SGGK* is that which he gives to the assembly himself: it is not until the end of the poem (ll. 2445-66) that 'Morgne þe goddes' is revealed as the *dea ex machina*.<sup>25</sup> She sent the Green Knight to Court in order to test the knights of the Round Table, 'For to assay þe surquidité 3if hit soth were/þat rennes of þe grete renown of þe Rounde Table' (ll. 2457-58) and to cause Guinevere to die of fright at 'þat ilke gome þat gostlych speked/with his hede in his honde' (ll. 2461-62). The text gives no reason why Morgan should wish to do this. Critics have pointed out that Morgan's enmity towards Guinevere and the Round Table is part of the Arthurian tradition.<sup>26</sup> Thus the lack of explanation may imply that the poet expected the audience to have some prior familiarity with that tradition. However this lack has been seen by some as an unfortunate narrative flaw: it has been the subject of much scholarly debate since Kittredge's original remark 'Every reader finds it unsatisfactory. It is the one weak spot in the superb English Romance.'<sup>27</sup> I do not propose to enter this debate but simply to point out that the very existence of a corpus of scholarly argument on the topic proves that at this point *SGGK* is not entirely straightforward.<sup>28</sup> Thus it is seen that the motivation as altered by the *GK* poet has become simple and in terms of an audience which I suggest the poet did not expect to be

- 
23. That the *Folio* scribe has written 'Agostes' is not certain: Madden has seen the name as 'Aggteb' (*Gawayne*, p. 226). Furnivall's 'Agostes' is undoubtedly the better reading, but because the word's terminal letter in the manuscript is to some extent occluded by the downstroke of a letter in the line above, I note that there is a possibility that it is not an 's' and it may be a poorly written 'n'. I note that Morgan La Faye does not appear in any of the analogues to any part of the story of *SGGK*: I am unable to suggest whom the uncertain 'Agostes' might be unless it is a corruption of Morgan's alias, 'Argante' mentioned by A.B. Friedman, in 'Morgan Le Fay in *Sir Gawain and the Green Knight*, *Speculum*, 35, 2 (1960), 264.
24. *SGGK* ed. Tolkien and Gordon, rev. Davis, p. 76.
25. She is also revealed in the same passage as Gawain's aunt, *not* as in *GK*, his mother-in-law.
26. For instance A.B. Friedman, 'Morgan Le Fay', p. 268; *Sir Gawain and the Green Knight*, ed. and intro. R.A. Waldron (London, 1970), p. 5; L.H. Loomis, 'Gawain and the Green Knight', *Arthurian Literature in the Middle Ages*, ed. R.S. Loomis (Oxford, 1959), p. 535.
27. Kittredge, *Study*, p. 136.
28. Very few scholars who have written on *SGGK* have failed to discuss this topic and therefore a full list of critical opinions is too cumbersome to include here. However the school of thought that agrees with Kittredge is represented by A.B. Friedman, 'Morgan Le Fay', p. 260-74, and the opposing view by D.A. Lawton, 'The Unity of Middle English Alliterative Poetry', *Speculum*, 58, 1 (1983), 72-93. Between them these two authors provide references to the majority of critical opinions.

familiar with classic Arthurian narratives, realistically understandable.

This condensation and simplification of causes is present throughout *GK*: a further example is *PF 71*'s explanation (with its touch of *noblesse oblige*), that Gawain wishes to accept the Green Knight's challenge because he ought since he is Arthur's nephew (st. 30) — and therefore the highest ranking knight present. This contrasts with *SGGK* where Gawain feels first, that it is 'not semely' for Arthur to accept the challenge; secondly because his (Gawain's) life would be the least loss to the court as he is only praiseworthy 'for as much as 3e [Arthur] ar myn em' (l. 356), and finally because 'I haue frayned hit at yow fyrst' (l. 359).<sup>29</sup>

Thus the motivations have been reduced or altered to take on a straightforward simplicity easily comprehensible to anyone: 'classical' Arthurian complications are smoothed out and in short, the shaping of the characters' motivations is part of the poet's technique towards the creation of an entertaining adventure.

The 'fiction' introduced into the narrative does not directly concern the action of the plot — if removed, the course of events continues undisturbed (Item 6: *Fiction & action*). The principal matters present in *GK* but not in the source narrative as we have it, are:

1. The narrator's explanation of the origins of the Round Table (st. 3).
2. The Green Knight's wife is enamoured of Gawain (st.8).
3. At Arthur's court the Green Knight is greeted by a porter (sts. 17-19),
4. Sir Kay boasts that he will overcome the green Knight (sts. 27-28).
5. The Green Knight is fed before the ordeal (sts. 30-32).
6. The Green Knight takes formal leave of Arthur (st. 36).
7. The Lady's mother brings the Lady to Gawain's bed (st. 63).
8. The Lady questions Gawain about his task (st. 67).
9. Gawain is informed that the master of the Green Chapel is sometimes courteous (st. 60).
10. On approaching the Chapel Gawain hears a horn (st. 76).
11. Gawain is accused of flinching *after* the blow has been given (st. 80).
12. The Green Knight returns to Arthur's court with Gawain (sts. 84-87).

These fictions are present as one of the means whereby the narrative might be shaped to please the poet's audience. Fictions 2, 7, 8 and 11 preserve the logic of the tale's sequence of events and the soundness of the plot by including explanations of why certain events take place: the tension of the narrative then lies in the question of how the poet will resolve the final bout without killing his hero — it no longer lies partially in esoteric questions of chivalric integrity. It can therefore be deduced that the audience to whom this straightforward, fast-paced narrative will probably appeal will themselves be simple men-of-action, their families, households and dependants, all by and large, more interested in the physical than the intellectual. This proposition is further enhanced when it is noted that unlike *SGGK*, the poet does not reserve the revelation of the identities, motivations and magical powers of half his six characters until the end of the text, but makes them known to the audience as soon as possible, because although these matters are subordinate to the action they add greatly to the interest.

Fictions 1, 2, 4 and 12 are consistent with the picture of the poet's audience as

---

29. I am not at all sure that Gawain's motivation in *PF 71* does not reflect the notion of 'ideal lordship' and that if as I will show, the text is perhaps written for a specific audience, there is not the faintest echo of distant flattery.

practical people with little appreciation of matters outside their immediate sphere of interest. That the poet feels it necessary to explain the origin of the Round Table suggests that he thinks the audience may be unfamiliar with it. This implies an audience of limited Arthurian knowledge.<sup>30</sup> However the introduction of Kay's boast in fiction 4 suggests that although the audience may not have been conversant with the more esoteric 'classical' Arthurian tales, they were familiar with the more homely versions in which Kay is often described as 'crabbed' and is presented as a comic figure. Similarly it is probable that fiction 12 is present as a reflection of knowledge of the 'popular' *PF 8: King Arthur and the King of Cornwall*.<sup>31</sup> The notion of a knight being called 'The Green Knight' need have no other source than the convention of describing knights by the tincture of their armour.<sup>32</sup> In 'narrative time' *PF 8* follows *PF 71*, as in the former Bredbeddle is one of Arthur's knights. If in 'real time' *Cornwall* preceded *GK* then I suggest that the latter poet, having used 'Bredbeddle' for reasons which I have previously remarked, deliberately invents the fiction of Bredbeddle's introduction to Arthur's court under Gawain's patronage. He does this in order that it might be inferred that it was *then* that Bredbeddle became one of Arthur's Knights.<sup>33</sup> The result is that it is plain to the audience that the narrative events they have just heard took place before *Cornwall*.

Fictions 3, 5, 6 and 10 are related to custom and etiquette. By their inclusion the characters of the tale are made to appear 'gentle' in terms that are relevant to the audience's understanding of correct behaviour in their own *milieu*. Anachronistic modernity is of course a commonplace in the Romance. However in *GK* it is casually present: it is not emphasised in order to impress by stressing a difference between the characters and the audience. It therefore suggests that the audience is connected to the kind of household which understands the custom described; that the mention is of a familiar usage.

With regard to the audience there is one further tentative suggestion to be made: that the text was primarily intended for people from Lancashire or Cheshire. The *GK* poet does not use the same geographic locations for the site of the King's dwelling as *SGGK*. In the latter, since Gawain's journey is north to Wales and the Cheshire Wirral (ll. 691-760), Arthur is presumed to live in a southern 'Camylot' (l. 37). In *GK* Arthur lives at 'Carleile' (st. 16). In *SGGK* the Green Knight lives somewhere beyond 'þe wyldrenesse of wyrale'.<sup>34</sup> Bredbeddle, however lives in the 'Castle of Flatting' in the Forest of Delamere (once the forests of Mara and Mondrem) in Cheshire. I cite the full context of the reference below, because the syntax is easily misunderstood and scholars have followed Furnivall who in his marginal gloss, has misread the passage to mean that

---

30. Kittredge, *Study*, p. 282.

31. This text exists only in a mutilated condition within the *Percy Folio*: its date of composition is unknown. However scholars agree that there is a high probability that its basic plot was taken from the French *Pèlerinage de Charlemagne* of about the middle of the twelfth century, at least one copy of which was made in England in 1300: R.N. Walpole, 'The *Pèlerinage de Charlemagne* Poem, Legend and Problem', *Romance Philology*, 8, 1 (1954), 173-186; Madden, *Gawayne*, p. 356-57; Ackerman, *Arthurian Literature*, ed. Loomis, p. 498. It is therefore arguable that it is possible for the ballad (*PF 8*), to have been composed prior to *PF 71*.

32. See for instance Sir Thomas Malory, 'The Tale of Sir Gareth of Orkney', *Malory: Works*, 2nd edn. ed. E. Vinaver (London, 1973), pp. [177]-226, in which there is a 'red', 'green', 'brown' and 'black' knight. See also G.J. Brault, *Early Blazon: Heraldic Terminology . . . with Special Reference to Arthurian Literature* (Oxford, 1972), pp. 31-35. Brault makes a particular study of Arthurian Knights known by a specific colour. It is also noticeable that the 'Green' knight appears in three of the *Folio* texts: *PF 71*, *PF 8* and *PF 139: The Carl off Carlile*.

33. Kittredge, *Study*, p. 130; Benson, *Art and Tradition*, 4pp. 35, 74.

*Arthur* was at Flatting (my identification of pronouns is given in square brackets):

That was a lolly sight to seene  
when horsse and armour was all greene. . . .  
His countenance [Bredbeddle's] he became right well,  
I dare itt safelye swear!

That time att Carleile lay our King —  
att a Castle of flatting was his [Bredbeddle's] dwelling,  
in the Forest of delamore.  
For( soo)th he [Bredbeddle] rode the sooth to say,<sup>35</sup>  
to Carleile he [Bredbeddle] came on Christmas day,  
into that fayre countrye.

When he [Bredbeddle] in to that place came . . .  
he said, "I am a venterous Knight  
& of your King [Arthur] wold haue sight . . .  
& other Lords that heere bee."

*PF* 71 sts. 15-17

'A Castle of flatting' has never been identified. It is probable that if it was a genuine edifice it was not more than a fortified manor: *PF* 71 itself twice refers to the 'castle' as a 'hall' (sts. 52 and 63).<sup>36</sup> If the name 'Castle of flatting' is corrupt then it seems to me that there is a probability that the 'f' of 'flatting', in the course of oral transmission, has been transferred from the 'f' of 'of' and therefore the root sound of the name would be something like 'att'n'. Thus it is possible that 'flatting' is a faulty transcript of the 'castle of hutton' mentioned in stanza 85.<sup>37</sup>

After the 'adventure', when Gawain and Bredbeddle leave to return to Carlisle, we are told that they break their journey at the 'castle of hutton' (st. 85). Furnivall, followed by other scholars who have either not looked at a map, or realised that the geography of *GK* differs from that of *SGGK*, maintains this Hutton to be a specific manor in Somerset on the grounds that the poem is set in the 'west countrye' (sts. 7 & 88).<sup>38</sup> The 'west country' is a perfectly valid description for any location west of a central area vertically bisecting the whole of England: the modern interpretation of the south-western counties only, is not applicable.<sup>39</sup> Certainly both Delamere Forest and Carlisle are western areas

---

34. For its location in mediaeval and later times see D. Sylvester, *A History of Cheshire* (Henley-on-Thames, 1971), maps 5 & 6 n.p.

Gawain's itinerary to Bertilak's castle and on to the Green Chapel has been the subject of much speculation: various interpretations are noted by Davis, *SGGK*, pp. 97-98 and more recently by R.W.V. Elliott, *The Gawain Country* (Leeds, 1984).

35. As previously noted, this line is almost certainly an example of dittography, and should read as the almost identical line in stanza 49: 'forth he rode the sooth to tell'.

36. The word 'castle' could be used to describe a relatively unimpressive building provided only that it had some fortifications: structurally a 'castle' was simply a fortified residence. R. A. Brown, M. Prestwick & C. Coulson, *Castles* (Poole, 1980), p. 114; L. Cantor, 'Castles, Fortified Houses, Moated Homesteads and Monastic Settlements', *The English Medieval Landscape*, ed. L. Cantor (London, 1982), p. 126-27, p. 134-5.

38. For instance (and one of the most recent from amongst many others), Helaine Newstead, 'Arthurian Legends', *A Manual of the Writings in Middle English, 1050-1500*, 3 Vols, ed. J. Burke Severs (New Haven, Conn., 1967), I, 57-58, who appears to have acquired her information entirely from secondary sources.

39. *HF* II, 76; Ackerman, *Arthurian Literature* ed. Loomis, p. 497-98; L.B. Hall, *The Knightly Tales of Sir Gawain* (Chicago, 1976), p. 37;

but to travel from the one to the other it is necessary to journey in an almost perfectly straight line *north*. If Gawain and Bredbeddle are setting out from the Green Chapel it is possible that if it is on their route, the ‘castle of hutton’ at which they lodge the first night is Bredbeddle’s castle of ‘Flatting’ although against this is the fact that The Chapel is only ‘3 furlongs’ from ‘Flatting’. However if the Green Chapel was north of ‘Flatting’ then the Hutton at which lodging was found was probably the Hutton in Lancashire, which lies on the direct route to Carlisle — and was owned by the Stanleys.<sup>40</sup> It was approximately ten miles from Lathom, the principal Stanley residence, and was

---

37. On the basis of nomenclature the most likely place to which the *GK* poet could have been referring, is Hatton Hall in the Parish of Waverton in the Hundred of Broxton. However although it had a moat surrounding about an acre of ground, the buildings (which do not appear to have been fortified and which were already falling into ruin when Ormerod saw them), were built in 1597. It is likely that they replaced an earlier residence, probably the manor house, which in view of the lack of reported surviving fortifications, is likely to have been simply a moated homestead. (G. Ormerod, *The History of the County Palatine and the City of Chester*, 3 vols., 2nd edn., rev. T. Helsby (London, 1882; rpt. Manchester, 1980), II, 794). None of the standard works on Cheshire, and in particular, *A History of the County of Chester*, 3 vols, ed. B.E. Harris, (Oxford, 1978-80), add anything further to Ormerod’s account. However a larger objection to Hatton Hall being ‘flatting’, is that it does not appear at any time to have existed within the bounds of Delamere Forest. It was situated about five miles south-east of Chester and well to the west of the River Gowy which for some of its length marked the eastern limit of the forest. Eaton Hall is also unlikely to be the site of Bredbeddle’s castle as, being due south of Chester, it was even further from Delamere, while another apparent possibility, Haddon Hall, is in Derbyshire.

The matters covered in this section with regard to forest boundaries and settlements are taken from the standard works already cited and also L. Cantor, ‘Forests, Chases, Parks and Warrens’, *The Medieval English Landscape*, ed. L. Cantor (London, 1982), p. 65; *Chester*, ed. Harris, II, 167-78; *Gazetteer of the British Isles*, rpt. 9th edn. with additions (Edinburgh, 1970); D. Sylvester, *A History of Cheshire*, (Henley-on-Thames, 1971); J. Mc. N. Dodgson, *The Place Names of Cheshire*, 6 Vols. (Cambridge, 1970-1981), and H.M.S.O. Standard One Inch Ordnance Survey Sheets 109, and 110.

Insofar as I have been able to discover, although Cheshire was rich in castles and fortifications of all kinds there is nowhere which was once within the bounds of Delamere Forest, which may have been Bredbeddle’s ‘castle’. However continuing the search for a place-name which could have been written as ‘hutton’ or ‘hatton’, Hoton Hall (also spelt Hooton or Hutton) is a possible choice. (J. McN. Dodgson, *The Place Names of Cheshire*, 6 vols. (Cambridge, 1970-81), IV, 189; ‘Thomas Wall’s Book of Crests [1530]’, ed. O. Barron, *The Ancestor*, 11 (1904), 182. Against it is the fact that like Hatton Hall it was not within Delamere Forest: however it was within Wirral Forest, the boundary of which was contiguous with Delamere Forest at its closest to Hoton — the precise boundary line does not appear to be known as each map given in the authorities, differs slightly. Hoton was also fortified: William Stanley obtained a licence on 10th August, 2 Hen. VII (1487):

. . . ad finiendam et sursam construendam turrem lapideam quam inceperat  
construere apud manerium suum de Hoton cum machicolationibus et  
battelationibus.

Ormerod, II, 413-15

The Stanleys had a special connection with the Forest of Delamere:

2 Jan: 20 Hen. VI: Reversion of the office of Chief Ranger of  
the forests of Mara and Mondrem [Delamere] to Sir Thomas  
Stanley and the heirs of his body. . . .

(*Victoria History of the County of Lancaster*, 7 vols., ed. W. Farrer & J. Brownbill (London, 1907; rpt. 1966), II, 110.) They were also the Master Foresters of Wirral Forest. (Ormerod, II, 353). From time to time they held all the important positions in the Shire from the Office of Chief Justice of Chester downwards (Ormerod, II, 792). After the accession of Henry VII the Stanleys were also the greatest landowners in Lancashire and Cheshire. (B. Coward, *The Stanleys, Lords Stanley and Earls of Derby 1385-1672* (Manchester, 1983), pp. 112-14). Thus because they were great magnates the conjecture that the poet may have wished to please them by mentioning Hoton, is not unlikely. The validity of the suggestion is not diminished when it is noted, as has been remarked by Lawton, that the *Percy Folio* is ‘the main repository of the verse of Stanley eulogy’ and that it ‘bears many signs of a strong local taste that must have been narrow in its appeal’. (Lawton, ‘*Scottish Field*’, *Leeds Studies in English*, NS 10 (1978).

presumably part of that very large estate.<sup>41</sup>

A connection between the Stanleys and *Sir Gawain and the Green Knight* has been seen by Wilson.<sup>42</sup> He argues that first, ‘The Stanley family’s connections with Wirral and North Staffordshire fit well with both the dialect of the poem and its topological references.’<sup>43</sup> Secondly, ‘A master-forester, himself [Stanley] ‘a wy3e þat watz wys vpon wodcrafterz’ (l. 1605), would have an especially appropriate enthusiasm’ for ‘the poem’s fine discriminations of the art of hunting’.<sup>44</sup> Thirdly, ‘The Green Knight’s unusual use of a holly bough may pun heraldically on a crest borne by the Wirral Stanleys’ — ‘a holly tree vert fructed gules’.<sup>45</sup> Lastly Wilson notes the Stanleys’ presumed interest in literature through their ownership of a Chaucerian manuscript (MS. Fairfax 16) and the *Percy Folio* texts associated explicitly with the family.<sup>46</sup> Wilson admits that his evidence ‘probably of patronage but possibly of authorship’, is circumstantial, but suggests that the existence of the *Folio*’s *GK* supports his theory:

Perhaps in *The Green Knight*’s reference to the castle of Hutton we may see not only a reference to the Stanleys at Hooton, but a recollection of *Sir Gawain and the Green Knight*’s original connection with the family, updated to take account of its move from Storeton to Hooton (which presumably cannot have been before 1396 when Margery de Hooton’s father, Sir William, died).<sup>47</sup>

My own research, set out below, while adding nothing to Wilson’s arguments concerning a possible Stanley connection with *SGGK*, does not detract from the idea that the *Folio*’s *GK* may have been composed under Stanley patronage.

After the adventure of the ‘grene knight’ is over, the terminal *explicatio* reveals that *the entire tale* has been told in order to explain a custom followed by the Knights of the Bath:

all the Court was full faine,  
aliue when they saw Sir Gawaine;  
they thanked god abone.  
that is the matter & the case  
why Knights of the bathe weare the lace  
vntill they haue wonen their shoen,  
or else a ladye of hye estate  
from about his necke shall it take  
for the doughtye deeds that hee hath done.<sup>48</sup>

PF 71: sts. 86-7

This is perhaps a modification of *SGGK* where the Lady’s girdle is adopted by the Round Table as a sign of their brotherhood (l. 2516). But here the relation of the Arthurian lace to a contemporary custom anachronistic to the tale’s narrative time brings the lace and the knights forward into a full focus that is not found in the probable source. As Speed

---

40. Coward, *Stanleys*, p. 91; T.C. Porteus, ‘The Hundred of Leyland in Lancashire’, *Chetham Society*, NS 90 (1931), 34.

41. *Victoria History: Lancashire*, III, 247-57.

42. E. Wilson, ‘*Sir Gawain and the Green Knight* and the Stanley Family of Stanley, Storeton and Hooton’, *Review of English Studies*, NS 30 (1979), 308-316.

43. Wilson, p. 312.

44. Wilson, p. 312.

45. Wilson, p. 312, p. 315.

46. Wilson, p. 315.

47. Wilson, p. 315.

points out, it associates knighthood in the past with knighthood in the present.<sup>49</sup> This association appears to be wholly original to the *GK* poet.<sup>50</sup> Why? Why should the poet have chosen at this important climactic point not to repeat or recast the sense of *SGGK*? Why should he have chosen instead to focus attention on the Knights of the Bath and by means of a very flattering Arthurian association? The only logical answer seems to be because the topic had become a particular subject of interest to the poet, perhaps his audience and, as Speed suggests, in all probability, a specific prospective patron.<sup>51</sup> If for the moment, the assumption is granted that this interest was likely to be the result of a local dignitary's elevation to the Order, the next question is why should he use the tale about Gawain and the Green Knight? I think that there are several reasons.

First: with its topographical references it is a tale that is probably familiar to the people of the area and therefore carries the authority of the known. Secondly, since the tale is already set in a specific area the poet can easily introduce congruent specific localities designed to be pleasing to a patron. Thirdly, and most importantly, the poet recognises in *SGGK* the existence of several features which need only the minimum of polishing to become a part of the custom he wishes to celebrate. The relevance of the poetic 'lace' to the Order of the Bath has been shown in the accompanying footnotes but there is another connection with the actual ceremony: 'The King shall put his arms about the neck of the Squire [who is being knighted], and lifting up his right hand he shall smite the Squire in the neck, saying thus, 'Be ye a good Knight', kissing him.'<sup>52</sup> This is a very close parallel to the Green Knight's blow.

The detail and the accuracy of the knowledge of the ceremony which I have shown

- 
48. The poet's statement that the white lace (a part of their formal attire) may be removed by a knight or a noble lady only when the wearer has performed some notable deed, is accurate. J.W. Hales, 'Introduction to *GK*', *Bishop Percy's Folio Manuscript*, (London, 1868; facsim. Detroit, 1968), II, 56-58. See also N.H. Nicolas, 'Bath', *History*, pp. 26 -27 who quotes a French formulary from BL. Cotton Nero, C. ix (which also contains an English translation),

*'The Manner of Making Knights after the Custom of England . . . that is, Knights of the Bath'*

'This noble new Knight anon shall be arrayed with a robe of blue . . . and he shall have upon the left shoulder, a white lace of silk hanging, and that lace he shall keep in that wise . . . unto that time he get him some [name] of worship by deserving, by witness . . . clearly reported: which report must enter into the ears of the worthy Prince, which hath made him knight . . . or else of some noble Lady for to take away the lace.'

See also Froissart, *Oevres*, ed. Kervyn de Lettenhove, vol. 16, p. 205:

. . . et leur donna longues cotes verts á estroites manches, fourrés de menu vair et grans chapperons parauls fourrés [sic] de menu vair á guise de prélat, et avoient lesdis chevaliers sus la senestre espaule ung double cordel de soye blanche á blanches houppes pendans.

49. *Romances*, ed. D. Speed, I, 236.
50. The extraordinariness of the *explicatio* is underlined both by the poet's apparently conventional respect for the need to have an accepted *auctoritas*, and by the findings of the paradigm which underline the generally accepted belief that early redactors would not invent fictions that grossly alter their source.
51. *Romances*, ed. Speed, II, 322.
52. Nicolas, 'Bath', *History*, p. 25, citing Cotton MS. Nero, C.ix, fol. 168, collated with other copies. J. Anstis, *Observations Introductory to an Historical Essay upon the Knighthood of the Bath* (London, 1725), remarks and is cited by Nicolas, that the white silk is in heraldic terms, emblematic of 'that immaculate honour' which the Knight is 'inviolably obliged to preserve and maintain', and the King's Blow on the neck is to remind the Knight that he 'ought not to be insensible of any indignity or affront: that honour is a tender point'.



the poem has, is not such as is likely to have been gathered other than by an eyewitness. According to the reports of the ceremony as laid down in the authorities I have cited, the only interested persons likely to have been eyewitnesses were the knight himself and his esquires. It is not of course possible at this temporal distance to know who wrote *GK* or for whose benefit, but it was I think almost certainly intended to please one of those regional Knights named by Nicholas as having been honoured within a decade of the turn of the century, and there is a possibility that it may have been written for a Stanley.<sup>53</sup>

In the foregoing discussions I have argued that *GK* is conservative, traditional and with little intellectual content: I believe that, as has been established is the case for much of the *Folio*, the poem was composed for the entertainment of the people of the counties about the west and north-west midlands — in particular perhaps for the dependants and followers of a magnate with large country estates. The alteration of the geography of *SGGK* in *GK*, has almost certainly been done because the new localities hold some significance. The most probable likelihood is that the places are known to the audience: the second possibility is that the poet's implication that these places once had a venerable Arthurian connection is a delicate piece of flattery towards a patron - perhaps the Stanleys.

## B. Conclusions

- I. Although the general 'shape' of any poem can be observed simply by reading it, the analysis of *PF 71* in terms of the *Durham* paradigm, clearly demonstrates (as it did for the previous historical texts) the manner in which the poet manipulates his matter to achieve a finished product. The analysis permits the details of the poet's arrangement of his 'facts' and structure to be more clearly seen than is possible through a simple reading. The observation of the protosource set beside the finished redaction and the method used to complete its rearrangement, shows not only what has been done and how, but reveals something of why and in general terms, for whom. This intimation of wider authorial purpose is also present in the studies made in previous chapters of this work. It would therefore appear that application of the *Durham* paradigm may serve to bring forward extra-textual information which is not immediately evident from the narrative in texts other than rhymed historical entertainment.
- II. The examination of *The grene knight* in the light of the *Durham* paradigm, shows that there is only one single paradigmatic item which is not relevant to it — in *PF 71* dialogue *does* help to forward the action (*Item 10*). Because *GK* is roughly

---

53. It is believed by some scholars that *SGGK* and *GK* were written as a Christmas/New Year celebration — perhaps as a complement to some particular occasion. One such occasion was for example, on the 14th of November, 1491, when Sir Thomas Stanley became a Knight of the Bath — his esquires were Thomas Neville and George Bekynsall. (N.H. Nicolas, *History of the Orders of Knighthood of the British Empire*, (London, 1842), III, Appendix, 'Chronological List', xi). It is noticeable that other than the Stanley noted above, there are only two knights within three decades either side of 1500 who were admitted to the Order and who *may* have been from Lancashire or Cheshire. These men were (1491) Sir Edward Trafford of Dunham and (1501) Sir Philip Bothe, who may have been one of the Booths of Massey. (N.H. Nicolas, *History of the Orders of Knighthood* III, Appendix, ix. Coward. *Stanleys*, pp. 112-15 cites the leading families of Lancashire and Cheshire.) There is no concrete evidence but because, one, the dates are compatible, two, the Stanleys were great magnates in the region from which the text stems, three, the properties mentioned in the tale may be Stanley estates, and four, since the *Folio* is a repository of Stanley poems, there is a possibility that *PF 71* may be another.

contemporary with *Durham*, this agreement supports the inference derived from my previous studies: paradigmatic accordance is at least partially a function of textual date of origin. It also suggests that this conclusion may be relevant for rhymed popular texts with other than a formal historical topic.

**TABLE 12.** *Stylistic Structure of 'The grene knight'*

Motifeme	Allomotif	Scene	Theme (Episode)		
1. <i>Exhortation</i>	a. Listen!	Threat			
2. <i>Scene setting</i> (Embedded: <i>Explication</i> )	a. Naming: King Arthur b. Locating: Britain c. Origin of Round Table d. Naming: Queen Guinevere				
3. <i>Arrival</i>	a. Many knights come for Xmas b. They set up tents and feast				
4. <i>Scene-setting</i>	a. Naming: Bredbeddle b. Locating: West country c. Naming: Gawain d. Bredbeddle's wife loves Gawain e. She has never met him f. She loves him for his valour g. Naming: Lady's Mother (Agostes) h. She is a witch				
5. <i>Despatch</i>	a. Agostes sends Villain to Court b. He is magically disguised c. He is to bring Hero to her daughter d. He is to test Hero's chivalric worth				
6. <i>Departure</i>	a. In early morning mounts good steed b. He is armed c. He is all green				
7. <i>Arrival</i>	a. Xmas Day Villain comes to Carlisle				
8. <i>Greeting</i> (Embedded: <i>Admittance</i> )	a. Porter greets Villain b. Villain asks to see Arthur c. Porter tells Arthur d. Arthur bids Porter admit him e. Villain greets Arthur				
9. <i>Challenge</i> (Embedded: <i>Permission</i> )	a. "I come to prove your knights" b. "You may, on foot or on horse" c. "He can try to strike off my head who will let me do the same in a year" d. Who is doughty enough to agree? e. I shall tell of the Chapel where I'll be"			Open Challenge	Honour Tested
10. <i>Boast</i>	a. Kay boasts of beheading Villain b. His boast is not accepted c. He is told to shut up				
11. <i>Acceptance</i>	a. Hero asks leave to accept b. Leave given c. Bout arranged for after the meal d. Villain feasted				
12. <i>Preparation</i>	a. Arthur wishes Hero good luck				
13. <i>Combat</i> (1st Blow)	a. Hero beheads Villain				
14. <i>Departure</i>	a. Villain picks up head b. Mounts horse c. Reminds Hero of his covenant d. Goes to the door e. Shakes hands with Arthur f. Leaves				
15. <i>Discomfiture</i> (Embedded: <i>Boast</i> )	a. Court is upset b. Hero Boasts: i) Not afraid: ii) Will seek Chapel c. Court agrees this is right d. Court swears revenge if Hero overcome	Battle (1st Blow)			
16. <i>Arrival</i> (Embedded: <i>Exhortation</i> )	a. Villain arrives home b. Says nothing of his deeds c. Knows his wife loves Hero d. Listen to the next fit				

**Fitt two:** 'The grene knight' (continued)

Motifeme	Allomotif	Scene	Theme (Episode)		
17. <i>Departure</i>	a. Hero's departure day arrives b. Court upset: King ill, Queen faints c. Hero in armour mounts steed d. Equipment gold or bejewelled	Hidden Challenge (Bargain)			
18. <i>Journey</i>	a. Hero's gear shone as he rode b. He saw many wonders				
19. <i>Arrival</i>	a. Evening, and Hero arrives at a castle b. Greets its lord and asks for lodging				
20. <i>Welcome</i>	a. Hero led to bright, warm chamber b. Supper provided with Lord & Lady				
21. <i>Exchange of Vows</i> (Embedded: Narrator's comment: Warning)	a. Lord questions Hero who tells all b. He doesn't know his host is the Villain! c. Villain says the Chapel is nearby d. Warns that the master is a magic-user e. Tells Hero to stay and rest f. He is going hunting on the morrow g. Hero and Villain promise to divide whatever each gains during the day				
22. <i>Scene Setting</i>	a. Villain out hunting; Hero in bed			Hidden Challenge (Temptation)	Honour Tested (continued)
23. <i>Seduction</i>	a. Agostes brings Lady to Hero b. Lady kisses him thrice c. "I will die if you spurn me"				
24. <i>Magic Gift</i>	a. Hero refuses to dishonour husband b. Also he has a task to perform c. Lady offers magic lace for protection d. Hero accepts it				
25. <i>Exchange of Gains</i> (Embedded: Narrator's Comment)	a. Villain returns with spoil b. Gives venison to Hero c. Asks what Hero has won d. Hero surrenders three kisses e. He keeps the lace f. It was the only wrong he did			Response (to Bargain)	
26. <i>Departure</i>	a. Morning, and Hero leaves b. Villain, now green, goes another way			Battle (2nd Blow)	
27. <i>Arrival</i>	a. On a plain Hero hears horn b. Sees the Chapel on a mount c. Hears Villain sharpening a blade				
28. <i>Welcome</i>	a. Villain welcomes Hero				
29. <i>Combat</i> (2nd Blow)	a. Villain asks Hero to stoop b. Villain strikes and makes small cut				
30. <i>Defeat</i>	a. Bredbeddle says Hero flinched b. Hero draws sword c. Challenges Bredbeddle to find him false d. He does: Gawain hid the lace e. Therefore he was wounded a little f. Bredbeddle asks to be taken to Court g. Gawain does so	Revelation of Test			
31. <i>Terminal Status-Quo</i> (Embedded: Explication)	a. Court is glad to see Gawain b. This is why the Bath Knights wear a lace c. When spurs are won it is removed d. Custom begun by Arthur at Gawain's asking				
32. <i>Valediction</i>	a. Explicit b. Prayer: Bless those who have heard this tale				

## IV. Form and tradition: 'The grene knight'

### *Introduction*

The question of the validity of the terms 'hero' and 'villain' for the chief protagonist and antagonist in *PF 71* is very important. It will be noted that in the preceding motifemic table, where narrative evidence available to audience perception suggests their rôles, I have referred to Bredbeddle and Gawain in terms of function: when it becomes apparent that the obvious rôle allocation is erroneous, I have referred to the two characters by their names.

For the purpose of this examination, it is necessary for readers to disregard any knowledge they may have of the plot or complementary units of *GK* prior to their revelation through the progress of the story. If the motifemic structure of the poem is studied from the viewpoint of an audience hearing the tale for the first time, it is evident that we are initially intended to believe Gawain and Bredbeddle to be representations of the traditional *hero* and *villain*. It will be shown that the motifemic structure of the text upholds the deception until the dénouement when it is seen that neither Gawain nor Bredbeddle conform to conventional expectations. It will be shown that the allomotific components of *terminal status-quo* are arranged to suit the characters' newly revealed modified rôles.

### A. *The Motifemes*

#### a. *Exhortation*

This motifeme contains the essential nuclear component, the *exhortation* itself and the peripheral component *moral*. The *exhortation* is present as the minimal allomotif 'List!' and the *moral* is given as an 'explication'. This, as a component of the opening motifeme, is unusual: I have not found another example of it in this position. Nevertheless the apparently embedded 'explication' relating to the equality of the knights of the Round Table is I think, a vestigial *moral*: it teaches the lesson that a king's nobles ought not to squabble for eminence amongst themselves: that rank alone does not merit honour. This *moral* is completed in the 'explication' found in the terminal *valediction* which points out that the Knights of the Bath are equal until they have performed a meritorious deed: in short, that honour must be earned. This is the basic theme of *PF 71: The grene knight*.

*Exhortation* does not contain the optional components *prayer*, *source*, or *synopsis*: the apparently vestigial presence of the latter is deceptive. There seems to be a *synopsis* which has been assimilated into the functions of the motifeme of *histoire*, *scene-setting*, and the motifeme of *discours*, *announcement-of-scene-change*.<sup>54</sup> *Synopsis* can be seen as having drifted from its associate component *exhortation* allowing the motifemes *explication* and *arrival* to intervene before achieving its ultimate placement in stanza 7. Thus *exhortation* is made to appear as structurally complex as it is in *PF 25: Scottish Feilde* — which also

---

54. Wittig, *Narrative Structures*, p. 61, refers to this as the *now-we-leave-and-turn-to* motifeme: with reference to this study I have preferred to use a broader term relating to motifemic function rather than syntagmemic detail.

encompasses drift, assimilation and embedding. However in *PF 71* the apparent complexity is false: the illusion is partly brought about by the brevity of the motifemes occurring between the opening *exhortation* and the first occurrence of *scene-change*. This last motifeme is a unit of *discours*: conventionally it consists of a statement to the effect that the narrator will now cease to speak of 'x' and will go on to speak of 'y'. Normally this allomotif cannot appear as a vestigial *synopsis* of *exhortation* because its natural positioning is some distance into the *histoire*. However because in *PF 71* there are only a few intervening stanzas between the beginning of the poem and the apparent *synopsis* it is seemingly possible that the motifeme demonstrates the drift, embedding and assimilation seen in *Scotish*.<sup>55</sup> That it does not is evident through an examination of the content of the actual lines:

Now of King Arthur noe more I mell  
but of a venterous knight I will you tell  
that dwelled in the west countrie. . . .

*PF 71*: st. 7

It has nowhere been suggested that the synoptic content of this motifemic component should refer to the whole of the tale about which the narrator is to speak, and in fact, many Romance *synopsis* units do concentrate on a single aspect of the plot: from that point of view there is nothing to inhibit the interpretation of the above lines as an allomotif of *synopsis*.<sup>56</sup> However, regardless of the depth of the actual summary, as a component of the opening motifeme *exhortation* it must occur before any story has been narrated, and therefore it can only look forward. The fact which prevents the identification of the above quoted lines as an opening *synopsis*, is contained in Wittig's observation that the motifeme which marks divisions of the story (my *scene-change*), is a 'two-slot' unit.<sup>57</sup> That is to say the complete motifeme will be dichotomic: in *GK* it will mention both the topic the poet has just discussed and the topic to which he now proposes to turn. The apparent 'synopsis' in stanza 7 fulfils this requirement and since as I have shown, the synoptic component of *exhortation* cannot look back, the lines being discussed are *scene-change*.

Thus the opening motifeme does not deviate from convention sufficiently to give notice that the narrator is not about to relate a tale which will comply with traditional audience expectation in every way.

b. *Valediction*

This motifeme contains the nuclear and obligatory component *prayer* and the peripheral and optional components *explicit* and *moral*: it omits only *source*.

The *explicit* and *prayer* follow Romance conventions:

Thus endeth the tale of the greene Knight.

- 
55. There are three intervening stanzas between *synopsis* and *moral*, and five between *synopsis* and the component *exhortation*.
56. As was noted in Chapter Two of this study, in a *synopsis* the narrator might speak only of the principal character, or of the principal character and his associates; he might give a brief outline of the hero's qualities, or perhaps a preview of events to be described. For Romance examples see Wittig, *Narrative Structures*, pp. 54-57.
57. Wittig, *Narrative Structures*, p. 61

god, that is soe full of might,  
to heauen their soules bring  
that haue hard this litle storye.

PF 71: st. 88

The *moral* has drifted and is embedded within the preceding motifeme, *terminal status-quo*. As its counterpart in the opening *exhortation*, so here also *moral* is presented as an ‘explication’. That it is a lesson is plainly stated by the poet:

that is the matter & the case  
why Knights of the bathe weare the lace. . . .

PF 71: st. 86

The classification as a motifemic component is not affected because the connection between the tale and the ‘explication’ is not clearly set out but must be inferred: the knights wear the lace as a symbol of equality until they have merited its removal: Honour must be earned and thereafter maintained. Gawain acquired the lace through his failure to maintain the standard: the Knights of the Bath wear it both as a symbol of equality and as a reminder to those who have earned its removal, that like Gawain, they too can lapse unless they guard the reason for their new status. The message that simply *being* a knight is not in itself a sufficient reason for high consequence, connects this terminal lesson with that with which the poem started.

c. *Terminal status-quo*

The presentation of this motifeme in *GK* is interesting in its relationship to the story. Conventionally *terminal status-quo* concerns the condition of the characters after the ‘adventure’ is over. It has especial reference to personal rewards or general benefits — which are always the perquisites of the protagonists: the antagonists are always either killed, captured, released from enchantment or, in special cases, converted. They are *never* rewarded. Yet in *PF* 71 the only person to be rewarded in the sense that a favour is granted and his personal status is consequently improved, is Gawain’s opponent, Bredbeddle, the Green Knight. Bredbeddle is, at his own request, introduced to Arthur’s court by Gawain. Both Benson and Kittredge believe that he then becomes the King’s vassal and/or a member of the Round Table.<sup>58</sup> Because of the previously mentioned confusion of noun and pronoun in *GK*, there is an additional factor which adds weight to the nature of Bredbeddle’s ‘reward’. This is a possible alternative interpretation to the apparent statement that Arthur initiated the custom of the Knights of the Bath wearing a lace:

Knights of the bathe weare the lace  
vntill they haue wonen their shoen,  
or else a ladye of hye estate  
from about his necke shall it take  
for the doughtye deeds that hee hath done.  
it was confirmed by Arthur the King  
(thorow Sir Gawains desiringe),  
The King granted him his boone.  
Thus endeth the tale of the greene Knight.

PF 71: sts. 86-88

---

58. Benson, *Art and Tradition*, pp. 35, 74; Kittredge, *Study*, p. 130

It is possible to interpret the last four lines as meaning that through Gawain's patronage the King granted Bredbeddle a boon — which in Arthurian convention can only be the satisfaction of the highest of 'good' knights' chivalric ambitions: to be admitted to the Round Table. However if these four lines are to be interpreted at their face value then Gawain, even if he is doubtfully seen as the first of the Knights of the Bath, is 'rewarded' by having a boon granted which publicly records his lapse. Undoubtedly this does much for the reinstatement of his Honour but it is hardly the conventional allomotif of the component *hero* of *status-quo*. (Note too that if the four lines refer to Bredbeddle then Gawain is not rewarded at all). Thus it appears that far from having been totally overcome as he should traditionally have been, the allomotif *rank* is applied to *villain* while *hero* receives *humiliation*. The answer is that Bredbeddle is a pseudo-villain and Gawain is a flawed-hero. At the end of the adventure, through the manipulation of this motifeme, their status in respect of one to the other is seen to be more nearly equal than was apparent at the beginning of the poem.

The penultimate component of this motifeme, *associates*, is missing. However, as in *SGGK*, it is possible to see a curtailed representative of the last component, *populace*, in the Court in general and their joy and gladness after the termination of the adventure.

d. *Boast*

i. *T-brag*

Sir Kay's outburst is not a *T-brag*:

"I shall strike his necke in tooe  
the head away the body froe!"

*PF* 71: st. 28

It is made in the presence of the challenger and therefore is a *reply-to-challenge*. The *T-brag* is seldom a function of the hero as it is almost always a 'vaunting of intention' on the part of the villain. Therefore the sentiment expressed by the Royal Court is not a true *T-brag* either because it is dependent upon a conditional conjunction and it is uttered by a group composed of 'good' characters:

all they swore together in fere,  
that and Sir Gawain over come were,  
they would bren all the west.

*PF* 71: st. 42

ii. *I-brag*

The *I-brag* is normally an expression indicating that the hero will if necessary, fight until he dies. It is said to encourage others, demonstrate the valour of the speaker's 'side' or demonstrate the speaker's personal worth. It is tied to the hero. Gawain's speech fulfils all but one of these criteria:

Sir Gawain comfort King and Queen  
& all the doughtye there be deene —  
he bade the[y] shold be still;  
said, "of my deed I was neuer feard  
nor yett I am nothing adread,  
I swere by St. Michaell;



for when draweth toward my day  
I will dress me in mine array  
my promise to fulfill.”

PF 71: sts. 39-40

Unless the reference to ‘my day’ refers to the last day of Gawain’s life, ‘death’ is not mentioned: it is rendered unnecessary by the fact that he and the audience believe that he will keep an appointment to be executed. These lines are a modified *I-brag*.

iii. *Gloat*

1. *Right*

This component is certainly present but it is given in a new form: *negative-right*. Conventionally the hero completely overcomes the villain because the hero is ‘right’. Here the victory is only partial (the hero is not killed but on the other hand the ‘villain’ is in no way discommoded) because the ‘hero’s’ conduct is *not* wholly ‘right’. This is not made plain until the end of the poem after the combat is over. Prior to this Gawain has been shown as a conventional *hero*. In order to maintain the surprise the poet has had to present this motifemic component as a ‘negative’ rather than ignore it. Likewise the villain normally loses because he upholds, or is, ‘wrong’: Bredbeddle, as is also made clear at the end of the text, is honourable; his character in fact has no stain even though he has seemingly played the rôle of *villain*.

B. *Conclusions*

- I. At least one component of each of the traditional motifemes has been modified. The *moral* of the *exhortation* is an ‘explication’ which contains half of the lesson finally completed in the *moral* of the *valediction* — also as an ‘explication’. The *terminal status quo* apparently rewards the wrong character. The *I-brag* does not directly refer to the hero’s death but is nevertheless a correct motifemic component of *boast*. Finally, *right* is made a negative component of *gloat*.

These manipulated motifemes show the poet’s subtle intelligence: to satisfy conventional audience expectation they have to be present but the poet is severely handicapped by having as his leading characters a pseudo-villain and a flawed-hero whose actual status — which cannot be revealed before the end of the poem — is not very disparate. If the poet were to complete the *moral* component of *exhortation* he would have a problem: too much detail might intimate to the audience the rôle deception practiced by his leading characters and lessen the effective impact of the climactic revelations. Therefore the poet cites only the first half of his aphorism: ‘Rank alone does not merit Honour’. When the story is over he adds the remainder: ‘Honour must be earned and maintained’.

It is difficult to assign heroic or villainous motifemic components to villains or heroes who are not what they seem. It would appear to have been possible for the poet to have taken no notice of their true rôles and given Bredbeddle a hearty *T-brag* and Gawain a splendid *I-brag*: such a course of action would firmly but wrongly identify each character and, at the dénouement the audience would feel cheated. It seems tentatively likely that the traditional rules were strict and that it

was incumbent on a poet to ignore disguises and so forth and only assign motifemic components appropriate to the character in his proper persona. On noting this fact I searched fifty-eight Romances and was quite unable to discover an example when the hero or villain, dissembling, is given a motifemic component to match his assumed rôle. This being so it does seem as though this study of *GK* has led to a new insight regarding traditional stylistic structure: that motifemes applicable to a given character-type must be linked with that character regardless of apparently contradictory plot-devices. Thus the *GK* poet has slightly altered each motifeme so that in each the truth is obscured — but is nevertheless present. It is apparent that the *GK* poet was a finer craftsman than has until now been thought.

- II. It is the virtually unanimous opinion of the few scholars who have commented on both *GK* and *SGGK* that the former is an inferior variant of the tale told in the latter. *GK* is a poem they say, from which ‘all the mystery, suspense and power have evaporated’; ‘a very degraded version’; ‘a good example of the worst that the popularisers were capable of; ‘none of the literary distinction which marks its model’.<sup>59</sup> There is no doubt that compared to ‘the crown — the masterpiece of a whole school of poetry’ [*SGGK*], *PF* 71 is inferior.<sup>60</sup> The trouble is that the school of thought that believes that *GK* is a ‘degraded’ *SGGK* arrive at this opinion through false propositions. First, the *Aesthetic Fallacy* which ‘attempts to organise an empirical enquiry upon aesthetic criteria’.<sup>61</sup> This applies to those critics, such as Ackerman and Newstead who criticise *GK* in terms of the aesthetic qualities which *SGGK* has — but which *GK* does not have. They ignore the fact that it has other qualities of its own and dismiss the whole poem as being ‘of consummate idiocy and banality’.<sup>62</sup>

Secondly, the *Fallacy of Archetypes* which ‘conceptualizes change in terms of the re-enactment of the primordial archetypes’.<sup>63</sup> I interpret this to mean that because *PF* 71 tells a similar story to *SGGK*, many critics have assumed that it must therefore be a version of the latter written with the same purpose and directives: since it differs from the archetypes (*SGGK* and its sources) the reworked text must therefore be degenerate.<sup>64</sup>

---

59. R. Ackerman, ‘English Romances’ *Arthurian Literature*, ed. R.S. Loomis, p. 497; J. Speirs, *Mediaeval English Poetry: The Non-Chaucerian Tradition*, (London, 1971), p. 201; D. Pearsall, *Old English and Middle English Poetry* (London, 1977) p. 262; H. Newstead, ‘Arthurian Legends’, *Manual*, ed. J. Burke-Severs, I, 57.

60. J. Speirs, *Mediaeval Poetry*, p. 216.

61. D.H. Fischer, *Historian’s Fallacies: Towards a Logic of Historical Thought* (London, 1971), p. 87ff.

62. D. Pearsall, *OE and ME Poetry*, p. 262.

Note for instance the terms in which L.H. Loomis describes *SGGK* and which give some idea of the qualities which are then sought for in *GK*:

With the exception of Chaucer’s *Troilus and Criseyde*, no other Middle English Romance approaches its artistic and spiritual maturity, its brilliant realism, its dramatic vigour, its poetic sensitivity to nuances of word and mood, its humour, its nobility of spirit.

*Arthurian Literature*, ed. R.S. Loomis, p. 528.

See also: R. Ackerman, ‘English Romances’, *Arthurian Literature*, ed. R.S. Loomis, pp. 497-98; H. Newstead, ‘Arthurian Legends’, *Manual*, ed. J. Burke-Severs, pp. 57-8.

63. D.H. Fischer, *Fallacies*, p. 150ff.

Thirdly, the *Fallacy of Cross-grouping* which is the assessment of one group (or thing) in terms of another group (or thing).<sup>65</sup> This seems to sum up the whole problem: *GK* is almost invariably assessed in terms relating to *SGGK* which are not relevant to it since it is not an alliterative masterpiece; it is not written with heavy dialectal emphasis; it does not contain a large amount of deep *sententiae*, and the meaning of the poem is not so obscure that there are almost as many interpretations as there are critics.<sup>66</sup>

Briefly, I suggest that if *GK* is viewed as a Romance *per se*, it can be allowed that the *PF 71* poet does not appear to have intended to follow *SGGK* closely and that he did not want his work to have the same 'mystery, power and suspense' &c. as its antecedent: that in fact he was writing a different poem for a different audience and from a different point of view: in short, that *The grene knight* is worthy of some praise in its own right.

The poet set out, as I have shown, to write a short, fast-moving, and entertaining rhymed tale for a specific audience. He succeeded in fulfilling his intention very well. He has simplified the essentials of the Gawain story that he wished to include, omitted matters he did not, and added material of his own to make a 'new' poem.

I have shown that the *PF 71* poet has omitted or condensed the repetitious or esoteric matter of *SGGK*. But it is noticeable that despite the disapproval of some scholars, the early revelation of Bredbeddle's apparent motives, his magic powers, his identity and his address, alleviates some of the apprehension and perhaps fear of the supernatural which the audience might feel. It does *not* remove the mystery, the tension and suspense, but merely concentrates it mainly on Gawain both as subject and object. The mystery and suspense in *GK* is suitable to the tastes of a practical audience of no great intellectual persuasion: 'How will Gawain keep his word and yet not be killed?', 'How will Bredbeddle get Gawain to his castle?', 'What will happen to him at this castle?'. These questions are in fact made more acute because the poet has given the audience advance notice that Bredbeddle is a magic-user, that he has an ulterior motive in enticing him to his home. The early knowledge that Bredbeddle's wife loves Gawain supports the conventional expectation of some sexual activity in the story. The revelation of the Lady's feelings for Gawain occurring early in the poem as a deliberate adaptation of the conventional 'lure', supports the idea that the poem is addressed to the predominantly male audience suggested by other factors in the text.

The omission of the matter of the pentangle is a reflection of the *GK* poet's

---

64. A critic who suggests that *GK* might be written for a different purpose and might not be a sadly mangled version of *SGGK* is J.R. Hulbert, 'Syr Gawayn and the Grene Knyzt', *Modern Philology*, XIII (1915-16), pp. 433-462, 689-730. On the other hand Kittredge, taking the popular view even goes so far as to present some remarkably unconvincing lexical 'proof' that *GK* was taken directly from *SGGK*: *Study*, pp. 282-89.

65. Fischer, *Fallacies*, p. 236ff.

66. Benson, *Art and Tradition*, p. 207; R.S. Loomis, *Arthurian Romance*, pp. 163-165, lists some of the theories as to *SGGK*'s meaning. There is no evidence, but the possibility remains that scholars, in their assessment of *PF 71*, have been unwittingly influenced by two other fallacies: the *Antiquarian Fallacy* which states that if a thing is 'old' it must be better than its descendants, and the *Fallacy of the Prevalent Proof*, which assumes that the current opinion held by many cannot be wrong.

estimation of his audience's ability and desire to 'reason' and suggests its limited intellectual taste. In *SGGK* the pentangle stands 'bytoknyng of trowþe' (l. 626); it is appropriate to Gawain because:

Gawan watz for gode knawen, and as golde pured,  
Voyded of vche vylany, wyth vertuez ennoured  
in mote;  
Forþy þe pentangle nwe  
He berin schelde and cote,  
As tulk of tale most trwe  
And gentylest knyȝt of lote.

*SGGK*: ll. 633-39.

The *SGGK* poet continues to detail Gawain's perfections, his love of the Virgin Mary and her connection with the pentangle. The end result is that his audience is left in no doubt that Gawain is the ultimate in human goodness and purity and rides 'on Godez halue' (l. 692). If then Gawain is the epitome of all virtues and under the protection of God, Mary and the pentangle, a worldly and practical audience, a) might well think it cheating when, at the end, this paragon is shown to have lapsed; b) it might prefer to have a leading character with whom it can to some extent identify, rather than an improbable model of excellence and c) find the resolution of the plot more credible if the hero is not set up on quite so high a pedestal at the beginning. Thus this one omission underlines the suggestion that *PF 71* is intended for the broad entertainment of a generally unsophisticated audience and perhaps shows that the poet is not without skill in manipulating his poem towards pleasing a specific group of people. As I have shown, unlike much of *SGGK* the poem is written *in ordine naturale* and the 'fictions' introduced into *GK* are also for the most part present to make the story more credible to the audience — believable and human motivations are provided, the characters behave according to current polite etiquette, a little sexual anticipation is added and a little humour with the familiar Sir Kay. The result is that the poem is brought closer to earthy reality and is given a warm immediacy that *SGGK* lacks. This does not mean that the poem is crude. It is in its own way quite as subtle and as sensitive as the protosource, and whilst due to the errors of transmission it no longer has perfect stanzaic form, the entire poem displays the same satisfying circularity as *SGGK* as it begins and ends with Arthur's Court and an 'explication'.

In summary, *The grene knight* has suffered through the existence of *SGGK* and the necessarily derogatory comparisons between the two. Taken as a poem in its own right and ignoring the minor errors of transmission, it is well-made. It is logical, fast-moving, interesting — both in its matter and the poet's manipulation of theme and stylistic structures — conventional in some aspects and unconventional in others, and it is good entertainment. In short it does not deserve the brusque dismissal given to it by *SGGK* scholars.

## V. PF 135: 'The Squier'

### A. Introduction

*The Squier* is a variant of *The Squyer of Lowe Degre*.<sup>67</sup> This latter text only exists in Copland's printed edition (c.1555-1560) and Wynkyn de Worde's fragment (c.1520) corresponding to lines 1-60, 301-420.<sup>68</sup> *SLD* dates from about 1450 and probably originated in the East Midlands.<sup>69</sup> It contains 1132 lines written in octosyllabic couplets. Mead presents it with no stanzaic division; Sands divides it into sections of varying length.<sup>70</sup> However on close and careful examination it becomes apparent that *SLD* was almost certainly originally written in stanzaic form — probably in the 8-line stanzas which now predominate over the occasional 6-line or 10-line divisions.<sup>71</sup>

*The Squier* has 170 lines in octosyllabic couplets and written in four-stress long-metre. There is no evidence to say whether like *SLD*, *Squier* also stems from the East Midlands, but there is a faint impression of a possible northern influence where the rhyme seems to require a phonetic spelling (shown in square brackets) in the following instances: 'man' [mon], 'bone' [bane], 'gone' [gane], 'home' [hame]. *PF* 135 is, not unexpectedly, slightly corrupt. This is seen in the presence of self-evidently omitted lines (which will be discussed presently), in a sprinkling of false rhymes, and in at least one line where the sense has been muddled.<sup>72</sup>

Mead notes that *Squier* is a sixteenth century composition on the basis of 'the presence of words unknown' earlier than this period.<sup>73</sup> He does not list these words but they are 'casement' (st. 10) — a window, first noted appearance 1556; 'torcher' (st. 34) — one who gives light as by carrying a torch, 1601, and 'blade' (st. 30) — a gallant, a beau. 1592.<sup>74</sup> Thus it seems probable that *PF* 135 dates from the latter half of the sixteenth century. It is possible that it is derived from the edition printed by John King (fl. 1550-1562) after June, 1560 when he was so licensed.<sup>75</sup> No copy of this edition exists so it is not known whether it was closer to *SLD* or *Squier*: the comparative brevity of the *Folio* text does suggest however that it may have been derived from an early printed broadside. Other pointers suggesting a late date are presently noted in this study's discussion of the *Durham* paradigm and *Squier*'s motifemic construction.

The ensuing paragraphs discuss the relationship between the variant texts and conclude that *SLD* can be used as a comparative text for *The Squier*. Mead and other

---

67. *The Squier* (BL. Add. MS. 27879, fol. 221<sup>r</sup>-222<sup>r</sup>; *HF* III, 263), will henceforward be referred to as *Squier* and *The Squyer of Lowe Degre* as *SLD*. I have checked the *Squier*, found in both *HF* and *SLD*, ed. W.E. Mead (Boston, 1904), pp. 1-46, against the Percy manuscript and note that *HF* is the better reproduction. It has no inaccuracies whereas Mead has been 'modernised' and emended.

68. Worde's fragment is almost identical to Copland's text and will henceforward be ignored: all references to *SLD* are to be understood as referring to Copland's edition.

69. *SLD*, ed. Mead, p. lxxvi; J.E. Wells, *A Manual of the Writings in Middle English* (New Haven & London, 1916), p. 149; *Middle English Verse Romances*, ed. D.B. Sands (NY, 1966), p. 249.

70. *SLD*, ed. Mead, pp. 1-46; *Romances*, ed. Sands, pp. 251-78.

71. Because *SLD* is only relevant to this study insofar as it is the only comparable text to *Squier*, I do not propose to expand this observation further here.

72. 'Fome' [sea], to rhyme with 'Hungarye' (ll. 5-6); 'hind' [hende]/'mourning' [?'mournende] (ll. 35-6); 'First'/'next' (ll. 53-4); 'shame'/'home' [hame] (ll. 59-60); 'gone'/'man' [mon] (ll. 77-8); 'alone'/'man' (ll. 107-8); 'Frane'/'bone' [bane] (ll. 151-52).

As Mead notes (*SLD*, p. 96), in line 52 '... dresse you like & other wise knight', the poet is muddling the two ideas: "You must dress otherwise" and "You must dress like a knight".

73. Mead, *SLD*, p. lxxvii.

75. *Transcript of the Registers of the Stationers' Company*, 5 vols. 1554-1640, ed. E. Arber (London, 1875-1894; repr. New York, 1950), I, 48.

scholars believe that all the extant versions probably stem from a hypothetical original (**X**), of the fifteenth century.<sup>76</sup> This theory as to the existence of an original is perhaps supported a little by the following facts: first, the opening one hundred lines of *Squier* (omitting pronouns and tense modifiers) contain thirty words which are currently archaic in either form or meaning and which may have been derived from **X**. The results of previous analyses undertaken in this study show that the nearest comparable figures are thirty-nine in *Flodden* and forty-two in *Grene knight*. Both of these texts are known to have had an antecedent version, the lexis of which may have influenced the later copy. The result of an analysis of verbs, nouns and adjectives present in *PF* 135, shows a high percentage of lexemes immediately derived from Old English (78%); This figure is similar to those found earlier in this study for poems dating from within a decade or so of 1500 and/or which may have been influenced by the lexis of a precursory text.<sup>77</sup>

It is not clear whether *Squier* was condensed directly from *SLD*, from **X**, or from some other version. As Mead states:

Some fifty lines or more of **P** [*Squier*] are practically unrepresented in **C** [*SLD*], and of the lines that remain many present but a suggestion of what appears in the other version. Especially noticeable is the fact that details common to **C** and **P** are often introduced in an order by no means the same in the two versions.<sup>78</sup>

Furthermore, *Squier* contains narrative detail omitted from *SLD*, which was probably present in the original, **X**.<sup>79</sup> Because the *SLD* only exists in the two printed versions it is not possible to estimate the extent to which the texts have been emended by their redactors and how much of the content of the copies from which they worked has been discarded. Although there are a few verbal similarities between *Squier* and *SLD*, this can be accounted for if the expressions were present in the presumptive original. Since, pending the discovery of **X**, none of these points can be checked, it cannot be conclusively asserted that *SLD* is not the source for *Squier*. Therefore for the purpose of paradigmatic comparison, the former text will be utilised.

Before that analysis is made it is necessary to present some initial comparisons between *SLD* and *Squier* and to comment on the fact that they belong to two different

---

74. *OED*, *sv.* **Casement** 2, **Torcher** 1, **Blade** III, 11: there were no relevant entries in the *MED*. That 'blade' has this meaning is plain in the context where a play on words is apparent. The King (who knows the answer beforehand) asks his daughter for whom she mourns (st. 29). She replies obliquely that she is not mourning any man alive — she thinks she is being secretly truthful — she is mourning the loss of her knife. Her father, also obliquely as he knows she mourns the loss of her lover, says (st. 30):

“if itt be but a blade,  
I can gett another as good made.”

The Lady takes up the *double entendre* and continues it with an unspoken reference to God as Creator, which confirms the meaning of 'blade' as 'beau':

“Father” she sais, “there is neuer a smith but one  
that can smith you such a one.”

76. *SLD*, ed. Mead, p. lxxvii.

77. *Durham*: 70%, c.1515; *Scottish*: 78%, c.1515; *Flodden*: 71%, c.1515; *Grene knight*: 79%, c.1500. The date of *Aldingar* (with 80%) is not known and although the *Folio* text of *Barton* (with 70%), dates from about 1600, it is earlier argued that there is every probability that the event (which took place in 1511) was celebrated in an original poem to which the *PF* poet has added his alterations.

78. *SLD*, ed. Mead, p. xviii.

79. For instance, the reason why the *Squier* went to Hungary (ll. 1-6).

literary genres.

Editors commonly group *SLD* with the late Middle English Romances.<sup>80</sup> In fact it is debatable whether it belongs in this category or is a ‘maverick’ text. Its nature has been, and still is much discussed: Critics, exemplified by Kane, have seen *SLD* as: ‘a poetic and idealized expression of the life and setting of romantic chivalry . . . soft and richly lambent in its effects’.<sup>81</sup> However it has also been described as a ‘Travestie’ of the conventional theme *exile-and-return*; likened to Chaucer’s well known caricature *Sir Thopas*, and also seen as a burlesque of the mediaeval knighting ceremony.<sup>82</sup> It has been ‘admired for its sensuous beauty’ and summed up as a text which ‘recalls events in the life of Christ . . . and concepts of Christian theology’.<sup>83</sup> On the other hand Rivers, who sees *SLD* as a satire revolving around a ‘frigid virgin’ and a ‘mercenary upstart’, notes that some commentators have been ‘brief, hostile or patronising in their evaluations’.<sup>84</sup> In short *SLD* would appear to be a source of some scholarly controversy.

The *Squier*’s brevity and apparent simplicity is overshadowed by *SLD*’s more evident presence, and it has consequently received only the cursory attention that befits its received position as an independent but degenerate *SLD* variant.<sup>85</sup> This study looks at *Squier*’s independence and notes the manner in which it differs from *SLD*. The following discussion shows that *PF* 135 does not belong to the Romance.

The *SLD* text presents incidents in a mainly sequential order. However *PF* 135 has:

a startling abruptness in transitions which are inexplicable except on the hypothesis that **P** [*Squier*] owes its brevity in part to careless oral transmission.<sup>86</sup>

Whilst I agree with Mead that the *Squier* has a large oral component, I also agree with Pearsall who is the sole scholar to note that it is a ballad.<sup>87</sup> The literature has ignored Pearsall’s classification and I have seen no discussion of it anywhere: indeed, as I have

---

80. It is for example included in: *Middle English Metrical Romances*, ed. W.H. French and C.B. Hale (New York, 1930), pp. 721-755; *Romances*, ed. Sands, pp. 249-278.

81. G. Kane, *Middle English Literature: A Critical Study of the Romances* (1951; rpt. New York, 1970), p. 90.

82. A. Brandl, ‘Mittelenglische Literatur’, *Grundriss der Germanischen Philologie*, 2, 1 (1893), 697:  
Der Squire von niedrigem Rang . . . ist eigentlich nur ein Travestie auf die alten Exil- und Rückkehrromanen. . . . Die Geschichte is ein Seitenstück zum “Sir Thopas”.

K.S. Kiernan, ‘“Undo Your Door” and the Order of Chivalry’, *Studies in Philology*, 70, 4 (1973), 345-366. See also C. Fewster, *Traditionality and genre*, Ch. V; pp. 129-149.

83. H. Diehl, ‘“For no theves shall come thereto”: Symbolic Detail in the *Squyr of Lowe Degre*’, *American Benedictine Review*, 32, 2, (1981), 141, 155.

Diehl also cites other critics who praise the poem’s ‘surface beauty and realistic descriptions’: *ibid.*

84. B. Rivers, ‘The Focus of Satire in *The Squire of Low Degree*’, *English Studies in Canada*, VII, 4 (1981), 379, n.386.

85. That this *is* its position is evident from Hornstein’s sketch in Severs’ *Manual*: A full description of *SLD* is given which is concluded with: ‘The Percy Folio MS. contains an independent and corrupt version of 170 lines, titled *The Squier*.’ This is similar to the summaries given by all the critical scholars cited on this topic in this chapter. Hornstein, ‘Miscellaneous Romances’, *Manual*, ed. Severs, p. 157. In this present study, as with *The grene knight*, and for the same reason, critical references to *The squier*, are mainly taken from relatively early scholars.

86. *SLD*, ed. Mead, p. xix; D. Pearsall, ‘The Development of the Middle English Romance’, *Mediaeval Studies*, XXVII (1965), p. 92.

previously noted, those authors who mention *PF* 135 at all are unanimous in placing it among the Romances. Pearsall does not give his reasons for his opinion other than to note that there are 'stereotyped forms of repetition (7-14) and a lyric tendency of formal reiterated complaint (127-48)'. The expansion of Pearsall's notice of the repetition present in *PF* 135, the immediately following argument, and further evidence given presently, will show that the various examples of common ballad practice found in *Squier* leave little doubt of the poem's genre.<sup>88</sup>

The Percy manuscript has no punctuation; therefore a reading from it is uninfluenced by editors' opinions and it is easily seen that the basic prosody of *PF* 135 is four lines to the stanza and four stresses to the line. The most frequent stanzaic division seen in balladry is the quatrain, and the *Squier*'s long-metre is second only to common-metre as the preferred ballad rhythm.<sup>89</sup>

Basing stanzaic division on considerations of topic, prosody and syntax, there seem to be some thirty-nine 4-line stanzas. The text is however corrupt and with some apparent *lacunae*: there are three six-line stanzas where from the sense of the narrative, a couplet appears to be wanting. Two lines seem to be missing somewhere between ll. 43-48 because as the text stands, in line 49 the Lady knows of the Squire's love although she has not been told. Likewise, an extra couplet is needed after line 52 which as has been previously mentioned, appears to have become muddled, and after line 68 the sense requires at least two further lines (and very probably more) to explain the abrupt change of locus and to tell of the ambush.

That stanzaic presentation is intentional is seen by the fact that the greater number of *PF* 135's stanzas are end-stopped. Similarly, intention is shown by the frequency of stanzaic linking through the repetition of a word or phrase carried from one stanza to the following unit. This method of ensuring narrative continuity is a well-known ballad practice.

Another well-known ballad convention is repetition: it is less often seen in the Romance where it is generally a simple function involving only a few repetends and a single technique. *The squier* contains at least six different figures of repetition as follows:

- i. *copulatio*:                   Repetition of a word or phrase with a few words between; (ll. 61, 97, 163-165).<sup>90</sup>
- ii. *adnominatio*:               Repetition of a word with variation of forms; ('seruice', ll. 8, 9, & 11: 'serued', ll. 10 & 12).
- iii. *anaphora*:                 Repetition in successive lines or clauses; (ll. 52-55).

---

87. D. Pearsall, *Old English and Middle English Poetry* (London, 1977), p. 261.

88. The aspects of folk-ballad which scholars of that genre consider to be characteristic attributes of the style, have been set out and referenced in previous chapters of this study and are therefore not repeated here.

The exposition of some of the features found in *Squier* are shown in more than cursory fashion (although without attending to *minutiae*) because, as far as I know, *Squier* has never been so discussed elsewhere.

89. J.W. Hendren, *A Study of Ballad Rhythm* (Princeton, 1936), pp. 60, 78 and *passim*.

90. I give only a few examples for each figure: it is not to be assumed that those which are given are necessarily all that there are.



- iv. *reduplicatio*: Repetition of last word or phrase in a unit is repeated at the beginning of the unit following:  
(ll. 2 & 3).
- v. *repetitio*: Repetition at the beginning of succeeding stanzas;  
(sts. 32-37: ll.135-150).
- vi. *regressio*: Repetition in the beginning or middle of a unit or the middle and the end.  
(ll. 47 & 49, 80 & 82, 121 & 122).

The following shows some of the above points in tabular form in order that the overall stanzaic cohesion can be clearly seen, together with the deliberate patterning of the quickening repetition between stanzas leading towards the poem's climax.

**Figure 8. Stanzaic Patterning in PF 135: *The Squier*.**

Stanza number	Repetition in lines within a stanza	Repetition between sts.	Tag line
1	1/4, 2/3		1 & 3
2	1/3		3
3	all	4 - 1	1 & 3
4		4 - 1	4
5	1/3		1
6	all		
7	all		2
8			2 & 3
9		2 - 1	3
10			2 & 4
(6)11	1/3, 2/4	4 - 1	1 & 3
12	1/3	1 - 1	1 & 2
(6)13	1/2/3/4/5		
14	1/3		1 & 3
15			1 & 3 & 4
16	1/1 & 3 st.14		
(6)17	1/3/5		
18	2/3/4		
19	1/3, 2/4		
20			2
21		1 & 2 - 1 & 2	3
22	3/4		1 & 2
23	1/3	3 & 4 - 1 & 3	
24		1 & 3 - 3	1
25	1/2/3	4 - 1	
26			3
27		3 - 1	1
28	1/3	1 - 1	4
29	3/4	1 & 3 - 1	all
30	1/3, 3/4	1 - 1 & 3	1
31	2/3/4	1-1	1
32		1 - 1 & 3	1 & 3
33	3/4	1 & 3 - 1	1 & 2
34		1 & 3 - 1 & (2)	1 & (2)
35	1/2	1 & (2) - 1 & (2)	1 & (2)
36		1 & (2) - 1 & (2)	1 & (2)
37		1 & (2) - 1 & (2)	1 (2) & 4
38			4
39			2,3,4
40			2
41	1/2/3	4 - 1	
42	1/2/4		

**Explanation**

- i. *Column Two:* 1/4,2/3 means that a word or phrase in lines 1 or 4 of the stanza numbered in column one, is repeated in lines 2 and 3 of the same stanza.
- ii. *Column Three:* 4 - 1 means that the 4th line of the previous stanza contains a word or phrase which is repeated in the 1st line of the stanza numbered in column one.
- iii. *Column Four:* 1 & 3 means that a tag or formula of some kind (not necessarily the same) occurs in the 1st and 3rd line of the stanza numbered in column one.

Stanza numbers preceded by a figure '6' in parentheses (6) indicate that the stanza has six lines: the remainder have four. The columns 'Repetition between stanzas' and 'Tag line', from stanzas 34 to 37 have a figure '2' in parentheses (2). This indicates that the Folio scribe has incorporated two frequently repeated lines into one with the addition of '&c.' at the end of the first line.

As column four of the Figure shows, and as might be expected from the high incidence of traditional lexis, the poet makes good use of the cheville. However there are a relatively low number (14) of syntagmemic phrases or formulaic tags conventional to the Middle English Romance.<sup>91</sup> Although some of these phrases are found in both the Romance and the Ballad, their number in *PF* 135 contrasts with the high number (50) of folk-ballad formulae also counted.<sup>92</sup>

It is concluded, with regard to prosody, lexis and overall construction, that *Squier* is not a shapeless 'poor relative' of *SLD* or 'X'. It has every appearance of having been composed with care and some skill by a person who has not chosen specifically to use the conventions of the Romance but has preferred the ballad format. It will presently be shown through paradigmatic comparison and analysis of stylistic and narrative structure, that this initial assessment is correct.

## B. *Synopsis of the Tale*

The following shows that *The Squier's* fundamental tale is very simple: it has only 17 plot-units. What complexity it has it gains through the use of the complementary unit. Although *PF* 135 does not have the symmetry of units seen in *Durham*, there is a minor amount of patterning — a function of repetitive dialogue — within the complementary-units attached to the plot-units from 13 to 16. It is noticeable that unlike the previous texts examined in this study, this poem has no example of a plot-unit standing alone and unelaborated. This is almost certainly due to the compression into the limits of a short text of source detail devoid of abrupt excitement.

It is perhaps not immediately evident from a scrutiny of the synopsis itself but *PF* 135 is also unusual in that it has two examples (pu 14 and pu 15) of a plot-unit that is not associated with a specific plot-line. Normally the sense of the plot-unit is plainly stated in the plot-line. It seems probable that where it is not so stated it must be inferred from the most obvious meaning found in the passage concerned. For instance the activities summed up in pu 14 *may* at a deeper level refer to a 'test of constancy' but their surface

---

91. These are: 'both great & small' (l. 16); 'curterous & kind' (l. 17); 'both night & day' (l. 26); 'alacke that euer I was borne' (ll. 30, 91); 'gold . . . fee' (ll. 31, 61); 'as I doe thriue' (ll. 47, 119); 'while I am woman aliue' (ll. 48, 105); 'itt were great shame . . .' (l. 59); 'naked as euer shee was borne' (l. 85); 'alacke! . . . & woe is . . .' (l. 89); 'For noe man in Christentye' (l. 118); '[white as] whales bone' (l. 154); 'worthye wight' (l. 157); 'Ladye bright' (l. 158).

92. *Squier* opens with the well known: 'It was a . . .' This is a conventional ballad opening. — C. Brown and R.H. Robbins, in their *Index to Middle English Verse* (New York, 1943), pp. 258-60, cite only six 'literary' works commencing in this fashion, and all of them are from the *Northern Homily Cycle*. The remainder of the traditional ballad tags found in *PF* 135 are equally well known and it is not therefore proposed to list them.

interpretation is as I have it. Similarly when stanza 37 is studied in conjunction with pu 16 (the release of the Squire) the unstated meaning of pu 15 (the king's capitulation) becomes evident.

The synopsis shows that apart from the points mentioned above, the composition of *Squier* is not remarkable. Its narrative construction is appropriate to a straightforward, single-paced, free-flowing tale which does not aspire to be anything other than a reported story.

	<b>Plot Unit</b>		<b>Complementary Unit</b>
<i>pu 1</i>	An English Squire flees to Hungary: sts. 1-2	<i>cu 1a</i>	He has offended the crown: st. 1 He dare not stay: st. 1
<i>pu 2</i>	He is taken into the service of the king's daughter: sts. 2-4	<i>cu 2a</i> <i>2b</i> <i>2c</i>	He serves in her household: st. 3 He serves her bread and wine: st. 3 He plays chess with her: st. 4
<i>pu 3</i>	He wins her love: st. 4	<i>cu 3a (i)</i> <i>3a (ii)</i> <i>cu 3a (iii)</i>	He is made usher: st. 4 He is in charge of protocol in Hall: st. 4 All love him for his kindness and courtesy: st. 5
<i>pu 4</i>	When he is unhappy he goes to a grove: st. 5	<i>cu 4a (i-ii)</i> <i>4a (iii-vii)</i> <i>cu 4b (i)</i> <i>cu 4b (ii)</i>	Maple and filbert described: st. 6 List of birds: sts. 6-7 Squire is very unhappy: st. 7 He leans against a thorn: st. 8
<i>pu 5</i>	Squire laments his love for the king's daughter: sts. 7-8	<i>cu 5a</i> <i>5b</i>	"If I had gold I could marry my Lady! st. 8 If I were of high rank she might love me!" st. 9
<i>pu 6</i>	She overhears: st. 9	<i>cu 6a</i> <i>6b</i> <i>6c</i> <i>6d</i> <i>6e</i>	She opens her window: st. 10 She asks of whom he speaks: st. 11 He refuses to say lest she complain to the King: st. 11 She swears she will not: st. 12 If he wants her love he must try another way: st. 12
<i>pu 7</i>	She tells him to gain the king's favour with knightly prowess so that they may marry: st. 13	<i>cu 7a</i> <i>7b</i> <i>7c</i>	He says he has no equipment: st. 14 She gives him 103 pounds: st. 15 She promises more: st. 16
<i>pu 8</i>	He is attacked by men about the Lady's chamber: st. 16	<i>cu 8a</i> <i>8b</i> <i>8c</i>	Squire asks the Lady to open her door: st. 17 20 men are against him: st. 17 She refuses to open to any but her father: st. 17

<i>pu 9</i>	The Squire is captured: st. 18	<i>cu 9a</i>	He is taken away: st. 18
<i>pu 10</i>	The disfigured body of a hanged man is propped against her door: sts. 18-19	<i>cu 10a</i> <i>10b</i> <i>10c</i>	The Lady has heard the fight: st. 20 She arises: st. 20 She is naked but for a mantle: st. 20
<i>pu 11</i>	She opens the door: st. 21	<i>cu 11a</i> <i>11b</i> <i>11c</i>	The dead man falls: st. 21 She cries out: st. 21 She regrets that she did not arise earlier: st. 21
<i>pu 12</i>	Thinking that the corpse is that of the Squire she laments his death: st. 22	<i>cu 12a (i)</i> <i>12a (ii)</i> <i>12a (iii)</i> <i>12a (iv)</i>  <i>cu 12b (i)</i> <i>12b (ii)</i>  <i>12b (iii)</i> <i>12b (iv)</i> <i>12b (v)</i>  <i>cu 12c (i)</i>  <i>12c (ii)</i>  <i>cu 12d (i)</i>   <i>cu 12e (i)</i> <i>12e (ii)</i>  <i>12e (iii)</i>	She states that she will embalm his hair and fingers in virgin wax: st. 22 She will draw his bowels and bury them in a Christian grave: st. 23 She will wrap him in lead: st. 23 She will raise him at her bedhead: st. 23  His body must become dust: st. 24 She will not be able to keep him then: st. 24 She will coffin him in wood: st. 24 She will spice him well: st. 24 She will bury him under a marble stone: st. 25  Daily she will say her prayers over him: st. 25 While she lives she will hear five masses a day: st. 25  (The hanged man's soul may be saved through the Lady's prayers alone! st. 26)  She will wear nothing but black: st. 26 She will not look at anything else: st. 27 She will wear no mantle nor ring: st. 27
<i>pu 13</i>	Eavesdropping, the King overhears: st. 27	<i>cu 13a</i> <i>13b</i> <i>13c</i>	He asks for whom she mourns: st. 28 She says it is for no man in 'Christenty'! st. 28 It is for no man alive! st. 29
<i>[pu 14</i>	The King, her father offers comfort which is refused: sts. 30-37]	<i>cu 14a (i)</i> <i>14a (ii)</i> <i>14a (iii)</i>  <i>cu 14b (i)</i>  <i>14b (ii)</i>   <i>cu 14c (i)</i>	She says she has lost her knife: st. 29 Her father offers to replace it: st. 30 She says there is only one smith to make a blade as good: st. 30  He offers to take her hunting, ride in comfort and see 30 harts: st. 31 "Godamercy, but all this will not comfort me" st. 32  He offers to take her [on a boat?]

- so that she may watch the fish jump  
while she eats: st. 32
- 14c (ii) "Godamercy &c." st. 33
- cu 14d (i) He offers her lawn sheets and fustian  
blankets: st. 33
- 14d (ii) "Godamercy &c." st. 34
- cu 14e (i) He will bring many torch carriers to  
her bedside: st. 34
- 14e (ii) "Godamercy &c." st. 35
- cu 14f (i) If she can't sleep he'll bring some  
minstrels: st. 35
- 14f (ii) "Godamercy &c." st. 36
- cu 14g (i) Pepper and cloves will be burnt to  
make sweet scent: st. 36
- 14g (ii) "Godamercy &c." st. 37
- [pu 15 The King acknowledges her  
constancy and cedes  
defeat: st. 37]
- cu 15a "You used to be red and white, now  
you are pale as lead: st. 37
- 15b I have your lover in my keeping" st. 38
- pu 16 The Squire is brought: st. 38
- cu 16a (i) The Lady faints: st. 39
- 16a (ii) She revives with the Squire's kisses;  
st. 39
- cu 16b (i) She asks her father why he  
separated such lovers: st. 40
- 16b (ii) He says he wished to marry her to  
a king: st. 40
- pu 17 The Lady and the Squire  
marry: st. 41
- cu 17a (i) Kings come from Spain: st. 41
- 17a (ii) From Germany: st. 41
- 17a (iii) From Norway: st. 41
- cu 17b (i) The feasting lasted one month and  
three days: st. 42
- 17b (ii) The lovers lived 30 winters and  
more: st. 42

## VI. The 'Durham' Paradigm and *The Squier*

*The Squier* is examined with a view to assessing its degree of conformity with the *Durham* paradigm, and it is found that the text disagrees with five of the paradigmatic items: in view of the text's probably late date of composition this would appear to conform with the findings previously made in this study. It is shown that the principal reason for these disagreements lies in the poem's transition from one style of rhymed entertainment to another, and it is shown that the poet's manipulation of the plot and construction of the original Romance has been worked to form a hybrid ballad. This has been achieved primarily through the reduction and simplification of the source plot: the following demonstrates that this has far-reaching effects and its consequences affect almost every paradigmatic item.

### A. Examination

The story-line of each of the *Folio* texts studied, has been short and easy to follow: this is also so in the case of *Squier* which consists of a single episode culminating in a grand climax (Item 13: *Episode*; Item 14: *Climax*). However *PF* 135 is considerably shorter and less involved than *SLD*, the plot of which is woven from multiple themes or motifs. To simplify his plot and shorten his tale the *Squier* poet narrows the focus of his tale by reducing his *histoire* to a single theme *maiden-faithful-to-her-love*, within the broad type-episode *love-separation-reunion*. He discards *SLD*'s complications of *betrayal* (starring the ubiquitous 'False Steward'): he effectively removes the *quest-for-knighthood* theme and reduces the *lovers-of-unequal-rank* motif to an incidental. Thus the straightforward omission of both the Squire's quest for knightly adventure (*SLD*: ll. 884-910) and the involvement of the Steward (ll. 283-300; 339-460; 510-520) has greatly simplified the complicated events occurring over the broad narrative spectrum of *SLD* (Item 1: *Simplification*).

The reduction of focus in this way results in the reduction of effective characters. *SLD* has nine individual characters who interact in centrally important rôles or play peripherally insignificant parts within the present action of the tale (Item 3: *Character focus*).<sup>93</sup> The tale also has a supernumerary cast of noble courtiers and armed men and reference is made to eight well-known Romance characters who supposedly exist in the tale's past.<sup>94</sup>

In *Squier* the omission of the Steward and his machinations and the substitution of an unknown and neutral corpse for his dead body, helps to reduce the number of characters from nine participants to three — or four if the hanged man's passive role is included.<sup>95</sup> The omission of the Steward who as Syr Maradose is the only named character in *SLD*, results in the entire cast of *Squier* being anonymous (Item 4: *Nomenclature*). No servitors are mentioned but the armed men are present as are the supernumerary nobles who at the terminal wedding, are joined by foreign kings.

The reduction of focus by omission has resulted in the necessity for the poet to invent in order to make good the hiatus caused by the unavoidable removal of a plot-device linked to the item omitted. The removal of the Steward and his actions is the cause of a paradigmatic disagreement where in one instance fictitious material in *Squier* — by which is meant the elements found in *PF* 135 which are not present in *SLD* — does affect the action of the plot (Item 6: *Fiction & event*). The expedition to the gallows and the introduction of the hanged man as a substitute for the corpse of *SLD*'s Steward is an invention of the *Squier* poet. If the fiction of the hanged man's body were to be removed from the narrative the plot device of *mistaken identity* would fail through lack of a corpse. The poet's elimination of the complications of the *betrayal* motif produces the need for him to invent in order to move the plot along. It is necessary for him to associate 'fiction' with 'action' but he is careful to invent as little as possible: that the end-result is the same is irrelevant, the important factor is that in *Squier* it is brought about with the help of a fiction.

---

93. Squire, Lady, King, Steward; usher (l. 461), panter (l. 461), butler (l. 461), page (l. 492), messenger (l. 1092, 99).

94. Libeaus, Gawain, Guy, Colbrand, King Arthur, Maid Ely [Elene], her 'dwarfe' and the Lady of Synadowne.

95. Squire, Lady, King, Hanged Man.

The narrowing of focus is achieved through the removal of superfluous themes. This is helped, and the focus is further refined, by the poet's manipulation of a single element — time. The basic theme of both *Squier* and *SLD* is that of *separation-reunion* but *SLD* utilises the *separation* allothemes *betrayal* and *quest-for-knighthood* (which here may be a variant of *exile*).<sup>96</sup> I have already spoken of the *Squier* poet's excision of the *betrayal* motif: the following shows that the element of *quest* is tied to 'time': alter the one and the other is also changed.

The chronological events in both *SLD* and *Squier* follow each other in a natural order but in the former text many of them are divided by lengthy intervals (Item 7: *Chronology*). The Squire loves the Lady for more than seven years before he speaks (l. 17); an unspecified time after her discovery of the corpse, the Lady's resolution is 'tested' by her father's proffered worldly comforts. After they have been refused she is let mourn over the corpse for the seven years (ll. 858, 930) which pass while the Squire is absent proving his chivalry (l. 891-900). The *PF* 135 poet telescopes all these periods of time so that we are not told how long the Squire has loved the Lady; the Lady grieves over the corpse for no longer than it takes for her to repeat to herself her embalming schedule, glance at the devotions she will undertake and reject the comforts which her father offers. Having been tested she does not then need to endure for seven years as the Squire is not sent on a journey to perform deeds of prowess: he is confined at the King's pleasure — but for hardly long enough to catch his breath before he is brought out and is reunited with the Lady.

The chronological compression besides removing allothemes, also has the effect of quickening the narrative action quite considerably; transferring much of the Squire's share of audience interest to the Lady and removing emphasis from her 'endurance', so that *Virtue Tested* becomes the simple *Virtue Rewarded*. That the lovers are virtuous and 'right' may as a convention almost be taken for granted but the poet carefully underlines the point when through the Lady (st. 40) he notes that their separation was a 'sinn' (Item 18: *Right*). He draws no lesson from this. In this regard *PF* 135 does not strictly conform to the paradigm because it does not have an explicit moral *sens* which is set out at intervals and explicitly encapsulated by the poet in a stanza at the end of the text (Item 15: *Post-climactic moral*; Item 16: *Moral: repetition*). However, as the following shows, although the story of *The Squier* cannot be regarded as 'edifying' through an overt and properly resolved conflict between 'good' and 'evil', or a virtue ostensibly lauded by the narrator or vice condemned, it nevertheless has an implicit moral seen in the virtue of the heroine. The narrowing of focus directs attention to a single character: *Squier's* focus has been altered through the removal of competing themes which highlight persons other than the king's daughter. The interest is now concentrated on the Lady around whose character the plot now revolves. Almost 60% of the text of *PF* 135 consists of the spoken word uttered by the players themselves, and it is seen that the sole purpose of much of the content of this dialogue is to demonstrate and expand certain personal qualities that the Lady has and which are necessary for the ultimate fulfillment of *Virtue Rewarded* through her exhibition of fidelity. In this regard dialogue concerns both character and moral (Item 9: *Dialogue: character & moral*). In *Squier* the rôles of both of the principal male players are complementary and subordinate to that of the Lady.

The Squire's fundamental part is to be the catalyst that activates her true love. Although in *PF* 135 the length and nature of the Squire's traditional *service* to his Lady is

---

96. B. Rosenberg, 'Morphology of the Middle English Metrical Romance', *Journal of Popular Culture*, I, 1 (1967), 66-67.

curtailed it is nevertheless performed (sts. 3-4). Unlike *SLD*, in *Squier* he is not at any time singled out as being specifically an unlikely candidate of 'lowe degre' but it is probably his conventional *lover's-lament* set in a traditional *locus amœnus* that shows the Squire to be at least a variant of the 'Courtly lover'. At once his function is clear to the audience: his character needs no further expansion as he is a recognisable stock type and a foil to the Lady.

The Lady, the central figure of the trio, who as 'king's daughter' needs no specific description, shows the depth of her love in her soliloquy over her supposed Lover's corpse (sts. 22-27). Her virtue is apparent in her Christian demeanour and thought (sts. 23, 25, 28, 40): her fidelity is shown in her refusal to be distracted from her purpose and her rejection of the worldly pleasures offered to her by her father (sts. 31-39).

In his position as 'Tempter' the King is also a foil to the Lady but since he is also the 'Rewarder', at the end of the same dialogue where he exercises his first function he exercises his second. He is shown to be a concerned parent able to put aside considerations of state: "I thought to haue marryed thee to a King" (st. 40) in favour of his daughter's 'loue & likinge' (st. 38). Specifically, the fundamental purpose of the poem's dialogue is to show that true fidelity is worthy of reward. And that is the story's *sens*.

The differences between *SLD* and *Squier* discussed above, have the result of bringing the tale more into line with the requirements of the Ballad than with the conventions of the Romance. The omission of much of the descriptive detail of *SLD* has quickened the poem's pace and brought it towards ballad conformity where factors such as minimal motivation, sudden scene-shifts, lack of narrative presence, and non-static dialogue are the rule.

The motivation for the characters' actions in *Squier* is less detailed than in *SLD* (Item 5: *Motivation*).<sup>97</sup> Perhaps the most striking example of this is found in the Lady's reasons for her refusal to open her door which in *SLD* are extended in an eighty-line passage (ll. 550-636) but have in *Squier* been reduced to a mere quatrain (st. 17).<sup>98</sup> The *SLD* author's partiality for amplification seen in the formal list beloved of Romance authors, is not present in *Squier* (Item 2: *Details*). *SLD*'s 30-line list of trees and birds (ll. 31-61) has been reduced here to seven lines (sts. 6-7) and the Lady's lengthy *farewell* (*SLD*, ll. 941-954) is omitted entirely. Likewise there is no hint of the careful notification of every change of scene present in the Romance source: *SLD*'s links between scenes are entirely lacking in *Squier* (Item 11: *Links*). This technique of 'leaping' from one scene to the next is a well known ballad component which has been previously discussed in this study.

Similarly in line with ballad convention *Squier* has only one use of the 'domestic our' and the direct address of *sententiae auctoris* (Item 17: *Partisan*):<sup>99</sup>

Through the praying of our Lady alone,

---

97. An exception is *Squier*'s initial presentation of the hero's reasons for leaving England. These reasons are not present in *SLD*, but were probably taken from *X*. Since there is no way of knowing whether the poet has abridged *X* they do not negate the validity of paradigm Item 5.

Mead. *SLD*, p. xxi-xxv

98. Ackerman argues that lines 571-636 are a later interpolation (Mead, *SLD*, p. lxxxiii-iv). Rivers and Kiernan disagree but even if they are wrong the passage in *Squire* is still only one quarter as long as the undisputed lines in *SLD*: Rivers, 'Focus', *ESC*, 7, 4 (1981), 381-82; Kiernan, 'Undo', *SP*, 70, 4 (1973), 362n.



saued may be the soule of the hanged man.

*PF* 135: ll. 105-105.

Apart from this single suggestion of the presence of the story-teller there is no indication of such a figure. The absence of a narrator in *PF* 135 (as will be shown) is also notable in the poem's units of *discours*. Since conventionally the Romance is partially structured around the extrinsic voice of the narrator while the Ballad is not, the *Squier's* lack of a *diseur* supports the idea that the text is a hybrid ballad and not a romance.

Although now more of a ballad than a romance, the text's connection with its source is never completely severed: there is continuity both in content and convention.

Continuity of content is seen in the dialogue found in *Squier* which cannot be said to be unsourced (Item 8: *Dialogue & source*). In both *PF* 135 and *SLD* some aspects of the tale are conveyed through speeches which when compared, demonstrate a similarity which is not the result of coincidence and which causes the text to disagree with the paradigm:

“Ye might have bewraied me to the kinge,  
And brought me sone to my endynge.”

*SLD*: ll. 125-26

“you wold complaine vnto our King  
& hinder me of my Liuinge.”

*Squier*: st. 11

She sayde, “Go away, thou wicked wyght,  
Thou shalt not come here this nyght;  
For I wyll not my dore undo  
For no man that cometh therto.”

*SLD*: ll. 549-52

“I will neuer my dore vndoe  
For noe man that comes me to,  
nor I will neuer my dore vnsteake  
vntill I heare my Father speake.”

*Squier*: st. 17

The reason for paradigmatic disagreement and continuity of content here is probably that having narrowed his poem to focus on a single theme of his source's tale, the poet is unable to deviate from the main points of his source's story. He must perforce use the key-phrases willy-nilly — it is for instance, difficult to speak simply of someone refusing to undo a door without using the words ‘undo’ and ‘door’.<sup>100</sup>

Having omitted much of the original text the poet has found himself left with a story presented mainly in dialogue and therefore it is not surprising that the relationship

---

99. From the context this ‘our Lady’ does not refer to the Virgin Mary: The designation of the King's Daughter as ‘Lady’ is spelt with an upper case ‘L’ throughout the text and she has not been represented as praying to Mary. Because of the couplet's present tense it can be either a part of the Lady's speech in which it is embedded or an extrinsic aside. Because the point of the ruse is that the Lady does not know that the corpse is not that of her lover — she has never heard of the hanged man — it cannot be part of her speech and therefore it must be a narrator's comment. The context of these two lines is quoted in full shortly.

100. Fewster points out the sexual symbolism of the phrase and notes that it is ‘fabliauesque’ (*Traditionality*, p. 146). It is I think, therefore possible that there is a *double entendre* and that in *Squier* the reference to ‘Father’ may be to ‘God’ speaking through the officiating clergy in the marriage service, or to that priest himself. This both emphasises the Lady's virtue and accounts for the reference to her Father which, in context is a little odd.

between dialogue and the event in *Squier* does not conform to the paradigm (Item 10: *Dialogue: movement & event*). The device of the ‘overheard lament’ is twice used on *PF* 135 to forward the action. First, the Squire’s ‘dole’ is overheard by the Lady; this leads to her emotional involvement and eventually to her own lament which is then overheard by the King. This in turn leads to his testing the strength of the Lady’s devotion and (through another series of verbal exchanges) to the ultimate ‘happy ending’.

Continuity of convention is seen in *Squier*’s observation of the apparent rule that the hero should be outnumbered or otherwise handicapped in any combat he undertakes (Item 19: *Outnumbering*). In *PF* 135 he faces odds at a ratio of twenty to one (st. 17). These figures conform to the paradigm in that they differ from the source — although the source is itself unsure and cites the Steward’s company as being respectively thirty-three men at arms (l. 416), thirty (l.537) or thirty-four (l. 639). (Item 20: *Figures*).

Finally paradigmatic agreement is also seen in the presence of a fictional addition to amuse the audience. (Item 12: *Light relief*). As in the texts already examined in this study, here too the ‘comic’ element is presented after a passage of some weight — perhaps to lighten the atmosphere, perhaps to raise a larger laugh through unexpected contrast, or both. That the ‘joke’ in *Squier* is deliberate is seen because it is the sole appearance of the narrator. The Lady has been describing the embalming process she proposes for her Lover in some detail and has concluded her funereal list with a note of the extensive programme of prayer which she will undertake for the rest of her life. At the conclusion of this passage the narrator wrenches the audience away from any development of sympathy for her loss, with his timely reminder that the corpse over which the Lady is being so doleful is the wrong one. He also hints that her proposed devotions are in the circumstances, excessive:

“ . . . & bury thee vnder a marble stone,  
& euery day say my prayers thee vpon,  
& euery day whiles I am woman aliue,  
for thy sake gett masses fiue.”  
(Through the praying of our Lady alone,  
saued may be the soule of the hanged man!)

*PF* 135: sts. 25-26

## B. Conclusions

- I. The comparison of *SLD* and *PF* 135 through paradigmatic analysis demonstrates that *Squier* is not a casually ‘degenerate’ version of its protosource: it is a deliberately independent poem. Using either *SLD* or perhaps *X* as a basis for his source information, an author has fashioned the story of the Romance into a ballad. However the paradigmatic examination adds to the information previously derived from a study of the text’s stylistic lexical patterning and usage and shows that *Squier* is a hybrid text: that it is neither a minstrel-ballad nor yet a folk-ballad but is in the process of developing from one to the other. The details of the author’s manipulation of his source material to effect a conversion are made evident and *Squier* is seen to be a text which exemplifies the transformation process at work.

- II. The function of the *Durham* paradigm when used in the analysis of a given text is confirmed: it determines both the manner in which a text relates to its source in content and composition and also the manner in which the author has manipulated his 'facts' and to what end. This appears to be relevant both for the rhymed narrative written for 'popular' entertainment with an historical base and for the fictional 'story'.

**TABLE 13.** *Stylistic Structure of ‘The Squier’*

Motifeme	Allomotif	Scene	Theme (Episode)	
1. <i>Scene Setting</i> (Embedded: <i>Entry of Hero/Heroine</i> )	a. An English Squire committed an offence b. He fled to Hungary c. He was employed by the King’s daughter	<i>Love Begins</i>		
2. <i>Courtly Service</i>	a. He serves her bread & wine b. He serves her at table c. He plays chess with her d. She comes to love him e. He is made usher f. He is liked by all			
3. <i>Lover’s Dole</i> ( <i>Confession</i> ) (Embedded: <i>Locus Amœnus</i> ; <i>Secret Overheard</i> ).	a. Squire goes to an arbour b. (List of trees) c. (List of birds) d. “If I had gold & fee I could marry the Lady” e. “If I were of high kin she might love me” f. Lady overhears g. Opens window h. Asks for whom he laments i. He confesses			<i>Love Established</i> (discovered- accepted)
4. <i>Plan</i> ( <i>Prospective ‘Adventure’</i> )	a. She says he must go and fight as a knight b. Earn the King’s regard c. Then they can marry			
5. <i>Promise</i> ( <i>Financial Support</i> )	a. He says he has no equipment b. She promises gold & fee c. She gives him 100 <sup>li</sup> & 3 d. She promises more when gone			
6. <i>Combat</i>	a. Squire is attacked b. He implores Lady to open her door c. She refuses d. Squire is captured			<i>Lover Lost</i>
7. <i>Ruse</i> ( <i>Mistaken Identity</i> )	a. Hanged man brought b. Disfigured c. Propped against Lady’s door d. Lady opens door e. Mistakes corpse for Squire	<i>Love tested</i>		
8. <i>Lover’s Lament</i> ( <i>Mourning for Dead</i> ) (Embedded: <i>Secret Overheard</i> )	a. Lady will embalm Squire b. She will pray c. She will only wear black d. No ornaments e. King overhears f. Asks for whom she laments g. She says no one alive h. She has lost a knife i. Only one smith can make such blades			
9. <i>Constancy Tested</i>	a. Father offers Lady many comforts b. She refuses all of them			
10. <i>Constancy Rewarded</i>	a. Father notes that Lady used to be red and white but is pale now b. Confesses he has Squire c. Squire is brought d. Lady swoons e. Revived with kisses f. King explains that he’d wanted to marry Lady to a King g. Lady and Squire marry h. Kings come to the wedding i. Feast lasts over a month			<i>Love Triumphs</i>
11. <i>Terminal Status-quo</i>	a. Lovers lived over 30 years			

## VII. Form and Tradition: ‘The Squier’

### *Introduction*

The following shows *PF* 135 to have a weak distribution of the motifemes

examined in this study. It is argued that this is in part due to the author's narrowing of the focus of his *histoire* and redirection of emphasis through the removal of the tale's original villain. It is shown however that although the author has created a story element independent of his source, traditional continuity has been maintained in his employment and rearrangement of a conventional motifemic 'set' to utilise the new narrative circumstances.

### A. *The Motifemes*

#### a. *Exhortation and Valediction*

*Squier* has neither of these two motifemes.

#### b. *Terminal Status-quo.*

This motifeme in *Squier* contains only the nuclear compulsory component *hero+family*, briefly represented in the conventional motif *long life*:

30 winters and some deale moe  
soe longe liued these louers too

PF 135: st. 42

#### c. *Boast*

None of the components of the above motifeme are present in *Squier* with the possible exception of a vestigial *right* component of *gloat*:

"Father" she sayes, "how might you for sinn  
haue kept vs 2 louers in twin?"

PF 135: st. 40

This occurs in the preferred position for this component, that is, after the 'victory' (here the lovers' reunion), and is I think perhaps an implicit *gloat* motif that hints at a 'vaunting of achievement' through the inherent righteousness of the lovers' cause.

The omission of the motifemes of *discours*, *exhortation* and *valediction* and the virtual omission of *boast* and its allomotific components is a function of the reduction of *Squier*'s length. The absence of the motifemes of *discours* may be related to preparation for the printed ballad market, but the cause of the non-appearance of all but a minor component of *boast* is the disappearance of the villain, Sir Maradose: a poem obviously cannot contain motifemes tied to a villain if there is no villain.<sup>101</sup> A function of the disappearance of the villain is the diminution of the heroic rôle: the leading male protagonist cannot demonstrate conventional knightly or righteous worth by withstanding and overcoming personified 'wrong'.<sup>102</sup> It follows that the motifemic components tied to heroic combat and its result cannot be present.

In *Squier* the elements *threat* and *betrayal* (*SLD* II. 161-70, 282-300, 341-57) vanish with the removal of the villain. Thus for the first half of his text the poet is left

---

101. In *SLD* among other rôles, the King combines the functions of 'Tempter' and 'Rewarder'. In *Squier* he is unaffected by the removal of the villain and retains these rôles: he is not a villain.

102. The scene where the Squire is overcome and taken away (Item 6 in the Table) is called *Combat*. In fact it could equally well have been called *Abduction* as there is (unlike *SLD*, l. 540) no mention of weapons, actual fighting or any specific single antagonist.

with *SLD*'s tripartite motifeme *confession-promise-difficult task*. This comprises a lover's confession of his passion to his Lady, her desire that in order to earn her love he should undertake a difficult task she will set for him, and her promise that she shall be his on its completion.

In *SLD* (ll. 171ff) the Lady imposes upon her suitor a seven year Quest to prove himself 'a venterous knight' (l. 250) 'for the love of me' (ll. 188, 216). She emphasises the task's difficulty and peril (ll. 175, 187) which the Squire will have to endure 'and ye my love should wynne' (l. 171). She promises to be his on his successful return and later in the poem, after seven years, the task is completed and she marries him. The idea that the Squire should prove his worth to please the king so that he will consent to the marriage of his daughter is secondary — if the king is not impressed and will not give his blessing then they will think of something else: 'Other wyse then must we do' (l. 268).

In *Squier*, *difficult task* changes its nature. The dangers and perils ahead are not mentioned, no length of time is given, no prospective journey mapped nor adversaries cited. The proposed course of action ceases to be a Quest. The whole reason for the undertaking is solely to impress the king and gain his approval for the lovers' marriage. In *Squier*, *difficult task* has become *plan* and part of an adaptation of the similar tripartite motifeme which Wittig names *confession-promise-plan*.<sup>103</sup> The three parts of the traditional motifeme are:-

1. Lover confesses love to helper . . .
2. who promises to assist . . .
3. and makes a plan for the lover to gain his Lady.

It will be seen that as *PF* 135 has it this motifeme has been very much modified. Its conventional structure requires a 'helper': here that rôle is taken primarily by the Lady. Since in her own part she has no place in the *plan* motifeme, this doubling of function, a reflection of the original *task* motifeme, is understandable. However the Squire momentarily assumes the mantle of 'helper' when the author uses one of Wittig's optional 'slots' for this motifeme: *helper-argues-with-lover* (st. 14).<sup>104</sup> This is not present in *SLD*'s *task* and its inclusion in *PF* 135 confirms that *task* has been changed to an amended *plan*. This latter motifeme conventionally concerns a lover's efforts to win the love of his Lady: here the aim is directed towards both lovers' mutual desire to marry, thus when the Squire, in arguing, takes on the rôle of 'helper' the Lady becomes the 'Lover' — which of course in her own rôle she is. Thus within this motifeme both the principal characters have dual rôle functions: the *Squier* poet has attempted to establish continuity by using the framework of a traditional motifeme.

## VIII. Conclusions

---

103. Wittig, *Narrative Structures*, pp. 70-79.

104. Wittig has another optional 'slot': *helper rewarded*. I am not at all sure that the poet has not also included a hint of this in the '100<sup>li</sup> and 3' which the Squire receives with the promise of more: *Squier*: st. 15. Wittig, p. 79.

- I. The text's motifemic presentation has been much affected by the shortening of the tale. The absence of the traditional opening and closing motifemes and the consequent disappearance of the narrator and audience participation lends a degree of impartiality to the story which flows as does a report: awareness that this is only a tale is heightened. This is emphasised in the *terminal status-quo* where the wedding is Proppian in its element of *reward-achieved* followed by the suggestion that 'they all lived happily ever after'. However although *Squier* is heading away from the Romance and its conventions it has not yet broken free. The *Squier* poet's narrative amendments have forced him to modify the construction of his motifemic components. He has done this but it is noticeable that he has conformed to tradition as much as he could even within his modifications. Thus this section of my study of *Squier* shows that insofar as the motifemic structure is concerned it agrees with and confirms the conclusion earlier derived from the study of other matters: this poem demonstrates a frozen moment in a process of literary change.
  
- II. This examination of sourced Romance items in the light of information derived from my study of Historical texts, although limited in scope, has shown that the results appear to follow a similar pattern. The poets' approach to their individual source text and their use of it with reference to their own work reflects their purpose in writing; the literary genre in which they are composing; and to a lesser extent, the times for which they write. It is also possible to gain some insight into extra-textual matters such as the nature of the audience for whom the text was written, its concerns and interests. Finally it is noted that despite each text's differing topic, the authors extend themselves to some lengths to maintain some touch with the conventions pertaining to the rhymed 'popular' entertainment that preceded theirs: to maintain continuity. This examination has shown that, History or Romance, these poems from *The Percy Folio* were written as a part of a continuing tradition.

# CHAPTER SEVEN

## MEDIAEVAL CONTINUITY AND *THE PERCY FOLIO*

### I. Conclusions

#### A. Introduction

This study discussed selected texts taken from *The Percy Folio*, a body of popular verse incorporated into a single manuscript collection a little before 1650. The collection as a whole is important because its individual texts were current in the years between the High Middle Ages and the Restoration. It can therefore be seen as a representative sample of contemporary taste at the end of an era.

In the light of the idea that there is a ‘tendency for accepted values to change more slowly than the circumstances of society that ultimately condition them’, this study set out to discover the extent to which representative texts of the *Folio* maintain tradition.<sup>1</sup> Although strictly speaking the manuscript is a Stuart collection, I had two reasons to think it might well incorporate the ‘accepted values’ of an earlier period, and therefore exhibit a strong continuance of mediaeval narrative custom.

First, the provenance of *The Percy Folio* and its prevailing dialect suggest that it is a predominantly rural collection, and country people are generally slower to accept change than their city counterparts. Secondly, although popular narrative verse composed for public entertainment may have appealed to some members of all levels of society, its primary audience appears to have been the young and the unsophisticated: both of these categories prefer the familiar and actively resent changes in their favourite narratives.<sup>2</sup> For these reasons I felt that there was a high probability that the manuscript might demonstrate mediaeval continuity.

However, I thought it unlikely that it would show no variation of tradition at all: the *Folio* texts were gathered post-mediaevally; after the establishment of mass communication through cheap print and during a period of considerable political, social and cultural upheaval.

Thus the purpose of this study has been to examine selected texts from the manuscript in order to determine the presence or absence of a constant level of continuity, and map and evaluate the progress of observed development or variation.

I found that there is a solid central stratum of continuing narrative tradition running through each of my subject texts. I found that where change exists, convention has been manipulated and modified to fit new requirements as they have arisen: convention was not discarded as the circumstances of society grew further and further away from the mediaeval. None of the alterations found made a wholly radical departure from, or a

---

1. Ferguson, *Indian Summer*, p. xiii; Wittig, *Narrative Structures*, p. 182.

2. See Margaret Spufford's *Small Books and Pleasant Histories: Popular fiction and its readership in seventeenth-century England*, London, 1981.



fundamental change to, stylistic convention. Nevertheless, here and there it is possible to see primitive harbingers of the style which reached its apogee in the cheap broadside ballads of the eighteenth-century.

\*\* \* \*\*

The texts from the *Folio* were analysed with the help of two tools. The first was a *schema* which I derived from a late mediaeval historical poem and which was initially drawn up as an investigative instrument to be used solely for the study required for that text. It was used to show how the author of *Durham*, purporting to set out an account of an historical battle, had used the facts present in his source document. I found that the patterns of authorial composition seen in *Durham* and set out in tabular form, were repeated in other texts of varying dates and provenance. Therefore this *schema* appeared to have some paradigmatic relevance to mediaeval continuity which it examined *externally*: it was mainly concerned with the conventions relating to a poet's manipulation of his text's connection with historical reality.

The second tool — a set of motifemic conventions taken from a large body of earlier Romances — helped to examine mediaeval continuity *internally*: they were mainly concerned with the traditional narrative and stylistic structure of each poet's presentation of his *histoire*.

Thus the mediaeval conventions of content and composition (*histoire* and *discours*) to be sought for in later works, were taken from the disparate genres of 'fictional' Romance and 'factual' History. This did not appear to affect their general application: both sets of conventions were found to be relevant to both types of narrative.

## II. Conclusions — The Paradigm

The patterning seen in the late mediaeval text *Durham*, was set out in a *schema* composed of twenty points. For convenience these are restated below in an abbreviated form:

1. Broad events are simplified.
2. Peripheral details are absent.
3. Narrative focuses on a few characters.
4. Names are absent or wrong.
5. Motivation is not detailed.
6. The historical event is not distorted by the addition of gross fictions.
7. Specific times when specific events are said to have happened are wrong.
8. Dialogue is usually unsourced.
9. Dialogue expands character or underlines the moral.
10. Dialogue does not greatly forward the principal event.
11. Links between scenes are likely to be fictitious.
12. Minor fictions are present as comic relief.
13. The topic covers a single episode.
14. There is a single grand climax.
15. The climax is followed by an explanation or moral.

16. The matter of the moral is repeated during the tale.
17. The poet is partisan.
18. The party favoured is Right.
19. The party favoured is handicapped.
20. Figures are inaccurate.

The following figure, where 'X' indicates that the given poem is not in agreement, sets out the findings relating to the paradigm and the texts studied:

**Figure 9. The 'Durham' Paradigm and the Percy Texts: I**

Item Nos.	Agin.	Bos.	Scot.	Flod.	Bart.	Buck.	Ald.	Wm.	Edg.	G.K.	Sq.	Agree-ment.
1								X	X			82%
2												100%
3												100%
4												100%
5		X	X	X		X		X	X			46%
6	X	X	X	X		X					X	46%
7												100%
8	X	X						X	X		X	55%
9												100%
10				X	X		X	X		X	X	46%
11		X	X		X	X	X	X	X			36%
12	X					X		X	X			64%
13		X										91%
14												100%
15	X		X								X	73%
16	X										X	82%
17						X		X	X			73%
18												100%
19								x				91%
20												100%
	75%	75%	80%	85%	90%	75%	90%	60%	70%	95%	75%	

In the diagram above, the paradigmatic item-numbers are presented on the left in numerical sequence from one to twenty: the *Percy* texts are set out in the order in which they are discussed in this study. These orders have no obvious significance: patterns within the data are not immediately evident and it is difficult to draw conclusions.

This is not the case in the the Figure below where the paradigmatic items are arranged in order of textual agreement: the items with which the *Folio* poems most often accord are placed at the top of the descending list. The *Percy* texts are arranged in approximate date order: the dates shown are, with perhaps the exceptions of *Scotish* and *Flodden*, to be understood to include a possible tolerance of plus or minus a decade. Nevertheless, even allowing for a certain amount of unavoidable temporal uncertainty, the information in the diagram is plain:

**Figure 10. The ‘Durham’ Paradigm and the Percy Texts: II**

Item Nos.	Ald. 1450	G.K. 1500	Bart. 1511	Flod. 1515	Scot. 1515	Bos. 1515	Sq. 1550	Buck. 1575	Agin. 1580	Edg. 1590	Wm. 1595	Agreement.
2												100%
3												100%
4												100%
7												100%
9												100%
14												100%
18												100%
20												100%
13						X						91%
19											X	91%
1									X	X		82%
16							X		X			82%
15							X		X			82%
17								X		X	X	73%
12								X	X	X	X	64%
8					X	X	X		X	X	X	45%
5				X	X	X		X		X	X	45%
6				X	X	X	X	X	X			45%
10	X	X	X	X			X				X	45%
11	X		X		X	X		X		X	X	37%
	90%	95%	90%	85%	80%	75%	75%	75%	75%	70%	60%	

The above Figure illustrates four points:

1. Some items, representing either structural or narrative mediaeval continuity in the selected poems, form a constant.
2. This constant is seen in paradigmatic items which relate to narrative construction.
3. Other paradigmatic items relating to narrative construction but *not* part of the constant, concern items which reflect an author’s fidelity to source ‘fact’.
4. Items not part of the constant and not relating to narrative construction, concern stylistic structure and the date of composition.

1. The Figure shows that there are eight paradigmatic items with which no text fails to conform, and two items which each have only a single discrepant text. These items comprise exactly one half of the paradigm and are consistently found in almost 100% of the texts. It would therefore appear that these items are narrative or stylistic constants.

2. The narrative emphasis in the selected *Folio* texts, exemplified by agreement with the paradigm, is traditional. In summary,<sup>3</sup> the *histoire* will:-

Omit or generalise detail (2), and show a lack of concern for exactitude in names, times and figures (4, 7 and 20), in order to emphasise the importance given to the necessity of focusing audience attention on a righteous hero (18, 9 and 3). This hero will be shown in an ‘adventure’, in which through a series of scenes organised in chronological sequence (13) (*Bosworth* dissenting), he will overcome some handicap (19) (*William* dissenting), and, in a satisfactory climax, achieve success (14).

This pattern seems to apply regardless of whether the heroic role is played by a

---

3. The numbers in parentheses represent the item-numbers in the paradigm.

composite or a single figure.

3. Some of the *Folio* poems do not agree with those paradigmatic items which relate to the presentation of a hero or an adventure. This is especially noticeable in those texts where the narrative is limited by the events described — the source ‘fact’. Unlike the Romance where the battle is peripheral to the individual, in historical texts the individual is peripheral to the battle.

The single instance of failure to handicap the hero (19) is probably due to fidelity to received history. Certainly narrative constraint is seen in five of the selected texts (*Agincourt*, *Bosworth*, *Flodden*, *Scottish* and *Edgar*) where ‘fact’ is faithfully portrayed even though the historical hero’s behaviour is less than heroic. That this is not just a latter-day value judgement is evident in the various ingenious authorial explanations for the heroic lapses. None of the authors seems to have felt it permissible to omit the unfortunate incident affecting his hero: all have nevertheless striven to fit him into the conventional pattern, and in doing so have impaired other apparently lesser, customary patterns. This explains why one text (*Bosworth*) does not conform to the tradition of a single episode (13): the poet, desiring to minimise the fact that his hero does not match the conventional heroic picture in all respects, has introduced a short supernumerary episode in which his blemished hero is shown to have exhibited the proper qualities. Similarly, paradigmatic items 5 and 6 (covering *motivation* and *fiction and history*) have also been manipulated to explain the less-than-heroic, and are not constants for these historical texts which, true to source history, must have a flawed hero.

The paradigm states that scene links (11) will be fictitious: seven of the texts do not conform, although two of these texts (*Aldingar* and *Bartton*) are listed only because they have no links — which cannot therefore be said to be fictitious. These two texts are closely allied to the folk-ballad: the juxtaposition of unlinked scenes is a well known commonplace in that genre. Scenes in the remaining five texts are linked by actions which are historically true. In this way the narrative of each of these texts is indebted to the author’s fidelity to his source, which in turn affects tradition.

The paradigm items 8 and 10 (*Dialogue and Source*; *Dialogue and Event*) each have six texts which do not agree, and which therefore generally reflect fidelity to source ‘fact’. Dialogue as an integral part of the forward movement of the *histoire*, is related to its presence and function in the poet’s written source in only two texts (*Squier* and *William*) — although the conversations of four other texts (*Scottish*, *Bosworth*, *Agincourte* and *Edgar*) visibly stem from their respective source dialogues (8). Three of the remaining four texts where dialogue is seen to profit the plot (10) (*Aldingar*, *Bartton* and *Flodden*) have no existing earlier sources, but the fourth (*Grene Knight*) is certainly indebted to a predecessor for the matter of its dialogues, though not the lexis.

4. The Table shows that the date of the text is allied to variations of stylistic tradition: the later the text, the higher the degree of variance.

In the chapters where these texts are discussed, I showed that unlike the other poems, the later ballads focus outwards: didactic and hortatory, they are written to instruct; they are ‘useful’ and audience entertainment is a secondary function. They are (certainly in the case of Deloney’s *William* and *Edgar*) one of a stream of similar broadsides, written to earn money. They are also written, in the case of the four latest texts at least, to be printed and sold to strangers by people other than the poet. Because

of this the balladist need not set up an interaction between himself and his audience through his matter or his style of *discours*: thus there is no comic relief (12) and the poet's personal feelings about his characters (17) is not shown. It can be reasonably presumed that he often has none since, as a cog in an industry, he is more likely to be impersonal than is a craftsman composing to please individual parochial patrons.

Because the texts do not focus on the narrative as a story *per se*, it is sometimes necessary for the educational balladeer to note events occurring over a broad historical spectrum (1) in order to place his topic in its proper setting. Although sourced dialogue (8) is not confined entirely to the broadsides, the later writers tend to copy their sources with only minimal word changes — sometimes necessitating distortion of word-order to accommodate rhyme and rhythm. Although, as is well known, many talented poets wrote an occasional ballad, this practice reflects the 'hack' status of the more humble balladeers who, under the stress of necessity, employed a mediocre talent to a wholly mercantile end.

\*\* \* \*\*

My general conclusions concerning narrative and mediaeval continuity in *The Percy Folio*, are that a core of eight stylistic and narrative patterns are repeated from text to text. This core represents a continuity of tradition.

#### A. CORE GROUP - NO CHANGE

Item No.	Brief Description	Effect
Item 2:	Details absent	Narrative simplicity
Item 3:	Focus on few characters	Narrative simplicity
Item 4:	Names absent . . . or wrong. . . .	Narrative simplicity Nil.
Item 7:	Times wrong	Nil
Item 20	Numbers wrong: conventional or exaggerated. . . .	Audience satisfaction
Item 9:	Dialogue: expands character or moral. . . .	Audience satisfaction
Item 14	Single grand climax	Narrative simplicity and Audience satisfaction
Item 18	Hero always Right	Audience satisfaction

It is noted that some of the paradigmatic items which do not appear in the core-group, are violated in only one or two texts, while others are found to be aberrant in many texts. This suggests a possible order of susceptibility to change.

#### B. GROUP TWO - SMALL CHANGE

Item No.	No. of Texts	Description of Alteration	Effect
Item 19	(1)	Hero not handicapped	Veracity of poet
Item 13	(1)	Topic not in a single episode	Complete story
Item 1	(2)	Broad span of events	Explanatory information
Item 15	(2)	No lesson, explanation or moral after Climax. . . .	Impartiality
Item 16	(2)	Matter of caudal moral &c.	

		not repeated in tale	(Both examples tied to above)
Item 17	(3)	Poet not partisan	Impartiality
Item 12	(4)	No comic relief	Gravity/Authorial distance

C. GROUP THREE - MOST CHANGE

Item No.	No. of Texts	Description of Alterations	Effect
Item 5	(6)	Motivation is detailed	Narrative interest
Item 6	(6)	Fiction does distort event	Narrative interest
Item 8	(6)	Dialogue is sourced	Veracity
Item 10	(6)	Dialogue does move the plot	Narrative interest
Item 11	(7)	Scenic links are not fiction	Veracity

A. It would appear that the core items which continue convention unchanged are those which concern ultimate audience reaction.<sup>4</sup> The story is kept simple and tailored to a predictable formula. It is shorn of irrelevant peripheral details and, proceeding towards a single grand climax, the focus is entirely on the principal character and a linear adventure. It seems that he is important as a representative of the genus *hero*: his individual circumstances insofar as they do not immediately affect his story, are of little account — hence the narrative indifference to the misrepresentation of names, times and abstract figures. When numbers represent enemies then they are likely to be exaggerated to emphasise heroic prowess in victory: both prowess and victory being a concomitant part of the hero's expected representation of 'Right'. The items in this group represent the most important of the basic ingrained elements of mediaeval narrative tradition and reinforce and perpetuate a known code. I therefore conclude that, regardless of the presence of other innovations or modifications, the inclusion of these items in a narrative, ensures audience acceptance for it through fulfilled expectations and comfortable familiarity: it underlines the fact that the fundamental formulaic structure of the tale is important to the society that repeats it.

B. The group of paradigmatic items which are aberrant only in a few of the subject texts, are found in the later works. With the exception of Items 13 and 1, they consist of negative modifications: the poet has *not* included comic matter, handicapped his hero, delivered a specific moral or lesson; he has not shown a partiality. The effect of these adjustments to traditional continuity (including items 13 and 1), is primarily to give the narratives a light gloss of reportage: the poet is distanced; he is an impartial 'observer' delivering an accurate account of events in an objective tone. I therefore conclude that the emphasis, whether deliberate or not, is directed towards convincing the audience that they are receiving a complete account of a true-life event in order that each poem's 'lesson' may be given added weight through being associated with something that really happened.

C. The final group, which shows those items most frequently subject to change, seems to incorporate positive qualification through factual or stylistic addition. In part, as I have previously noted, this is owing to the necessity of excusing the non-traditional behaviour of a flawed hero, but I conclude that contributing as it does to a modest growth

---

4. It is probable that in a different group of texts a certain amount of marginal overlap might be expected: that an item presently appearing in one or two instances in the second group, might appear in the first group, and that an item from that group might appear on the periphery of the middle group. I suspect that such an item is the 'inclusion of an extra episode' (13) found only in *Bosworth*.

in the sophistication of the narratives' interest, it may also represent a modest growth in the sophistication of audience narrative preference.

To sum up: it is well known that early printed popular verse entertainment naturally copied existing plots and existing narrative styles. Maintenance of fundamental traditional continuity probably ensured audience recognition of a narrative as familiar and therefore acceptable. It follows that the alteration of the less important mediaeval patterning found in popular rhymed entertainment would not form a barrier to public approval provided that the basic form was still recognisable. The tendency in the later texts of the second group to alter conventional narrative presentation in favour of reportage and extra detail, is a harbinger of the early journalism of the first newsheets of the Civil Wars. This more distant, more comprehensive style, together with the presence of not normally sourced material in group three, reflects a different professionalism and the advent of the balladeer as a 'hack' writer. It may also represent the beginnings of a widening of public education and sophistication of public taste.<sup>5</sup>

In short, my conclusions relating to the application of the paradigm to my subject texts, are that it is now possible to recognise in detail some of the early narrative elements which exist unaltered in selected texts from *The Percy Folio*; and, where alterations have taken place, to recognise the changes and assess their significance. In essence, convention is retained in those items which affect audience satisfaction and therefore ensure acceptance of the tale, and discarded where changing standards of community education and instruction are involved.

\*\* \* \*\*

### III. Conclusions — The Motifeme

The continuity of mediaeval convention with regard to textual motifemic structure in *The Percy Folio*, is very strong. None of the works studied failed to comply with tradition in some degree even though some texts had rearranged the conventional presentation to suit their circumstances.

It was found that the later texts modified traditional motifemic convention in several ways and for several reasons, but all of these reasons were connected with the cultural and practical changes inherent in the societal phenomenon commonly called 'progress'.

1. The requirements of printing.

Where the motifemes *exhortation* and *valediction* are either wholly lacking or reduced to a vestigial component, the reason was shown to be likely to be a function of the space available on a broadside sheet.

2. Increase in cultural *tempo*.

The use of motifemic *assimilation* where several motifemic components are combined suggests that the leisurely verbosity of the Middle English Romance is

---

5. The ever increasing availability of printed non-fictional texts and the growth in literacy, provides the possibility, however unlikely, that some members of an audience, perhaps having become interested, could verify the facts of a ballad by consulting the same work from which the 'hack' author had taken them in the first place.

found to be less desirable or practical as time goes on, but that nevertheless the traditional form is preserved as much as possible.<sup>6</sup> This use of traditional form is also paradoxically seen in an innovation present in the later *terminal status-quo*: the negative allotif. In *Scotish* for instance, the hero is shown not to be enjoying a reward, but the reward which he is actively ‘not enjoying’ is the negative aspect of a formulaic allotif reward for *populace, law-and-order*. Similarly in the broadside, *Buckingham* the villain is punished — but he is punished with the negative aspect of several allotifs of the positive heroic reward. Despite the reversal of form the continuity of mediaeval tradition is obvious.

3. The growth of Humanism.<sup>7</sup>

This is seen in the introduction of new allotifs such as *god-save-the-king/yeomen/the Earl of Derby*, into *prayer* components. The desire that the *populace* as the ‘cominality’ might be the subject of general prosperity shows a developing permissiveness in the social acceptance of the importance of secular and concrete practicalities. There is a visible diminution of the emphasis on the spiritual seen in the earlier almost ubiquitous *heavenly reward* allotif.

4. National pride.

A growing consciousness of national esteem in the matter of martial conflict is seen in the introduction of five new allotif components of the *boast* related to battles: *assessment of strength, villain’s lament, humiliation of dead villain, enumeration of victories, and enumeration of spoils*. All of these new components patriotically emphasise the extent of the victory. It would appear from this and from the proliferation of ‘popular’ historical verse, as evidenced by the number present in *The Percy Folio* and other sources, that there is an increase in the dissemination of overt National Pride in the more humble forms of poetry: the ordinary people of post-mediaeval society are widening their identity to include national as well as the established parochial boundaries.

5. The spread of education. I.

The later *Folio* texts have a new subcomponent (*explication*) incorporated into the component *moral* of the motif *valediction*. This innovation is likely to be the result of public intellectual curiosity having been stimulated through the growth of literacy and the proliferation of reading matter.<sup>8</sup> Broadside texts were written as a commercial business: the balladeer’s prospective audience was of no individual interest to him; there was no personal interaction as his audience was an unknown, widespread and to him, disembodied entity. He could write his poem as he pleased — his only criterion being its market value, sometimes achieved through the degree of efficiency with which he could present the lesson it illustrated. Ballads which have some ‘educational’ pretensions in that they

---

6. Wittig notes (*Narrative Structures*, p. 153) that *assimilation* in the Middle English Romance, occurs in the large structural unit called a type-episode. She does not observe it in the motif.

7. Here defined as:

‘Awareness of mundane human interests; concern with human (not religious etc.) matters, emphasis on common human needs and the here-and-now’.

8. The teaching and learning-by-heart of mnemonic verses is an ancient tradition in non-literate societies, and I am not suggesting that this aspect of education is new, except perhaps inasmuch as post printing, the preceptual verse was less likely to be delivered orally to the pupil; more likely itself to have been taken from a written source, and certainly made available to a comprehensive cross-section of the public in larger numbers than ever before.



purport to explain the historical origins of some topic, from necessity use the new component, *explication*. This is not so in those texts where the lesson has a behavioural application. The innovation in those texts is that *moral* becomes the poem's *raison d'être*: it is no longer an optional component but becomes nuclear and obligatory.

6. The spread of education. II.

That the production of poems with an historical subject contributed to popular education is too well known to need detailing here. The assimilation of character rôles into a composite hero is a necessary variation due both to choice of topic, and the fact that in factual historical entertainment the individual is peripheral to the battle. This necessity meant that it was difficult for the poet to include the *boast* component *I-brag* (or other motifemes of dialogue tied to the hero) unless he produced an heroic spokesman. There was then the danger that the audience would mistake the spokesman for the hero. The investigation based on the paradigm led me to conclude that the poet was conventionally at pains not to alter the historical hero but to show even his least heroic deeds. This conclusion is reinforced by the various measures taken to ensure that the audience does not wrongly identify the heroic spokesman for the hero. The *Durham* poet provides his composite hero at various times with a voice belonging to a member of each of the Three Estates: a bishop, a yeoman and the king. Each of these voices fulfils a different motifemic function. The *Flodden* poet sets his text's narrative time after the conflict is finished and further distances his characters by placing them in France. But he also provides a speaker from disparate Estates: an earl and a yeoman. *Scotish* divides the narrative between England and France and permits speech in England, where the conflict takes place, to the villain only. In France the heroic voice is given to the King. He was not present at the battle so there is no likelihood of confusion. *William* has an heroic voice which is quite plainly presented as a chorus of yeomen. This sacrifices the immediacy of individual dialogue even though the heroic brag is present, but identifies the hero — the subject of the poem's moral — without danger of doubt.

7. The spread of education. III.

Factual fidelity in the poetic recording of an event which had a composite historical hero necessitates further modification of the traditional motifeme because of the heroic duplication of rôles. This duplication gives rise to amalgamation and alteration of the motifemic components in the *terminal status-quo*. Thus the traditional Romance 'rewards' allocated to the single *hero* or *hero* + *family* are inappropriate when *hero* is also *associates* and *populace*; if the composite hero is to benefit it has to be done collectively: no new guerdon is invented, the composite hero achieves the customary rewards traditionally given to *populace*.

Because this study discusses only two tales based on the Romance, it is not wise to be emphatically didactic regarding any conclusions I might derive solely from them. In general it was noted that these two texts both retained traditional motifemes. Some of their allomotifemic components had been modified but nowhere to such an extent as to outrage tradition or grossly violate mediaeval continuity. However, although I am here confining my summary of findings to the general, it is possible to present one definite conclusion indirectly arrived at through my examination of *The grene knight*. My study of this text led me to re-examine over fifty Middle English Romances and discover that a

motifemic presentation found in *GK* is a previously unremarked stylistic tradition:

- Motifemes or their components, applicable to a given character type must be linked with that character regardless of plot-devices.

For instance, if a villain is disguised as a hero he may nevertheless *not* be linked to a hero-tied motifeme.

In summary, the presence of unaltered motifemes, and more particularly, the presence of narrative information in the form of new allomotifs put forward as components of traditional motifemes, confirms the importance of audience satisfaction through the perpetuation of known formulae. The changing cultural values gently reflected in the new allomotifs are quietly disseminated in popular rhymed entertainment as a continuing part of the established tradition.

#### IV. General Conclusions

It was not unexpected to find that texts originating prior to the mass distribution of cheap printed verse tailored towards popular entertainment, have a higher degree of conformity to earlier tradition and lexical patterns than later works. This is partly because the later 'popular' poet writes under different conditions from those of the earlier author. I have shown that the work of the early poet may show that when composing, he has in mind a relatively small (probably regional) audience (which may include a specific patron), who expect the poet's work to contain specific stylistic and structural features; to whom he may sing, recite or read his work in person; with whom he is therefore likely to have some kind of inter-relationship, and from whom he may then and there collect a reward. Thus he is less likely than the broadside author to regard his work as an intellectual chore, more likely to conform to the expectations of his smaller and possibly actively vociferous audience, and his work will therefore be more aligned with tradition. However, this study has determined that regardless of the changed conditions surrounding the later writer, a core of mediaeval continuity is present in the popular rhymed entertainment of *The Percy Folio*.

My research has enabled me to establish several things in more detail than has hitherto been accomplished. First, I have been able to pin-point those aspects of tradition which, in the texts studied, continue unchanged, continue although modified, or have been discarded. Secondly, the nature of the traditional content retained, modified or rejected, clarifies the author's poetic status, his personal affiliations and his ultimate object in composing his poem. Thirdly, they also provide an indication of the presence of hybridisation and suggest a broad date of textual origin. My final conclusion relates to an observation made by Wittig and which concerns the purpose of the formulaic structure and narrative codes of the Middle English Romance:

Because neither the style nor the narrative patterns generally convey a great deal of new information to its audience (the audience already knows what will happen — how the story will turn out — and probably even anticipates certain scenes, motifs, and even language formulas), they [the Romances] are free to serve as vehicles for other, perhaps more vital kinds of information. This information (which may be obscured . . . by the complexities of the narrative process) is encoded within the deeper structure of the stories and . . . certain narrative components; it quite clearly has to do with the reinforcement and perpetuation of certain social and political beliefs held by the community. Because of the immense amount of psychological energy which must be

invested in these beliefs . . . any formula . . . which contains these codes will itself be preserved by the community, often past the time when it ceases to hold importance for the whole group (the general community is almost always extremely conservative and resists change). Any phenomenon which violate community standards will be ignored and significant violations may be explicitly disallowed.<sup>9</sup>

The deep-structure topics of the *Folio* texts concern the same universals as the Romances — Honour, Justice, Fidelity, Power. New information is not presented through the large units of scene or episode but reflections of cultural change are comfortably embedded in familiar motifemes as new allomotific components. This study has particularly noted the fact that whenever possible these allomotific constructions have conformed to tradition with only the minimum of alteration so that, for instance, the new composite hero does not receive a new *reward* but has that which normally belongs to *populace*; the presentation of a modified formulaic motifeme is achieved through the reversal of its customary allomotifs, as negatives, and there is an increase in *assimilation* — the combination of multiple motifemic functions being preferred to outright omission. The caution with which these changes are made confirms the latter half of Wittig's argument, which reciprocally explains why such caution is needed.

Apart from the innovations mentioned above, and the introduction of the composite hero, the greatest reflection of altered cultural focus is seen in the terminal prayers' perfunctory mention or complete renunciation of the traditional request for a reward after death, in favour of a plea for present prosperity. It may not be by chance that this, the clearest innovation, is part of the poet's *discours* at the end of the text and often immediately concerns the desires of the audience in terms of present reality.

The introduction of the composite hero as a variant of mediaeval Romance tradition, is, where possible, to some extent mitigated by the appointment of a spokesman of properly noble or chivalric rank. However, even where this amelioration has taken place, the function is frequently shared by a representative of a lower estate. In fact the fundamental cultural change to affect the continuity of the old formulae, is the tacit acknowledgement that the community includes the ordinary man and the recognition of his past, present and future contribution to the culture as the force behind England's military power, a present lucrative market for entertainment, and, with the growth of literacy and ideas, an awakening mass-intelligence capable of disturbing the status-quo if not instructed as to established acceptable conduct. Thus the later texts show a decided increase in their didactic moral content and homiletic tone. Some texts flatter the commons by conceding that the ordinary man is capable of heroic deeds but retain unaltered those aspects of tradition which reinforce the general communal belief in the basic validity of the orthodox social stratification by insisting that ordinary men are capable of such deeds only when inspired by the leadership of their rightful lords or noble commanders. Other texts demonstrate particular virtues to be emulated by the public by following custom and exemplifying the virtues in a person or a character nobly born and which underlines the idea that birth equals worth to such an extent that, as I discovered, traditionally a disguised hero may not violate his innate nobility by usurping any motifemic function tied to a villain — or vice-versa.

Thus, as shown in this study, long after the society which gave rise to them had disappeared, the basic structures of mediaeval continuity persisted. Their hardy survival was not only because of community conservatism and love of the familiar; not only because their formulaic stylistic and narrative patterns assisted the facility of poetic

---

9. Wittig, *Narrative Structures*, p. 181-82.

composition, but also because, and perhaps most importantly, they represented an ideal society that people still wanted and needed to believe in.

## **BIBLIOGRAPHY**

(This is a list of works consulted in the preparation of this thesis.)

## **PRIMARY SOURCES**

PRIMARY SOURCES

MANUSCRIPTS

This is a list of manuscripts which I have consulted *in situ*. Manuscripts in this list which contain, refer to, or in some other fashion are relevant to a particular text found in *The Percy Folio*, or which contain Romances or other texts studied in the preparation of this work, are indicated by the name of the text in parenthesis.

*British Library*

- Additional 27879                    (*THE PERCY FOLIO*)
- Manuscript at back of printed verses, C. 39. 37., 'Various Poems':  
(*PF 33: When Phebus addrest*)
- Additional 5830                    (*PF 37: Earles off Chester*)
- Additional 10337                   (*Elizabeth Rogers' Virginal Book: PF 131: Now the  
springe is come; PF 188: Balowe*)
- Additional 15118                   (*PF 64: When First I sawe*)
- Additional 15225                   (*PF 87: Buckingham betrayd by Banister*)
- Additional 16441                   (*PF 186: Alffonso & Ganselo*)
- Additional 22283                   (*Robert of Sicily*)
- Additional 22582                   (*PF 28: Walking in a Meadow grene*)
- Additional 22603                   (*PF 51: The kinge enjoyes his rights againe; PF 44: Off  
a puritane*)
- Additional 24665                   (*Giles Earle: PF 18: See the bwildinge; PF 60: Doe you  
meane; PF 42: Dulcina; PF 144: Lovers hearke alarum;  
PF 44: Off a puritane*)
- Additional 24859                   (*PF 41: Merline*)
- Additional 24990                   (*PF 18: See the bwildinge*)
- Additional 27642                   (*PF 11: Sir Lancelott of Dulake*)
- Additional 27879                   (*Percy Folio*)
- Additional 28638                   (*Robin Hood's Garland: PF 6: Little John, the Beggar  
and the Three Palmers*)
- Additional 29396                   (*PF 95: When as I doe reccord*)
- Additional 29408-9                (*Buchan: PF 14: Lord Barnard and Little Musgrave; PF  
23: The heire of Lin;  
PF 46: Kinge John & Bishoppe; PF 106: Childe  
Maurice*)
- Additional 30162                   (*PF 48: Cheuey Chase*)
- Additional 38599                   (*Shann Family Book: PF 141: Hero & Leander; PF 133:  
Aoeneas & Dido; PF 185: Queene Dido*)
- (*PF 41: Merline*)
- Cotton Caligula A. ii.            (*Chevalere Assigne; PF 101: Eglamore; Octavian; PF  
105: Libius Disconius; Emaré; Launfal*)

Cotton Galba E. ix.	( <i>Ywain &amp; Gawain</i> )
Cotton Vespasian A. xxv.	( <i>PF 10: Captain Carre</i> )
Cotton Vitellius D. x.	( <i>PF 77: Agincourte Battell</i> )
Harley 293	( <i>PF 39: Flodden Feilde</i> )
Harley 306/1	( <i>PF 132: Bosworth Feilde</i> )
Harley 367	( <i>PF 39: Flodden Feilde; PF 154: Ladye Bessiye</i> )
Harley 433	( <i>PF 87: Buckingham betrayd by Banister</i> )
Harley 542	( <i>PF 132: Bosworth Feilde</i> )
Harley 565	( <i>PF 77: Agincourte Battell</i> )
Harley 2127	( <i>PF 49: When loue with unconfined; PF 193: Coridon</i> )
Harley 2149	( <i>PF 37: Earles off Chester</i> )
Harley 3504	( <i>PF 79: Durham Feilde</i> )
Harley 3810	( <i>Sir Orfeo</i> )
Harley 6223	( <i>PF 41: Merline</i> )
Harley 6340	( <i>PF 41: Merline</i> )
Harley 6918	( <i>PF 56: Newarke</i> )
Harley 7332	( <i>Feargod Barbon's Book: PF 156: I Dreamed my Loue; PF 119: Darkesome Cell</i> )
Royal 19. C. xiii	( <i>PF 11: Sir Lancelott of Dulake</i> )
Royal 20. C. vi	( <i>PF 11: Sir Lancelott of Dulake</i> )
Royal 20. D. iv	( <i>PF 11: Sir Lancelott of Dulake</i> )
<i>Bodleian Library, Oxford</i>	
Ashmole 36	( <i>PF 59: The Tribe of Banburye</i> )
Ashmole 37	( <i>PF 153: To Oxfforde; PF 49: When Loue with unconfined; PF 58: The worlde is changed</i> )
Ashmole 38	( <i>PF 52: The Aegiptian Quene</i> )
Ashmole 47	( <i>PF 52: The Aegiptian Quene</i> )
Ashmole 48	( <i>Sheale: PF 48: Cheuey Chase</i> )
Ashmole 61	( <i>PF 105: Libius Disconius; Orfeo; Sir Cleges</i> )
Ashmole 219	( <i>PF 11: Sir Lancelott of Dulake</i> )
Ashmole 423	( <i>PF 158: A Propecye</i> )
Don. c. 57	( <i>PF 57: Amongst the mirtles</i> )
Don. d. 58	( <i>PF 98: Iliue where I loue</i> )
Douce F. F. 71	( <i>PF 7: Robin Hoode his death</i> )
Douce Frag. e. 40.	( <i>PF 21: Sir Lambewell</i> )
Eng. Poet. c. 50	( <i>PF 158: A Propecye</i> )
Eng. Poet. e. 14	( <i>PF 155: Are Women Faire; PF 45: Cooke Laurel</i> )
Eng. Poet. f. 10	( <i>PF 45: Cooke Laurel; PF 113: The Turke in Linen</i> )
Eng. Poet. f. 16	( <i>PF 18: See the bwildinge</i> )
Malone 19	( <i>PF 17: Listen Jolly Gentlemen; PF 45: Cooke Laurel</i> )
Malone 23	( <i>PF 17: Listen Jolly Gentlemen</i> )
Malone 941	( <i>PF 21: Sir Lambewell</i> )

- Montagu e. 14 (PF 49: *When Loue with unconfined*)
- 4<sup>o</sup> Rawlinson 566  
Rawlinson c. 86 (PF 21: *Sir Lambewell*; PF 13 *The Marriage of Sir Gawaine*; PF 34: *Fryar & Boye*)
- Rawlinson d. 1267 (PF 49: *When loue with unconfined*)  
Rawlinson f. 34 (PF 111: *Sir Degree*; *Degaré*)  
Rawlinson Poet. 26 (PF 158: *A Propecy*; PF 137: *O noble Festus*)  
Rawlinson Poet. 62 (PF 45: *Cooke Laurel*)  
Rawlinson Poet. 65 (PF 151: *The Lauinian Shore*; PF 57: *Amongst the mirtles*)
- Rawlinson Poet. 85 (PF 178: *As yee came from the holye*)  
Rawlinson Poet. 116 (PF 50: *Cloris*)  
Rawlinson Poet. 147 (PF 42: *The Aegiptian Quene*; PF 143: *Songs of Sheparden*)
- Rawlinson Poet 152 (PF 53: *The Mode of France*)  
Rawlinson Poet. 172 (PF 155: *Are Women Faire*)  
Rawlinson Poet. 246 (PF 157: *The Caulere*; PF 138: *O Watt where art thou*)
- Tanner 88 (PF 158: *A Propecy*)  
Tanner 306 (PF 132: *Bosworth Feilde*)
- Top. Cheshire c. 9 (PF 37: *Earles off Chester*)
- Oxford Colleges*  
Christ Church Mus. 439 (PF 98: *I liue where I loue*)
- Corpus Christi 255 (PF 46: *Kinge John & Bishoppe*)  
Corpus Christi 327 (PF 68: *Downe sate the shepard*)  
Corpus Christi 328 (PF 180: *A Mayden heade*; PF 155: *Are Women Faire*)
- Cambridge University Library*  
Ee iii 1 (PF 79: *Durham Feilde*)  
Ee iii 59 (PF 22: *Sir Aldingar*)  
Ff. i. 6 (*Sir Degrevant*)  
Ff. ii. 38 (PF 72: *Sir Triamore*; PF 101: *Eglamore*; PF 111: *Sir Degree*; *The Earl of Toulouse*)  
Ff. v. 48 (PF 84: *Guye of Gisborne*)  
Kk. v. 30 (PF 21: *Sir Lambewell*)
- Cambridge Colleges*  
King's 13 (*William of Palerne*).
- Magdalene 25241.4 (PF 34: *Fryar & Boye*)  
Magdalene 363(23) (PF 34: *Fryar & Boye*)
- Broughton Ho., Kirkcudbright.*  
Hornel Library, Kinloch MSS. (PF 14: *Lord Barnard and Little Musgrave*; PF 29: *Glasgerion*; PF 90 *Childe Waters*)
- Tenbury Wells*



St. Michael's College Mus. 1018 (*PF 63: Faine Wolde I change; PF 67: How fayre shee  
be*)

*Victoria & Albert Museum*

Dyce 25. F. 39

(*PF 70: Come come come; PF 193: Coridon; PF 68:  
Downe sate the shepard*)

PRIMARY SOURCES

PRINTED REFERENCES — MAINLY HISTORICAL

(For the purpose of this catalogue historical authors have been listed following the form of their name by which they are most commonly known: thus 'Adam of Usk', rather than 'Usk. Adam of,'. In this and the following listings, where the first line of an entry consists of the title to a work beginning with *The* or *A*, these words have been omitted: the entry is listed alphabetically under the initial letter of the next word to occur in the title).

- Adam of Usk. *Chronicon Adae de Usk A.D. 1377-1421*. Ed. E. M. Thompson. 2nd edn. London, 1904.
- Agnellus, Thomas. *Radulphi de Coggeshall, Chronicon Anglicanum, de Expugnatione Terrae Sanctae Libellus, Thomas Agnellus de Morte et Sepultura Henrici Regis Angliae Junioris, Gesta Fulconis Filii Warini, Excerpta ex Otiis Imperialibus Gervasii Tileburiensis*. Ed. J. Stevenson. London, 1875.
- André, Bernard. *Historia Regis Henrici Septimi, a Bernardo Andrea Tholosate Conscripta; necnon alia quaedam ad eundem regem spectantia*. Ed. J. Gairdner. London, 1858.
- Andrew of Wyntoun. *The Original Chronicle of Andrew of Wyntoun*. Ed. F. J. Amours. Vols. I to V. Edinburgh, 1903-1914.
- Anglo-Saxon Chronicle: A Revised Translation*. Ed. D. Whitelock, D. C. Douglas, and S. I. Tucker. London, 1961.
- Annales Bertiniani*. Vol. I of *Monumenta Germaniae Historica*. Ed. G. H. Pertz. Hanover, 1826; rpt. 1963.
- Annales de Margan, 1066-1232; Annales de Theokesberia, 1066-1263; Annales de Burton, 1004-1263*. Vol. I of *Annales Monastici*. Ed. H. R. Luard. London, 1864.
- Annales de Saint Bertin*. Vol. IV of *Collection des Mémoires Relatifs a l'Histoire de France*. Ed. M. Guizot. Paris, 1824.
- Annales Monasterii de Bermundeseia; Annales Prioratus de Dunstaplia*. Vol. III of *Annales Monastici*. Ed. H. R. Luard. London, 1866.
- Annales Monasterii de Oseneia; Annales Prioratus de Wigornia*. Vol. IV of *Annales Monastici*. Ed. H. R. Luard. London, 1869.
- Annals of the Lords of Warrington*. Ed. W. Beaumont. Chetham Society OS 86, 87 (1972-73).
- Arthur: A short sketch of his life and history in English verse of the first half of the fifteenth century*. Ed. F. J. Furnivall. EETS OS 2, London, 1864; rpt. New York, 1984.
- Asloan, John. *The Asloan Manuscript, A Miscellany in Prose and Verse Written by John Asloan in the Reign of James the Fifth*. Ed. W. A. Craigie. Edinburgh, 1925. Vol. II.
- Asser. *Asser's Life of King Alfred together with the Annal of St. Neots erroneously ascribed to Asser*. Ed. W. H. Stevenson. Rev. D. Whitelock. Oxford, 1959.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 'Life of Alfred'. In *Six Old English Chronicles*. Ed. and trans. J. A. Giles. London, 1848, pp. 44-86.
- Aubrey, John. *Brief Lives*. Ed. O. L. Dick. Harmondsworth, 1949.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Three Prose Works: Miscellanies; Remaines of Gentilisme and Judaisme; Observations*. Ed. John Buchanan-Brown. Fontwell, Sussex, 1972.
- Bagford Ballads, Illustrating the Last Years of the Stuarts*. Ed. J. W. Ebsworth. Ballad

- Society (1876-80). 2 vols. Facsimile, New York, 1968.
- Ballads & Broad-sides chiefly Of the Elizabethan Period and Printed in Black Letter, Most of which were formerly in the Heber Collection and are now in the Library at Britwell Court, Buckinghamshire.* Ed. H. L. Collmann. 1912; rpt. New York, 1971.
- Barbour, John. *Barbour's Bruce.* Ed. M. P. McDiarmid and J. A. C. Stevenson. Edinburgh, 1980. Vol. II.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Bruce; or, The Metrical History of Robert I. King of Scots.* Ed. J. Jamieson. Glasgow, 1869.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Buik of Alexander or the Buik of the Most Noble and Valiant Conqueror Alexander the Grit.* Ed. R. L. Graeme Ritchie. Edinburgh, 1925. Vol. I.
- Bartholomew of Cotton. *Bartholomæi de Cotton Monachi Norwicensis, Historia Anglicana; (A.D. 449—1298) necnon ejusdem Liber de Archiepiscopis et Episcopis Angliae.* Ed. H. R. Luard. London, 1859.
- Bell., Robert, ed. *Early Ballads Illustrative of History, Traditions, and Customs; also Ballads and Songs of the Peasantry of England, Taken Down from Oral Recitation and Transcribed from Private Manuscripts, Rare Broad-sides and Scarce Publications.* London, 1877; Detroit, 1968.
- Beltz, G. F., ed. 'Original Record of... Entry of King Henry VIII into Tournay... in 1513.' *Archæologia*, 27 (1838), 257-61.
- Bongaerts, T., ed. *Correspondence of Thomas Blount (1618-1679) A Recusant Antiquary.* Amsterdam, 1978.
- Boëthius, Hector. *Chronicle of Scotland.* London, 1773; rpt. London, 1818.
- Bower, Walter. *Joannis de Fordun Scotichronicon, cum Supplementis et Continuazione Walteri Boweri.* Ed. W. Goodall. Edinburgh, 1759.
- Briefe Relation of The siege at Newark, As it was delivered To the Council of State At Derby-house, by Lieutenant Col. Bury, whom the Earl of Manchester sent to Report.* London, 1644.
- Brut Y Brenhinedd.* Ed. and trans. J. J. Parry. Cambridge, Mass., 1937.
- Brut Y Tywysogion, or the Chronicle of the Princes.* Ed. J. W. Ab Ithel. London, 1860.
- Buchanan, George. *The History of Scotland.* Edinburgh, 1582. Trans. J. Aikman. 4 vols. Glasgow, 1827.
- Buchanan, Maurice. *Liber Pluscardiensis.* Ed. F. J. H. Skene. Vols. I and II. Edinburgh, 1877-80.
- Buck, Sir George. *History of King Richard the Third (1619).* Ed. A. N. Kincaid. Gloucester, 1979.
- Calendar of Documents Relating to Scotland: AD 1307-1357.* Ed. J. Bain. Edinburgh, 1887. Vol. III.
- Calendar of Fine Rolls Preserved in the Public Records Office: Henry VII, 1485-1509.* London, 1962. Vol. XXII.
- Calendar of Inquisitions Post Mortem and other Analogous Documents: Henry VII.* London, 1898; rpt. Nendeln / Liechtenstein, 1973. Vol. I.
- Calendar of the Close Rolls Preserved in the Public Record Office: Edward IV, Edward V and Richard III, AD 1476-1485.* London, 1954.
- Calendar of the Close Rolls Preserved in the Public Record Office: Edward III, 1349-1354.* London, 1906; rpt. Nendeln / Liechtenstein, 1972. Vol. IX.
- Calendar of the Patent Rolls Preserved in the Public Record Office: Edward IV, Edward V and Richard III.* London, 1901; rpt. Nendeln / Liechtenstein, 1971.
- Calendar of the Patent Rolls Preserved in the Public Record Office: Henry VII, AD 1485-1494.* London, 1914; rpt. Nendeln / Liechtenstein, 1970.
- Camden, William. *Camden's Britannia 1695.* Facsimile with introduction by S.

- Piggott with G. Walters. Newton Abbott, Devon, 1971.
- \_\_\_\_\_ *Camden's Britannia Newly Translated into English with large additions and improvements.* Oxford, 1695.
- \_\_\_\_\_ *Remaines concerning Britain.* Ed. J. Philipot. 7th edn. London, 1674.
- Campbell, W., ed. *Materials for a History of the Reign of Henry VII.* Vols. I and II. London, 1873, 1877.
- Capgrave, John. *Chronicle of England.* Ed. F. C. Hingeston. London, 1858.
- \_\_\_\_\_ *Liber de Illustribus Henricis.* Ed. F. C. Hingeston. London, 1858.
- Capitularia Regum Francorum.* Ed. A. Boretius and V. Krause. Hanover, 1890.
- Caxton, William. 'Continuation of the Polychronicon', *Polychronicon Ranulphi Higden.* Ed. J. R. Lumby. London, 1882. Vol. VIII.
- Chrimes, S. B. *Lancastrians, Yorkists and Henry VII.* 2nd edn. London, 1966.
- Chronica de Mailros e codice unico in bibliotheca Cottoniana servato, nunc iterum in lucem edita.* Introd. J. Stevenson. Edinburgh, 1835.
- Chronicle of Lanercost.* Trans. Sir Herbert Maxwell. *Scottish Historical Review*, 6 - 10, 1909-1913.
- Chronicle of the Reigns of Henry II. and Richard I. A.D. 1166—1192; known commonly under the name of Benedict of Peterborough.* Ed. W. Stubbs. Vol. II. London, 1867.
- Chronicles of England, Westmynstere, 1480.* Facsimile of William Caxton's edn. Amsterdam, 1973.
- Chronicles of London.* Ed. C. L. Kingsford. Oxford, 1905; Gloucester, 1977.
- Chronicon ab Anno 1189 ad 1556 ex Registro Fratrum Minorum Londiniae.* Vol. II of *Monumenta Franciscana.* Ed. R. Howlett. London, 1882.
- Chronicon Aethelwardi: The Chronicle of Aethelward.* Ed. A. Campbell. London, 1962.
- Chronicon Angliae ab Anno Domini 1328 usque ad Annum 1388: Auctore Monacho quodam Sancti Albani.* Ed. E. Thompson. London, 1874.
- Cole, C. A., ed. 'Versus Rhythmici in Laudem Regis Henrici Quinti.' *Memorials of Henry the Fifth, King of England.* London, 1858.
- Collection of Loyal Songs Written against the Rump Parliament, Between the Years 1639 and 1661.* London, 1731.
- Collection of Old Ballads, Corrected from the Best and most Ancient Copies Extant with Introductions Historical and Critical.* 3 vols. London, 1723.
- Corbett, J. S., ed. *Fighting Instructions 1530-1816.* Navy Records Society, n.p., 1905.
- \_\_\_\_\_ *Papers relating to the Navy during the Spanish War 1585-1587.* Navy Records Society, n.p., 1898.
- Crowland Chronicle Continuations 1459-1486.* Ed. N. Pronay and J. Cox. London, 1986.
- Customs of London, otherwise called Arnold's Chronicle.* Ed. F. Douce. London, 1811.
- Dodridge, Sir John. *The History of the Ancient and moderne Estate of The Principality of Wales, Dutchy of Cornewall, and Earldome of Chester.* London, 1630; facsimile, Amsterdam, 1973.
- Early English Poetry, Ballads, and Popular Literature of the Middle Ages.* Percy Society, 27, London, 1849.
- English Historical Documents c.1042-1189.* Ed. D. C. Douglas and G. W. Greenaway. London, 1969. Vol. II.
- English Historical Documents c.1327-1485.* Ed. A. R. Myers. London, 1969.
- English Historical Documents c.500-1042.* Ed. D. Whitelock. London, 1955. Vol. I.
- Eulogium (Historiarum Sive Temporis): Chronicon ab orbe condito usque ad Annum Domini M.CCC.LXVI, a Monacho quodam Malmesburiensi exaratum.* Ed. F. Scott-Haydon. Vols. I to III. London, 1858-1863.
- Fabyan, Robert. *The Chronicle of Fabian which he nameth the Concordaunce of Histories newly perused and continued from the beginnyng of Kynge Henry the Seventh to th'Ende of Queene Mary.* London,

- Fifteenth-Century Courtesy Book*. Ed. R. W. Chambers. EETS OS 148, London, 1914; rpt. London, 1962.
- First English Life of Henry the Fifth written in 1513 by an Anonymous Author commonly known as 'The Translator of Livius'*. Ed. C. L. Kingsford. Oxford, 1911.
- Firth, C. H., ed. *Naval Songs and Ballads*. Navy Records Society, 33 (1908).
- Flodden Papers: Diplomatic Correspondence between The Courts of France and Scotland 1507-1517*. Ed. M. Wood. Edinburgh, 1933.
- Florence of Worcester. *The Chronicle of Florence of Worcester with Two Continuations; comprising Annals of English History, from the Departure of the Romans to the Reign of Edward I*. Trans. T. Forester. London, 1854.
- Flores Historiarum*. London, 1601. Ed. H. R. Luard. 3 vols. London, 1890.
- Foxe, John. *The Acts and Monuments of John Foxe*. Vols. I and II. London, 1843, 1844.
- Frodoard of Rheims. *Histoire de L'Eglise de Rheims*. Ed. 'F. G.' Vol. V of *Collection des Mémoires relatifs a l'Histoire de France*. Ed. M. Guizot. Paris, 1824.
- Froissart, Sir John. *Chronicles of England, France, Spain, and The adjoining Countries, from the latter part of the Reign of Edward II to the Coronation of Henry IV*. Trans. T. Johnes. 2 vols. London, 1839.
- \_\_\_\_\_ *Oeuvres de Froissart publiées avec les variantes de Divers Manuscrits*. Ed. M. le baron Kervyn de Lettenhove. Vol. V. Bruxelles, 1868; rpt. Osnabrück, 1967.
- \_\_\_\_\_ *The Chronicles of Jean Froissart in Lord Berner's Translation*. Ed. G. and W. Anderson. London, 1963.
- Gaimar, Geffrei. *Lestorie des Engles solum La Translacion Maistre Geffrei Gaimar*. Ed. T. Duffus Hardy and C. Trice Martin. Vols. I and II. London, 1888, 1889.
- Gairdner, J., ed. *The Historical Collections of a Citizen of London in the Fifteenth Century*. Camden Society, NS 17 (1876).
- Galfridi Le Baker de Swynbroke. *Chronicon Angliae Temporibus Edwardi II et Edwardi III*. Ed. J. A. Giles. London, 1847.
- 'Gazette of the Battle of Flodden, September, 1513.' Appendix to *The History of Scotland from the Accession of the House of Stuart to that of Mary, with Appendixes of Original Papers*. By John Pinkerton. London, 1797. Vol. II, 456-58.
- Geoffrey of Monmouth. *The History of the Kings of Britain*. Trans. L. Thorpe. Harmondsworth, 1966.
- Gerald of Wales. *Itinerarium Kambriae et Descriptio Kambriae*. Vol. VI of *Giraldi Cambrensis opera*. Ed. J. F. Dimock. London, 1868.
- Gervase of Tilbury, *Radulphi de Coggeshall Chronicon Anglicanum, de Expugnatione Terrae Sanctae Libellus, Thomas Agnellus de Morte et Sepultura Henrici Regis Angliae Junioris, Gesta Fulconis Filii Warini, Excerpta ex Otiis Imperialibus Gervasii Tileburiensis*. Ed. J. Stevenson. London, 1875.
- Gesta Henrici Quinti: The Deeds of Henry the Fifth*. Trans. and introd. F. Taylor and J. S. Roskell. Oxford, 1975.
- Gesta Regis Henrici Secundi*. Ed. W. Stubbs. 2 vols. London, 1867.
- Grafton, Richard. *Abridgement of the the Chronicles of Englande*. London, 1562; rpt. London, 1570.
- Great Chronicle of London*. Ed. A. H. Thomas and I. D. Thornley. n.p. 1938; facsimile, Gloucester, 1983.
- 'Grey Friars' Chronicle'. Vol. II of *Monumenta Franciscana*. Ed. R. Howlett. London, 1882.
- Guillaume de Poitiers. *La Vie de Guillaume-le-Conquérant*. Vol. 29 of *Collection des Mémoires relatifs a L'Histoire de France*. Ed. M. Guizot. Paris,

- 1826.
- Hall, Edward. *Hall's Chronicle; containing the History of England during the reign of Henry the fourth, and the succeeding monarchs, to the end of the reign of Henry the Eighth, in which are particularly described the manners and customs of those periods.* Collated edns. of 1548 and 1550; rpt. London, 1809.
- \_\_\_\_\_ *The Union of the Two Noble Families of Lancaster and York: 1550.* Facsimile, Menston, 1970.
- \_\_\_\_\_ *The Vnion of Two Noble and Illustre Famelies of Lancastre & Yorke beeyng long in continuall discension for the croune of this noble realme, with al the actes done in bothe the tymes of the princes, bothe of the one linage & of the other, beginnyng at the tyme of Kyng Henry the Fowerth, the first aucthor of this deuision, and so successiuey procedyng to ye reigne of the high and prudent Prince King Henry the Eyght, the vndubitate flower and very heire of bothe the sayd Linages.* London, 1548.
- Halliwell, J.O.P., ed. *Early Naval Ballads.* London, 1841.
- \_\_\_\_\_ *The Most Pleasant Song of Lady Bessy; and how she married King Henry the Seventh of the House of Lancaster.* Percy Society, 20, London, 1847.
- \_\_\_\_\_ *The Thornton Romances.* London, 1844.
- Hardyng, John. *The Chronicle of John Hardyng. (Together with the continuation by Richard Grafton to the thirtyfourth year of King Henry the Eighth).* London, 1812
- \_\_\_\_\_ *The chronicle of John Hardyng, from the firste begynnyng of Englande, unto the reigne of kyng Edward the fourth wher he made an end of his chronicle.* London, 1543; facsimile, Amsterdam, 1976.
- Henry of Blaneфорde. *Johannis de Trokelowe, et Henrici de Blaneфорde, Monachorum S. Albani, necnon Quorundam Anonymorum Chronica et Annales, Regnantibus Henrico Tertio, Edwardo Primo, Edwardo Secundo et Henrico Quarto.* Ed. H. T. Riley. London, 1866.
- Henry of Huntingdon. *The Chronicle of Henry of Huntingdon.* Trans. and ed. T. Forester. London, 1853.
- Heyward, Sir John. *The Lives of the III Normans, Kings of England: William the first, William the second, Henrie the first.* London, 1613.
- Higden, Ranulph. *Polychronicon Ranulphi Higden Monachi Cestrensis; together with the English translation of John Trevisa and an unknown writer of the fifteenth century.* Ed. C. Babington and J. R. Lumby. 8 vols. London, 1865-82.
- Holinshed, Raphael. *Holinshed's Chronicles of England, Scotland and Ireland.* Ed. Sir Henry Ellis. Vols. I to VI. London, 1807-11.
- \_\_\_\_\_ *The third volume of chronicles beginning at Duke William the Norman... and continued to the yeare 1586.* First edn. 2 vols. London, 1577. Continued in 3 vols. by John Hooker and others. London, 1587.
- Ingulph's Chronicle of the Abbey of Croyland with the Continuations by Peter of Blois and Anonymous Writers.* Trans. H. T. Riley. London, 1854.
- James IV. *The letters of James the Fourth 1505-1513.* Collected by R. K. Hannay. Ed. R. L. Mackie and A. Spilman. Edinburgh, 1953.
- Jean de Troyes. *The Memoirs of Philip de Commines, Lord of Argenton; containing the Histories of Louis XI and Charles VIII, Kings of France and of Charles the Bold, Duke of Burgundy, to which is added The Scandalous Chronicle or Secret History of Louis XI by Jean de Troyes.* Ed. A. R. Scoble. Vols. I and II. London, 1855, 1889.
- Jean Juvenal des Ursins. *Histoire de Charles VI, Roy de France, et des choses Memorables aduenues durant 42 années de son Regne, depuis*

- Jean le Bel. *1380 iusques à 1422*. Augmentée par D. Godefroy. Paris, 1653.  
*Chronique de Jean le Bel*. Ed. J. Viard and E. Déprez. Paris, 1905. Vol. II.
- Jean Lefevre. *Memoires de Jean le Fevre, Seigneur de Saint-Remy*. Supplement to *Chroniques d'Enguerrand de Monstralet*, Volumes VII and VIII of *Collection des Chroniques Nationales Françaises du Treizième au Quinzième Siècle*. Ed. J. A. Buchon. Paris, 1826.
- Jean Molinet. *Chroniques de Jean Molinet (1474-1506)*. Ed. G. Doutrepoint and O. Jordogne. Academie Royal de Belgique: Classe des Lettres et des Sciences Morales et Politiques. Collections des Anciens Auteurs Belges. Vols. I to III. Brussels, 1935-37.
- Jean Raoulet. 'Chronique de Jean Raoulet, ou Chronique Anonyme du Roi Charles VII.' Vol. III of *Chroniques de Charles VII*. Ed. Vallet de Viriville. Paris, 1858.
- Jehan de Waurin. *A Collection of the Chronicles and Ancient Histories of Great Britain, now called England*. Vol. I. Trans. and ed. Sir William Hardy. Vol. II. Trans. Sir William Hardy. Ed. E. L. C. P. Hardy. Vol. III. Trans. and ed. E. L. C. P. Hardy. London, 1864, 1887, 1891.
- \_\_\_\_\_ *Recueil des Croniques et Anchiennes Istories de la Grant Bretaigne, a present nomme Engleterre, par Jehan de Waurin, Seigneur du Forestal*. Ed. William Hardy. London, 1864. Vol. I.
- Johannes Iperius. 'Ex (a) Chronico Sithiensi S. Bertini'. In *Recueil des Historiens des Gaules et de la France*. Par Dom Martin Bouquet. New edn. Paris, 1870. Vol. VII, pp. 266-268.
- John Benet of Harlyngdon. 'John Benet's Chronicle for the Years 1400 to 1462.' Ed. G. L. and M. A. Harriss. *Camden Society Miscellany*, 24, 4th series, 9 (1972), 151-233.
- John Leslie. *The Historie of Scotland Wrytten First in Latin by the Most Reuerend and Worthy Jhone Leslie Bishop of Rosse and Translated in Scottish by Father James Dalrymple Religious in the Scottis Cloister of Regensburg, the zeare of God, 1596*. Ed. E. G. Cody and W. Murison. Scottish Text Society, 5 and 6 (1888-95).
- John Major. *A History of Greater Britain as well England as Scotland compiled from the Ancient Authorities by John Major, by name indeed a Scot, but by Profession a Theologian 1521*. Trans. and ed. A. Constable. Introd. A. J. G. Mackay. Scottish History Society, 10, (1892).
- John of Fordun. *Joannis de Fordun Scotichronicon, cum Supplementis et Continuatiōe Walteri Boweri*. Ed. W. Goodall. Edinburgh, 1759.
- \_\_\_\_\_ *John of Fordun's Chronicle of The Scottish Nation*. Vol. IV of *Historians of Scotland*. Trans. F. J. H. Skene. Ed. W. F. Skene. Edinburgh, 1872.
- John of Oxnead. *Chronica Johannis de Oxenedes*. Ed. H. Ellis. London, 1859.
- John of Trokelow. *Johannis de Trokelowe, et Henrici de Blaneforde, Monachorum S. Albani, necnon Quorundam Anonymorum Chronica et Annales, Regnantibus Henrico Tertio, Edwardo Primo, Edwardo Secundo et Henrico Quarto*. Ed. H. T. Riley. London, 1866.
- John Page. *John Page's Siege of Rouen: Kritische Textausgabe, Nebst Ausfürlicher Einleitung, Anmerkungen, Glossar und Zwei Kartenbeilagen*. Ed. H. Huscher. Leipzig, 1927.
- Knighton, Henry. *Chronicon Henrici Knighton vel Cnitthon Monachi Leycestrensis*. Ed. J. L. Lumby. Vols. I and II. London, 1889,

- 1895.
- Kronyk van Vlænderen, van 580 tot 1467.* Ed. C. P. Serrure and P. Blommaert. Gent, 1840.
- 'La Estoire de Seint Aedward Le Rei'. In *Lives of Edward the Confessor*. Ed. H. R. Luard. London, 1858.
- 'La Rotta de Scocesi'. In *The Secret of Flodden with the 'Rout of the Scots': a translation of the contemporary Italian poem 'La Rotta de Scocesi'*. Trans. W. M. Mackenzie. Edinburgh, 1931, pp. 95-123.
- Lambarde, William. *A Perambulation of Kent*. London 1570. Introduction R. Church. Bath, 1970.
- Lazamon. *Lazamon: 'Brut'*. Ed. G. L. Brook and R. F. Leslie. EETS OS 250, 277, London, 1978, 1963.
- Le Livere de Reis de Brittanie e Le Livere de Reis de Engleterre.* Ed. John Glover. London, 1865.
- Lettenhove, M. le baron Kervyn de. *Istore et Croniques de Flandres, d'après les textes de divers manuscrits*. Bruxelles, 1879.
- Letters and Papers, Foreign and Domestic of the Reign of Henry VIII.* Ed. J. S. Brewer. Revd. R. H. Brodie. 2nd edn. London, 1920; rpt. Vaduz, 1965.
- Liber Monasterii de Hyda; Comprising a Chronicle of the Affairs of England from the Settlement of the Saxons to the Reign of King Cnut; and a Chartulary of the Abbey of Hyde, in Hampshire.* Ed. E. Edwards. London, 1866.
- Liber Pluscardensis.* Ed. F. J. H. Skene. Vols I and II. Edinburgh, 1877, 1880.
- Lloyd, Richard. *A briefe discouse of the most renowned actes and right valiant conquests of those puisant Princes, called the Nine worthies*. London, 1584.
- Mackie, J. D., ed. 'The English Army at Flodden.' *Scottish History Society Miscellany*, 8 (1951) 35-85.
- Madden, Sir Frederic, ed. 'Political Poems of the Reigns of Henry VI and Edward IV.' *Archaeologia*, 29 (1842).
- Mancini, Dominic. *The Usurpation of Richard the Third: De Occupatione Regni Angliae per Riccardum Tercium Libellus*. Trans. C. A. J. Armstrong. 2nd edn. Oxford, 1984.
- 'Manuscripts of the Duke of Hamilton'. Eleventh Report, Appendix, Part VI of *Historical Manuscripts Commission*. London, 1887.
- Martyn, William. *The Historie of the Lives of the Kings of England from William the Conquerour to the end of the reigne of King Henry the VIII*. London, 1638.
- Mason, George and John Earsden. *The Ayres that were Sung and Played, at Brougham Castle in Westmerland, in the King's Entertainment: given by the Right Honourable the Earle of Cumberland, and his Right Noble Sonne the Lord Clifford*. London, 1618; facsimile, Menston, 1970.
- Matthew Paris. *Matthaei Parisiensis, Monachi Sancti Albani, Historia Anglorum, sive, ut vulgo dicitur, Historia Minor*. Ed. F. Madden. Vols. I to III. London, 1866-69.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Matthaei Parisiensis, Monachi Sancti Albani, Chronica Majora*. Ed. H. R. Luard. Vols. I to VI. London, 1872-82.
- 'Mercurius Aulicus, March 23, 1643.' In Vol. III, Newsbook I, Oxford Royalist Volume 2, of *The English Revolution*. Ed. R. Jeffs. London, 1643; facsimile, London, 1971.
- Monstralet, Enguerrand de. *The Chronicles of Enguerrand de Monstralet, A Gentleman formerly resident at Cambrai in Cambresis*. Trans. T. Johnes. London, 1809.
- More, Sir Thomas. *The History of King Richard III and Selections from the English and Latin Poems*. Ed. R. S. Sylvester. New Haven, Conn.,



- 1976.
- Murimuth, Adam. *Adae Murimuth Continuato Chronicarum*. Ed. E. Maunde Thompson. London, 1889.
- Nennius. 'History of the Britons.' In *Six Old English Chronicles*. Ed. and trans. J. A. Giles. London, 1848, pp. [383]-416.
- Oppenheim, M., ed. *Naval Accounts and Inventories of the Reign of Henry VII 1485-86 to 1495-97*. Navy Records Society, 1896.
- Original Letters Illustrative of English History; including numerous royal letters from autographs in the British Museum and one or two other collections*. Ed. Henry Ellis. 3 vols. London, 1824-46.
- Page, John. *The Siege of Rouen*. In *The Historical Collections of a Citizen of London in the Fifteenth Century*. Ed. J. Gairdner. London, 1876.
- Palmer, R., ed. *A Ballad History of England from 1588 to the Present Day*. London, 1979.
- 'Papers Relating to the Captivity and Release of David II.' *Scottish Historical Society Miscellany*, 3rd series, 9 (1958), 1-35.
- Percy, Bishop Thomas. *The Correspondence of Thomas Percy and David Dalrymple, Lord Hailes*. Ed. A. F. Falconer. Vol. IV of *The Percy Letters*. Gen. ed. Cleanth Brooks and others. Louisiana State University Press, 1954.
- \_\_\_\_\_ *The Correspondence of Thomas Percy and Edmond Malone*. Ed. A. Tillotson. Vol. I of *The Percy Letters*. Gen. ed. Cleanth Brooks and others. Louisiana State University Press, 1944.
- \_\_\_\_\_ *The Correspondence of Thomas Percy and Evan Evans*. Ed. A. Lewis. Vol. V of *The Percy Letters*. Gen. ed. Cleanth Brooks and others. Louisiana State University Press, 1957.
- \_\_\_\_\_ *The Correspondence of Thomas Percy and George Paton*. Ed. A.F. Falconer. Vol. VI of *The Percy Letters*. Gen. ed. Cleanth Brooks and others. Louisiana State University Press, 1961.
- \_\_\_\_\_ *The Correspondence of Thomas Percy and Richard Farmer*. Ed. C. Brooks. Vol. II of *The Percy Letters*. Gen. ed. Cleanth Brooks and others. Louisiana State University Press, 1946.
- \_\_\_\_\_ *The Correspondence of Thomas Percy and Thomas Warton*. Ed. M.G. Robinson and L. Dennis. Vol. III of *The Percy Letters*. Gen. ed. Cleanth Brooks and others. Louisiana State University Press, 1951.
- \_\_\_\_\_ *The Correspondence of Thomas Percy and William Shenstone*. Ed. C. Brooks. Vol. VII of *The Percy Letters*. Gen. ed. Cleanth Brooks and others. Louisiana State University Press, 1977.
- Pierre de Langtoft. *The Chronicle of Pierre de Langtoft, in French verse, from the earliest period to the death of King Edward I*. Ed. T. Wright. 2 vols. London, 1866, 1868.
- Raine, J., ed. *Historical Papers and Letters from the Northern Registers*. London, 1873.
- Raleigh, Sir Walter. *The History of the World*. Ed. C. A. Patrides. 1614; London, 1971.
- Ralph of Cogshall. *Radulphi de Coggeshall Chronicon Anglicanum*. Ed. J. Stevenson. London, 1875.
- Ralph of Diceto. *The Historical Works of Master Ralph de Diceto, Dean of London*. Ed. W. Stubbs. 2 vols. London, 1876.
- Redman, Robert. 'Vita Henrici Quinti.' *Memorials of Henry the Fifth, King of England*. Ed. C. A. Cole. London, 1858.
- Relation, or Rather a True Account, of the Island of England; with Sundry Particulars of the Customs of These People and of the Royal Revenues under King Henry the Seventh, about the Year 1500*. Trans. C. A. Sneyd. Camden Society OS 37 (1847).
- Richard of Cirencester. *Speculum Historiale de Gestis Regum Angliae*. Ed. J. E. B.

- Mayor. Vols. I and II. London, 1863, 1869.
- Rishanger, William. *Willelmi Rishanger, quondam Monachi S. Albani, et quorundam anonymorum, Chronica et Annales, regnantibus Henrico Tertio et Edwardo Primo*. Ed. H. T. Riley. London, 1865.
- Robert Lindesay of Pitscottie. *The Historie and Cronicles of Scotland From the Slauchter of king James the First To the Ane thousande fyve hundreith thrie scoir fyftein zeir*. Ed. A. J. G. Mackay. Scottish Text Society, 42, 43, 60 (1899-1911).
- Robert Manning of Brunne. *The Story of England A.D. 1388*. Ed. F. J. Furnivall. London, 1887.
- Robert of Avesbury. *De Gestis Mirabilibus Regis Edwardi Tertii*. Ed. E. Maunde Thompson. London, 1889.
- Robert of Gloucester. *Robert of Gloucester's Chronicle*. Oxford, 1724. Rpt. in vols. I and II of *The Works of Thomas Hearne, M.A.* London, 1810.
- Roger of Hoveden. *Chronica Magistri Rogeri de Houedene*. Ed. W. Stubbs. London, 1868.
- Roger of Wendover. *The Flowers of History*. Ed. H. G. Hewlett. London, 1889. Vol. III.
- Rollins, Hyder E., ed. *A Pepysian Garland: Black-Letter Broadside Ballads of the Years 1595-1639, Chiefly from the Collection of Samuel Pepys*. Rev. edn. Cambridge, Mass., 1971.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Cavalier and Puritan*. New York, 1923.
- Rous, John. 'John Rous's Account of the Battle of Bosworth.' In *Richard III and the Early Historians*. Ed. A. Hanham. Oxford, 1975, pp. 120-24.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Rous Roll*. Introd. C. Ross. Gloucester, 1980.
- 'Scottish Feilde'. Ed. J. P. Oakden. In *Remains Historical and Literary Connected with the Palatine Counties of Lancaster and Chester*. Chetham Society NS 94 (1935) [i-viii], 1-31.
- Seng, P. J., ed. *Tudor Songs and Ballads from MS Cotton Vespasian A-25*. Cambridge, Mass., 1978.
- Skelton, R., ed. *The Cavalier Poets*. London, 1970.
- Source Book of Scottish History*. Vol. II. Ed. W. C. Dickinson, G. Donaldson and I. A. Milne. 2nd edn. London, 1958.
- Speed, John. *The Historie of Great Britaine vnder the Conqvests of the Romans, Saxons, Danes and Normans*. London, 1632.
- Spont, Alfred, ed. *Letters and Papers Relating to the War with France 1512-1513*. Navy Records Society, n.p. 1897.
- Sprott, Thomas. *Thomae Sprotti Chronica*. Ed. T. Hearne. Oxford, 1729.
- Starkey, Thomas. *England in the Reign of King Henry the Eighth*. Ed. S. J. Herrtage. 2 vols. London, 1871. Rpt. 1 vol. 1878. New York, 1973.
- Stewart, William. *The Buik of the Croniclis of Scotland: or a Metrical Version of the History of Hector Boece; by William Stewart [c.1530]*. Ed. W. B. Turnbull. 3 vols. London, 1858.
- Stow, John. *The Annales or Generall Chronicle of England begun first by Maister Iohn Stow and after him continued and augmented... unto the ende of this present yeere 1614 by Edmund Howes, gentleman*. London, 1615.
- Strecche, John. 'Chronicle of John Strecche for the reign of Henry V'. Ed. F. Taylor. *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library*, 16,1 (1932), 137-88.
- Symeon of Durham. *Symeonis Monachi Opera Omni*. Ed. T. Arnold. Vols. I and II. London, 1882, 1885.
- The Bruce and Wallace published from 2 ancient Manuscripts preserved in the Library of the Faculty of Advocates*. Ed. J. Jamieson. Glasgow, 1820; rpt. 1869.
- The Brut or the Chronicles of England*. Ed. F. W. D. Brie. EETS OS 131, 136, London. Vol. I 1906; rpt. New York 1960; Vol. II, London, 1908; rpt. New

- York, 1971.
- The Canting Academy; or Villanies discovered, wherein is shewn the Mysterious and Villanous Practices of that wicked Crew, commonly known by the Names Hectors, Trapanners, Gilts etc..* 2nd edn. London, 1674.
- Thomas of Burton. *Chronica Monasterii de Melsa, a fundatione usque ad annum 1396 auctore Thoma de Burton, Abbate.* Ed. E. A. Bond. Vols. I to III. London, 1866-68.
- Thomas of Elmham. 'Chronologia Augustinensis.' *Historia Monasterii S. Augustini Cantuariensis.* Ed. C. Hardwick. London, 1858.
- Thomas of Elmham, 'Elhami Liber Metricus de Henrico Quinto.' *Memorials of Henry the Fifth, King of England.* Ed. C. A. Cole. London, 1858.
- Thomas of Walsingham. *Gesta Abbatum Monasterii Sancti Albani, a Thoma Walsingham, Regnante Ricardo Secundo, Ejusdem Ecclesiae Praecentore, Compilata.* In Vol. II of *Chronica Monasterii S. Albani: AD 1290-1349.* Ed. H. T. Riley. London, 1867.
- \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
*Thomae Walsingham, Quondam Monachi S. Albani, Historia Anglicana.* In Vol. I of *Chronica Monasterii S. Albani.* Ed. H. T. Riley. London, 1863.
- \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
*Ypodigma Neustriae, a Thoma Walsingham, Quondam Monacho Monasterii S. Albani, Conscriptum,* in *Chronica Monasterii S. Albani.* Ed. H. T. Riley. London, 1876. Vol. VII.
- Thorne, William. *William Thorne's Chronicle of St. Augustine's Abbey, Canterbury now rendered into English by A.H. Davis.* Introd. A. H. Thompson. Oxford 1934.
- Topsell, Edward. *The Historie of Fovre-Footed Beastes.* London, 1607.
- Trevisa, John. *Polychronicon Ranulphi Higden Monachi Cestrensis; together with the English translation of John Trevisa and an unknown writer of the fifteenth century.* Ed. J. R. Lumby. London, 1882.
- 'Trewre encountre or Batayle lately don betwene Englande and Scotlande.' In *Ballade of the Scottysse Kynge.* Ed. John Ashton. London, 1882, pp. 63-78.
- Two of the Saxon Chronicles parallel with supplementary extracts from the others.* Ed. J. Earle. Rev. edn. Ed. C. Plummer. Oxford, 1892.
- Vergil, Polydore. *Historia Anglica: 1555.* Facsimile, Menston, 1972.
- \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
*Polydore Vergil's English History, from an early translation preserved among the MSS. of the old Royal Library in the British Museum: Volume I containing the first eight books comprising the period prior to the Norman Conquest.* Ed. Sir Henry Ellis. Camden Society, OS 36 (1846).
- \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
*The Anglica Historia of Polydore Vergil: AD 1485-1537.* Ed. and trans. Denys Hay. London, 1950.
- \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
*Three Books of Polydore Vergil's English History, comprising the reigns of Henry VI., Edward IV. and Richard III..* Ed. Henry Ellis. Camden Society, OS 29 (1844).
- Vita et Gesta Henrici Quinti Anglorum Regis.* Ed. T. Hearne. Oxford, 1972.
- Wall, Thomas. 'Thomas Wall's Book of Crests.' *The Ancestor*, 11 (1904), 178-90.
- Walter of Coventry. *The Historical Collections of Walter of Coventry.* Ed. W. Stubbs. Vols. I and II. London, 1872, 1873.
- Walter of Guisborough. *The Chronicle of Walter of Guisborough previously edited as the Chronicle of Walter of Hemingford or Hemingburgh.* Ed. H. Rothwell. Camden Society, 89 (1957).
- Wilkins, W. W., ed. *Political Ballads of the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries.* 2 vols. London, 1860.
- William Gregory, Skinner. *Chronicle.* In *The Historical Collections of a Citizen of London in the 15th Century.* Ed. J. Gairdner. Camden Society,

NS 17 (1876).

William of Malmesbury. *Willelmi Malmesbiriensis Monachi: De Gestis Regum Anglorum*. Ed. W. Stubbs. 2 vols. London, 1889.

Wood, Anthony A' and P. Bliss. *Athenae Oxoniensis: An Exact History of All the Writers and Bishops who have had their Education in the University of Oxford: to which are added the Fasti or Annals of the Said University by Anthony A Wood, M.A. of Merton College: A New Edition with Additions and a Continuation by Philip Bliss, Fellow of St. John's College*. 3rd edn. London, 1817; rpt. New York, 1967. Vol. III.

Wright, T., ed. *Political Poems and Songs relating to English History, composed during the period From the Accession of EDW. III. to that of RIC. III.*. Vols. I and II. London, 1859.

\_\_\_\_\_ *Songs and Ballads, with Other Short Poems, Chiefly of the Reign of Philip and Mary*. London, 1860, rpt. London, 1977.

PRINTED SOURCES — MAINLY LITERARY

- Arbour of Amorous Devices*. Ed. H. E. Rollins. Cambridge, Mass. 1937.
- Adam of Cobsam. *The Wright's Chaste Wife*. Ed. F. J. Furnivall. EETS OS 12, London, 1865; rpt. 1965.
- 'Alisaunder'. *William of Palerne ... To which is added a fragment of the Alliterative Romance of Alisaunder; Translated from the latin by the same author, about A.D. 1340*. Ed. W. W. Skeat. EETS ES 1, London, 1867; rpt. New York, 1973, pp. 177-249.
- Amis and Amiloun*. Ed. M. Leach. EETS OS 203, London, 1937; rpt. 1960.
- Ancient Scottish Ballads, Recovered from Tradition, and never before published*. London, 1827.
- Andrew Crawford's Collection of Ballads and Songs*. Ed. E. B. Lyle. Edinburgh, 1975.
- Anglo-Norman Text of 'Le Lai du Cor'*. Ed. C. T. Erickson. Oxford, 1973.
- 'Appolonius of Tyre.' In *Five Middle English Narratives*. Ed. R. D. Stevick. New York, 1967, pp. 37-97.
- Arber, E., ed. *The Dunbar Anthology, 1401-1508*. London, 1901.
- Armes, W. D., ed. *Old English Ballads and Folksongs*. London, 1909.
- Armin, Robert. *The Collected Works of Robert Armin*. Introduced by J.P. Feather. 2 vols. Facsimile. New York, 1972.
- Ashton, J., ed. *A Century of Ballads*. London, 1887.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Humour, Wit and Satire of the 17th Century*. New York, 1884.
- Athelston, A Middle English Romance*. Ed. A. McI. Trounce. EETS OS 224, London, 1951; New York, 1984.
- Ault, N., ed. *Elizabethan Lyrics from the Original Texts*. London, 1925.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Seventeenth Century Lyrics from the Original Texts*. Rev. edn. London, 1950.
- Ayton, Sir Robert. *The English and Latin Poems of Sir Robert Ayton*. Ed. C. B. Gullans. Edinburgh, 1963.
- Ballad Minstrelsy of Scotland: Romantic and Historical*. Rev. edn. London, 1893.
- Ballad of Flodden Field*. Ed. C. A. Federer. Manchester, 1884.
- Ballads from Manuscripts*. Vol. I. Ed. F. J. Furnivall; Vol. II. Ed. W. R. Morfill. Ballad Society, 1-10, London, 1868, 1873; facsimile, New York, 1968.
- Ballattis of Luve*. Ed. J. MacQueen. Edinburgh, 1970.
- Bannatyne, George. *The Bannatyne Manuscript Written in Tyme of Pest 1568*. Ed. T. W. Ritchie. Vols. I-IV. Edinburgh, 1928-1934.
- Barry, P., ed. *The Maine Woods Songster*. Cambridge, Mass., 1939.
- Basse, William. *Poetical Works of William Basse (1602-1653) now for the first time collected*. Ed. R. W. Bond. London, 1893.
- Beaumont, Francis and John Fletcher. *Philaster or Love Lies a-Bleeding (1620)*. Ed. A. Gurr. London, 1969.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Knight of the Burning Pestle*. London, 1613. Ed. J. Doebler; London 1967.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Knight of the Burning Pestle*. London, 1613; facsimile, Amsterdam, 1969.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Knight of the Burning Pestle*. London, 1613. Ed. A. Gurr; Edinburgh, 1968.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Works of M<sup>r</sup> Francis Beaumont and M<sup>r</sup> John Fletcher in Ten Volumes Collated with all the former Editions and Corrected with Notes Critical and Explanatory, by the late M<sup>r</sup> Theobald, M<sup>r</sup> Seward of Eyam in Derbyshire and M<sup>r</sup> Sympson of Gainsborough*. London, 1750.
- Bel-Vedere or the Garden of Muses*. Ed. C. Crawford. Spencer Society (1895); rpt. New York, 1967.
- Bickerstaffe, Isaac. *Love in a Village*. London, 1773; rpt. London, 1818.
- Bishop Percy's Folio Manuscript: Ballads and Romances*. Ed. J. W. Hales and F. J. Furnivall. London, 1868. Facsimile, introd. L. Shepard. 3 vols.

- Detroit, 1968.
- Bishop Percy's Folio Manuscript: Loose and Humorous Songs.* Ed. F. J. Furnivall. London, 1868.
- Blezard, T., ed. *Original Westmorland Songs chiefly relating to Scenes and Incidents in the Districts of Kendal & Windermere.* Kendal, 1868.
- Boas, F. S., ed. *Songs and Lyrics from the English Play Books.* London, 1945; rpt. London, 1947.
- Book of the Knight of La Tour-Landry, compiled for the Instruction of his Daughters; translated from the original French into English in the Reign of Henry VI, and edited for the first time from the unique manuscript in the British Museum, Harl. 1764, and Caxton's print, A.D. 1484* Ed. T. Wright. Introd. F. J. Furnivall. EETS OS 32, London, 1868; rpt. New York, 1973.
- Book of the Ordre of Chyvalry.* Ed. A. T. P. Byles. EETS OS 168, London, 1926; rpt. New York, 1971.
- Breton, Nicholas. *Poems by Nicholas Breton.* Ed. J. Robertson. Liverpool, 1952.
- *The Works in Verse and prose of Nicholas Breton.* Ed. A. B. Grosart. 1879; rpt. New York, 1966.
- Brewer, E., ed. *From Cuchulainn to Gawain.* Cambridge, 1973.
- Brittons Bowre of Delights.* Ed. H. E. Rollins. London, 1591; Harvard, 1933.
- Brougham, E. M., ed. *Varia: A Miscellany of Verse & Prose Ancient & Modern.* London, 1925.
- Buchan, N. and P. Hall, eds. *Scottish Folksinger.* Glasgow, 1973.
- Bullen, A. H., ed. *Lyrics from the Dramatists of the Elizabethan Age.* London, 1891.
- *Lyrics from the Song Books of the Elizabethan Age.* London, 1891.
- *Poems, Chiefly Lyrical from Romance and Prose Tracts of the Elizabethan Age with chosen poems of Nicholas Breton.* London, 1890.
- *Some Shorter Elizabethan Poems.* London, 1903.
- Burlington-Fawcett, F., ed. *Broadside Ballads of the Restoration Period from the Jersey Collection known as the Osterley Park Ballads.* London, 1930.
- Burrow, J. A., ed. *A Reading of Sir Gawain and the Green Knight.* London, 1965.
- Campion, Thomas. *Campion's Works.* Ed. P. Vivian. Oxford, 1909.
- *Selected Songs of Thomas Campion.* Ed. W. H. Auden. Introd. J. Hollander. Boston, 1973.
- *Thomas Campion: Songs and Masques with observations in the art of English poesy.* Ed. A. H. Bullen. London, 1903.
- *Works of Thomas Campion.* Ed. W. R. Davis. London, 1969.
- Cantus, Songs, and Fancies to Three, Four or Five Parts, both apt for Voices and Viols.* 2nd edn. Aberdeen, 1666.
- Capell, Edward, ed. *Prolusions or Select Pieces of Antient Poetry.* London, 1760.
- Carew, Thomas. *The Poems of Thomas Carew.* Ed. R. Dunlap. Oxford, 1949.
- Chambers, E. K. and F. Sidgwick. *Early English Lyrics — Amorous, Divine, Moral and Trivial.* London, 1907; rpt. London, 1966.
- Chappell, W., ed. *A Collection of National English Airs, consisting of Ancient Song, Ballad, and Dance Tunes, interspersed with remarks and anecdote, and preceded by an essay on English Minstrelsy.* 2 vols. London, 1840.
- *Popular Music of the Olden Time; A Collection of Ancient Songs, Ballads and Dance Tunes Illustrative of the National Music of England.* 2 vols. London, n.d.
- Charles, Duke of Orleans. *The Poems of Charles of Orleans.* Introd. S. Purcell. Cheadle, Cheshire, 1973.
- Chepman and Myllar Prints, Nine Tracts from the First Scottish Press Edinburgh 1508 followed by the two other tracts in the same volume in the National Library of Scotland.* Ed. W. Beattie. Facsimile edn.

- Edinburgh, 1950.
- Chettle, Henry. 'Kind-Harts Dreame.' In 'A Mirrour of Monsters', William Rankins; 'Preface to Robert Greens 'Menaphon'', Thomas Nashe; 'Kind-Harts Dreame', Henry Chettle. Introduced by A. Freeman. Facsimile, New York, 1973.
- Cheuelere Assigne*. Ed. H. H. Gibbs. EETS ES 6, London, 1868; rpt. New York, 1973.
- Choice Old Scottish Ballads*. Ed. T. G. Stevenson. n.p. 1848; facsimile, Wakefield, 1976.
- Choyce Drollery*. London, 1656. Ed. J. W. Ebsworth. n.p., 1876.
- Clayton, T., ed. *Cavalier Poets*. Oxford, 1978.
- Cleveland, John. *J. Cleaveland Revived: Poems, Orations, Epistles, And other of his Genuine Incomparable Pieces*. 2nd edn. London, 1660.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Poems. By John Cleavland. With Additions, never before Printed*. London, 1659.
- Collection of Seventy-Nine Black-Letter Ballads and Broad-sides Printed in the Reign of Elizabeth between the years 1559 and 1597*. London, 1867.
- Collier, J. P., ed. *Broadside Black-letter Ballads*. London, 1868.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Illustrations of Old English Literature*. 2 vols. 1866; rpt. New York, 1966.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Old Ballads from Early Printed Copies*. Percy Society, 1, London, 1840.
- Combat Betweene Conscience and Covetousnesse in the Minde of Man*. London, 1598.
- Congreve, William. *The Works of William Congreve*. Ed. M. Summers. New York, 1964.
- Corbet, Richard. *Certain Elegant Poems, Written by Dr. Corbet, Bishop of Norwich*. London, 1647.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Poëtica Stromata or A Collection of Sundry Peices [sic] in Poetry*. n.p., 1648.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Poems of Richard Corbett*. Ed. J. A. W. Bennett and H. R. Trevor-Roper. Oxford, 1955.
- Cottevill, H. B., ed. *Ballads Old and New*. London, 1921.
- Covent Garden Drollery*. n.p. 1672.
- Crawhall's Chap-book Chaplets*. London, 1883; facsimile, London, 1976.
- Crosby's Caledonian Musical Repository*. Edinburgh, n.d.
- Crowch, Humfrey. *Loves Court of Conscience, Written upon two several Occasions, with new Lessons for Lovers Whereunto is annexed a kinde Husbandes advice to his Wife*. London, 1637.
- Cunningham, A., ed. *Traditional Tales of the English and Scottish [sic] Peasantry*. London, 1874.
- Davies, John. *Wittes Pilgrimage*. In *The Complete Works of John Davies of Hereford*. Ed. A. B. Grosart. London, 1878; rpt. London, 1968.
- Deloney, Thomas. *The Garland of Good Will*. London, 1631.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Novels of Thomas Deloney*. Ed. M. E. Lawlis. Bloomington, Ind., 1961.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Works of Thomas Deloney edited from the earliest extant editions & broadsides with an introduction and notes by Francis Oscar Mann*. Oxford, 1912.
- Dixon, J. H., ed. *Ancient Poems, Ballads and Songs of the Peasantry of England*. Percy Society, 18, London, 1846.
- Doughtie, E., ed. *Lyrics from English Airs*. Cambridge, Mass., 1970.
- Duke Rowland and Sir Otuell of Spayne*. Ed. S. J. Herrtage. EETS ES 35, London, 1880, pp. 53-104.
- Duncan, E., ed. *Lyrics from the Old Song Books*. 1927; rpt. New York, 1971
- Dyboski, R., ed. *Songs, Carols and Other Miscellaneous Poems from the Balliol Manuscript 354, Richard Hill's Commonplace-Book*. EETS OS 101, London, 1908; rpt. New York, 1973.
- 'Earl of Toulouse'. In *The Middle English Metrical Romances*. Ed. W. H. French

- and C. B. Hale. New York, 1964.
- Earle, Giles. *Giles Earle: His Booke*. Ed. P. Warlock. London, 1932.
- Earle, John. *Earle's Microcosmography*. Ed. A. S. West. Cambridge, 1897.
- Earle, John. *The Autograph Manuscript of Microcosmographie*. Facsimile, Leeds, 1966.
- Early English Alliterative Poems in the West-Midland Dialect of the Fourteenth Century*. Ed. R. Morris. EETS OS 1, London, 1864; 2nd. edn. 1869; rpt. 1965.
- Early Metrical Tales; Including The History of Sir Egeir, Sir Gryme, and Sir Gray-Steill*. Edinburgh, 1826.
- Ebsworth, J. W., ed. *Merry drollery compleat; being jovial poems, merry songs &c. collected by W.N., C.B., R.S. & J.G. lovers of wit, both parts 1661, 1670, 1691*. Rpt. Boston, Lincs., 1875.
- \_\_\_\_\_ *The Amanda Group of the Bagford Poems*. Hertford, 1880.
- Edmonstone, D., ed. *Lyrics from Old Song Books*. New York, 1927; rpt. 1971.
- Emaré*. Ed. E. Rickert. EETS ES 99, London, 1908.
- Englands Helicon*. Ed. H. MacDonald. London, 1600, rpt; London, 1949.
- England's Parnassus or The choysrest Flowers of our Moderne Poets with their Poeticall Comparisons*. London, 1600; facsimile, Menston, 1970.
- English and Scottish Popular Ballads*. Ed. F. J. Child. 5 vols. Boston, 1882-98; rpt. New York, 1965.
- English Garner*. Ed. E. Arber. Vols. I to VIII. London, 1877-95.
- Erl of Tolous and The Emperes of Almayn*. Ed. G. Lüdtke. Berlin, 1881.
- Euing Collection of English Broadside Ballads in the Library of the University of Glasgow*. Intro. J. Holloway. Glasgow, 1971.
- Facetiae: comprising 'Musarum Deliciae' or 'The Muses Recreation' by S<sup>r</sup> J.M. & Ja. S. [Sir John Mennis and Dr. James Smith], 1656; 'Wit Restor'd' 1658 and 'Wit's Recreations' 1640 collected with poems of 1641, 1654 and 1653 editions added*. n.p., n.d.
- Firumbras and Otuel and Roland*. Ed. M. I. O'Sullivan. EETS OS 198, London, 1935; rpt. New York, 1971.
- 'Floris and Blanche flour'. In *Five Middle English Narratives*. Ed. R. D. Stevick. New York, 1967, pp. 98-139.
- Floriz and Blaunche flour*. Ed. J. Rawson-Lumby. EETS OS 14, London, 1866. Rev. G. H. McKnight. London, 1901; rpt. 1962, pp. 71-110.
- Folklore and Songs of the Black Country & West Midlands*. Ed. M. and J. Raven. Vol. III. Wolverhampton, 1967.
- Ford, Thomas. 'Airs to the Lute.' In *Musicke of Sundrie Kindes, 1607*. Ed. E. H. Fellowes. The English School of Lutenist Song Writers; 1st series. London, 1921.
- French, W. H. and C. B. Hale, eds. *Middle English Metrical Romances*. New York, 1930.
- Friedman, Albert B., ed. *The Viking Book of Folk Ballads of the English-Speaking World*. 1956; reissued Harmondsworth, 1982.
- Furnivall, F. J., ed. *Arthur: A Short Sketch of his Life and History in English Verse of the First Half of the Fifteenth Century*. London, 1864.
- \_\_\_\_\_ *Captain Cox, his Ballads and Books; or, Robert Laneham's Letter: Whearin part of the entertainment untoo the Queens Majesty at Killingworth Castl, in Warwik Sheer in this Soomers Progress 1575 is signified; from a freend officer attendant in the Court, unto his freend, a Citizen and Merchaunt of London . . . and the Complaynt of Scotland*. Ballad Society, 7, London, 1890; facsimile, New York, 1968.
- \_\_\_\_\_ *Love-poems and Humourous Ones*. Ballad Society, 11, London, 1874; facsimile, New York, 1977.
- 'Gamelyn'. In *Middle English Verse Romances*. Ed. D. B. Sands. New York, 1966.



- Gay, John. *The Beggar's Opera*. London, 1728; Sydney 1923.
- Generydes, a romance in seven-line stanzas. Ed. W. A. Wright. 2 vols. EETS OS 55 & 70, London; Vol. I, 1873; Vol. II, 1878; rpt. in 1 vol., New York, 1973.
- Giles, J. A., ed. *Six Old English Chronicles of which Two are now First Translated from the Monkish Latin Originals*. London, 1848.
- Gollancz, Sir I., ed. 'Death and Liffe, a Medieval Alliterative Debate Poem in a Seventeenth Century Version.' In *Select Early English Poems*. London, 1930. Vol. V.
- \_\_\_\_\_ *The Percy Folio: Old English Ballads and Romances*. London, 1910.
- Gower, John. *The English Works of John Gower*. Ed. G. C. Macaulay. EETS ES 81 1900; rpt. 1978; ES 82 1901; rpt. 1978.
- Gray, A., ed. *Four-and-Forty: A Selection of Danish Ballads presented in Scots*. Edinburgh, 1954.
- Grosart, A. B., ed. *The D<sup>r</sup> Farmer Chetham Manuscript: being a commonplace-book in the Chetham Library, Manchester*. Chetham Society (1873).
- Gummere, F. B. *Old English Ballads*. Boston, 1899.
- Guy of Warwick: The Second or 15th-century Version*. Ed. J. Zupitza. EETS ES 25, 26, London, Vol. I, 1875; Vol. II, 1876; rpt. 1 vol. 1966.
- Guy of Warwick*. Ed. J. Zupitza. EETS ES 42, 48 59, London, Vol. I 1883; Vol. II 1887; Vol. III 1891; rpt. in 1 vol., 1966.
- Halliwell, J.O.P., ed. *Early English Miscellanies, in Prose and Verse, Selected from an Inedited Manuscript of the Fifteenth Century*. London, 1855.
- \_\_\_\_\_ *Palatine Anthology: a Collection of ancient poems and ballads (together with a few articles in the prose) relating to Lancashire and Cheshire*. London, 1850.
- \_\_\_\_\_ *The Loyal Garland: A Collection of Songs of the Seventeenth Century, reprinted from a black-letter copy supposed to be unique*. Percy Society, 29, London, 1849.
- \_\_\_\_\_ *The Nursery Rhymes of England, Collected principally from Oral Tradition*. Percy Society, 4, London, 1842.
- Handefull of Pleasant Delites by Clement Robinson and divers others*. London, 1584. Ed. A. Kershaw. London, 1926.
- Hartshorne, C., ed. *Ancient Metrical Tales: printed chiefly from original sources*. London, 1829.
- Hazlitt, W. C., ed. *Remains of the Early Popular Poetry of England*. 4 vols. London, 1864.
- Herrick, Robert. *The Complete Poetry of Robert Herrick*. Ed. J. M. Patrick. New York, 1963.
- Heywood, John. *John Heywood's Works and Miscellaneous Short Poems*. Ed. B. A. Milligan. Urbana, Illinois, 1965.
- Heywood, Thomas. *A Challenge for Beautie*. London, 1636.
- \_\_\_\_\_ *The Dramatic Works of Thomas Heywood Now First Collected with Illustrative Notes and a Memoir of the Author in Six Volumes*. 1874; rpt. New York, 1964.
- High Book of the Grail: A translation of the thirteenth century romance of Perlesvaus*. Trans. N. Bryant. Cambridge, 1978.
- Hilton, John. *Catch that Catch Can*. 1652; facsimile, New York, 1970.
- 'Horn Childe and Maiden Rimmild'. Ed. J. Caro. In *Englische Studien*, 12 (1889), 349-66.
- Ipomedon*. Ed. E. Kölbing. Breslau, 1889.
- Jacke of Dover, his Quest of Inquirie, or his Privy Search for the Veriest Foole in England*. London, 1604, also Part II, *The Penniles Parliament of Threed-Bare Poets: or, all Mirth and Wittie Conceites*. London, 1608; rpt. Percy Society, 7, London, 1842.
- Jacobus de Cessolis. *Jacobus de Cessolis: The Game of Chess, translated and printed by William Caxton c.1483*. Facsimile of 2nd edn. Introduced by

- N.F. Blake. London, 1970.
- Jamieson, R., ed. *Popular Ballads and Songs from Traditional Manuscripts and Scarce Editions; with Translations of similar pieces from the Ancient Danish Language, and a few originals by the Editor.* 2 vols. Edinburgh, 1806.
- Jeffares, A. N., ed. *Seven Centuries of Poetry.* London, 1955.
- John Audelay. *The Poems of John Audelay.* Ed. J. O. Halliwell. Percy Society, 14, London, 1844.
- Johnson, Richard. *Crown Garland of Golden Roses.* 1612 edn. Rpt. Percy Society, 6, London, 1842.
- Jordan, Thomas. *A Royal Arbor of Loyal Poesie.* London, 1664.
- Kennedy, P., ed. *Folksongs of Britain and Ireland.* London, 1975.
- King Horn: *An edition based on Cambridge University Library MS. Gg.4.27(2).* Ed. R. Allen. London, 1984.
- King Horn, Floriz and Blanchefleur, The Assumption of our Lady.* Ed. G. H. McKnight. London, 1901.
- King Horn.* Ed. J. Hall. Oxford, 1901.
- 'King of Tars'. Ed. F. Krause. *Englische Studien*, 11 (1888), 33-62.
- Kinloch, G. R., ed. *Ancient Scottish Ballads.* London, 1827.
- The Ballad Book.* Edinburgh, 1827.
- Laing, D., ed. *Select Remains of the Ancient Popular and Romance Poetry of Scotland.* Edinburgh, 1822; rev. edn. 1885.
- Langland, William. *Piers Plowman: An Edition of the C-text.* Ed. D. Pearsall. London, 1978.
- \_\_\_\_\_ *The Vision of Piers Plowman (B-Text).* Ed. A. V. C. Schmidt. London, 1978.
- Lawes, Henry. *The Musical Companion: containing Dialogues, Gleees, Ballads & Ayres, in several Varieties. The Second Part.* London, 1667.
- \_\_\_\_\_ *Treasury of Musick; containing Ayres and Dialogues To Sing to the Theorbo-Lute or Basse-Viol.* London 1669; facsimile, Ridgewood, N.J., 1966.
- 'Lay Le Freine'. In *Middle English Verse Romances.* Ed. D. B. Sands, New York, 1966.
- Lay of Havelock the Dane.* Ed. W. W. Skeat. Rev. K. Sisam. 2nd edn. Oxford 1915; rpt. 1979.
- Le Bone Florence of Rome.* Ed. C. Falvo Heffernan. Manchester, 1976.
- Le Prince d'Amour or The Prince of Love. With A Collection of Several Ingenious Poems and Songs by the Wits of the Age.* London, 1660.
- Leach, M., ed. *The Ballad Book.* New York, 1955.
- Lindsay, J., ed. *Loving Mad Tom: Bedlamite Verses of the XVI and XVII Centuries.* London, 1970.
- Lovelace, Richard. *The Poems of Richard Lovelace.* Ed. C. H. Wilkinson, Oxford, 1930.
- Loyal and Humorous Songs.* New York, 1779.
- Lybeaus Desconus.* Ed. M. Mills. EETS OS 261, London, 1969.
- Lyly, John. *The Complete Works of John Lyly.* Ed. R. W. Bond. 3 vols. Oxford, 1902.
- MacQueen, J., ed. *Ballatis of Luve.* Edinburgh, 1970.
- Maidment, J., ed. *A New Book of Old Ballads.* Edinburgh, 1844,  
*A North Countrie Garland.* Edinburgh, 1824,
- \_\_\_\_\_ *Mantel et Cor, deux lais du 12<sup>e</sup> siècle.* Ed. P. Bennett. Exeter, 1975.
- Masefield, John, ed. *Lyrics of Ben Jonson, Beaumont and Fletcher.* London, 1906.
- Medieval English Romances.* Ed. Diane Speed. 2 vols. Sydney, 1987.
- Merry Drolleries.* Ed. J. W. Ebsworth. London, 1661; rpt. 1875.
- Merry Songs of Olden Times.* Arranged H. Jackson. London, 1932.
- Middle English Versions of Partenope of Blois.* Ed. A. Trampe Bødtker. EETS ES 109, London, 1912; New York, 1973.
- Middleton, Thomas. *The Works of Thomas Middleton.* Ed. A. H. Bullen. 8 vols.

- London, 1885.
- Mills, M., ed. *Six Middle English Romances*. London, 1973.
- Minor Poets of the Caroline Period. Ed. G. Saintsbury. 3 vols. Oxford, 1921.
- Minot, Laurence. *The Poems of Laurence Minot*. Ed. J. Hall. 2nd edn. Oxford, 1897.
- Mirror for Magistrates*. Ed. L. B. Campbell. Oxford, 1938; rpt. London, 1960.
- Morley, Thomas. *The First Booke of Ayres*. London, 1600.
- Motherwell, William, ed. *Minstrelsy Ancient and Modern*. Glasgow, 1827; new edn. Paisley, 1873.
- Munday, Anthony. *A Banquet of Daintie Conceits*. By A. M. London, 1588.
- Musa Proterva. Ed. A. H. Bullen. London, 1889.
- Musarum Deliciae: or The Muses Recreation, containing severall pieces of poetique wit*. By S<sup>r</sup> J. M. and Ja:S. 2nd edn. London, 1656.
- Nashe, Thomas. *The Works of Thomas Nashe*. Ed. R. B. McKerrow. 5 vols. London, 1904-1910.
- New Academy of Compliments or The Lovers Secretary*. Worcester, 1795.
- Nimmo, A., ed. *Songs and Ballads of Upper Clydesdale*. Edinburgh, 1882.
- Octavian, now first published from MSS. at Lincoln and Cambridge*. Ed. J. O. Halliwell. Percy Society, London, 1844.
- Of Arthour and of Merlin*. Ed. O. D. Macrae-Gibson. EETS OS 268, London, 1973. Vol. I.
- Official Book of Bawdy Ballads*. London, 1979.
- Old Ballads, Historical and Narrative with Some of Modern Date Collected from Rare Copies and MSS. by Thomas Evans*. Ed. R. H. Evans. 4 vols. Rev. edn. London, 1810.
- Otuel*. Ed. S. J. Herrtage. English Charlemagne Romances Pt. VI. EETS ES 39, London, 1882; rpt. 1967, 63-116.
- Ovidius, Naso P. *Heroides and Amores*. Ed. and trans. G. Showerman. 2nd edn. Cambridge, Mass., 1977. Vol. I.
- Oxford Book of Ballads*. Ed. J. Kinsley. Oxford, 1969.
- Oxford Book of Seventeenth Century Verse*. Ed. H. J. C. Grierson and G. Bullough. Oxford, 1934; rpt. 1958.
- Oxford Book of Sixteenth Century Verse*. Ed. E. K. Chambers. Oxford, 1932; corrected edn. Oxford, 1961.
- Padelford, F. M. *Early Sixteenth Century Lyrics*. London, 1907.
- Palmer, R., ed. *Everyman's Book of British Ballads*. London, 1980.
- Paradise of Dainty Devices, 1576-1606*. Ed. H. E. Rollins. Cambridge, Mass., 1927.
- Parnassus Biceps*. London, 1656, Ed. G. Thorn Drury. n.p., 1927.
- Partenay, or Lusignen: otherwise known as the Tale of Melusine, Translated from the French of La Coudrette (before 1500 AD)*. Ed. W. W. Skeat. EETS OS 22, London, 1866.
- Pasquils Palinodia, and His progresse to the Taverne; where, after the survey of the Sellar, You are presented with A pleasant pynte of Poeticall Sherry*. London, 1619.
- Pembroke, W. and B. Ruddier. *Poems written by the Right Honourable William Earl of Pembroke, ... Whereof many of which are answered by way of repartee by S<sup>r</sup> Benjamin Ruddier, Knight*. London, 1660.
- Percy, Bishop Thomas, ed. *Reliques of Ancient English Poetry, Consisting of Old Heroic Ballads, Songs and Other Pieces of our Earlier Poets, together with some few of later date*. 4th edn. London, 1794. Ed. H. B. Wheatley. 3 vols. London, 1886; facsimile, New York, 1966.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Reliques of Ancient English Poetry, Consisting of Old Heroic Ballads, Songs etc.*. Ed. E. Walford. London, n.d.
- Perrault, Charles. *The Fairy Tales of Charles Perrault*. Paris, 1697. Trans. and introd. G. Brereton. Harmondsworth, 1957.
- P[hillips], E[dward]. *Mysteries of Love & Eloquence, Or, the Arts of Wooing and Complementing*. London, 1658.

- Phoenix Nest.*                    Intro. H. MacDonald. London, 1593; rpt. London, 1926.
- Pinder of Wakefield.*        Ed. A. E. Horsman. Liverpool, 1956.
- Pinto, V. de Sola, and A. E. Rodway, eds. *The Common Muse.* London, 1957.
- Playford, John.                 *English Dancing Master.* Introd. M. Dean-Smith. Facsimile of the 1651 edn. London, 1957
- \_\_\_\_\_                         *Musicall Ayres.* London, 1652.
- Poems and Essays with a Paraphrase on Cicero's Lælius, or, of Friendship.* By a Gentleman of Quality. London, 1674.
- Poetical Rhapsody.*         Ed. H. E. Rollins. 2 vols. Cambridge, Mass., 1931.
- Poetry of the English Renaissance 1509-1660.* Ed. J. W. Hebel and H. H. Hudson. New York, 1929.
- Raleigh, Sir Walter.         *Poems of Sir Walter Raleigh.* Ed. A. M. C. Latham. London, 1951.
- \_\_\_\_\_                         *The Poems of Sir Walter Raleigh collected and authenticated with those of Sir Henry Wotton and other courtly poets from 1540-1650.* Ed. J. Hannah. London, 1885.
- Ramsay, Allen, ed.         *Tea-Table Miscellany: A Collection of Choice Songs, Scots and English.* 2 vols. 14th edn. Glasgow, 1876.
- Ravenscroft, Thomas.       *Deuteromelia: or the Second part of Musicks melodie, or melodius Musicke of Pleasant Roundelaies.* London, 1609; facsimile, Amsterdam, 1971.
- \_\_\_\_\_                         *Melismata: Musical Phansies Fitting the Court Cities and Country Humours.* London, 1611; facsimile, Amsterdam, 1971.
- \_\_\_\_\_                         *Pammelia, Musickes Miscellanie or Mixed Varietie of Pleasant Roundelauyes.* London 1609; facsimile, Amsterdam, 1971.
- Ritson, Joseph, ed.         *Ancient Songs and Ballads.* 3rd edn. Revd. W. C. Hazlitt. London, 1877.
- Robbins, R. H., ed.         *Historical Poems of the XIV<sup>th</sup> and XV<sup>th</sup> Centuries.* New York, 1959.
- Robert de Boron.             *Merlin: Roman en Prose du XIII<sup>e</sup> Siècle publié avec La Mise en Prose du Poème de Merlin de Robert de Boron d'après le Manuscrit Appartenant a M. Alfred H. Huth.* Ed. G. Paris and J. Ulrich. Paris, 1886.
- Roland and Vernagu.*        Ed. S. J. Herrtage. English Charlemagne Romances Pt. VI. ETS ES 39, London, 1882; rpt. 1969.
- Rollins, Hyder, E., ed.     *A Poetical Rapsody 1602-1621.* 2 vols. Cambridge, Mass., 1931-32.
- Rollins, Hyder E., ed.     'Ballads from Additional Manuscript 38,599.' *Modern Language Association of America*, 28, 1 (1923), 133-42.
- \_\_\_\_\_                         *Old English Ballads, 1553-1625: Chiefly from Manuscripts.* Cambridge, 1920.
- \_\_\_\_\_                         *The Pack of Autolycus.* London, 1927; reissued 1969.
- \_\_\_\_\_                         *The Pepys Ballads.* 8 vols. Cambridge, Mass., 1929-1931.
- Rollins, Hyder E.            *Analytical Index to the Ballad Entries (1557-1709) in the Registers of the Company of Stationers of London.* Chapel Hill, N.C., 1924.
- Rowlands, Samuel.         *The Complete Works of Samuel Rowlands.* Vol. III. Hunterian Club, 1880.
- \_\_\_\_\_                         *Uncollected Poems.* Introd. F. O. Waage. Gainesville, Florida, 1970.
- Roxburghe Ballads.*         Ed. C. Hindley. 2 vols. London, 1873.
- \_\_\_\_\_                         Vols. I-III, ed. W. Chappell; IV-VIII, ed. J. W. Ebsworth. Ballad Society, 1869-1890; facsimile, New York, 1966.
- Salter, Thomas.             *A Mirrhor mete for all Mothers, Matrones and Maidens, intituled the Mirrhor of Modestie.* London, n.d.
- Sands, D. B., ed.             *Middle English Verse Romances.* New York, 1966.
- Schmidt, A. V. C. and N. Jacobs, eds. *Medieval English Romances.* London, 1980.
- Scottish Feilde and Flodden Feilde: Two Flodden Poems.* Ed. I. F. Baird. New York,

- 1982.
- '*Scottish Field*'. Ed. J. Robson. *Chetham Miscellanies*, 2 (1856), [iii]-26.
- Scottish Historical Ballads and Poems*. No. 15 of Short Studies in English Literature. London, n.d.
- Scottish Traditional Versions of Ancient Ballads*. Ed. J. H. Dixon. Percy Society, 17, London, 1845.
- Sege off Melayne*. Ed. S. J. Herrtage. EETS ES 35, London, 1880; rpt. New York, 1973, pp. 1-52.
- Seventeenth Century Songs and Lyrics*. Ed. J. P. Cutts. Columbia, Missouri, 1959.
- Sharp, Cecil. *Cecil Sharp's Collection of English Folk Songs*. Ed. M. Karpeles. London, 1974. Vol. II.
- Sharpe, C. K., ed. *A Ballad Book*. Edinburgh, 1823.
- Sharpham, Edward. *Cupids Whirligig*. Ed. A. Nicoll. London, 1607; rpt., n.p., 1926.
- Shirburn Ballads, 1585-1616*. Ed. A. Clark. Oxford, 1907.
- Sir Amadace*. Ed. C. Brookhouse. *Anglistica*, 15 (1968), 10-59.
- Sir Amadas*. Ed. C. Brookhouse. *Anglistica*, 15 (1968), 112-133.
- Sir Beues of Hamtoun*. Ed. E. Kölbing. 3 vols. EETS ES 46, 48, 65. Vol. I, 1885, Vol. II, 1886, Vol. III, 1894; rpt. in 1 vol. New York, 1973.
- Sir Cleges*. Ed. A. Treichel. *Englische Studien*, 22 (1896), 374-89.
- Sir Degrevant*. Ed. L. F. Casson. EETS OS 221, London, 1949; rpt. London, 1970.
- Sir Eglamour of Artois*. Ed. F. E. Richardson. EETS OS 256, London, 1965.
- Sir Ferumbras*. Ed. S. J. Herrtage. English Charlemagne Romances Pt. I. EETS ES 34, London, 1879; rpt. 1966.
- Sir Gawain and the Carl of Carlisle, in Two Versions*. Ed. A. Kurvinen. Helsinki, 1951.
- Sir Gawain and the Green Knight*. Ed. J. R. R. Tolkien and E. V. Gordon. 2nd edn. Rev. N. Davis. Oxford, 1972.
- Sir Gawain and the Green Knight*. Ed. R. A. Waldron. London, 1970.
- Sir Gawain and the Green Knight*. Ed. Sir I. Gollancz. EETS OS 210, London, 1940; rpt. London, 1950.
- Sir Gawain and the Green Knight*. Ed. W. R. J. Barron. Manchester, 1979.
- Sir Gawain and the Green Knight*. Trans. B. Stone. 2nd edn. Harmondsworth, 1974.
- Sir Gowther*. Ed. K. Breul. Berlin, 1886.
- Sir Orfeo*. Ed. A. J. Bliss. 2nd edn. Oxford, 1966.
- Sir Perceval of Galles*. In *The Early Metrical Romances of Perceval, Isumbras, Eglamour and Degrevant*. Ed. J. O. Halliwell. Camden Society, OS 30 (1844), 1-267.
- Sir Thomas Malory. *Works*. Ed. E. Vinaver. 2nd edn. London, 1973.
- Sir Ysumbras*. Ed. J. Zupitza. *Palaestra*, 25, Berlin, 1901.
- Sire Degarre nach der gesamten Überlieferung und mit Untersuchungen über die Sprache und den Romanzenstoff*. Ed. G. Schleich. Heidelberg, 1929.
- Skeat, W. W., ed. *Specimens of English Literature: AD 1394-1579*. 6th edn. Oxford, 1892.
- Skelton, John. *A ballade of the Scottysse kynge*. London, 1513; facsimile, Dunfermline, 1979.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *A Ballade of the Scottysse Kynge*. London, 1513. Facsimile, introd. J. Ashton. London, 1882.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Complete Poems of John Skelton*. Ed. P. Henderson. London, 1931.
- Smith, J. Stafford, ed. *Musica Antiqua. A Selection of Music of this and other Countries, from the Commencement of the Twelfth to the beginning of the Eighteenth Century*. London, 1812.
- Smyth, John. *The Berkeley Manuscripts*. Ed. J. MacLean. Vols. I to III, Gloucester, 1883-85.
- Sommers, H. O., ed. *The Vulgate Version of Arthurian Romances*. 8 vols. Washington, 1909-1916.

- Song of Roland: An Analytical Edition.* Ed. G. J. Brault. 2 vols. London, 1978.
- Song of Roland.* Ed. S. J. Herrtage. EETS ES 35, London, 1880; rpt. New York, 1973, pp. 105-135.
- Sowdone of Babylone and of Ferumbras his sone who conquerede Rome.* Ed. E. Hausknecht. English Charlemagne Romances Pt. V. EETS, ES 38, London 1881, rpt. Oxford, 1969.
- Speculum Amantis.* Ed. A. H. Bullen. London, 1902.
- Spink, I., ed. *English Lute-Songs.* 2nd series, 18, London, 1962.  
*English Song: Dowland to Purcell.* London, 1974.
- ‘Squire of Low Degree’. In *Middle English Verse Romances.* Ed. D. Sands. New York, 1966, pp. 249-78.
- Squyr of Lowe Degre.* Ed. W. E. Mead. Boston, 1904.
- Stevenson, B. E., ed. *The Home Book of Verse.* 9th edn. New York, 1953.
- Stevenson, G., ed. *Pieces from the Makculloch and the Gray Manuscripts together with the Chepman and Myllar Prints.* Edinburgh, 1918.
- Stevenson, T. G., ed. *Choice Old Scottish Ballads.* n.p., 1848; facsimile, Wakefield, 1976.
- Stevick, R. D., ed. *Five Middle English Narratives.* New York, 1967.
- Stewart, M., ed. ‘A Recently-Discovered Manuscript: ‘ane taill of Sir colling ye kny<sup>l</sup>.’ *Scottish Studies*, 16 (1972), 23-39.
- Syr Gawaine; A Collection of Ancient Romance-Poems by Scottish and English Authors Relating to that Celebrated Knight of the Round Table.* Ed. Sir Frederic Madden. London, 1839; facsimile, New York, 1971.
- Syr Tryamour.* Ed. J. O. Halliwell. Percy Society, 16, London, 1846.
- Syr Tryamowre: A Metrical Romance with Introduction. Glossary and Notes.* Ed. A. J. E. Schmidt. Utrecht, 1937.
- Taill of Rauf Coilyear.* Ed. S. J. Herrtage. EETS ES 39, London, 1882; rpt. 1969.
- Tannenbaum, S. A., ed. ‘Unfamiliar Versions of Some Elizabethan Poems.’ *PMLA*, 45 (1930), 809-821.
- The Aviary, or Magazine of British Melody.* London, n.d.
- ‘The Cursed Dancers of Colbek’. In *Five Middle English Narratives.* Ed. R. D. Stevick. New York, 1967, pp. 27-36.
- Thomas Chester. *Sir Launfal.* Ed. A. J. Bliss. London, 1960.
- Thomas of Erceldoune.* Ed. J. A. H. Murray. EETS OS 61, London, 1875; rpt. New York, 1973.
- Till Eulenspiegel: A Merye Jest: London (1528?).* Facsimile, Amsterdam, 1971.
- Tom of Bedlam’s Song.* Introd. D. Greenwood. San Francisco, 1931.
- Torrent of Portyngale.* Ed. E. Adam. EETS ES 51, London, 1887; rpt. New York, 1973.
- Tottel’s Miscellany.* Ed. H. E. Rollins. 2 vols. Rev. edn. Cambridge, Mass., 1965.
- Traditional Tunes of the Child Ballads with their Texts, according to the Extant Records of Great Britain and America.* Ed. Bertrand H. Bronson. Vols. I to IV. Princeton, 1959-72.
- Trioedd Ynys Prydein: The Welsh Triads.* Ed. R. Bromwick. Cardiff, 1961.
- Virgilius, Publius Maro. *Publi Vergili Maronis: Aeneidos: Liber Quartus.* Ed. A. S. Pease. Cambridge, Mass., 1935.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Aeneid.* Trans. W. F. Jackson Knight. Harmondsworth, 1956.
- Waller, Edmund. *The Poems of Edmund Waller.* Ed. G. Thorn Drury. London, 1893; rpt. New York, 1968.
- Walton, Izaak. *The Compleat Angler.* 1653 and 1676 edns. Ed. J. Bevan. Oxford, 1983.
- Wardroper, J., ed. *Love and Drollery.* London, 1969.
- Warner, William. *Albion’s England.* London, 1602.
- ‘Wedding of Sir Gawain and Dame Ragnell.’ In *Middle English verse Romance.* Ed. D. B. Sands. New York, 1966, pp. 323-347.
- Wells, C., ed. *The Book of Humorous Verse.* Rev. edn. New York, 1947.
- Westminster Drolleries, Both Parts, of 1671, 1672; Being a Choice Collection of Songs and Poems, Sung at Court & Theatres: With Additions made by*

- 'A Person of Quality', *Now First Reprinted from the Original Editions*. Ed. J. W. Ebsworth. Boston, Lincs., 1875.
- Wilbye, John. *The Second Set of Madrigals*. London, 1609; facsimile, Menston, 1972.
- William of Palerne* (otherwise known as *The Romance of "William and the Werwolf"*) *Translated from the French at the command of Sir Humphrey De Bohun about A.D. 1350*. Ed. W. W. Skeat. EETS ES 1, London, 1867; rpt. New York, 1973.
- Wills, W. H., ed. *Poets' Wit and Humour*. London, n.d.
- Wilson, John. *Ten Songs from John Wilson's 'Cheerfull Ayres or Ballads' (1659)*. Arranged by I. Holst. Oxford, 1959.
- Windsor Drollery. Being a more Exact Collection Of the Newest Songs, Poems, and Catches, Now in Use, Both in City and Country, then [sic] any yet Extant*. London, 1672.
- Wit and Drollery, Jovial Poems. Never before Printed. By Sir J. M. Ja: S., Sir W. D., J. D. and other admirable Wits..* London, 1656.
- Wit and Mirth: or Pills to Purge Melancholy*. Ed. Thomas d'Urfey. 6 vols. London 1719/20 edn. reissued 1876. Facsimile. introd. C. L. Day. New York, 1959.
- Wit Restor'd In severall Select Poems Not formerly publish't*. London, 1658.
- Wither, George. *Poems by George Wither*. Vol. III. 'Juvenilia'. London 1871 edn; rpt. New York, 1970.
- \_\_\_\_\_ *The Poetry of George Wither*. Ed. F. Sidgwick. 2 vols. London, 1902.
- Wood H. H., ed. *James Watson's Choice Collection of Comic and Serious Scots Poems*. 1706, 1709 and 1711 edns. Rpt. 1869; reissued Edinburgh, 1977.
- Wotton, Sir Henry. *The Poems of Sir Walter Raleigh, collected and authenticated with those of Sir Henry Wotton and other courtly poets from 1540-1659*. Ed. J. Hannah. London, 1885.
- Wright, T., ed. *The Nutbrowne Maid: From the earliest Edition of Arnold's Chronicle*. London, 1836.
- Wyatt, Sir Thomas. *Collected Poems*. Ed. Joost Daalder. Oxford, 1975.
- Ywain and Gawain*. Ed. A. B. Friedman and N. T. Harrington. EETS OS 254, London, 1964.
- 'Ywayn and Gawayn'. In *Five Middle English Narratives*. Ed. R. D. Stevick. New York, 1967, pp. 140-283.

REFERENCE SOURCES

- Bale, John. *Scriptorum Illustrium Maioris Brytanniae Catalogus*, Basle, 1557, 1559. 2 vols. London, 1971.
- Beckson, K. and A. Ganz. *Dictionary of Literary Terms*. 9th edn. New York, 1983.  
*Bibliography of British History: Tudor Period, 1485-1603*. Ed. G. Conyers Read. 2nd edn. 1959; rpt. Hassocks, Sussex, 1978.
- Bordman, Gerald. *Motif Index of the English Metrical Romances*. Helsinki, 1972.  
*Brewer's Dictionary of Phrase and Fable, Revised and Enlarged*. London, n.d.  
*British Museum: General Catalogue of Printed Books*. Photolithographic edn. London, 1963.
- Brogan, T. V. F. *English Versification 1570-1980*. Baltimore, 1981.
- Brook, G. L. *English Dialects*. 2nd edn. London, 1965.
- Burke, Sir John B. *General Armory of England*. London, 1884.  
*Cambridge Medieval History*. Ed. C. W. Previté-Orton and Z. N. Brooke. Vol. VIII. Cambridge, 1936.
- Case, A. *Bibliography of English Poetical Miscellanies 1521-1750*. Oxford, 1935.
- Churchill, W. A. *Watermarks in Paper in Holland, England, France etc. in the XVII and XVIII Centuries and their Interconnection*. Amsterdam, 1935.
- Cokayne, G. E. *Complete Peerage of England, Scotland, Ireland, Great Britain and the United Kingdom, extant, extinct or dormant*. Vols. I to VIII. Exeter, 1887-98; Rev. edn. V. Gibbs and others. Vols. I to XIII. London, 1910-49.
- Compact Edition of the Oxford English Dictionary*. Oxford, 1979.
- Corser, Thomas. *Collectanea Anglo-Poetica: or A Bibliographical and Descriptive Catalogue of a Portion of a Collection of Early English Poetry*. 10 Parts. Chetham Society, n.p., 1870-1880.
- Crawford, Earl of. *Bibliotheca Lindesiana: Catalogue of a Collection of English Ballads of the XVIIth and XVIIIth Centuries printed for the most part in Black Letter*. 1890; rpt. New York, n.d.
- Crum, Margaret. *First-Line Index of English Poetry 1500-1800 in Manuscripts of the Bodleian Library, Oxford*. Oxford, 1969.
- Davies, T. L. O. *Supplementary English Glossary*. London, 1981.
- Dawson, G. E. and L. Kennedy-Skipton. *Elizabethan Handwriting: 1500-1650*. London, 1966.
- Day, C. L. and E. B. Murrie. *English Song Books 1651-1702: A Bibliography with a First-Line Index of Songs*. London, 1940.
- Dictionary of National Biography*. Ed. Sir Leslie Stephen and Sir Sidney Lee. 22 vols. Oxford, 1917. Rpt. London, 1950.
- Dobson, E. J. *English Pronunciation 1500-1700*. 2 vols. 2nd edn. Oxford, 1968.
- Dodgson, J. McN. *The Place-Names of Cheshire*. Vols. I to VI. Cambridge, 1970-81.
- Douglas, R. *The Peerage of Scotland*. Edinburgh, 1764.
- Ekwall, Eilert. *Concise Oxford Dictionary of English Place Names*. 4th edn. Oxford, 1960.
- Fergusson, R. *Dictionary of Proverbs*. Harmondsworth, 1983.
- Gable, J. Harris. *Bibliography of Robin Hood*. University of Nebraska Studies in Language, Literature and Criticism, No. 17. Lincoln, Nebraska, 1939.
- Gazeteer of the British Isles*. The Geographical Institute. 9th edn. Edinburgh, 1970.
- Grose, F. *A Classical Dictionary of the Vulgar Tongue*. Ed. E. Partridge. 3rd edn. London, 1931.
- Heawood, Edward. *Watermarks: mainly of the 17th and 18th centuries*. Vol. I of *Monumenta Chartae Papyracea Historiam Illustrantia*. Ed. E. J.



- Labarre. Hilversum, 1950.
- Index of Middle English Verse*. Ed. Carleton Brown and R. H. Robbins. New York, 1943.
- Index of Middle English Verse: Supplement*. Ed. R. H. Robbins and J. L. Cutler. Lexington, Kentucky, 1965.
- Kerchove, René de. *International Maritime Dictionary*. n.p. 1948; 2nd edn. London, 1961.
- Kurath, H., S. M. Kuhn and J. Reidy. *Middle English Dictionary*. Ann Arbor, 1952 —
- Latham, R. E. *Revised Medieval Latin Word-List from British and Irish Sources*. London, 1965.
- Lemon, Robert. *A Catalogue of a Collection of Printed Broad-sides in the Possession of the Society of Antiquaries of London*. London, 1866.
- Lemprière, J. *Lemprière's Classical Dictionary (1788)*. 1865 edn; facsimile, London, 1984.
- Magill, Frank. *Magill's bibliography of literary criticism*. 4 vols. Eaglewood Cliffs, N.J., 1979.
- Manual of Writings in Middle English, 1050-1500*. Ed. J. F. Wells. New Haven, 1916. Vols. 1 and 2 ed. J. Burke Severs; Vol. 3 ed. A.E. Hartung. New Haven, Conn., 1967-72.
- Metcalf, W. C. *A Book of Knights Banneret, Knights of the Bath and Knights Bachelor made between the fourth year of King Henry VI and the Restoration of King Charles II; with the Arms given in Cotton MS Claudius from 1 King Henry VII to 28 Queen Elizabeth and Knights made in Ireland between the years 1566 and 1698, together with an Index of Names*. London, 1885.
- Mossé, F. *A Handbook of Middle English*. Baltimore, 1952.
- Mullins, E. L. C. *Texts and Calendars: An Analytical Guide to Serial Publications*. London, 1958.
- Neubecker, Ottfried. *A Guide to Heraldry*. London, 1979.
- New Cambridge Bibliography of English Literature*. Ed. George Watson. Cambridge, 1974.
- New Grove Dictionary of Music and Musicians*. Ed. S. Sadie. London, 1980.
- Oxford Dictionary of Nursery Rhymes*. Ed. I. and P. Opie. Oxford, 1980.
- Page, W. and others. *Victoria History of the Counties of England*. Westminster, 1900-
- Partridge, Eric. *A Dictionary of Slang and Unconventional English*. 8th edn. London, 1984.
- \_\_\_\_\_ *Dictionary of Catch Phrases British and American, from the Sixteenth Century to the Present Day*. London, 1977. Rev. edn. London, 1983.
- \_\_\_\_\_ *Dictionary of the Underworld*. London, 1949.
- \_\_\_\_\_ *Shakespeare's Bawdy*. Rev. edn. London, 1968.
- \_\_\_\_\_ *Slang today and yesterday*. 3rd edn. London, 1950.
- Pelzer, A. *Abréviations Latines Médiévales*. 2nd edn. Louvain, 1966.
- Penny Cyclopædia of the Society for the Diffusion of Useful Knowledge*. 16 vols. London, 1833-46.
- Petti, Anthony G.,  
Rimbault, E. F. *English literary hands from Chaucer to Dryden*. London, 1977.
- Bibliotheca Madrigaliana: A Bibliographical account of the Musical and Poetical Works published in England during the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries under the titles Madrigals, Ballets, Ayres, Canzonets &c.* London, 1847.
- Ringler, W. A. 'A Bibliography and first line index of English Verse printed through 1500.' *The Papers of the Bibliographical Society of America*, 49 (1955).
- Smith, Sir William. *Latin-English Dictionary*. Rev. J.F. Lockwood. 3rd edn. London, 1945.
- Sonnino, L. A. *A Handbook to Sixteenth Century Rhetoric*. London, 1968.
- Spevack, M. *A Complete and Systematic Concordance to the Works of*

- Shakespeare*. Hildesheim, 1969.
- Strattmann, F. H. *A Middle-English Dictionary*. Revd. H. Bradley. London, 1940.
- Summary Catalogue of Western Manuscripts in the Bodleian Library at Oxford*.  
Compiled by F. Madan and others. 8 vols. Oxford, 1895-1953.
- Thomason, George. *Catalogue of Pamphlets, Books, Newspapers and Manuscripts  
relating to the Civil War, the Commonwealth and Restoration  
collected by G. Thomason, 1640-61*. London, 1908.
- Thompson, Stith. *Motif Index of Folk Literature*. 6 vols. Rev. edn. Copenhagen,  
1956.
- Transcript of the Registers of the Company of Stationers of London*. 8 vols. Vols. I-V  
(1554-1640) ed. E. Arber. Vols. VI-VIII (1640-1708) ed. Eyre  
and Rivington. London, 1875-1894 Rpt. 1950, New York.
- Wagner, A. R. *A Catalogue of English Mediaeval Rolls of Arms*. Oxford, 1950.
- Ward, H. L. D. *Catalogue of Romances in the Department of Manuscripts in the  
British Museum*. Vol. I. London, 1883.
- Wright, J. *The English Dialect Grammar*. Oxford, 1905.

## **SECONDARY SOURCES**

SECONDARY SOURCES

- Ackerman, R.W. *Backgrounds to Medieval English Literature*. New York, 1966.  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 'English Rimed and Prose Romance.' In *Arthurian Literature in the Middle Ages*. Ed. R. S. Loomis. Oxford, 1959, pp. 480-519,  
 'Some Scribal Errors in the English Arthuriana.' *Research Studies of the State College of Washington*, 25 (1957), 14-23.
- Alexander, Michael van Cleave. *The First of the Tudors: A Study of Henry VII and His Reign*. London, 1981.
- Allen, M. J. 'The Harlot and the Mourning Bride.' In *The Practical Vision: Essays in English Literature in Honour of Flora Roy*. Ed. J. Campbell and J. Doyle. Waterloo, Ontario, 1978, pp. 15-28.
- Allies, Jabez. *On the Ancient British, Roman and Saxon Antiquities of Worcestershire*. 2nd edn. with Supplement. London, 1852.
- Atkins, John. *The Mediaeval Experience*. Vol. III of *Sex in Literature*. London, 1978.
- Babler, O. F. 'More Robin Hood Bibliography.' *Notes and Queries*, 196 (1951), 130 and 394.
- Bagley, J. J. *History of Lancashire*. 2nd edn. London, 1961.
- Bailey, R. W. 'Authorship attribution in a forensic setting.' In *Advances in Computer-Aided Literary and Linguistic Research*. Proceedings of the Fifth International Symposium on Computers in Literary and Linguistic Research. Gen. eds. D. E. Ager, F. E. Knowles and J. Smith. Birmingham, 1979, pp. 1-20.
- Baker, Ernest. *The Elizabethan Age and After*. Vol. II of *The History of the English Novel*. London, 1929; rpt. New York, 1957.
- Barber, Charles. *Early Modern English*. London, 1976.
- Barber, R., ed. *Arthurian Literature*. Suffolk, 1981.
- Barber, Richard. *Edward, Prince of Wales and Aquitaine*. Woodbridge, Suffolk, 1978.
- Barnes, Geraldine. 'Cunning and Ingenuity in the Middle English 'Floris and Blanche-flur.' *Medium Aevum*, 53, 1 (1986), 10-23.
- Barrie, J. M. *Courage*. London, 1922.
- Barrow, G. W. S. *Robert Bruce and the Community of the Realm of Scotland*. London, 1965.
- Barry, P., F. H. Eckstrom and M. W. Smyth. *British Ballads from Maine: The development of popular songs with texts and airs*. New Haven, Conn., 1929; rpt. New York, 1982.
- Barthes, Roland. *Image-Music-Text*. Trans. S. Heath. London, 1977.
- Basilus, H. A. 'The Rhymes in *Eger and Grime*.' *Modern Philology*, 35 (1937-38), 129-33.
- Baskerville, C. R. 'English Songs on the Night Visit.' *PMLA*, 36, 1 (1921), 565-614.  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
*The Elizabethan Jig*. Chicago 1929; rpt. New York, 1965.
- Baugh, A. C. *A Literary History of English*. London, 1967.  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 'The Middle English Romance: Some Questions of Creation, Presentation and Preservation.' *Speculum*, 42, 1 (1967), 1-31.
- Beck, Horace P. 'Say Something Dirty.' *Journal of American Folklore*, 75 (1962), 195-199.
- Beedome, Thomas. *Select Poems, Divine and Humane*. Bloomsbury, 1928.
- Bence-Jones, M. *The Cavaliers*. London, 1976.
- Bennett, H. S. *English Books and Readers*. 2nd edn. 3 vols. Cambridge, 1969.
- Bennett, Michael J. *Community, Class and Careerism: Cheshire and Lancashire Society in the Age of 'Sir Gawain and the Green Knight'*. Cambridge, 1983.  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 'Sources and problems in the Study of Social Mobility: Cheshire in the Later Middle Ages.' *Transactions of the Historic Society*

- of Lancaster and Chester*, 128 (1979), 59-95.
- Bennett, M. J. *The Battle of Bosworth Field*. New York, 1985.
- Benskin, Michael, and M. Laing. 'Translation and *Mischsprachen* in Middle English manuscripts.' In *So meny people longages and tonges*. Ed. M. Benskin and M. L. Samuels. Edinburgh, 1981, pp. 55-106.
- Benson, L. D. and J. Leyerle. *Chivalric Literature*. Kalamazoo, Mich., 1980.
- Benson, L. D. *Art and Tradition in Sir Gawain and the Green Knight*. New Brunswick, N.J., 1965.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 'The Meaning of *Sir Gawain and the Green Knight*.' In *Critical Studies of Sir Gawain and the Green Knight*. Ed. D. R. Howard and C. Zacher. London, 1968, pp. 295-310.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 'The style of Sir Gawaine.' In *Critical Studies of Sir Gawain and the Green Knight*. Ed. D. R. Howard and C. Zacher. London, 1968, pp. 109-24.
- Bercovitch, S. 'Romance and Anti-Romance in *Sir Gawain and the Green Knight*.' In *Critical Studies of Sir Gawain and the Green Knight*. Ed. D. R. Howard and C. Zacher. London, 1968, pp. 257-66.
- Berringer, Ralph W. 'Thomas Champion's Share in *A Booke of Ayres*.' *PMLA*, 58, 1, 1 (1943), 938-48.
- Billings, A. H. *A Guide to the Middle English Metrical Romances*. New York, 1901.
- Blagden, C. 'Notes on the ballad market in the second half of the seventeenth century.' *Studies in Bibliography*, 11 (1954), 161-62.
- Blanch, R. J., ed. *'Sir Gawain' and 'Pearl': Critical Essays*. London, 1966.
- Bliss, A. J. 'The Hero's Name in the Middle English Versions of *Lanval*.' *Medium Aevum*, 26, 2 (1957), 80-85.
- Bloomfield, M. W. '*Sir Gawain and the Green Knight*: An Appraisal.' In *Critical Studies of Sir Gawain and the Green Knight*. Ed. D. R. Howard and C. Zacher. London, 1968, pp. 24-55.
- Bold, A. *The Ballad*. London, 1979.
- Boswell, George. 'Reciprocal Controls Exerted by Ballad Texts and Tunes.' *Journal of American Folklore*, 80, 315 (1967), 169-74
- Bowers, R. H. '*Gawain and the Green Knight* as Entertainment.' In *Critical Studies of Sir Gawain and the Green Knight*. Ed. D. R. Howard and C. Zacher. London, 1968, pp. 72-83.
- Brandl, Alois. 'Mittelenglische Literatur (1100-1500).' *Grundriss der Germanischen Philologie*, II (1893), 609-718.
- Brault, G. J. *Early Blazon: Heraldic Terminology in the Twelfth and Thirteenth Centuries with Special Reference to Arthurian Literature*. Oxford, 1972.
- Briggs, Katherine M. and R. L. Tongue, eds. *Folktales of England*. London, 1965.
- Broeke, Marcel P. R. van den, and L. Goldstein. 'Consonant Features in Speech Errors.' In *Errors in Linguistic Performance*. Ed. V. Fromkin. New York, 1980, 47-65.
- Bronson, Bertrand. 'A Sense of the Past.' *Sewanee Review*, 67, 1 (1959), 145-155.
- Browman, C. P. 'Perpetual processing: Evidence from Slips of the Ear.' In *Errors of Linguistic Performance*. Ed. V. Fromkin. New York, 1980, pp. 213-30.
- Brown, P. W. F. 'More Robin Hood Bibliography.' *Notes and Queries*, 196 (1951), 86.
- Brown, R. Allen, M. Prestwick and C. Coulson, eds. *Castles*. Poole, Dorset, 1980.
- Bryan, Margaret, B. 'Recent Studies in Champion.' *English Literary Renaissance*, 4, 1 (1974), 404-11.
- Buchan, David. 'British Balladry: Medieval Chronology and Relations.' In *The European Medieval Ballad*. Odense, 1978, pp. 98-106.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 'Oral Tradition and Literary Tradition: The Scottish Ballads.' In *Oral Tradition: Literary Tradition, A Symposium*. Odense, 1977,

- pp. 56-68.
- \_\_\_\_\_  
Bullough, G., ed. *The Ballad and the Folk*. London, 1972.
- Burke-Severs, J. *Narrative and Dramatic Sources of Shakespeare*. London, 1966.
- Burke-Severs, J. *The Literary Relationships of Chaucer's 'Clerkes Tale'*. Yale, 1942; rpt. 1972.
- Burne, A. H. *The Crecy War*. Westport, Conn., 1955; rpt. 1976.
- Burrow, J. A. *Medieval Writers and their Work: Middle English Literature and its Background, 1100-1500*. Oxford, 1982.
- Calverton, V. F. *Sex Expression in Literature*. New York, 1926.
- Camp, Charles W. *The Artisan in Elizabethan Literature*. New York, 1924.
- Campbell, A. *An Introduction to the History of Poetry in Scotland from the Beginning of the Thirteenth Century down to the Present Time*. 1798; rpt. New York, 1972.
- Campbell, J. and J. Kent. *Biographia Nautica: or Memoirs of those Illustrious Seamen, to whose Intrepidity and Conduct the English are Indebted for the Victories of their Fleets, the Increase of their Dominions, the Extension of their Commerce, and their Pre-eminence on the Ocean*. Dublin, 1795. Vol. II.
- Cantor, Leonard, ed. *The English Medieval Landscape*. London, 1982.
- Cantor, Leonard. 'Castles, Fortified Houses, Moated Homesteads and Monastic Settlements.' In *The English Medieval Landscape*. London, 1982, pp. 126-153.
- Celce-Murcia, M. 'On Meringer's Corpus of "Slips of the Ear".' In *Errors in Linguistic Performance*. Ed. V. Fromkin. New York, 1980.
- Chambers, E. K. *English Literature at the Close of the Middle Ages*. Oxford, 1945.
- Christophersen, P. *The Ballad of Sir Aldingar: its origins and analogues*. Oxford, 1952.
- Clouston, W. A. *Additional Analogues to "The Wright's Chaste Wife"*. EETS Supplement to OS 12, London, 1865.
- Clowes, William L. *The Royal Navy; A History from the Earliest Times to the Present*. 5 vols. London, 1897. Vol. I.
- Coleman, J. *English Literature in History: 1350-1400*. London, 1981.
- Collamer, R. E. 'Query with notes on Percy's Folio Manuscript.' *American Notes and Queries*, 8, 1 (1969), 92-94.
- Collier, J. P., ed. *Extracts from the Registers of the Stationers' Company of Works Entered for Publication between the Years 1570 and 1587*. Shakespeare Society, 38 and 41 (1848, 1849).
- \_\_\_\_\_  
Colman, E. A. M. *Illustrations of Old English Literature*. 1866; New York, 1966.
- \_\_\_\_\_  
Cornelius, R. D. *Bibliographical Essay on Sixteenth- and Seventeenth-Century English Studies in Australia, 1958-72*. Sydney, 1973.
- \_\_\_\_\_  
Coward, B. *The Dramatic Use of Bawdy in Shakespeare*. London, 1974.
- Cutts, J. P. 'A New Text of an Old Ballad.' *PMLA*, 46 (1931), 1025-33.
- Cutts, J. P. *The Stanleys, Lords Stanley and Earls of Derby, 1385-1672*. Manchester, 1983.
- Cutts, J. P. 'Early 17th Century Lyrics at St. Michael's College.' *Music and Letters*, 37 (1956), 221-33.
- Dahl, Torsten. 'Early 17th Century Lyrics at St. Michael's College.' *Music and Letters*, 37 (1956), 221-33.
- Dahl, Torsten. *An inquiry into aspects of the language of Thomas Deloney*. Acta Jutlandica: Aarschrift for Aarhus Universitet XXIII, 2; Humanistisk Serie 36, Linguistic Studies in some Elizabethan Writings I. Copenhagen, 1951.
- Davenport, W. A. *The Art of the Gawain-Poet*. London, 1978.
- Davies, J. H. *Musicalia: sources of information in music*. Oxford, 1966.
- Davies, R. T. *Medieval English Lyrics*. London, 1965.
- Davis, Bertram H. 'Thomas Percy, The Reynold's Portrait and The Northumberland House Fire.' *Review of English Studies*, NS 33, 129 (1982),

- 23-33.
- Dearing, Vinton A. *Principles and Practice of Textual Analysis*. Berkeley, 1974.
- Dennis, Leah. 'Thomas Percy: Antiquarian vs. Man of Taste.' *PMLA*, 57, 1, 1 (1942), 140-54.
- Dickinson, W. C. *Scotland from the Earliest Times to 1603*. Revd. A. A. M. Duncan. 3rd edn. Oxford, 1977.
- Diehl, H. '“For no theves shall come thereto”': Symbolic Detail in *The Squyr of Lowe Degre*.' *American Benedictine Review*, 32, 2 (1981), 140-55.
- Donovan, M. J. *The Breton Lai: A Guide to Varieties*. London, 1969.
- Dorson, R. M. *The British Folklorists: A History*. London, 1968.
- Duckles, Vincent, and F. B. Zimmerman. *Words to Music*. Los Angeles, 1967.
- Dundes, Alan, and Robert A. Georges. 'Some Minor Genres of Obscene Folklore.' *Journal of American Folklore*, 75 (1962), 221-226.
- Duzee, Mabel van, ed. *A Medieval Romance of Friendship: Eger and Grime*. New York, 1963.
- Elderton, Sir William. 'William Elderton: Ballad Writer.' *The Genealogists' Magazine*, 2, 11 (1953), 378-82.
- Ellegaard, Alvar. *A Statistical Method for Determining Authorship: The 'Junius Letters' 1769-1772*. No. 13 of Gothenberg Studies in English. Gothenberg, 1962.
- Elliott, R. W. V. *The Gawain Country*. Leeds, 1984.
- Entwhistle, W. J. *European Balladry*. Oxford, 1939.
- Espinasse, Francis. *Lancashire Worthies*. London, 1874.
- European Medieval Ballad: A Symposium*. Odense, 1978.
- Farrer, W. and J. Brownbill, eds. *Victoria History of the County of Lancaster*. Oxford, 1911; rpt. London, 1966.
- Fellowes, E. H. *The English School of Lutenist Song Writers*. London, 1922.
- Felver, C. S. 'Robert Armin's Fragment of the Bawdy Ballad of 'Mary Ambree'.' *Notes and Queries*, 7 (1960), 14-16.
- Ferguson, A. B. *The Indian Summer of English Chivalry*. Durham, N.C., 1960.
- Fewster, C. *Traditionality and genre in the Middle English Romance*. Cambridge, 1987.
- Firth, C. H. 'Ballads and Broad-sides.' In *Shakespeare's England*. Oxford, 1916, II, 511-38.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 'The Ballad History of the Reigns of Henry VII and Henry VIII.' *Transaction Royal History Society*, 3rd series, 2 (1908), 21-50.
- Fischer, David H. *Historian's Fallacies: Towards a Logic of Historical Thought*. London, 1971.
- Fisher, H. A. L. *The History of England from the Accession of Henry VII to the Death of Henry VIII*. Vol. 5 of *The Political History of England*. London, 1906.
- Forbes, E. G. *The Birth of Scientific Navigation*. Maritime Monographs and Reports, No. 10, London, 1974.
- Ford, Boris, ed. *Medieval Literature: Chaucer and the Alliterative Tradition*. Harmondsworth, 1982.
- \_\_\_\_\_ *Medieval Literature: The European Inheritance*. Harmondsworth, 1983.
- Fowler, David C. *A Literary History of the Popular Ballad*. Durham, N.C., 1968.
- Frankis, P. J. 'The Erotic Dream in Medieval English Lyrics.' *Soc. Néophilologique de Helsinki Bulletin*, 57 (1956), 228-37.
- Friedman, Albert B. 'A New Version of Musselburgh Field.' *Journal of American Folklore*, 66 (1953), 74-77.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 'Morgan Le Fay in *Sir Gawain and the Green Knight*.' *Speculum*, 35, 2 (1960), 260-274.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 'Percy's Folio Manuscript Revalued.' *Journal of English and*

- \_\_\_\_\_ *Germanic Philology*, 53 (1954), 524-31.
- \_\_\_\_\_ *The Ballad Revival: Studies in the Influence of Popular on Sophisticated Poetry*. Chicago, 1961.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 'The First Draft of Percy's *Reliques*.' *PMLA*, 69, 4, 1 (1954), 1233-49.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 'The Formulaic Improvisation Theory of Ballad Tradition — A Counterstatement.' *Journal of American Folklore*, 74 (1961), 113-15.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 'The Late Mediaeval Ballade and the Origin of Broadside Balladry.' *Medium Aevum*, 26 (1957), 95-110.
- Fromkin, V., ed. *Errors in Linguistic Performance*. New York, 1980.
- Gairdner, J. *The Battle of Bosworth*. London, 1895; rpt. Upminster, Essex, 1975.
- Gardiner, S. R. *History of the Civil War 1642 -1649*. New York, 1965.
- Garnes, Sara, and Z. S. Bond, 'A Slip of the Ear: A Snip of the Ear? A Slip of the Year?' In *Errors in Linguistic Performance*. Ed. V. Fromkin. New York, 1980, pp. 231-39.
- Gilchrist, Anne G. 'Some Additional Notes on the Traditional History of Certain Ballad-Tunes.' *English Folk Dance and Song Society*, 3, 4 (1936-39), 274-80.
- Goodman, A. and A. MacKay. 'A Castilian report on English affairs, 1486.' *English Historical Review*, 88, 346 (1973), 92-98.
- Goodman, Anthony. *The Wars of the Roses: Military Activity and English Society, 1452-1497*. London, 1981.
- Gradon, Pamela. *Form and Style in Early English Literature*. London, 1971.
- Graham, Winston. *The Spanish Armada*. London, 1972.
- Gresham, F. 'The Jew's Daughter: An Example of Ballad Variation.' *Journal of American Folklore*, 47, 186 (1934), 358-61.
- Gummere, F. B. *The Popular Ballad*. 1907; rpt. New York, 1959.
- Göller, Karl H., ed. *The Alliterative Morte Arthure*. Cambridge, 1981.
- Hall, Louis B. *The Knightly Tales of Sir Gawain*. Chicago, 1976.
- Halpert, H. 'Folklore and Obscenity: Definitions and Problems.' *Journal of American Folklore*, 75 (1962), 190-194.
- Halstead, C. A. *Richard III*. 2 vols. 1844; rpt. Dursley, Gloucs., 1977.
- Hamer, D. 'Editions of 'Chevy Chase'.' *Notes and Queries*, 164 (1933), 381-85, 398-401, 418-20.
- Hammer, Jacob. 'Some additional manuscripts of Geoffrey of Monmouth's *Historium Regum Britanniae*.' *Modern Language Quarterly*, 3 (1942), 235-42.
- Hanham, A. *Richard III and his Early Historians, 1483-1535*. Oxford, 1975.
- Harner, D. 'Editions of Chevy Chase.' *Notes and Queries*, 164 (1933), 381-85; 398-401; 418-20; 434-38.
- Harris, B. E., ed. *Victoria History of the Counties of England: A History of the County of Chester*. Vols. I to III. Oxford, 1978-80.
- Hart, E. F. 'The Answer-Poem of the Early Seventeenth Century.' *Review of English Studies*, NS 7 (1956), 19-29.
- Hart, Walter M. *Ballad and Epic: A Study in the Development of the Narrative Art*. 1907; rpt. New York, 1967.
- Heawood, Edward. 'The Position on the Sheet of Early Watermarks.' *The Library*, 9, 4th series (1929), 38-47.
- \_\_\_\_\_ *Watermarks: mainly of the 17th and 18th centuries*. Vol. I of *Monumenta Chartae Papyraceae Historiam Illustrantia*. Hilversum, 1950.
- Hector, L. C. *The Handwriting of English Documents*. 2nd edn. London, 1966.
- Hendren, J. W. *A Study of Ballad Rhythm*. Princeton, N.J., 1936.
- Hennell, Colonel Sir R. *A History of the King's Bodyguard*. London, 1904.
- Heywood, Thomas. *The Earls of Derby and the Verse Writers and Poets of the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries*. Chetham Society 29



- (1853).
- Hibbard, Laura A. *Mediaeval Romance in England: A study of the sources and analogues of the Non-cyclic Metrical Romances*. New edn. New York, 1963.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Mediaeval Romance in England*. New York, 1969.
- Hill, Christopher. *Society and Puritanism in Pre-Revolutionary England*. London, 1964.
- History of Northumberland*. Ed. M. H. Dodds. Newcastle-upon-Tyne, 1935. Vol. XIV.
- Hodgart, M. J. C. *The Ballads*. New York, 1962.
- Holt, J. C. *Robin Hood*. London, 1982.
- Holzappel, Otto, J. McGrew and I. Pio, eds. *The European Medieval Ballad: A Symposium*. Proceedings of the Second International Symposium; The Centre for the Study of Vernacular Literature in the Middle Ages. Odense, 1977.
- Hotopf, W. H. N. 'Semantic Similarity as a Factor in Whole-word Slips of the Tongue.' In *Errors in Linguistic Performance*. Ed. V. Fromkin. New York, 1980, pp. 97-109.
- Houck, Margaret. *Sources of the Roman de Brut of Wace*. Folcroft, Penn., 1974.
- Howard, D. R. 'Structure and Symmetry in *Sir Gawain*.' In *Critical Studies in Sir Gawain and the Green Knight*. Ed. D. R. Howard and C. Zacher. London, 1968, pp. 159-173.
- Howarth, Robert G. *Two Elizabethan Writers of Fiction: Thomas Nashe and Thomas Deloney*. Cape Town, 1956.
- Hugill, R. *Castles and Peles of Cumberland and Westmorland*. Newcastle-upon-Tyne, 1977.
- Hulbert, James. R. 'Syr Gawain and the Grene Knyzt.' *Modern Philology*, 13 (1915-16), 433-62, 669-730.
- Hulbert, J. R. 'Quatrains in Middle English Alliterative Poems.' *Modern Philology*, 48, 2 (1950), 73-81.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 'The "West Midland" of the Romances.' *Modern Philology*, 19, 1 (1921), 1-16.
- Hunt, C. 'Scottish Ballads and Music in the Robert White Collection in the University Library, Newcastle upon Tyne.' *Bibliothek*, 5 (1968), 138-41.
- Husain, B. M. C. *Cheshire under the Norman Earls, 1066-1237*. Chester, 1973.
- Hutton, W. *The Battle of Bosworth Field, between Richard the Third and Henry, Earl of Richmond, August 22, 1485*. 2nd edn. with additions by J. Nichols. London, 1813.
- Irvine, W. Fergusson. 'The Early Stanleys.' *Transactions of the Historic Society of Lancashire and Cheshire*, 105 (1953), 47-68.
- Jacobs, Nicolas. 'Old French "Degaré" and Middle English "Degarre" and "Deswarre".' *Notes and Queries*, 225 (1970), 164-65.
- Jefferson, B. L. 'A note on *The Squyr of Lowe Degre*.' *Modern Language Notes*, 28, 4 (1913), 102-103.
- Johnston, A. *Enchanted Ground*. London, 1964.
- Jones, James H. 'Commonplace and Memorization in the Oral Tradition of the English and Scottish Popular Ballads.' *Journal of American Folklore*, 74, 292 (1961), 97-112.
- Kane, George. *Middle English Literature: A Critical Study of the Romances, The Religious Lyrics, 'Piers Plowman'*. 1951; rpt. New York, 1970.
- Kastendieck, M. M. *England's Musical Poet: Thomas Campion*. Oxford, 1938; rpt. New York, 1963.
- Kendall, P. M. *Richard the Third*. London, 1955.
- Kiernan, K. S. "'Undo Your Door" and the Order of Chivalry.' *Studies in Philology*, 70, 4 (1973), 345-66.
- Kiteley, J. F. 'The Knight who cared for his life.' In *Critical Studies in Sir Gawain and the Green Knight*. Ed. D. R. Howard and C.

- Zacher. London, 1968, pp. 182-212.
- Kittredge, G. L. *A Study of Gawain and the Green Knight*. n.p. 1916; rpt. Gloucester, Mass., 1960.
- Knight, Stephen, T. 'The oral transmission of *Sir Launfal*.' *Medium Aevum*, 38, 2 (1969), 164-69.
- Kristensson, G. *A Survey of Middle English Dialects 1290-1350: The Six Northern Counties and Lincolnshire*. Lund, 1967.
- Lander, J. R. *Crown and Nobility 1450-1509*. London, 1976.
- Lawlis, Merrit E. *Apology for the Middle Class: The Dramatic Novels of Thomas Deloney*. Bloomington, Ind., 1960.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 'Shakespeare, Deloney and the Earliest Text of the Arthur Ballad.' *Harvard Library Bulletin*, 10 (1956), 130-35.
- Laws, G. Malcolm. *American Balladry from British Broad-sides*. Philadelphia, 1957.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The British Literary Ballad*. Carbondale, Illinois, 1972.
- Lawton, D. A., ed. *Middle English Alliterative Poetry and its Literary Background*. Cambridge, 1982.
- Lawton, David A. 'Scottish Field: Alliterative Verse and Stanley Encomium in the Percy Folio.' *Leeds Studies in English*, NS 10 (1978), 42-57.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 'The Unity of Middle English Alliterative Poetry.' *Speculum*, 58, 1 (1983), 72-93.
- Legman, G. 'Misconceptions in Erotic Folklore.' *Journal of American Folklore*, 75 (1962), 200-208.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Horn Book: Studies in Erotic Folklore and Bibliography*. New York, 1964.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 'Towards a Motif Index of Erotic Humour.' *Journal of American Folklore*, 75 (1962), 227-48.
- Levine, Mortimer. 'Richard III — Usurper or Lawful King?.' *Speculum*, 34 (1959), 191-401.
- Lewis, C. Day. *The Lyric Impulse*. London, 1965.
- Lewis, C. S. 'The Anthropological Approach.' In *Critical Studies of Sir Gawain and the Green Knight*. Ed. D. R. Howard and C. Zacher. London, 1968, 59-71.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Discarded Image: An Introduction to Medieval and Renaissance Literature*. 1964; rpt. London, 1974.
- Lingard, John. *Abridgement of the History of England*. Ed. J. Burke. 15th edn. Dublin, n.d.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The History of England from the first invasion by the Romans to the Accession of William and Mary in 1688*. 10 vols. 5th edn. London, 1849.
- Liu, Tai. *Discord in Zion: The Puritan Divines and the Puritan Revolution 1640-1660*. The Hague, 1973.
- Long, John H. 'The Ballad Medley and the Fool.' *Studies in Philology*, 67 (1970), 505-16
- Loomis, Laura Hibbard. 'Gawain and the Green Knight.' In *Arthurian Literature in the Middle Ages*. Ed. R. S. Loomis. Oxford, 1959, pp. 528-40.
- Loomis, Roger S. *Arthurian Literature in the Middle Ages*. Oxford, 1959.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Development of Arthurian Romance*. New York, 1963.
- Lowbury, Edward, T. Salter and A. Young. *Thomas Campion: Poet, Composer, Physician*. London, 1970.
- Lyle, E. B., ed. *Ballad Studies*. Totowa, N.J., 1976.
- Lyle, E. B. 'The Turk and Gawain as a Source of *Thomas of Erceldoune*.' *Forum for Modern Language Studies*, 6, 2 (1970), 98-102.
- Mackenzie, K. R. H., ed. *Marvellous Adventures and Rare Conceits of Master Tyll Owl-glass*. London, 1890.
- Mackenzie, M. L. 'The Great Ballad Collectors: Percy, Herd and Ritson.' *Studies in Scottish Literature*, 2, 2 (1964), 213-233
- Mackenzie, W. M. *The Secret of Flodden with the 'Rout of the Scots': a translation of the contemporary Italian poem 'La Rotta de Scocesi'*.

- Edinburgh, 1931.
- Markham, A. M. 'The Meaning of Sir Gawain and the Green Knight.' *PMLA*, 72 (1957), 574-86. Rpt. in 'Sir Gawain' and 'Pearl': *Critical Essays*. Ed. R. J. Blanch. London, 1966, pp. 159-75.
- Martin, B. K. 'Sir Launfal and the Folktale.' *Med. Aevum*, 35 (1966), 199-210.
- Matheson, L. M. 'A Fragment of Sir Eglamour of Artois.' *English Language Notes*, 17, 3 (1980), 165-68.
- Maxwell, Sir Herbert, *A History of the House of Douglas from the earliest times down to the legislative union of England and Scotland*. 2 vols. London, 1902.
- McFarlane, K. B.,  
McIntosh, A. *The Nobility of Later Medieval England*. Oxford, 1973.  
'A New Approach to Middle English Dialectology.' *English Studies*, 44 (1963), 1-11.
- McMillan, D. J. "Five Traditional Medieval Historical Ballads and the Nature of Oral Transmission." Diss. Maryland 1963.  
'Some Popular Views of Four Mediaeval Battles.' *Southern Folklore Quarterly*, 31, 2 (1966), 179-91.
- McSpadden, J. W. *Stories of Robin Hood*. London, 1906.
- Metlitzki, Dorothee. *The Matter of Araby in Medieval England*. New Haven, 1977.
- Metzner, E. E. 'Lower Germany, England, Denmark and the Problem of Ballad Origins.' In *The European Medieval Ballad*. Odense, 1978, pp. 26-39.
- Miles, Josephine. *The Primary Language of Poetry in the 1640s*. 1948; rpt. Westport, Conn., 1979.
- Millican, C. B. 'The Origin of the Ballad "Kinge : Arthurs Death" in the Percy Folio MS.' *PMLA*, 46, 4 (1931), 1020-25.
- Mills, M. 'Christian Significance and Romance Tradition in SGGK.' In *Critical Studies of Sir Gawain and the Green Knight*. Ed. D. R. Howard and C. Zacher. London, 1968, pp. 85-105.
- Mohl, R. *The Three Estates in Medieval and Renaissance Literature*. New York, 1933.
- Moore, Arthur K. 'The Literary Status of the English Popular Ballad.' *Comparative Literature*, 10, 1 (1958), 1-20.
- Moore, John R. 'The Influence of Transmission on the English Ballads.' *Modern Language Review*, 11, 4 (1916), 386-408.
- Moorman, Charles. *Editing the Middle English Manuscript*. Jackson, Mississippi, 1975.
- Morrah, P. *Prince Rupert of the Rhine*. London, 1976.
- Morrill, J., ed. *Reactions to the English Civil War 1642-1649*. London, 1982.
- Morris, B. *John Cleveland (1613-658), A Bibliography of his Poems*. London, 1967.
- Morton, A. Q. *Literary Detection: How to prove authorship and fraud in literature and documents*. New York, 1978.
- Music in English Renaissance Drama*. Ed. John H. Long. Lexington, 1968.
- Nearing, Homer. "English Historical Poetry, 1599-1641." Diss. Pennsylvania 1945.
- Needham, G. B. 'New Light on Maids "Leading Apes in Hell".' *Journal of American Folklore*, 75 (1962), 106-119.
- Nettel, Reginald. *Seven Centuries of Popular Song: A Social History of Urban Ditties*. London, 1956.
- Nicolas, H. *History of the Battle of Agincourt, and of the Expedition of Henry the Fifth into France in 1415*. 2nd edn. London, 1832; facsimile, London, 1970.  
*History of the Orders of Knighthood of the British Empire, of the Order of Guelphs of Hanover, and of the Medals, Clasps and Crosses conferred from Naval and Military services*. 4 vols.

- London, 1842.
- Nicolson, J. and R. Burn. *The History of the Antiquities of the Counties of Westmorland and Cumberland*. 2 vols. London, 1777; rpt. Wakefield, 1976.
- Norman, V. *Arms and Armour*. Sydney, 1972.
- Nygaard, Holger O. 'Popular Ballad and Medieval Romance.' In *Ballad Studies* Ed. E. B. Lyle. Totowa, N.J., 1976, pp. 1-19.
- Oakden, James P. and E. R. Innes. *Alliterative Poetry in Middle English*. I *The Dialectal and Metrical Survey*. Manchester, 1930. II *A Survey of the Traditions*. Manchester, 1935. Rpt. 2 vols. as 1. Hamden, Conn., 1968.
- Oakeshott, R. Ewart. *A Knight and his Castle*. Guildford, Surrey, 1976.
- Oldman, C. B. 'Watermark Dates in English Paper.' *The Library*, 4th series, 25 (1945), 70-71.
- Oman, Charles. *A History of the Art of War in the Middle Ages*. 2nd edn. New York, 1924. Vol. II (AD 1278-1485).
- Ormerod, George. *The History of the County Palatine and City of Chester*. 3 vols. Revised T. Helsby. 2nd edn. London, 1882; rpt. Manchester, 1980.
- Packe, Michael. *King Edward III*. Ed. L. C. B. Seaman. London, 1983.
- Paget, Sir Julian. *The Yeomen of the Guard: 500 Years' Service, 1485-1985*. Poole, 1984.
- Palgrave, Sir Francis. *The History of Normandy and of England*. London, 1851. Vol. I.
- Palmer, J. J. N., ed. *Froissart: Historian*. Woodbridge, Suffolk, 1981.
- Pearsall, Derek. *Old English and Middle English Poetry*. London, 1977.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 'Rhetorical 'Descriptio' in 'Sir Gawain and the Green Knight'.' *Modern Language Review*, 50, 2 (1955), 129-134.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 'The Development of Middle English Romance.' *Mediaeval Studies*, 27 (1965), 91-116.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 'The English Romance in the Fifteenth Century.' *Essays and Studies*, NS 29 (1976), 56-83.
- Pease, H. *The Lord Wardens of the Marches of England and Scotland*. London, 1913.
- Peltz, Catherine W. 'Thomas Campion, An Elizabethan Neo-Classicist.' *Modern Language Quarterly*, 11, 1 (1950), 3-6.
- Perrin, W. G. *British Flags, Their Early History and their Development at Sea*. Cambridge, 1922.
- Perroy, E. *The Hundred Years War*. Trans. B. Wells. London, 1965.
- Peters, Edward. *The Shadow King: Rex Inutilis in Medieval Law and Literature, 751-1327*. New Haven, 1970.
- Pike, K. L. *Language in relation to a unified theory of the structure of human behaviour*. 2nd edn. The Hague, 1971.
- Porteus, T. C. 'The Hundred of Leyland in Lancashire.' *Chetham Society*, NS 90 (1931), 1-119.
- Poulton, Diana. 'The black-letter broadside ballad and its music.' *Early Music*, 9, 4 (1981), 427-37.
- Pound, Louise. 'On the Dating of English and Scottish Ballads.' *PMLA*, 47, 1 (1932), 10-16.
- Pratt, S. M. 'The Authorship of Four Poems in the "Garland of Good Will".' *Notes and Queries*, NS 1, 1 (1954), 327-328.
- Preston, Thomas. *The Yeomen of the Guard: Their History from 1485-1885*. London, [1885].
- Propp, Vladimir. *Morphology of the Folk Tale*. Trans. L. Scott. Ed. L. A. Wagner. Introd. A. Dundes. 2nd edn. London, 1968.
- Putnam, George H. *Books and their Makers During the Middle Ages*. 2 vols. 1896-97; rpt. New York, 1962.
- Quicherat, J., ed. *Procès de Condemnation et de Réhabilitation de Jeanne d'Arc*

- dite La Pucelle*. Paris, 1847.
- Ramsay, Sir James. *Lancaster and York: A Century of English History (AD 1399-1485)*. 2 vols. Oxford, 1892; facsimile, Ann Arbor, 1978. Vol. II.
- Renwick, W. L. and H. Orton. *The Beginnings of English Literature to Skelton, 1509*. 3rd. edn. London, 1966.
- Reuter, O. R. 'Thomas Deloney's *Thomas of Reading* and *The Pinder of Wakefield*. *Neuphilologische Mitteilungen*, 4, 77 (1976) 599-609.
- Richardson, D. A. 'The Golden Mean in *Campion's Airs*.' *Comparative Literature*, 30 (1978), 108-32.
- Richmond, V. B. *Laments for the Dead in Medieval Narrative*. Pittsburgh, 1966.
- Richmond, W. E. 'A New Look at the Wheel: An Essay in Defining the Ballad.' In *The European Medieval Ballad*. Odense, 1978, pp. 86-97.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 'Ballad Place Names.' *Journal of American Folklore*, 59 (1946), 263-67.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 'The Development of the Popular Ballad: A New Theory.' *Genre*, 3, 1 (1970), 198-204.
- Rickert, Edith. *Early English Romances in Verse: Done into Modern English by Edith Rickert: Romances of Friendship*. New York, 1967.
- \_\_\_\_\_ *Early English Romances in Verse: Done into Modern English by Edith Rickert: Romances of Love*. New York, 1966.
- Ridley, J. *The Roundheads*. London, 1976.
- Rimbault, E. F. *Musical Illustrations of Bishop Percy's 'Reliques of Ancient English Poetry'*. London, 1850, rpt. Norwood, Pa., 1973.
- Ringler, William A. 'Bishop Percy's Quarto Manuscript (British Museum MS Additional 34064) and Nicholas Breton.' *Philology Quarterly*, 54,1 (1975), 26-39.
- Risdill-Smith, G. and M. Toynbee. *Leaders of the Civil Wars 1642-1648*. Kineton, Warwickshire, 1977.
- Rivers, Bryan. 'The Focus of Satire in *The Squire of Low Degree*.' *English Studies in Canada*, 7, 4 (1981), 379-87.
- Rollins, Hyder E. 'Concerning Bodleian MS. Ashmole 48.' *Modern Language Notes*, 24, 6 (1919), 340-51.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 'The Black Letter Broadside Ballad.' *PMLA*, NS 27, 1 (1919), 258-339.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 'The Troilus - Cressida Story from Chaucer to Shakespeare.' *PMLA*, 32, NS 25 (1917), 383-429.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 'Thomas Deloney and Brian Melbanke: Notes on Sources.' *Harvard Studies and Notes in Philology and Literature*, 19, (1937), 219-25.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 'Thomas Deloney's Euphuistic Learning and *The Forest*.' *PMLA*, 50, 3 (1935), 679-86.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 'William Elderton: Elizabethan Actor and Ballad Writer.' *Studies in Philology*, 27 (1920), 199-45.
- Rosenberg, B. A. 'The Morphology of the Middle English Metrical Romance.' *Journal of Popular Culture*, I, 1 (1967), 63-77.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 'The Three Tales of *Sir Degaré*.' *Neuphilologische Mitteilungen*, 76 (1975), 39-51.
- Rosenthal, J. T. 'The King's 'Wicked Advisors' and Medieval Baronial Rebellions.' *Political Science Quarterly*, 82 (1967), 595-618.
- Ross, Charles. *Richard III*. London, 1981.
- Rule, Margaret. *The Mary Rose*. London, 1982.
- Salomon, L. B. *The Devil Take Her! A Study of the Rebellious Lover in English Poetry*. New York, 1961.
- Samuels, M. L. 'Spelling and Dialect in the Late and Post- Middle English Periods.' In *So meny people longages and tonges*. Ed. M. Benskin and M. L. Samuels. Edinburgh, 1981.

- Scattergood, V. J. *Politics and Poetry in the Fifteenth Century*. London, 1971.
- Schofield, W. H. *English Literature from the Norman Conquest to Chaucer*. London, 1906.
- Scholes, Percy A. *The Puritans and Music in England and New England*. London, 1934.
- Schwegler, R. A. "Sources of the Ballads in Bishop Percy's Folio Manuscripts." Diss. Chicago 1978.
- Scott, Sir Walter. *Minstrelsy of the Scottish Border*. 3rd edn. Edinburgh, 1806. Vol. I.
- Shears, F. S. *Froissart: Chronicler and Poet*. London, 1930.
- Shepard, Leslie. *John Pitts, Ballad Printer of Seven Dials, London, 1765-1844 with a short account of his predecessors in the Ballad & Chapbook Trade*. London, 1969.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Broadside Ballad: A Study in Origins and Meaning*. London, 1962.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 'The Finding of the Percy Folio Manuscript: A Claim of Prior Discovery.' *Notes and Queries*, NS 14, 1 (1967), 415-16.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The History of Street Literature*. Newton Abbot, Devon, 1973.
- Silverstein, T. 'The Art of *Sir Gawain and the Green Knight*. In *Critical Studies of Sir Gawain and the Green Knight*. Ed. D. R. Howard and C. Zacher. London, 1968, pp. 182-212.
- Simeone, William E. 'More Robin Hood Bibliography.' *Notes and Queries*, 196 (1951), 4-5.
- Simons, E. N. *Henry VII: The First Tudor King*. London, 1968.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Reign of Edward IV*. London, 1966.
- Simpson, Claude. *The British Broadside Ballad and its Music*. New Brunswick, N.J., 1966.
- Simpson, J. 'Otherworld Adventure in an Icelandic Saga.' *Folklore*, 77 (1966), 1-20.
- Simpson, P. 'Walkley's Piracy of Wither's Poems in 1620.' *The Library*, 4th series, 6 (1926), 271-277.
- Sinclair, J. M. 'When is a poem like a sunset?.' *Review of English Literature*, 6 (1965), 76-91.
- Slover, Clark H. "'Sire Degarre": A Study of A Mediaeval Hack Writer's Methods.' *Studies in English: University of Texas Bulletin*, No. 3133 (1931), 6-23.
- Smithers, G. V. 'Story Patterns in Some Breton Lays.' *Medium Aevum*, 22, 2 (1953), 61-92.
- Solomon, J. 'The Lesson of *Sir Gawain*.' In *Critical Studies of Sir Gawain and the Green Knight*. Ed. D. R. Howard and C. Zacher. London, 1968, pp. 267-78.
- Spearing, A. C. 'Gawain's Speeches and the Poetry of "Cortaysye".' In *Critical Studies of Sir Gawain and the Green Knight*. Ed. D. R. Howard and C. Zacher. London, 1968, pp. 174-81.
- Spector, S. 'Symmetry in Watermark Sequences.' *Studies in Bibliography*, 31 (1978), 162-78.
- Speirs, John. *Medieval English Poetry: The Non-Chaucerian Tradition*. London, 1971.
- Spink, I. 'Campion's Entertainment at Brougham Castle, 1617.' In *Music in English Renaissance Drama*. Ed. J. H. Long. Lexington, 1968.
- Spufford, Margaret. *Small Books and Pleasant Histories: Popular fiction and its readership in seventeenth-century England*. London, 1981.
- Steenstrup, J. C. H. R. *Medieval Popular Ballad*. Copenhagen, 1891. Trans. E. G. Cox. Introd. D. C. Fowler. Seattle, 1968.
- Stenton, Sir Frank, Stephenson, C. H. *Anglo-Saxon England*. 3rd edn. Oxford, 1971.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Gawain Romances of the Percy Folio Manuscript." Diss.

- York 1975.
- Stevenson, Allen H. 'A Critical Study of Heawood's *Watermarks Mainly of the 17th and 18th Centuries*.' *Papers of the Bibliographical Society of America*, 45 (1951), 23-36.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 'New Uses of Watermarks as Bibliographical Evidence.' *Papers of the Bibliographical Society of the University of Virginia*, 1 (1948-49), 151-82.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 'Watermarks are Twins.' *Studies in Bibliography*, 4 (1951-52), 57-91.
- Stewart, George R. 'The Meaning of *Bachelor* in Middle English.' *Philological Quarterly*, 13, 4 (1934), 40-47.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 'The Meter of the Popular Ballad.' *PMLA*, 40, 4 (1925), 933-62.
- Stokoe, William C. 'The Double problem of *Sir Degaré*.' *PMLA*, 70 (1955), 518-34.
- Storey, R. L. *The Reign of Henry VII*. London, 1968.
- Sweet's Anglo-Saxon Reader*. Rev. D. Whitelock. 15th edn. Oxford, 1970.
- Sylvester, D. *A History of Cheshire*. Henley-on-Thames, 1971.
- Taylor, A. P. 'The Sick Tune.' *Modern Language Notes*, 65 (1950), 345-47.
- Taylor, D. S. 'The Lineage and Birth of Sir Aldingar.' *Journal of American Folklore*, 65 (1952), 139-47.
- Taylor, James. *The Great Historic Families of Scotland*. London, 1889.
- Taylor, R. *The Political Prophecy in England*. New York, 1911.
- Third part of Miscellany Poems*. Ed. and trans. John Dryden. 5th edn. London, 1727.
- Thompson, Roger. *Unfit for Modest Ears*. London, 1979.
- Thomson, R. S. 'The Transmission of Chevy Chase.' *Southern Folklore Quarterly*, 39 (1975), 63-82.
- Tillyard, E. M. W. *The Elizabethan World Picture*. London, 1943; rpt. London, 1958.
- Todorov, T. 'Les catégories du récit littéraire.' *Communications*, 8 (1966), 125-51.
- Trounce, A. McI. 'English Tail Rhyme Romances.' *Medium Aevum*, 1, 1 (1932), 87-108.
- Turville-Petre, T. *The Alliterative Revival*. Cambridge, 1977.
- Ullmann, W. *Medieval Political Thought*. Harmondsworth, 1975.
- Wagner, Bruce L. "The Popular Erotic Lyric in Middle English." Diss. Temple University 1977.
- Walpole, R. N. 'The *Pèlerinage de Charlemagne*: Poem, Legend and Problem.' *Romance Philology*, 8, 1 (1954), 173-186.
- Ward, John. 'Apropos *The British Broadside Ballad and its Music*.' *Journal American Musicological Society*, 20 (1967), 28-86.
- Wark, K. R. *Elizabethan Recusancy in Cheshire*. Manchester, 1971.
- Waters, David W. *The Art of Navigation in England in Elizabethan and Early Stuart Times*. 2nd edn. with revisions. Greenwich, 1978.
- Watkins-Jones, A. 'Bishop Percy and the Scottish Ballads.' *Essays and Studies*, 28 (1933), 110-121.
- Wedgwood, C. V. *Poetry and Politics under the Stuarts*. Cambridge, 1960.
- Wells, Evelyn K. 'Playford Tunes and Broadside Ballads.' *English Folkdance and Song Society*, 3, 4 (1936-39), 259-73.
- \_\_\_\_\_ *The Ballad Tree*. New York, 1950.
- White, R. B. 'A Note on the Green Knight's Red Eyes.' In *Critical Studies of Sir Gawain and the Green Knight*. Ed. D. R. Howard and C. Zacher. London, 1968, pp. 223-226.
- Whitehead, John. *The Guardian of the Grail*. London, 1959.
- Williams, Daniel. "'A place mete for twoo battayles to encountre': The siting of the Battle of Bosworth, 1485." *The Ricardian*, 7, 92 (1986), 86-96.
- Williams, D. T. *The Battle of Bosworth*. Leicester, 1973.
- Williamson, George. *Seventeenth Century Contexts*. Rev. edn. Chicago, 1969.

- Willson, D. Harris. *King James VI and I*. London, 1956.
- Wilson, Anne. *Traditional Romance and Tale: How Stories Mean*. Ipswich, 1976.
- Wilson, Edward. 'Sir Gawain and the Green Knight and the Stanley Family of Stanley, Storeton, and Hooton.' *Review of English Studies*, NS 30 (1979), 308-16.
- Wilson, J. 'Authorship of the Chronicle of Lanercost.' *Scottish Historical Review*, 10, 2, 38 (1913), 138-55.
- Wilson, R. H. 'Malory and the Ballad "King Arthur's death".' *Mediaevalia et Humanistica*, NS 6 (1975), 141-49.
- Wilson, R. M. *Early Middle English Literature*. London, 1951.
- Wittig, Susan. *Stylistic and Narrative Structures in the Middle English Romances*. London, 1978.
- Woodward, G. W. O. *Reformation and Resurgence: England in the Sixteenth Century*. London, 1963.
- Wright, Louis B. *Middle-Class Culture in Elizabethan England*. New York, 1958.
- Wyld, Henry Cecil. *A History of Modern Colloquial English*. 3rd edn. Oxford, 1956.
- . *Studies in English Phonetics from Surrey to Pope*. London, 1923.
- Wylie, J. H. *The Reign of Henry the Fifth*. Vol. I. Cambridge 1914; rpt. New York, 1968. Vol. II. Cambridge, 1919. Vol. III, with W.T. Waugh, Cambridge, 1929.
- Wyn-Jones, E. 'Wales and Bosworth Field — Selective Historiography?' *Journal of the National Library of Wales*, 21, 1 (1979), 43-75.
- Young, P. and R. Holmes. *The English Civil War: A Military History of the Three Civil Wars, 1642-1651*. London, 1974.
- Yule, G. Udney. *The Statistical Study of Literary Vocabulary*. Cambridge, 1944.
- Zaret, Daniel. *The Heavenly Contract: Ideology and Organisation in Pre-Revolutionary Puritanism*. Chicago, 1985.